

# What we talk about when we talk about teaching: Teacher knowledge sources in an online community of practice

by Timothy Hampson

British Council's Master's Dissertation Awards 2021  
Commendation



Department of Education, University of Oxford

**What we talk about when we talk about  
teaching: Teacher knowledge sources in an online  
community of practice**

Timothy Hampson

Word Count: 20,000

Dissertation submitted to the University of Oxford in partial fulfilment of the requirements  
for the degree of MSc in Applied Linguistics for Language Teaching

August 2020

## Acknowledgements.

This paper is dedicated to the memory of my father who passed away while I was writing it. Without his encouragement and financial support, I would not have been able to complete this project and I am sorry he never got to see it finished.

I also want to thank my family and partner for their advice and emotional support as I spoke to them endlessly about an incredibly niche project. My cohort, and especially Kelly and Andie, were always on hand to offer help and advice.

Finally, I want to thank Dr Heath Rose for going above and beyond in being a supportive supervisor. When a student approaches you to say they've developed a six-million-word corpus, a typical response would be 'find something more manageable'. It takes someone special to say 'go for it'.

## Abstract

Understanding the ways in which teachers develop as teachers and construct pedagogical knowledge is essential to ensure that this development and knowledge construction is effective. One specific concern is that research is not being read by or otherwise communicated to teachers. Research into this area has relied on introspection, teacher self-report or stimulated recall methodologies. However, this paper problematises these approaches and suggests the analysis of texts written by teachers as an alternative or supplement for these approaches.

For this a forum for teachers was scraped to create a 5.9 million word corpus of teachers discussing teaching. A mixed grounded theory approach was taken to the analysis of this corpus beginning with random sampling to categorise and quantify knowledge sources before using purposive sampling to further explore attitudes towards these knowledge sources. The study found that teachers used a diverse range of knowledge sources to create knowledge in the forum with *interaction* and *ideas* being more common than *resources* and *experience*. The teachers' attitudes towards knowledge sources were generally positive. However, they had reservations about research as overly jargon filled and too often proving the obvious. Furthermore, the teachers in the forum saw themselves as creators rather than consumers of teaching knowledge and highlighted the importance of knowledge being created with regards to specific classroom contexts.

The study offers set of fifteen codes for categorising research. It argues that while researchers may view teachers as 'research deficient', this is not the way in which teachers viewed themselves. Furthermore, it recommends that to treat researchers and teachers as equals, it is necessary to treat teachers as knowledge builders equal with researchers rather than the consumers of research output.

# Table of Contents

## **1. Introduction 5**

- 1.1. *Rationale* 5
- 1.2. *Aims* 6
- 1.3. *Overview* 7
- 1.4. *Context* 7
- 1.5. *Research Questions* 8
- 1.6. *Reflexivity and the literature review* 8

## **2. Initial Literature Review 10**

- 2.1. *Reflective literature* 10
- 2.2. *Intervention studies* 10
- 2.3. *Reported belief studies* 11
- 2.4. *Stimulated recall* 11
  - 2.4.1. *Consciousness and stimulated recall* 11
  - 2.4.2. *Responses to validity concerns in stimulated recall* 12
  - 2.4.3. *A review of stimulated recall studies* 13
  - 2.4.4. *Teacher writing vs stimulated recall* 15

## **3. Methodology Discussion 16**

- 3.1. *Mixed grounded theory* 17
  - 3.1.1. *Grounded theory* 17
  - 3.1.2. *Mixed methods, methodology and paradigms* 17
- 3.2. *Constructivism* 18
- 3.3. *Naturalism and Trustworthiness* 20
  - 3.3.1. *Credibility* 21
  - 3.3.2. *Transferability* 22
  - 3.3.3. *Dependability and Conformability* 23

## **4. Research Procedure 25**

- 4.1. *Data Sources* 25
- 4.2. *Procedure* 25
  - 4.2.1. *Stage One—Web Scraping* 26
  - 4.2.1. *Stage Two—Categorizing Knowledge Sources* 27
  - 4.2.2. *Stage Three — Qualitative corpus analysis* 28
    - Estimation of source usage* 28
    - Calculating inter-coder reliability* 28
    - Calculating code correlation* 28
  - 4.2.3. *Stage Four – Analysis of attitudes towards knowledge sources* 29
  - 4.2.4. *Activities undertaken throughout the research process* 29
    - Interviews* 29
    - Peer debriefing* 30
- 4.3. *Ethics* 30

## **5. Findings 30**

### *5.1. Description of knowledge sources (RQ1) 31*

#### 5.1.1. Experience 31

Others' Teaching Experience 31

Others' non-teaching experience 32

Own classroom experience 33

Classroom Adjacent 34

Learning experience 34

Out of school 35

Teacher education 36

#### 5.1.2. Ideas 37

Dogme 37

Logic and hypotheticals 38

Personal knowledge and opinion 39

Thinkers, theories and methodologies 41

#### 5.1.3. Interaction 42

Other forum posts 42

Questioning and answering 42

#### 5.1.4. Resources 43

Non-Teaching Resources 43

Teaching Resources 44

### *5.2. Quantitative analysis of knowledge sources 45*

#### 5.2.1. Measures of frequency 45

#### 5.2.2. Measures of co-occurrence 47

#### 5.2.3. Measures of inter-coder reliability 50

### *5.3. Description of attitudes towards knowledge sources 51*

#### 5.3.1. Attitudes towards experience as a knowledge source 51

#### 5.3.2. Attitudes towards ideas as a knowledge source 52

#### 5.3.1. Attitudes towards interaction as a knowledge source 53

#### 5.3.1. Attitudes towards resources 54

## **6. Discussion 56**

### *6.1. Knowledge building as postmethod 58*

### *6.2. Practical and symbolic activity 59*

## **7. Conclusion 61**

### *7.1. Limitations 61*

### *7.2. Suggestions for further research in this area 62*

### *7.3. Recommendations for practice 62*

## **8. References 63**

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Rationale

Cook (2015), in his article describing the current state of applied linguistics research, writes that despite the field's ever-increasing scope,

applied linguistics, named as such, continues in many fora to be predominately about 'second language' teaching and learning, and about transmitting insights from research to practice, just as it was in the beginning, while those who are interested in other 'real-world problems in which language is a central issue' generally publish elsewhere and speak at other conferences" (p. 427)

While language teaching remains at the core of applied linguistics, there is little evidence that these recommendations are making their way into classrooms. Rose (2019) presents the state of the field as "a research community that talks to other researchers and a teaching community that talks to other teachers." (2019, p. 898). It has been argued that in several areas research has been slow to translate into practice. For example, Paran (2017) writes that despite a broad consensus that extensive reading (ER) is beneficial for learning, "ER has still not made the inroads into ELT practice that one would have expected" (p. 503). Similarly, Galloway (2017) writes that while there is a consensus in the literature against the use of 'native' speaker norms, the English language teaching (ELT) profession has been slow to adapt to reflect this. This poses a significant issue for the research community. If the knowledge generated by research isn't making its way into classrooms, researchers may be labouring under a false assumption of utility. Put bluntly, it matters little how good the pedagogical knowledge generated by research is if no one is paying attention to it.

Furthermore, it has been argued that a disconnect between teachers and researchers has led to a decline in the classroom utility of research. McKinley (2019) writes that in recent years there has been an increased pressure on researchers to focus on high-impact journals which are:

often more concerned with controlled studies underpinned by methodological rigour than in real-world educational practices, leading TESOL researchers to not only abandon contextualised holistic research in favour of controlled abstract research, but also to undervalue teaching itself. (p. 8)

Maley (2016) writes that research is often “focused on facts which would be obvious even to an uninformed observer” (p. 3) giving the example of a 200 page long PhD thesis proving that anxiety is harmful to listening comprehension.

Even when research does make its way into the classroom, a lack of teacher involvement in its creation can cause issues. Medgyes (1986) argues that a lack of engagement with teachers meant that the version of communicative language teaching that was rolled out into schools was too often impractical for teachers. To improve the relevance of research to teachers it has been suggested that there be more of a place for holistic professionals who act as both teachers and researchers (McKinley, 2019) or for researchers to collaborate more closely with teachers (Rose, 2019). However, Medgyes (2017) writes that “Until proven otherwise, the pedagogical relevance of language-related academic research is of dubious value and the role researchers play may be considered parasitical.” (p.496) and calls on teachers to rely on one another, rather than researchers, for development.

However, the bulk of the literature on this issue, and the entirety of the literature cited thus far, involves the personal reflections of researchers rather than the view of teachers themselves. In this environment, an increased understanding of how teachers generate knowledge about teaching as well as their attitudes towards those knowledge sources is beneficial. This understanding must, however, be grounded in the experiences of teachers themselves.

## 1.2. Aims

This inquiry is a mixed grounded theory (MGT), i.e. a grounded theory that mixes methods, methodologies and paradigms from outside grounded theory, based on a corpus generated from the Dogme ELT Yahoo Discussion List and interviews with forum members. By scraping this online forum, it was possible to generate an almost six-million-word corpus of teachers talking about teaching. As this forum was significant in the creation of an entire teaching method and philosophy, it is hoped that studying this forum will allow for an improved understanding of the creation of knowledge about teaching in action. The study aims to categorise the sources of teacher knowledge within this forum and analyse attitudes towards them. It is hoped understanding how teachers generate knowledge and how they feel about their sources of knowledge will assist researchers in orienting their work towards teachers. Furthermore, it is hoped that this improved orientation of research is of practical benefit to teachers.

### 1.3. Overview

This dissertation consists of six chapters:

Chapter one introduces the aims, rationale and context of the study. It answers questions about reflexivity and the literature review that should be considered before beginning proceeding chapters.

Chapter two is an initial review of the literature that contextualises this study vis-a-vis preceding studies while avoiding theories that could inform data analysis later on.

Chapter three discusses the reasons behind decisions made in the methodology.

Chapter four outlines the methodology.

Chapter five presents the findings.

Chapter six discusses those findings.

Chapter seven concludes by highlighting key conclusions, presenting limitations of the study and discussing recommendations for future research and practice.

### 1.4. Context

The context of this study is the Dogme ELT Yahoo Discussion List. Dogme is a movement named after the Dogme 95 Manifesto: a 'vow of chastity' (see von Trier, 1995) for filmmakers seeking to avoid the excesses of cinema in the nineties. This vow involved, among other things, a promise to use only sound, props and lighting found on location. Similarly, Dogme ELT (henceforth just 'Dogme') is a reaction against the excesses of mass market ELT leaving teachers "buried under an avalanche of photocopies, visual aids, transparencies, MTV clips and Cuisenaire rods." (Thornbury, 2000a, p. 2). Dogme seeks to remove these materials from the classroom and focus on participant driven conversation.

Thornbury (2000b) writes that the forum was formed in 2000 for the discussion of Dogme ELT and that, while there had been some articles about Dogme before, this forum became the driving force for the Dogme movement. The forum had 1809 unique users, 18038 total posts and a total word count of 5.96 million words. While full data of the makeup of the forum is not available, based on interviews with forum members the membership was disproportionately male and made up of native speakers. Based on comments from interviewees, the forum was generally very helpful and provided both information about teaching as well as a sense of community. For interviewee three (I3) who did not have access to a wide professional network locally when they joined the forum, the forum provided a 'staff room' feel and created friendships that have lasted to this day.



This context is well suited for this research as it provides a clear example of teachers generating pedagogical knowledge. While this context is not representative of all contexts where teachers talk to one another, it does allow us to understand one specific instance of what happens when teachers construct knowledge. While it is hard to quantify if a forum generated 'good' knowledge about teaching, it is clear from the forum and interview data that the forum was useful for its users. Because Dogme has been for the large part ignored by the research community, this context gives a relatively unique look how teacher discussions can work when teachers are 'left to their own devices'.

### 1.5. Research Questions

Based on the aims and rationale of this study, the following research questions were selected:

RQ1: Which sources of knowledge did teachers in this forum use to construct pedagogical knowledge?

RQ2: To what extent were each of these knowledge sources relied upon?

RQ3: What attitudes did the teachers in this forum take towards these knowledge sources?

### 1.6. Reflexivity and the literature review

Grounded theory seeks to ground the research findings in the views of participants. One aspect of this, particularly of interest in constructivist grounded theory (see, Charmaz, 2006), is reflexivity. Reflexivity involves the researcher recognising that the research findings are a co-construction of themselves and research participants. Charmaz (2006) writes that "constructivists attempt to become aware of their presuppositions and to grapple with how they affect the research. They realize that grounded theorists can ironically import preconceived ideas into their work when they remain unaware of their starting assumptions." (p. 131). There are several aspects to maximising reflexivity. The majority of these will be outlined in §3-4. However, one aspect that, because it impacts the structure of this paper, should be discussed earlier on is the literature review in grounded theory.

The extent to which research should be engaged with before the commencement of a study is controversial in GT literature. A 'purist' approach "requires the researcher to enter the research field with no preconceived problem statement, interview protocols, or extensive

review of literature.” (Holton, 2007, p. 269). However, Clarke (2005, p. 13) argues such attempts to be a ‘theoretical virgin’ are impractical given that researchers typically *do* hold knowledge about the field which is of value and impossible to put aside. In the case of this study, a purist approach was similarly impractical; as I had already engaged with the literature extensively prior to adopting elements of GT for this study, any ‘theoretical virginity’ had already been lost by the time of data analysis.

Furthermore, it has been argued that this purist approach is not only impractical but undesirable. Charmaz (2006) argues that a greater knowledge of the literature prior to coding allows for the researcher to use that knowledge to provide more articulate codes but recommends that this knowledge of the literature be allowed to “lay fallow” early in the coding process (p.165). Dunne (2011) highlights that reviewing some of the literature before commencing a study helps ensure there is a good rationale for the study, that it meets a gap in the literature, that the study is well contextualised and orientated. He also argues this approach helps the researcher avoid conceptual pitfalls or ‘discovering’ something that is already well established.

These arguments present a strong case for *some* literature review prior to the commencement of a study. However, this does not imply that the literature review be completed before the study begins. Thornburg and Dunne (2019) recommend that the literature review in GT be conducted in three phases: initial, ongoing and final. They write that the initial literature review examines what work has been done in the area previously while remaining sceptical of the theoretical framework of any existing theories. The ongoing phase occurs during the study and involves the researcher seeking out literature linked to the findings as they emerge. In this stage, “The researcher seeks to identify existing theories and concepts which help to elevate the grounded theory to a more abstract level.” (Thornberg & Dunne, 2019, p. 211). Thornburg and Dunne’s third stage is the ‘final literature review’ which involves the comparing of the theory generated with existing literature.

This initial-ongoing-final literature review model was adopted for this study with an initial literature review (see §2) which seeks to position this research vis-à-vis existing literature in this area. An ongoing literature review was conducted as the codes, themes and attitudes began to emerge. The final literature review was conducted as the research process ended. The literature from the ongoing and final literature reviews is discussed in section six.

## 2. Initial Literature Review

This section provides an overview of current studies into teacher knowledge and knowledge building. The aim of this section is to situate the present inquiry in the existing research. As such, it provides an overview of what approaches have been taken thus far rather than seeking to provide a complete overview of the findings.

### 2.1. Reflective literature

Secondary studies into teacher cognition (see, among others, Kramsch, 2015; Maley, 2016; McKinley, 2019; Medgyes, 2017; Paran, 2017; Rose, 2019) have typically been focused on the relationship between research and practice. This research provides interesting perspectives on the relationship between research and practice (see, §1.1). Such findings must be taken with caution as these studies are typically authored by researchers in journals edited and reviewed by other researchers. A clear gap in this type of study then is that they are not grounded in the experiences of teachers.

### 2.2. Intervention studies

Intervention studies examine the impact an intervention has on the way teachers think. Pennington and Richards (1997) followed the progress of five teachers in Hong Kong through their teacher training and first year as practising teachers. During their training the teachers were taught to teach using the communicative method and embraced it, however by the end of their first year they had reverted to the drilling and grammar translation teaching styles they had experienced as school students. This suggests that exposure to theory may not translate into a long-term change in classroom practice, even when that theory is subscribed to.

Another approach to intervention is to measure the effect of reflective practice on teachers. For example, Farrell (2016) took a case study approach to investigating three teachers engaged in reflective practice. The teachers in this study followed a framework of reflective practice that asked them to reflect on their philosophy, principles, teaching theories, practice and the sociocultural dimensions of their practice. Farrell reports this experience allowed these teachers to realise beliefs and principles that had previously been tacitly held leading to a closer alignment of theories, beliefs and philosophies with their practice.

### 2.3. Reported belief studies

Reported belief studies involve self-report of beliefs and attitudes by teachers via questionnaire (e.g. Borg, 2009). However, self-report alone may be problematic as teachers' beliefs and practices may not align. For example, in a study into L2 reading instruction, Kuzborska (2011) compared teachers' stated beliefs about reading instruction with their teaching practice. While she concludes that "there was a relatively strong relationship between the teachers' [stated] beliefs and their classroom practices", this is only true generally and for several of the beliefs examined, there was little link between the teachers' stated beliefs and their classroom practice. Graden (1996) similarly found that teacher beliefs about L2 reading instruction generally aligned with their practice, but that in specific areas there was a strong incongruity. Because teachers can, at least sometimes, act in a way that contradicts their stated beliefs about how they teach, Borg (2015) recommends that research into teacher cognition make reference to classroom practice and that typically this has involved stimulated recall methodologies.

### 2.4. Stimulated recall

In stimulated recall methodology (SRM), "participants are asked to recall thoughts they had had while performing a prior task or while they had participated in a prior event" (Gass, 2016, p. 14). SRM has been popular in assessing teacher knowledge and is perhaps the methodology closest to the approach of this inquiry. SRM studies have often been used to attempt to avoid the issues with self-report of beliefs. However, I will argue here that stimulated recall has often been attributed an overstated ability to access tacit knowledge and belief. I will compare SRM with the approach of the present inquiry.

#### 2.4.1. Consciousness and stimulated recall

My argument against the efficacy of SRM centres on the idea that it is unable to access mental processes because we do not have conscious access to these. Earl (2014) in a review of the literature around consciousness concludes that both initiating and controlling actions and making choices and decisions are nonconscious processes. He writes that while we might be aware of thoughts prior to a decision and of the decision itself, "When making a choice or decision, the step from awareness of the various options to one's decision is a

nonconscious process" (2014, p. 4). While we might recall thoughts that occurred at the time a thought process occurred, we cannot recall the thought process itself. If, "It is the result of thinking, not the process of thinking that appears spontaneously in consciousness" (Miller, 1962, p. 56), it is also only the result of thinking, not the thinking itself, that is recalled.

That we are unable to access mental processes directly raises questions about SRM. In their influential review of the literature on verbal reports of mental processes, Nisbett and Wilson (1977) make three claims. First, that reports on stimuli and higher-order mental responses are often inaccurate. Second, that when people report on which stimulus caused a higher-order response from them, they may base that report on pre-held theories of what a reasonable cause would be. In cases where the stimulus is incongruent with participants' perceptions of what could have caused their mental response, the stimulus may be reported to be noninfluential. Third, that even when people accurately describe the stimulus that caused their higher-order response, this is because they based that description on previously held correct theories of what stimulus could cause that response. Put another way, when research participants recall thoughts that they believe to be stimuli for mental processes, this may be incorrect post-hoc rationalisations.

#### 2.4.2. Responses to validity concerns in stimulated recall

I have identified three responses to this criticism in the literature. First, Gass and Mackey (2000) argue Nisbett and Wilson do not distinguish between the studies they reviewed based on their quality. While this is true, this response more raises a question than demonstrates that the studies reviewed are of low quality. Second, Gass and Mackey (2005) argue that it is possible to mitigate the arguments of Nisbett and Wilson by performing the stimulated recall promptly after the recalled event. This second response is frequently cited in simulated recall studies in applied linguistics (see table 1). However, it fundamentally misunderstands the argument Nisbett and Wilson make; it is not that access to higher-order thought processes diminishes over time, but rather that higher-order thought processes are not at any point accessible. If this is true, prompt recall does not alter the underlying accessibility of processes.

The third response comes from Borg (2015) who suggests that even if teachers cannot access the reasons why they perform actions through introspection, the reasons they give during SRM studies are still of value. However, if this rationale is used, it concedes one of the

major purported benefits to SRM: that it allows some kind of special access to mental states or processes not otherwise offered. While the post-hoc rationalisations tied to specific events offered by SRM may offer more to the researcher than the more general rationalisations offered by other methodologies, they remain post-hoc rationalisations.

#### 2.4.3. A review of stimulated recall studies

Table 1 outlines the stated purpose and measures taken to ensure quality of stimulated recall in a non-exhaustive list of studies. There is some range in terms of the extent to which methodological concerns were engaged with in these studies. Several of these studies adopted a stance that the teachers' post-hoc constructions of what had happened were the desired result of the study. Other studies positioned stimulated recall as a way of accessing tacit beliefs or thought processes. The later type did generally take measures to ensure the validity of this stimulated recall, but these treated methodological concerns about stimulated recall as connected to short term memory rather than a lack of access to mental processes. While this review of SRM studies is not systematic, it does highlight that SRM studies often purport to offer a type of access to teachers' mental processes that I have argued is not supported by the methodological literature.

Table 1: Summary of the Purpose and Validity Measures of a Selection of Stimulated Recall Studies

	What is the purpose of stimulated recall?	Measures taken to ensure stimulated recall validity
Andrews and McNeil (2005)	Citing Gass and Mackey (2000) to "explore subjects' thought processes and strategies" (p. 163).	Simulated recall session performed "as soon as practicable" (p. 163) after teaching.
Basturkmen et al. (2004)	Specifically interested in teachers' 'stated beliefs'. Because teachers may be unwilling or unable to express beliefs, it is desirable to "access beliefs indirectly" e.g. through stimulated recall.	Not stated.
Borg (1998)	"To understand the inner perspectives on the meanings of the actions of those being studied" (p.11) Interested in the teacher's understanding of their decisions.	Not stated.
Breen et al. (2001)	Teacher belief can be embedded in practice and thus hard to articulate. While recognising the research data were co constructed by researcher and teachers, "the imperative through this stage of the research as to obtain data representing as direct access as possible to the teachers' own construction of their work." (p.477).	Researchers avoided making judgment statements on the teachers' work and checked their understanding by repeating/paraphrasing data back to teachers.
Burns and Knox (2005)	Not stated.	Teachers sent transcripts of lessons prior to stimulated recall sessions to "overcomes the difficulties of short-term memory." (p. 242).
Graden (1996)	"To explore the teachers' design and implementation of instruction and the beliefs underpinning their practices" (p. 388).	Same day recall sessions performed when possible.

Gatbonton (1999)	"Despite concerns some have raised regarding the subjectivity and lack of standard procedure associated with verbal recall as a tool for analysing teachers' thoughts, it was used in this study because it is still one of only a few instruments available for proving teachers' knowledge" (p.44).	"Ideally, the teachers should have viewed each videotaped lesson right after teaching it, but it was often not possible to schedule this." (p.37).
Golombek (1998)	Interested in the responses as constructed narratives rather than as a direct method of analysing knowledge construction.	Claims to follow procedures in Shavelson and Stern (1981), but this article is a general discussion of methodology that does not offer specific procedures.
Johnson (1994)	Interested in meanings assigned to events by teachers.	Not stated.
Kuzborska (2011)	"The method of stimulated recall in the present study was used to help make the teachers' implicit theories about reading explicit." (p. 107).	Stimulated recall sessions performed as soon as feasible.
Mangubhai et al. (2004)	"This method was used to provide a source for cross-checking in- depth interview data and to supplement such data in instances where the teacher was reminded, by cues on lesson videotapes, of other aspects of his/ her practical theory not revealed in the in- depth interviews. (p. 269).	Not stated.

#### 2.4.4. Teacher writing vs stimulated recall

This section compares SRM with the analysis of teacher writing, the primary data source for the present inquiry. Spivey (1997) writes that there are a range of perspectives on writers and writing. Individuals can be viewed as agents in writing, allowing for a perspective that highlights their personal social aims within the discourse. However, she also argues that when individuals write for a group and as part of groups:

They reveal and construct their social identities through their ways of speaking, thinking, and knowing. Individuals bring to their social acts of communication much knowledge including discourse knowledge, topic knowledge, and world knowledge, that they have developed in prior social experiences. Individuals 'read' the immediate social context from their own position within a larger socio-cultural-



historical context, and they construe their audiences when they write. [...] Even if there is only one named author, a group may also be seen as a collaborative writing team. (1997, p. 123).

In a forum then, we can view individual posts as contributions of the individual, but also as a collaborative effort, especially, but not only, when there is consensus.

Spivey (1997, pp. 124–125) writes that when we consider the *what* of written composition, we must distinguish the mental and physical products. She writes that we construct a mental meaning as well as physical (or indeed digital) marks. Based on the marks, we construct further mental meanings. Based on these constructed mental meanings we create further physical marks. Citing Britton's (1978) study, where writers who were denied access to what they had previously written struggled to write coherently, Spivey argues that "The constructive process of reading one's own writing seems to be an important part of the constructive process of writing." (p. 125)

Thus, while examining writing may not provide access to higher level mental processes, based on the understanding of writing outlined above, examining writing has several differences from SRM that stand in its credit:

1. While I have argued that validity issues in SRM do not stem from the time between the event and the recall, writing happens concurrently with the thought process that leads to its creation. Unlike SRM, what is written is temporally as close as can be to the thought processes we seek to investigate.
2. Written output is not just an output of the thought process. Because writers read what they have written as they write, what is written is an integral part of the writing process. This is evidenced by Britton (1978) who found that writers write differently if they do not have access to what they had previously written. While this might not give access to thought processes, it offers a different kind of access to how teachers construct knowledge about teaching.
3. While the results of SRM is a construction of the researcher and the participant, written output in a forum is a construction of the author and other members of that forum. Although researcher bias might impact the way forum posts are interpreted, the posts themselves are unimpacted by the researcher.

### 3. Methodology Discussion

This inquiry adopts a mixed grounded theory approach grounded in constructivist and naturalist paradigms. This chapter first outlines grounded and mixed grounded theory before exploring constructivism and naturalism.

### 3.1. Mixed grounded theory

#### 3.1.1. Grounded theory

Grounded theory (GT) is an approach to research that grounds its findings in the beliefs of informants rather than the researcher (Hadley, 2020). Charmaz (2012) writes that GT is an inductive method that begins with concrete description of cases before developing more abstract categories “You begin with an area to study. Then, you build your theoretical analysis on what you discover is relevant in the actual worlds that you study within this area.” (p. 28). Thus, GT allows the researcher to generate “analytic categories directly from the data, not from preconceived concepts or hypotheses.” (Charmaz, 2012, p. 32).

There are several reasons for the adoption of GT in this study. GT can generate theory ‘in rupture’, that is theory that uses concepts and constructs which are novel to the area of inquiry (Johnson & Walsh, 2019; Walsh, 2015). Given the issues with current research outlined above, such rupture is desirable. It is also desirable given the lack of attempts to categorise sources of teacher knowledge. Hadley writes that GT provides for the “development out of what happened in the field and not as the verification of what ‘should be’ as envisaged by armchair academics far removed from the social environment.” (2020, p. 268). In the context of this study, which involves perceptions of the value of the output of the research community, I wished to ground the research as much as possible in the perceptions of teachers to avoid bias. As noted in §2.1 much of the research into teacher-research engagement has involved personal reflections on the part of researchers. This means there is a gap in the literature for research grounded in teacher experiences.

#### 3.1.2. Mixed methods, methodology and paradigms

Johnson and Walsh define mixed grounded theory as “a research approach that includes the development of a grounded theory using qualitative and/or quantitative data and it uses elements, logics, and strategies from both GT and mixed research traditions” (2019, p. 523). MGT involves mixing at more than just the level of GT with other research methods. Greene (2015) writes that mixed research generally can involve the mixing of method (of gathering data), methodology (i.e. the way those data are analysed) and paradigm (the worldview behind the research). The mixing of methods and methodologies allows for the weaknesses of one method or methodology to be balanced by others. “The flaws of one method are often the strengths of another; and by combining methods, observers can achieve the best of each while overcoming their unique deficiencies (Denzin, 1978, p. 302). The mixing of

paradigms “offer different standpoints on what is knowledge and what is worth knowing, they carry with them different values about social phenomena and how best to understand them.” (Greene, 2015, p. 614).

While the mixing of methods and methodologies has become commonplace in research, mixing paradigms has been less so. While such paradigm mixing may appear as a kind of ideological pick-n-mix which demonstrates a lack of commitment to any particular stance, I would argue that it in fact makes studies more robust by forcing their findings to stand up to more than one conception of truth. This study uses quantitative corpus analysis methods, such as calculating inter-rater reliability, that might be more commonly associated with (post)positivist research paradigms. Designing a methodology to satisfy both constructivists and (post)positivists holds that methodology to more rigour than holding it to one standard alone. Furthermore, we will see that for constructivist researchers, trustworthiness (i.e. an ability for research to be seen as worthy of attention by a wide group of people as possible) is the key determinant of if research is of a high quality. By incorporating other research paradigms, this research can be made worthy of attention to a wider group of people and thus this approach does not contradict constructivist principles.

MGT is particularly interesting as it allows GT to transcend its traditional boundaries. GT has typically seen as only exploratory, “although grounded theory is evidence-based, the outcome of a grounded theory study is still just a theory” (McAllister, 2001, p. 236). Johnson and Walsh write “although traditional GT focused on exploration, one can conduct both exploration and confirmation in an MGT” (2019, p. 524). In other words, method mixing, in this case the mixing of GT with techniques more typically associated with text analysis, allows the findings of MGT to be more than ‘just a theory’.

### 3.2. Constructivism

This inquiry involves the classification of and analysis of attitudes towards teacher knowledge sources. Such research poses a challenge to the researcher in that such categorisations and perceived attitudes are constructs: they exist only in the minds of those who use them, and these interpretations affect how data are categorised by researchers (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). However, it is not only the act of categorisation that is subjective. Constructivists argue that listening or reading equally involve construction by the reader/listener.

The constructive approach argues against the tacit assumption that sentences 'carry meaning.' People carry meanings, and linguistic inputs merely act as cues which people can use to recreate and modify their previous knowledge of the world. What is comprehended and remembered depends on an individual's general knowledge of his environment. If a few words or sentences are sufficient to allow a listener to construct a description of a whole situation he is doing much more than simply concretizing the linguistic inputs. Instead he now has considerably more information at his disposal than he actually heard. (Bransford et al., 1972, p. 207).

Constructivists disagree on the extent to which *everything* is constructed (Spivey, 1997) and indeed it is beyond the scope of this paper to take a position on such matters. However, Carr and Kemmis (1986, pp. 86–92) argue that when it comes to observing the actions of people, interpretation matters. We need not apply a constructivist epistemology to all types of science to recognise that inquiry into human actions requires a recognition that constructions of the meaning of human actions can differ. Given that this inquiry involves the analysis of teacher talk online, it is similarly important for this inquiry to adopt a constructivist epistemology and research paradigm that can appropriately navigate the difficulties of doing research that accounts for differences in interpretation.

Constructivist research is typically contrasted with positivist and postpositivist (often written as (post)positivist) epistemologies. (Post)positivist research paradigms are based on falsificationism: an approach where hypotheses are tested with experiments that attempt to falsify them and become more corroborated if they are not falsified. However, for Lincoln and Guba (1985) such falsificationism depends on there being an external reality to falsify claims against. They argue that (post)positivist concepts like validity and reliability are focused on an isomorphic, i.e. one-to-one, relationship with an external reality. If this reality is inaccessible or nonexistent, it is not possible to falsify against it. Put simply, because two observers' constructions can differ while remaining equally legitimate, it is meaningless (and indeed impossible) to falsify those constructions or to rely on a paradigm that revolves around falsification.

The adoption of constructivism in the context of this study also impacts the way the quality of the research is evaluated. I will now move on to discuss naturalism and grounded theory methodology which attempt, respectively, to ensure the trustworthiness of constructivist inquiry and grounded inquiry as much as possible in the constructions of informants.

### 3.3. Naturalism and Trustworthiness

A constructivist viewpoint does not entail an 'anything goes' approach to research; indeed because research from this standpoint is frequently criticised for a lack of 'rigour', demonstrating its quality is of particular importance (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Naturalism is a paradigm of constructivist research that instead of trying to demonstrate that research findings are a close match for an external reality, seeks to increase the likelihood that the research's audience find the findings worthy of attention, a state Lincoln and Guba refer to as "trustworthiness" (1985, p290).

For Lincoln and Guba (1985), trustworthiness can be divided into four areas each of which is a 'turn' from postpositivist paradigms and each of which has associated actions that contribute to it. Table 2 describes the naturalist 'equivalents' of (post)positivist conceptions of good research along with the activities suggested to ensure these four aspects of trustworthiness.

Table 2: Summary of Postpositive Conceptions of Good Research with Naturalist Equivalents and Suggested Actions

(Post)positivist Term	Naturalist Term	Suggested Actions for Naturalist Inquiry (unless otherwise indicated, from Lincoln & Guba 1985)
<b>Internal Validity</b>	Credibility	Prolonged engagement: Research performed over an extended period of time to build trust and avoid distortion.
		Persistent engagement: Research goes beyond surface-level readings.
		Triangulation: Use of multiple sources, methods, investigators and theories to 'cancel out' potential imperfections (see Table 4 and Denzin, 1978)
		Peer debriefing: Regular meetings with a neutral peer to keep the researcher 'honest' and for them to defend the direction of their research.
		Negative case analysis: Paying attention to cases that do not fit into the current coding scheme. Working to ensure coding schemes fit all negative cases.
		Referential adequacy: Holding back a proportion of the data and testing hypotheses generated on other sections of the data on these unused data.
		Member checking: Checking the findings of the investigation with members of the group being investigated.
<b>Representativeness</b>	Transferability	Provide a thick description of the research context that allows readers to decide for themselves if the research context is similar enough to their context to ensure the results can be transferred between the two.
<b>Reliability</b>	Dependability	Lincoln and Guba see dependability as broader than and inclusive of reliability. Techniques for ensuring dependability include triangulation, having multiple researchers.
		Providing an audit trail.
		Inter and intra-rater reliability statistics (Ary et al., 2010).
<b>Objectivity</b>	Conformability	Triangulation and auditing.
		Providing an audit trail.

### 3.3.1. Credibility

Lincoln and Guba (1985) write that in naturalism, credibility refers to the extent to which the findings represent the range of constructions under investigation. The researcher should “first, to carry out the inquiry in such a way that the probability that the findings will be found to be credible is enhanced and, second, to demonstrate the credibility of the findings by having them approved by the constructors of the multiple realities being studied. (Lincoln

& Guba, 1985, p. 296). Credibility has the most numerous suggested activities. Table 3 outlines the ways in which this study has attempted to build trustworthiness at each stage.

*Table 3: Summary of Credibility Building Activities in this Inquiry*

Stage	Credibility Building Activity	Credibility Criteria Met
One	n/a	n/a
Two	Coding done over many posts.	Prolonged Engagement
	Coding preformed systematically and iteratively to find deeper themes	Persistent Engagement
	Negative cases actively sought out during the coding process and codes adapted to be inclusive of these.	Negative Case Analysis
	100 additional posts coded after codes established to check for negative cases	Referential Adequacy Negative Case Analysis
Three	Additional data about which words are most unique to each knowledge source generated	Persistent Engagement
	Additional data generated quantifying the extent to which each knowledge source was used in the forum.	Persistent Engagement
	Peer review process to confirm findings and identify negative cases	Triangulation (by investigators) Negative case analysis
Four	Further investigation into attitudes towards different knowledge sources	Prolonged Engagement
		Persistent Engagement & Triangulation by method
Throughout	Regular meeting with a peer throughout the research process.	Peer Debriefing
	Unstructured interviews with members of the community throughout the research process	Member checking

### 3.3.2. Transferability

In contrast to the (post)positivist paradigm which seeks to make studies generalisable to all situations, naturalist inquiry offers a thick (i.e. detailed) description of the context of the study that can be used to understand how transferable the research is to other contexts on a case-by-case basis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This study has attempted to provide a thick

description of the research content, which should be sufficient to establish similarities and difference between this and other contexts.

### 3.3.3. Dependability and Conformability

Lincoln and Guba (1985) write that dependability is the naturalist shift from 'reliability'. Dependability is interested in preserving the research from instability in the world or from changes the research brings about in the context where it takes place. Conformability is a shift from 'neutrality'. If all perceptions are constructed, no observations can be truly neutral. However, the researcher can present the participants' views in as unaltered a form as possible. As such, the research findings can be 'confirmed' in the words of participants. For Lincoln and Guba, both dependability and conformability are built by triangulation. They cite Denzin (1978) who offers a breakdown of the types of triangulation (a term he uses synonymously with method mixing (see p. 294)) available to the researcher. The use of MGT allows for this research to 'cover many bases' in terms of this triangulation (interestingly, although his work predates the development of MGT, Denzin uses 'triangulation' and method mixing simultaneously (see, 1978, p. 294)). Table 4 outlines the methods of triangulation used in this study following categories from Denzin (1978).



Table 4—Methods of Triangulation Categorised by Type of Triangulation Listed in Denzin (1978)

Triangulation by:	GT portions of research triangulated by:
Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Qualitative content analysis of the forum posts in stage three</li> <li>b) Interview data (n.b. the interview data is separated from the forum by both time and, being one-on-one rather than group based, level of collectively (see, Denzin, 1978, pp. 295-296))</li> </ul>
Investigator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) In stage four, inter-rater reliability measures are calculated.</li> <li>b) Peer debriefing took place throughout the research process.</li> </ul>
Theory	Denzin (1978, pp. 298–301) suggests that when conflicting theories exist in the literature a list of propositions for each theory be created. These lists can then be compared to the data to see which are borne out thus giving each theory a ‘fair shot’ at being shown to be correct and avoiding researcher bias in which theories are applied. This type of triangulation is particularly relevant in stage five and is applied where there are different theories as to the usefulness of particular teacher knowledge sources.
Methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) In stage three and four, methods more commonly associated with quantitative corpus analytics are adopted.</li> <li>b) Interview data was collected.</li> </ul>

Lincoln and Guba (1985) recommend audit trails as building both dependability and objectivity. Audit trails involve providing raw data as well as specifying how the research findings were generated from this such that it is possible for readers to reconstruct the findings from the raw data. For this study, anonymised copies of the coded posts used in stages two to four have been provided (see appendix 2-3) and have been cited using squared brackets (for example, ‘[23, 503]’ indicates that post 23 and 503 are being referenced).

## 4. Research Procedure

### 4.1. Data Sources

This inquiry is based on a corpus of nearly six million words scraped from the Dogme ELT Forum. Additional data comes from interviews conducted with forum members.

### 4.2. Procedure

This study involves four stages. The first involves the initial gathering of forum data. Stages two and five involve GT methodology while stage two applies quantitative corpus analysis methodologies. In addition, interview data were collected throughout the research process. Thus, this procedure allowed for the mixing of method, (it involves both interview and corpus data), methodology (the corpus data were analysed using both GT and quantitative corpus analysis) and paradigm (it uses both inductive and confirmatory research paradigms).

Table 5: Summary of the Research Process

Stage	Activities	Goals	Research questions answered
One	The scraping of posts from the forum and associated data wrangling	To gather data	n/a
Two	Grounded theory analysis of one thousand posts	To construct categories of knowledge sources used in the forum	RQ1
Three	Quantitative analysis of forum posts through:		
	Estimation of the amount sources used throughout the forum	To understand which knowledge sources were most drawn upon in the forum	RQ2
	Calculation of inter-coder reliability	To build the reliability/trustworthiness of the findings of stage two	RQ1 (confirmatory)
	Phi coefficient analysis	To analyse correlations of codes co-occurring in posts	RQ1
Four	Grounded theory analysis of attitudes towards knowledge sources	To understand attitudes to knowledge sources within the forum	RQ3
Throughout	Interviews with forum members	To corroborate and expand upon research findings	RQ1, RQ2, RQ3

#### 4.2.1. Stage One—Web Scraping

Web scraping is the extraction of a large amount of data from the internet using a computer script (see Mitchell, 2015). The Dogme ELT Forum created URLs for posts by assigning them consecutive numbers (i.e. the URL for the first post ends in ‘.../1’, the second ends in ‘.../2’ and so on). A script was created using the Python programming language with the Beautiful Soup (Richardson, 2007) and Pandas (McKinney, 2010) libraries being used for HTML processing and data wrangling. The script, for values of  $n$  between a given start and end point, essentially:

1. Downloads a forum post using  $x$  as the last element in the file path of the URL.

2. Using class tags in the HTML, identifies the date, author and forum post text.
3. Writes this information to a .csv file along with an identifying number.
4. Increases the value of  $n$  by one.
5. Repeats the process until  $n$  reaches the end point value.

This script was run over a series of days until data from all forum posts had been extracted. Additional scripts were created to delete duplicated posts and null entries (posts that had been deleted after their creation resulted in the script downloading null entries).

#### 4.2.2. Stage Two—Categorizing Knowledge Sources

Codifying or coding is process of assigning labels, called ‘codes’ to segments of text (Riazi, 2016). In GT, coding begins as directly descriptive but through a process of ‘constant comparison’ to previous codes, patterns begin to emerge (Belgrave & Seide, 2019; Charmaz, 2006; Holton, 2007) . Saldaña writes that coding is “a method that enables you to organize and group similarly coded data into categories or “families” because they share some characteristic – the beginning of a pattern” (2013, p. 9). However, Dey (2007) writes that it is not always possible or appropriate to form categories on similarity alone. He writes that in practice it is difficult to form rules of group membership that include all items that belong in a group and excludes all non-members. He concludes that, causal links, theory and social perceptions of a category can be included in the creation of that category.

Coding began with a randomly selected sample of 700 posts. The coding followed a process of ‘constant comparison’ whereby codes begin as directly descriptive but as patterns emerge, abstracted categories are formed (Kelle, 2007). The first cycle of coding coded all instances where a source of pedagogical knowledge was presented in the text. Codes were created describing the source of knowledge. Codes were periodically returned to and, when appropriate, recoded. The coder’s understandings of the codes naturally increases over time and thus it is important to periodically return to older codings with a better understanding (Saldaña, 2013). During the coding process, special attention was paid looking for negative cases, i.e. cases that did not fit into the existing codes. Furthermore, memos were taken to assist in analysis of the codes (see, Charmaz, 2006).

Corbyn and Strauss define ‘saturation’ as a point where no new theories or codes are emerging and that the codes created are well developed (2015). After 400 posts or approximately 135,000 words, a stable set of codes had been developed and I determined saturation had been reached. For referential adequacy (see §3.1.1 and §3.3) and to confirm this saturation, new batch of 100 forum posts was randomly selected from amongst thus far

unused posts and coded according to the previously generated codes. The absence of negative cases in this stage of the analysis suggested both that saturation had been achieved and that the codes were adequate for the corpus as a whole. In total approximately 169,000 words of forum posts were coded in this stage.

#### 4.2.3. Stage Three — Qualitative corpus analysis

In this stage, several qualitative corpus analysis methods were applied to describe the categories generated in stage two and corroborate their differences.

##### *Estimation of source usage*

This stage provides an estimation of how many posts in the forum as a whole fell used each knowledge source. At this point 500 posts had been coded. Based on these estimates, the proportion of posts in the entire forum was calculated along with margin of error at a 95% confidence interval. This means that we can be 95% sure that the proportion of posts in the forum as are within the margin of error either above or below the given proportion.

##### *Calculating inter-coder reliability*

For this stage, a research assistant was recruited and trained in the coding system developed in stage two. They were then given a selection of 100 posts chosen at random from the posts coded in §2. Scott's  $\pi$  was then calculated as a measure of inter-rater reliability.  $\pi$  can be seen as superior to Cohen's  $\kappa$  in that  $\kappa$  fails to account for different coders who do not apply codes with equal frequency (Krippendorff, 2004b).  $\pi$  was calculated for each code. A high value for  $\pi$  indicates a strong level of agreement between the coders which in turn indicates that the codes are reliable or dependable.

##### *Calculating code correlation*

This stage provides a measure of which codes appeared together in posts. Phi coefficient data were calculated for each pair of codes. The phi coefficient is a measure of correlation with a score of 1 representing perfect correlation between the two codes. A score of -1 represents a perfect lack of correlation.

#### 4.2.4. Stage Four – Analysis of attitudes towards knowledge sources

This stage of the study investigated forum users' attitudes towards the various knowledge sources categorised previously. This involved theoretical sampling of posts about each knowledge source. Theoretical sampling aims for sampling within concepts and is iterative with the results of each round of sampling informing future avenues of research (Corbyn & Strauss, 2015). Typically, theoretical sampling in GT might involve creating more data on topics that had emerged. For this study it was not always possible to create more posts or ask questions in the forum given that it is now defunct. However, given the size of the data set available, there was always an opportunity to explore data that were new to me in order to explore topics of interest. A key method of sampling data was key term searching of the corpus as a whole. This allowed for deeper exploration of particular topics.

The coding process in this stage proceeded in a manner similar to stage two. When attitudes towards a knowledge source were present in the text, this was coded. Once again, this began as a directly descriptive process but through a process of constant comparison, themes began to emerge. As themes emerged the ongoing literature review process began with existing theories being read, compared to the current findings, and where appropriate incorporated. A final literature review took place after data analysis had concluded to compare the findings of this research with existing literature.

#### 4.2.5. Activities undertaken throughout the research process

##### *Interviews*

During the research process, unstructured interviews were conducted with three members of the forum. I1 was a senior member of the forum from the foundation of the forum. I2 joined the forum as a novice teacher and I3 joined early in the life of the forum but became senior member of the forum over time. The core purpose of these interviews was member checking and to investigate attitudes. Member checking involves the checking of preliminary findings with members of the group those findings were taken from (see, Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These interviews also provide a source of data on attitudes towards knowledge sources, particularly when such attitudes were less apparent from textual analysis. For example, it was difficult to find attitudes towards experience when 'experience' was

searched for as a key term, but it was possible to ask the interviewees their opinion on experience.

#### *Peer debriefing*

Peer debriefings were conducted through the research process. In keeping with the recommendations of Lincoln and Guba (1985), meetings were conducted with a peer at a similar place in their academic career with a knowledge of the research context and a similar approach to research. The purpose of these meetings was to question the researcher's approach and biases, to discuss hypotheses under development, to discuss methodology and as a source of catharsis in the research process.

#### 4.3. Ethics

Ethical issues with this study concerned the interview data rather than the forum data. The data from the Dogme forum is available on a public forum with a specific disclaimer that the site is open source and can be freely copied, adapted and distributed. Prior to conducting interviews, ethical approval for the interview procedures was sought from and granted by the Central University Research Ethics Committee (CUREC) (see appendix 1). Interview participants were provided with information sheets and completed consent forms prior to the interview.

## 5. Findings

During the coding process, four broad themes and fifteen codes emerged. This chapter will first describe the research process and the results generally before exploring each of the themes. It takes the following structure:

5.1: Provides a description of knowledge sources found in the forum (RQ1)

5.2: Provides an overview of the quantitative analysis performed on the forum (primarily RQ2 but also RQ1 and RQ2)

5.3: Analyses attitudes towards knowledge sources in the forum. (RQ3)

Hadley (2017) writes that there is some disagreement in grounded theory literature as to the amount of verbatim material to include. He warns that if the author focuses too much on field material, they run the risk of appearing unanalytical; however, not including enough verbatim material runs the risk of the author's conclusions appearing under-supported. One advantage of the present study is that it is possible to make the posts that this study used available to the reader, and these are referenced using square parentheses. I have attempted to include a healthy amount of verbatim material, particularly where that material is analysed in depth.

## 5.1. Description of knowledge sources (RQ1)

### 5.1.1. Experience

#### *Others' Teaching Experience*

This code refers to knowledge based on the experiences of other teachers. These experiences were used as positive examples of teaching [182] and as negative examples to be juxtaposed with a Dogme approach [222, 481]. For example:

This morning the photocopier was broken!!! (Great!!) One teacher wanted to start a discussion with her group on times they've broken the law (speeding, jaywalking, smuggling - i.e 400 cigarettes) so what did she do? Desperately looked for a handout in one of the resource books only to be reminded that the photocopier was broken. "But how do I get the ball rolling", she cried. "Give them one or two examples" I said, "and then get them to brainstorm more". Is it so difficult to get a ball moving? [481]<sup>1</sup>

In this post, the non-Dogme teacher is presented as overly reliant on pre-prepared materials with the implied message being that the belief that you need materials to start a conversation is somewhat ridiculous.

Post [181] juxtaposes the experiences of two teachers. The first teacher:

when he worked at a school in Greece was under strict orders to do at least 2 pages from the course book each lesson, and if he hadn't done them and written them in his register he got a real bollocking from his DoS. The result was that he took the students out on Friday and Saturday evenings so that they could all speak English together with him!

---

<sup>1</sup> Posts are, unless otherwise stated, copied verbatim from the forum and, unless otherwise stated, have not been edited for clarity or grammar. \*\*\* has been used to anonymise



The poster compares this to another teacher who is more organised and flexible with working from a coursebook and found ways to work with the school's restrictions. The author reflects that teacher differences can be as much about personality as much as pedagogical belief and writes that a class based on the coursebook that is well mediated "perhaps gives the students just as much learning, involvement and decision power as pure dogme; it's just that so often the course book is just 'done', not mediated, that it lends itself so easily to becoming the 'bete noir'." [181]

### *Others' non-teaching experience*

The use of the experiences of others who are not teachers covered 2% of the 500 initially coded posts. While some of these posts were focused on formal education, many forum members used this knowledge source to discuss how people learn languages outside of the classroom. Given how much discussion amongst teachers is, understandably, based around classroom practice, this is an interesting alternative perspective in the forum.

In an illustrative example, post [240] examined the poster's son's experience learning Spanish in Chile. The poster explained that their son's Spanish had developed much faster than theirs because:

he has been fed on a diet of listening to stories in Spanish, playing tag in Spanish, being teased and teasing in Spanish, even fighting in Spanish (He goes to a Steiner school here), whereas I, being married to an English woman, teaching and teacher training in English and not having the wildest of social lives( having a [one] year old son as well), am to all intents and purposes immersed in an English speaking world.

I wonder where my Spanish level would be if I could spend my days playing tag and painting with a bunch of Chilean kids.

This post argues for immersion in a language as an effective means of learning that language. It also comments on the idea that young people are better language learners than adults by arguing that young people simply have more affordances for language immersion than adults do. In this way, the post uses the experience of others to generate knowledge that would be useful for other forum members.

### *Own classroom experience*

The use of one's own teaching experiences as a source of knowledge was, by a wide margin, the most common form of experience drawn upon in the forum. This took a number of forms:

- The use of class experience to ask questions and prompt discussion [52, 63]
- The use of class experience as an example of good practice in itself [53, 74, 130, 257, 499]
- The use of class experience as an example of bad practice [75]
- The use of class experience to make a point or as a source of reflection [60, 76, 102, 103, 484]
- The use of class experience to reflect on learner differences [297]

In some cases, the experience is somewhat abstracted, i.e. they refer to experience in general rather than a specific incident. Post [211] is an example of such a post in response to a question about the utility of the International Phonetic Script (IPA), that requires little interpretation by the poster:

Most importantly, with students, IPA has helped some interpret the pronunciation guides in learner dictionaries, although \*\*\* is right about phonemic script providing approximations of an idealized form of spoken language (if that's an accurate representation of what you said, \*\*\*).

Here, the lessons are that IPA can be useful for students as it allows them to look up pronunciations in learner dictionaries. Although the poster does draw on another post to acknowledge the limitations of using dictionaries for pronunciation. The poster goes on to explain that students, especially in lower-level classes, may find learning IPA burdensome and that there are certain personality types that take to IPA learning more eagerly than others. These findings appear likely to be a useful response to the question about the IPA that can guide the questioner's future practice.

In contrast, post [63] begins with an abstracted account of difficulties with Dogme ELT before talking about a specific event. The poster is frustrated that their students want them to teach IELTS (a standardised test) and describes a particular class where they 'stuck to the book' and felt that it was not useful. Compared with the previous example, this post requires more interpretation by the poster to be useful to others with most useful information for the reader being contained in the second, more reflective, paragraph. This trend of more abstracted posts requiring less interpretation was apparent in many of these posts.

It is notable that the post here not only seeks to inform others but also appears to be a useful way for the poster to ‘let of steam’ at the end of a frustrating day. They describe how Dogme, and presumably the Dogme forum, is a useful way to connect with likeminded teachers; an outlet that it seems not to exist elsewhere in their professional life.

### *Classroom Adjacent*

*Classroom adjacent* describes teachers using experiences from school life excluding the classroom. This includes:

- Preparing materials [8, 66]
- Posts describing experiences with industrial relations [134, 444]
- Staffroom discussion [180, 503]
- Experience as an external examiner (e.g. as an IELTS examiner) [228, 264]
- Experiences with management [354, 467]

Post [339] provides a strong example of *classroom adjacent* experience as a knowledge source. In response to another post, the poster is able to use their experience as a director of studies observing teachers’ classes to help concerns about requiring lesson plans prior to lesson observations. They start by comparing their experiences in general to another poster who does ask for lesson plans. The poster then talks through a specific incident observing a teacher who began to deviate from the lesson plan before returning to it lesson plan. The poster stresses the importance of respecting this teacher’s beliefs and outlines their post-observation conversation and the potential insecurities around lesson timing that led the teacher to return to the lesson plan. The poster explains that they “don’t feel right or comfortable explaining to a teacher why s/he should have deviated from the plan – unless of course the teacher half wanted to but was unsure about whether to do it – but I can put a few alternative ideas forward, and make it clear that it’s okay to go in without a full lesson plan.” This provides a very specific answer to the original request for ways to encourage teachers to deviate from lesson plans that is likely to build knowledge in the question asker.

### *Learning experience*

This code was used for posters who had used their own experience of learning a knowledge source. This includes posts that reference learning experiences inside [175, 278] and outside

the classroom [200, 240] as well as language learning [278, 367] and non-language learning [147] experiences.

Post [456] describes in detail the poster's experiences joining a Catalan class at a community centre. The poster was initially dismayed to learn the teacher is an inexperienced teacher who took over the class at the last minute. However, the teacher was very candid about their inexperience, willing to take suggestions and allowed it when students, "perhaps taking advantage of her youth, ingenuousness and relative lack of a clear plan, interrupted constantly to bombard her with questions, often about what seemed to me to be fairly minor points of pronunciation and grammar." While the poster is sometimes critical of the teacher's reliance on photocopies, they report a good learning experience and conclude:

The point of all this is simply to underline yet again the point that learning is jointly constructed (she's helping us, we're helping her, we're helping each other) and that the materials far from supporting the learning process simply inhibit it. The fact that the materials are photocopies would seem to support \*\*\*'s radical stand, although I am very sympathetic to \*\*\*'s (and \*\*\*'s) line, especially with higher level learners.

Here we can see a poster reaching quite sophisticated conclusions by blending their experiences as a learner with theoretical knowledge about socially constructed learning.

### *Out of school*

This code was used for posts where the poster generated knowledge about teaching based on experiences unrelated to school. This code, by its nature, was relatively broad and thus is hard to identify trends within this code beyond stating that it was diverse. The following examples give a 'sampler' of how out of school experience was used in the forum.

- Discussing norms around politeness in language use in different countries [146]
- Experiences listening to dialects in everyday life [189]
- Introspection on one's own experience and if thought consists of words or not [237]
- Discussing how financial constraints can affect teachers [269]

Post [172] responds to a discussion of phonics (i.e. sound-by-sound) and holistic (i.e. word-by-word) reading instruction. The poster describes an experience of

being impressed by the example of a British person newly arrived in Moscow who thought it would be easier to navigate the underground system by memorising the

interior decor of each station than by learning the Cyrillic alphabet and comparing the names of stations with those on the map. Now that's really holistic!

While the poster describes themselves as 'impressed', it is not clear how much irony is meant by this statement. It is possible to read this as a rebuke of holistic reading instruction if we interpret the person learning the appearance of every subway station in Moscow to avoid learning Cyrillic as saving themselves one significant task by undertaking an even more taxing one. In a similar way, holistic reading instruction might avoid the task of learning to read phonetically by undertaking the more difficult task of learning to read every word. The poster uses their experience as a metaphor that allows them to make their point and thus the experience can be seen as integral to the knowledge built.

### *Teacher education*

Teacher education describes experiences on teacher education courses such as CELTA, DELTA or master's courses as well as in-service teacher education. This includes as a teacher or as a learner and these courses included:

- Teacher training for NGOs [35]
- Studying for a teaching diploma [82, 310]
- Providing in-service training for English teachers [111]
- Teaching university level teacher training courses [285]

In post [69], in response to a request to "please share what happened today in class", the poster describes a language teaching methodology class where they applied Dogme style techniques to teacher training. In the first they

gave them a minute to get an idea and then rather noisily pulled a chair over and sat down among them and asked them to tell the rest of us their concerns. I had their classmates comment on ideas they had to offer them and I only participated minimally. Without a doubt the best class of the semester.

The author writes that this approach appears to be encouraging a Dogme approach among the students as they "expressed a concern about how much or little to use a textbook and referred to the dogme approach specifically." This post appears to be useful for readers who might 'practice what they preach' when discussing Dogme in their wider teaching life. It is also an example of the use of using a positive experience as an exemplar for other teachers.

### 5.1.2. Ideas

*Ideas* in the forum are perhaps the most diverse category in terms of how they are used. When forum users draw on *ideas*, this might be a personal belief or knowledge, a theory (this might be anything from Marxism, to the works of a specific thinker to a methodology like PPP), or the use of logic or hypotheticals to generate ideas. I have coded *Dogme* as separate to other theories and methodologies as its place in the forum was different to other ideas. *Dogme* in many cases is written about as an end in itself rather than a means to an end.

#### *Dogme*

*Dogme* as a system of belief was used primarily in two ways:

- as a rationale for practice [107, 265]
- as a way of evaluating practice [198, 220]

Given that the forum is dedicated to *Dogme*, it is perhaps understandable that *Dogme* is frequently, but not always, used as analogous for ‘good practice’. In many cases, being ‘dogmatic’ was enough to justify or positively evaluate practices. That said, there was also a willingness to discuss what it means to be a *Dogme* teacher in the forum as well as posts against overly purist approaches to *Dogme* [430].

Post [99] provides an example of justifying practice using *Dogme*. The poster wrote “Keeping a retrospective account of what you did as opposed to notes on what you intend to do has often been mentioned on this list as good *dogme* practice.” In this post, recording classroom activity retrospectively is presented as good because it’s ‘good *Dogme* practice’, rather than as a means to an end.

In other posts, however, posters discuss going against the letter of the *Dogme* ‘Vow of Chastity’ (Thornbury, 2001; see also, Thornbury, 2017) that “No recorded listening material should be introduced into the classroom: the source of all “listening” activities should be the students and teacher themselves. In response to a comment that “if your reason for taking in lots of tapes of different accents is to keep your students happy and motivated, that seems like a perfectly good rationale.” the poster replied:

It is partly because I am not a 'native speaker' myself that my students ask me to bring the recorded examples into class. Although I do also record speaking activities that happen in the class, these are used to back up the speaking (with further language analysis and feedback) rather than to offer challenging listening opportunities. The students recognize that distinction. [306]

Here the implicit argument seems to be that the original rule against external materials exists because such materials make classes less student centred. However, given that the materials are being used in response to student concerns, the lessons are still following the spirit of Dogme, even if the letter of the vow of chastity is being broken. The poster argued that the students "recognise the difference" between the use of recordings in a Dogme spirit and more typical use.

#### *Logic and hypotheticals*

This code covers two related ways of building knowledge in the forum:

- Logic: the use of deduction to build a new piece of knowledge from another piece of knowledge.
- Hypotheticals: this refers to the use of imagined scenarios (e.g. an imagined classroom) to generate knowledge based on what would happen in that scenario.

*Logical* posts typically have a premise and a conclusion drawn from that premise although sometimes this is implied, for example:

BANNING the use of the mother tongue has implications that are totally unacceptable., NEGOTIATING an agreement with the learners that "English only" makes sense in terms of efficient learning and subsequent acquisition is a different matter. [248].

Here the implication is that banning students L1 in the classroom has unacceptable implications, *therefore* we shouldn't do that. Similarly, the post argues that it would be acceptable to negotiate an English only policy; *therefore*, that is a better approach.

*Hypotheticals* work in a similar way in that their structure is that *if* teachers did x, then y would happen. In post [60], the poster offers an explanation of why it can be hard for teachers to adapt to Dogme teaching using a hypothetical situation.

Imagine--this shouldn't be too hard--a learner who has spent virtually all his/her academic career on the receiving end of exchanges like this:

T: How's the weather?

S: Sunny.

T: That's right. It's a sunny day.

(Neither looks out the window, where it has begun to rain on Seoul.)

What will happen when this learner becomes a teacher? All his/her life he/she has slotted one-word one-turn answers to long, laboriously grammaticized, three turn exchanges which are firmly closed, and which can and do randomly change topic every three turns. Suddenly the tables are turned, and it is the learner who is now completely responsible for grammar, topic choice, and even nomination of interlocutor.

Here the poster asks the reader to imagine a teacher whose language education has never focused on communicative competence (see, Dörnyei, 1995). When this teacher 'suddenly' is expected to focus far more on communication in the classroom, it is implied that they will suffer difficulty. The poster goes on to speculate that even if this teacher does try to adopt a Dogme approach, they might still be overly focused on grammar because of how they learned. Using hypotheticals in this way, the poster makes a powerful argument for a teacher's previous L2 language education can impact their current practice.

Other posts using *hypotheticals* were less fully imagined than this post. For example,

One thing I noticed with many peoples recent postings [...] was that people were going in with plans as to what they wanted to find out from the students.

Wouldn't it be worth opening everything up from the word go and saying to the students - write down 10 things you'd like to be asked about (for example) [220].

Here the hypothetical teaching situation is less well developed, but it is still potentially of use for the reader. According to the poster, this approach to teaching is relatively rare and thus by asking "Wouldn't it be worth..." taking an action, the poster invites the reader to consider more deeply why they would not take such an approach.

### *Personal knowledge and opinion*

The *personal knowledge and opinion* code was used for posts where the poster uses their own knowledge or opinion as a resource. This code was generally used for

- Posts explicitly making reference to the fact that the posters knowledge or opinion is the source of the knowledge (e.g. "As far as I know" or "In my opinion").



- Posts where knowledge is presented without a source and in such a way that it can be assumed the poster themselves is the source of the knowledge or opinion.

While much is made in the literature of the difference between knowledge and belief, this was not borne out in the posts themselves. For example, posters introduced what the literature might call knowledge with 'In my opinion'.

[191] is a post where it can be assumed the poster themselves is the source. In a discussion of 'parsnips' (an acronym of 'politics, alcohol, religion, sex, narcotics, -isms, pork', denoting taboo topics typically avoided by coursebooks), the poster writes,

The problem with 'Parsnips' is that they can be too personal, too close to the bone. No coursebook writer could risk such areas BUT individual teachers can. However, the teacher in question must try and play with an [open] mind, asking why? but not being judgmental.

While this post does not explicitly state that poster is the knowledge source here, the lack of other rationale implies that it is being presented simply as the poster's knowledge or opinion.

As knowledge and opinion is the second most frequent knowledge source in the forum, there may be doubts as to whether the knowledge constructed in the forum is overly anecdotal or simply posters expressing their own opinions. Certainly, in many cases, this knowledge would not meet the standards required for academic work. However, there are two mitigating factors here. First, that this knowledge created with this source is frequently uncontroversial and second that this knowledge source was frequently used in conjunction with other knowledge sources.

On many occasions, the knowledge built based on *personal knowledge and opinion* is hard to disagree with. For example,

Handouts also give students a chance to hear and see words at the same time. That is why my students really enjoy it when I copy lyrics to popular songs. [350].

Here it is not clear that the explanation given requires a great deal of evidence to be persuasive. It appears to be entirely reasonable.

*Knowledge and opinion* also cooccurred with other knowledge sources frequently. There was a significant co-occurrence with five of the 14 other knowledge sources. Of the 152 posts coded as *personal knowledge and opinion*, only 14 used this as their only knowledge source.

Of these, much of the knowledge presented is uncontroversial such as computer infrastructure in many places not being sufficient for online learning [14], kids needing magic in their lives [96], providing examples of progressive schools [197], information about a test [353], etc. While 30% of posts use personal knowledge and opinion as a part of their knowledge building, this should not be interpreted as those posts being unsubstantiated opinion. 91% of those were used in combination with other knowledge sources and in many cases the knowledge and opinions given were entirely reasonable.

### *Thinkers, theories and methodologies*

*Thinkers theories and methodologies* is a code applied where a post abstractly draws on a thinker theory or methodology. Posts coded as *resources* used a specific resource while *thinkers, theories and methodologies* refers to the more general use of ideas.

While *resources*, and particularly *teaching resources* tended to be used to discuss the contents of the resource, *thinkers, theories and methodologies* was more often used to make broader points. For example, post [108] draws on a wide range of thinkers including Brecht, Van Eyck and Tolstoy to draw a parallels to learner experiences. Brecht was a playwright and theorist of theatre who was anti-immersive: he sought to remind the audience of the constructed nature of what they were watching to encourage them to draw parallels with their own lives. To apply this to ELT materials, the poster argues that these should also acknowledge the constructed nature of ELT activities and “gleefully shatter the illusion with a direct appeal to the audience as an audience”, which I interpret to mean that students should be aware of the fact that real-world communication differs greatly from what they do in the classroom.

However, for some posts, thinkers were drawn on to talk more directly. In post [286], the poster refers to an applied linguist rather than a specific text simply because they do not currently have access to that text:

Maybe Im doing him a disservice (I dont have the book to hand), but I think it all comes down to your interpretation of artificial. Cook says that people have frowned on the artificial for too long a period in the world of EFL and that they do so for no good reason. He claims that most of the language use we engage in as language users is in fact artificial and that justifies the use of artificial language in the classroom for him. [286],

Here the thinker is drawn on generally, but the point made by the poster is essentially the same as the one made by Cook. While the poster doesn't directly cite the original text, the post is still of use for the reader because, while it may be in a second-hand manner, the knowledge point made by Cook is still presented to the reader.

### 5.1.3. Interaction

#### *Other forum posts*

Other forum posts were primarily used in the forum for:

- Citing an idea to, at least partly, disagree with it [70, 109]
- Recommending other posts as a resource (without expanding on that other post) [169, 210]
- Citing an idea to expand on it [11, 46, 51]

[423] references six other posts:

\*\*\*, so good to have you with us! I'm glad you've shared your concerns and doubts about Dogme here. Healthy skepticism and critical inquiry are important. Thank you!

There's not much I can add to the comments by \*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\* and \*\*\*. I would suggest, however, that the notion of 'grammaring' is more significant than grammar when it comes to learning a language. Have you read [Scott Thornbury's] book *Uncovering Grammar*? It's an excellent introduction to the idea that grammar is as grammar does, if you will.

The poster references one post which raises doubts about Dogme and five responses to that post. It builds on the other responses by disagreeing that a previous poster is mistaken and that "the notion of 'grammaring' is more significant than grammar when it comes to learning a language." It also suggests further resources. This post relies on other posts to create knowledge and provides value not only to the original poster but to other repliers with whom the poster disagrees.

#### *Questioning and answering*

Questioning and answering was an important activity within the forum. 24% of posts involving the asking or answering of questions was a number higher than expected and this

highlights the importance of helping other teachers in the forum. In post [294] the poster responds to a post which reads

One of my advanced students recently wrote:-

I've enjoyed the lessons more this term, the teacher(s) seem to be far more interested in the students but I'm not really sure what I've learnt. It's been less substantial.

Maybe the lack of coursebook and photocopies has meant less for them to reflect on?

The poster first offers encouragement before recommending creating a retrospective syllabus that learners fill in at the end of each lesson to keep a track of what they have learned. This post is an exemplar of good *questioning and answering* in that it contains both a good specific question and answer. To sum up, posts which answer questions clearly are a potential knowledge source within the forum, while posts that offer questions have a high potentiality of being answered which in turn generates knowledge.

#### 5.1.4. Resources

##### *Non-Teaching Resources*

While non-teaching resources often featured some level of interpretation by the author, this was not always extensive. For example, "I just think that Yoda is proof that the syntax can be all over the place, but the meaning is still conveyed." [59]. However, in other posts, this was far more substantial.

Here's a link to the site I referenced in a previous post: <http://www.pbs.org/speak/> if you're interested in American dialects, slang and the controversy over whether American English is more impoverished than ever. Interestingly, it seems regional and local dialects are still alive and kicking, although television has facilitated understanding of many regional dialects in North America.

Here the resource is a website about dialects. While this site is not directly related to ELT, the poster expands on how exposure to a range of dialects helped them question their assumptions on grammar teaching. The post can be interpreted as wanting the reader to visit the site so that they can go through a similar process of having their preconceptions about grammar challenged and so the recommended website becomes a way of building knowledge about teaching.

### *Teaching Resources*

A diverse range of teaching materials are used as knowledge sources in the forum. These included:

- Blog posts [16]
- Books written for teachers [85, 94, 235]
- Academic texts about teaching [64]
- Speeches [159]
- Online resource banks [238, 299]

The way in which these resources were use also varied:

- Quoted as a standalone, or near standalone, post. [104, 159]
- Quoted or paraphrased with a commentary. [16]
- Used as an external resource [110]
- As support for a point being made by the poster [219]

During the coding process, I had expected to find a difference between academic and non-academic texts; however, it became increasingly apparent as coding went on that it is difficult to find a meaningful line between academic and non-academic texts based on posts that refer to them. It might be easy to accept a journal article as academic, but some journals are aimed more at researchers than teachers and vice versa. For example, *ELT Journal* [cited in 181] seeks to link “the everyday concerns of practitioners with insights gained from relevant academic disciplines such as applied linguistics, education, psychology, and sociology.” (*ELT Journal*, 2020). Similarly, Skehan’s ‘A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning’ (1998) [cited in, 334] appears to be academic, but has a great deal of practical advice for teachers. In contrast, ‘Teaching Unplugged’ (Meddings & Thornbury, 2009 [cited in, 360, 446]) is divided into two sections, the first is an overview into the research unpinning a Dogme (or ‘unplugged’) approach to teaching, while the second, more substantial, section offers a collection of activities. These two texts offer a different mix of academic discussion and practical advice, but it is not clear how far in either direction a text would have to go to cross the line between academic and practical. Given this difficulty in separating the two and the way they were treated similarly in the forum, the decision to not make this separation was made.

## 5.2. Quantitative analysis of knowledge sources

### 5.2.1. Measures of frequency

Table 6 presents the number of forum posts in the initial 500 randomly sampled posts which used each knowledge source. It offers a raw count of the number of posts using that code as well as that number expressed as a percentage of all posts. Furthermore, it offers a count of the number of times each knowledge source was used as the only knowledge source and then that number expressed as a percentage of posts using that knowledge source.

Table 6: Summary of Knowledge Source Usage

	Knowledge source	Number of posts using	As a % of all posts	Margin of error	Number of times used alone	Solo use as a % of usage of that code
<b>Experience</b>	Others' non-teaching experience	11	2%	±1.2%	2	18%
	Others' teaching experience	14	3%	±1.5%	2	14%
	Classroom Adjacent	21	4%	±1.7%	3	14%
	Own in-class experience	95	19%	±3.4%	10	11%
	Own learning experience	21	4%	±1.7%	0	0%
	Own out-of-school experience	17	3%	±1.5%	0	0%
	Teacher training	17	3%	±1.5%	1	6%
<b>Ideas</b>	Dogme ideology	51	10%	±2.6%	4	8%
	Logic and hypotheticals	136	27%	±3.8%	7	5%
	Personal knowledge and opinion	152	30%	±4.0%	14	9%
	Thinkers, theories and methodologies	50	10%	±2.6%	3	6%
<b>Interaction</b>	Other forum post	156	31%	±4.0%	12	8%
	Questioning and answering	122	24%	±3.7%	27	22%
<b>Resources</b>	Non-Teaching resource	29	6%	±2.1%	7	24%
	Teaching resource	94	19%	±3.4	24	26%

Table 7 presents the number of forum posts in the initial 500 randomly sampled posts which contained each of the broad knowledge sources. Note that posts coded with two codes grouped under the same theme are only counted towards that theme once and thus the total number of codes for each theme will not match the number of posts that contained that theme.

Table 7: Summary of Theme Usage

Knowledge source	Count	As a % of posts
<b>Experience</b>	159	32%
<b>Ideas</b>	257	51%
<b>Interaction</b>	246	49%
<b>Resources</b>	120	24%

Ideas and interaction were by some margin more common knowledge sources than experience which was slightly more common than resources. The lack of focus on resources is perhaps particularly notable as, while frequency is not a perfect indicator of importance, it suggests that experience, ideas and interaction were more significant sources of knowledge than resources. Potential reasons for this will be discussed in the coming chapters.

#### 5.2.2. Measures of co-occurrence

Table 8 presents data representing the co-occurrence of knowledge sources in a single post measured by the phi coefficient. A score of 1 represents a perfect positive relationship (i.e. if one knowledge source appears or doesn't appear in a post, the same is always true of the other) and -1 a perfect negative relationship (i.e. if one knowledge appears or doesn't appear in a post, the opposite is true of the other). 0 represents no relationship between the two. Statistically significant relationships ( $p < 0.05$ ) are bordered.



Table 8: Phi Coefficient Data for Co-Occurrence of Themes

	Other's non-teaching	Other teacher's experience	Classroom Adjacent	Own in class experience	Own learning experience	Own out of school experience	Teacher Training	Dogme ideology	Logic and hypotheticals	Personal knowledge and	Thinkers Theories and	Other forum post	Questioning and asnwering	Non-Teaching Text	Teaching Text
Other non-teaching	n/a	-0.03	-0.03	-0.04	0.037	0.047	-0.03	-0.05	0.092	-0.01	-0.05	0.046	-0.05	0.021	0.033
Other teacher's experience	-0.03	n/a	0.085	0.041	-0.04	0.035	-0.03	-0.02	0.005	0.046	0.024	0.069	-0.07	0.01	-0.02
Classroom Adjacent	-0.03	0.085	n/a	0	0.006	-0.04	0.016	-0.01	-0.02	0.013	-0.04	0.031	-0	-0.01	-0.05
Own in class experience	-0.04	0.041	0	n/a	0.026	-0.04	0.022	0.191	0.059	0.101	0.059	0.125	0.022	0.032	-0.06
Own learning experience	0.037	-0.04	0.006	0.026	n/a	0.016	0.016	-0.01	0.074	0.057	0.03	0.031	-0	-0.05	-0.02
Own out of school experience	0.047	0.035	-0.04	-0.04	0.016	n/a	-0.04	-0.06	0.059	0.068	0.158	0.017	-0	0.095	-0.09
Teacher Training	-0.03	-0.03	0.016	0.022	0.016	-0.04	n/a	-0.03	-0.02	0.044	0.011	-0.03	0.048	-0.05	-0.09
Dogme ideology	-0.05	-0.02	-0.01	0.191	-0.01	0.063	0.027	n/a	0.061	0.136	-0	0.073	0.009	-0.03	0.075
Logic and hypotheticals	0.092	0.005	-0.02	0.059	0.074	0.059	-0.02	0.061	n/a	0.251	0.111	0.316	0.009	0.002	-0.03
Personal knowledge and	-0.01	0.046	0.013	0.101	0.057	0.068	0.044	0.136	0.251	n/a	0.099	0.137	0.06	0.003	-0.11
Thinkers Theories and	-0.05	0.024	-0.04	0.059	0.03	0.158	0.011	-0	0.111	0.099	n/a	0.135	-0.03	0.06	0.044
Other forum post	0.046	0.069	0.031	0.125	0.031	0.017	-0.03	0.073	0.316	0.137	0.135	n/a	-0.06	-0	-0.03
Questioning and asnwering	-0.05	-0.07	-0	0.022	-0	-0	0.048	0.009	0.009	0.06	-0.03	-0.06	n/a	0.041	-0.05
Non-Teaching Text	0.021	0.01	-0.01	0.032	-0.05	0.095	-0.05	-0.03	0.002	0.003	0.06	-0	0.041	n/a	-0.05
Teaching Text	0.033	-0.02	-0.05	-0.06	-0.02	-0.09	-0.09	0.075	-0.03	-0.11	0.044	-0.03	-0.05	-0.05	n/a

The reporting of co-occurrences does not represent an end in itself but rather a means to further exploration and explanation of the data (Krippendorff, 2004a). Thus, it was important to look at posts where there was a significant correlation and explore the reasons why this was the case. In many cases these co-occurrences highlighted an observable trend in the data; however, there were also several cases where it was not obvious why there was a statistically significant co-occurrence. Table 9 summaries posts where there was a statistically significant co-occurrence and, when those were apparent, gives possible reasons.

Table 9: Significantly Correlated Themes and Possible Reasons for Co-Occurrence

Source one	Source two	Possible reason for co-occurrence
Other's non-teaching experience	Logic and hypotheticals	Many posts tagged with both of these codes used the experience as an example for a logical argument [115, 409], or used logic [7] or hypotheticals [240] to interpret an experience.
Own in-class experience	Dogme ideology	It is likely that teachers in a Dogme forum frequently used Dogme ideas when teaching and thus their reports on teaching also contained these ideas.
Own in-class experience	Personal knowledge and opinion	Unclear.
Own out-of-school experience	Thinkers, theories and methodologies	<i>Own out-of-school experience</i> posts tended to build teaching knowledge by being relevant to the theory around teaching rather than the teaching itself and so they often mentioned theories [101] or methodologies [86].
Own out-of-school experience	Non-Teaching resource	Unclear.
Dogme ideology	Personal knowledge and opinion	Forum member's attitudes towards Dogme were often positive and as such when they expressed their opinions and personal knowledge, those often also drew on Dogme.
Logic and hypotheticals	Thinkers, theories and methodologies	Many posts coded with both of these codes drew on thinkers, theories or methodologies as the basis for a hypothetical or logical argument [214, 286] or used hypotheticals or logical arguments in favour of thinkers theories or methodologies [60, 365].
Logic and hypotheticals	Other forum post	Posts coded with both of these themes often added to knowledge in another forum post using logic.
Personal knowledge and opinion	Thinkers, theories and methodologies	Unclear.
Thinkers, theories and methodologies	Other forum posts	Unclear.
Teaching resource	Negative correlation with several other codes	Many posts coded as <i>teaching resource</i> offered only a quotation from or reference to that resource without discussion or interpretation and this may have caused the significant negative correlation with several other codes [see, 5, 55, 271]. 26% of posts coded as <i>teaching resource</i> only used that code.

### 5.2.3. Measures of inter-coder reliability

Scott's  $\pi$  was calculated for each of the codes and for the forum as a whole. Allen (2017) writes that while there is some disagreement on benchmarks, scores above .4 can be interpreted as 'moderate', scores above .6 as 'substantial' and scores above .8 as 'almost perfect' in terms of inter-rater agreement. Table 10 gives the  $\pi$  scores for each code and generally. Overall, there was 'substantial' agreement. For individual codes, these were generally 'moderate' or 'almost perfect' except *questioning and answering*. One potential issue was that identifying *questioning and answering* in many cases required the interpretation of long chains of posts which, because of the limitations of how forum data were scraped were not always presented as cleanly as they might have been on the web page itself. It may have been easier for me, having read had the entire sample of 150,000 words of forum posts multiple times, to interpret these long strings of posts better than the rater who read 10% of the posts once.

Table 10: Inter-Coder Reliability by Theme and Across all Themes

Code	Scott's $\pi$
Other's non-teacher experience	0.94
Other's teacher's experience	0.98
Classroom Adjacent	0.94
Own in class experience	0.71
Own learning experience	0.96
Own out of school experience	1.00
Teacher Training	0.98
Dogme ideology	0.83
Logic and hypotheticals	0.82
Personal knowledge and opinion	0.67
Thinkers Theories and Methodologies	0.96
Other forum post	0.67
Questioning and answering	0.56
Non-teaching text	0.89
Teaching text	0.85
All Themes	0.75

### 5.3. Description of attitudes towards knowledge sources

#### 5.3.1. Attitudes towards experience as a knowledge source

During the theoretical sampling stage posts expressing attitudes towards experience were not forthcoming when 'experience' was used as a search term. However, when 'reflection' was used as a search term, it was easier to find attitudes, and these were generally positive. For example, the following post views theory as essential for teaching as it is a dynamic activity involving people:

As teachers, we need to observe and reflect because teaching is not like changing tires or baking bread. Teachers interact with human beings, not inanimate objects, so the activity is dynamic, personal, and ever changing. [502].

Reflection was not only seen as a positive activity; it was also linked to Dogme practice. In post [501], in response to a post calling for a modernisation of Dogme, the poster writes:

I love the way that dogme endlessly revisits its origins and reassesses its integrity. This constant reflection is an excellent model for professional development, especially since it is informed by cycles of classroom practice, which again, \*\*\*, you have been so generous in contributing.

Personally, I love the way that dogme morphs and evolves, constantly changing shape and even direction - dynamic, emergent, adaptable, and maddeningly (for some) elusive.

This fuzziness is for me its strength - how else could it have survived for so long? I'm constantly amazed [at] the way dogme is being picked up by a whole new generation of teachers and appropriated for their own contexts and purposes. Just when you thought it was dead in the water....

Here the poster argues that being informed by reflection on classroom practice allows Dogme to be adaptable and long lasting. This has the implication that methods imposed in a top-down manner are less adaptable as they do not allow input from reflection.

Interviewees expressed positive attitudes toward experience as a knowledge source. I2 remarked that posts based on experience were the most meaningful source of knowledge for their professional development. Reading the experiences of others acted as a "proof of concept" for more communicative classes that gave them the confidence to adopt a similar approach in their own classroom. When asked specifically if they were ever concerned that relying on experience was not a legitimate source of teaching knowledge, they replied that this was not a concern "I don't think I cared about the research, honestly, the fact that

people were [sharing experiences] was enough” and “If someone proved tomorrow that Dogme is the most effective, it wouldn’t change anything to me.”

### 5.3.2. Attitudes towards ideas as a knowledge source

Attitudes towards the relationship between Dogme practice and theories and methodology were a major point of discussion in the forum. This relationship is complex with because as posts describe Dogme practice as informed by theory, but not dictated by it. Post [465] presents theory and methods as useful for teachers early in their career, but argues that as they gain experience, this experience should be relied on more:

For me, theory is something that comes after or alongside the practice. I began teaching by following rigid lesson plans (the teacher's book of the 80s ancestor of Headway). Good thing, too; I couldn't have taught otherwise. Then, over the years, I've gradually refined my practice, simply by doing more of what seems to work and less of what didn't work. This process has probably seen me move in the direction of healthy educational practice, but as much as that, it is getting to know who I am, my strengths and weaknesses as a human and a teacher, and getting to know what the students want and were willing to do (their motivation, and oriental occidental differences real or imagined). Theory is useful to me, not as a template to lay over my teaching.

[507] is more concerned with methods than theories but makes a similar point in a more academic way. The poster draws heavily on Kumaravadivelu’s (2001, see also §6.2 below) notion of postmethod pedagogy whereby pedagogy is situated in the teaching context rather than relying on general principles.

Dogme then might be informed by methodologies, but Dogme teachers are not, in the words of Kumaravadivelu “consumers of knowledge”, they are encouraged to “theorize from practice and practice what they theorize.” (p. 541) This relationship does not mean Dogme does or can not draw on theory or methodology, but Dogme methods are not dictated by theory.

Post [508] takes a similar point of view towards methods. The poster writes that teachers’ attitudes towards methods are tied to their attitudes towards uncertainty. The poster writes that methods such as PPP or the audiolingual method are beneficial for teachers in that they prescribe a sequence of actions to be repeated. This reduces the amount of uncertainty for teachers, but this does not mean that they are effective. The poster concludes:

In particular, collective anxiety causes teachers to favour methods that allow them to retain control over input, output and learner behaviour generally. The underlying methodology is teachability oriented.

Much as [507] presents a move from methodology to Dogme as an ability to move beyond method to be a teacher who can ““theorise from practice and practice what they theorise”, [508] presents Dogme as a step away from the certainty of a prescribed method.

This positivity around Dogme in a Dogme forum is perhaps neither especially surprising or interesting. However, the framing of Dogme as not being against other methods, but rather being postmethod is in some ways counter to how the relationship between teachers and theory has been discussed in the past. This will be discussed further in §6.1.

### 5.3.3. Attitudes towards interaction as a knowledge source

When assessing attitudes towards interaction in that forum, it is important to be aware that selection bias and unwillingness to criticise a group of which one is a member could influence the attitudes expressed. Thus, it is perhaps unsurprising that posts about the group were generally positive about it. The group is described as “provocative/interesting” [510] and as providing “a counterpoint to some received and accepted wisdom which is not always as it should be” [511]. Post [516] marvels at the “generosity of the contributors” to the forum, while in post [512] the poster writes “What I've particularly appreciated about this list, apart from the succour it gives from the pain of isolation on your ideas, is the variety of voices in the postings. They are always interesting and always stimulating.”

Disagreement in the forum was commented on during interviews as a positive aspect of the forum. Both I1 and I2 described a mix of users who were heavily invested in Dogme and ‘doubters’ leading to an environment where Dogme advocates frequently had to justify their approach. I2 noted that this was somewhat unique to the forum while for I1:

Some of the best threads were those where people who were kind of sceptical coming in. [...] there were threads where there were people challenging the assumptions underlining Dogme and it was very good practice for those who were committed to the practice, so to speak, to defend it.

Post [509] describes the forum as willing to introspect on what happens in its user’s classrooms.

I also see it as a list where a number of dedicated individuals are prepared to open their classroom doors and let us know what goes on in there. And they are also keen to discuss the rationale of what they are doing in ways that can include theoretical considerations, discussion of new ideas and goes well beyond: "Any tips for teaching the Present Perfect?" [509]

In post [514], which attempts to remind forum members of what they have in common after a disagreement, the poster writes:

What I haven't experienced on any other list, and I've been involved with more than a few, is so many people prepared so often to argue out in public what they do in the privacy of their individual classrooms, and what they ponder and puzzle over late at night, early in the morning, when they can't sleep or when they have had a lousy lesson.

To sum up, while there is some level of selection bias where those who find interaction in the forum useful are more likely to become and remain members and post about it, forum posts demonstrate that the forum both was a positive environment at least for those who posted about it. Based on descriptions of the forum as "provocative" [510], its users as prepared to "argue out in public what they do in their individual classrooms" [514] and the comments from interviewees, the forum does not appear to have been an 'echo chamber' for members. Furthermore, the posts above indicate the attitude of forum members was one of candour and generosity towards one another that appears to have been of benefit to forum members.

#### 5.3.4. Attitudes towards resources

The perceptions of research in the forum are generally more negative than positive.

Researchers are seen as out of touch with the real classroom and research itself is viewed as overly interested in jargon:

That language is an "emergent complex system" seems like common sense to me. Of course, it's nice to have hard research to back up common sense. Too bad research usually concealed in layer upon layer of jargon. [178]

In post [503], the poster describes their experience studying a master's course after several years of teaching:

I had to laugh at the out-of-touch-with-reality-ness of most of what we talked about. That's not to say I didn't enjoy myself - I loved the reading and the discussion and the writing and the research - but did it influence my teaching? To be frank? No. It just made it a lot easier for me to justify what I do/did, and to talk the talk.... Academia is a game, really, and most of the researchers and writers about ELT are not from the place where so many learners are to be found - high school classrooms. What happens in language schools and university-based language centres has almost no relationship to what happens in mainstream schools. Unfortunately, those at the sharp end don't have a lot of time for research and reading because we're busy doing duty, attending swimming galas, attending discipline team meetings.

In this post, the poster argues that engaging with academia is interesting and enables them to participate in academic discourse, but that it is not useful to practice. They criticise writers and researchers for being too distanced from classroom practice and argue that many practising teachers are too busy with their teaching duties.

Post [506] argues that research literature is not necessary for teachers, and especially newly qualified teachers, because blogs offer equally high-quality information in a more easily digestible format:

"You said that "the literature is frequently too dense for more newly qualified teachers." I'm not sure what you mean by "the literature" but I'd like to say that there is probably just as much quality information, if not more, in teacher blogs as there is in the literature, and that teachers, newly qualified and otherwise, can learn a great deal by reading one another's blogs, by commenting on them, and by linking and cross linking to them." [506]

Post [505] makes two criticisms of academia. Firstly:

theory is so often written by people in a different club, they may be ex-teachers, but they are rarely practising teachers. And because they are playing to different rules - and they must also satisfy their academic colleagues reading over their shoulder - it is not rarely that you have to fight their style to wrest meaning from it.

In other words, writing for academia is different from writing for teachers, I will return to this idea in §6.2. The poster also writes that there to fully engage with theory is too much of a commitment for them as a practicing teacher:

But once I tacitly accept the need to read books of theory, something else kicks in. Panic. How can I ever possibly read enough to really understand, to come to an informed, balanced opinion? Isn't it safer for my own peace of mind to fall back on reference to practical teaching experience and intuition, to relax into being "just" a teacher and forget academia?



I've just finished a book that \*\*\* mentioned some time ago on this list, *The Social Turn in Second Language Acquisition* by David Block. As far as I can judge it is a rather impressive book, most of it devoted to a painstaking examination of what is really meant by three key terms - second, language, and acquisition!

He has fascinating things to say about all three, but my panic sets in is because to do so he has consulted (he lists them in his references) about 500 key articles and books. And much of it is very complicated stuff. It requires a clear head and a lot of thinking and re-reading to follow.

It's not surprising that few teachers write theory. How can they have the time to read and understand it let alone write it? As David Block explains of his own case, "This book is the product of a decade of reading and thinking about second languages acquisition." [505].

However, other posts are less critical in their view of academia. In post [504], the poster defends the benefit they have gotten from academic study:

For me, [the Dogme forum] has helped and continues to help me get past the basic teaching skills I learned on my TESOL course. It helps me question dogmatic teaching principles and helps me develop a style of teaching that I am more comfortable with, more student led. But I do not discount the advantage that academic study has given me, helping me develop a better understanding of why I do what I do. But I also question accepted language teaching practices and am willing to look elsewhere at other successful teaching/training/instructing methods to see if I can use them in my own teaching.

The poster here defends researchers arguing that criticism of researchers may be equally applicable to other professions and that while academic qualifications don't guarantee someone will be a good teacher, generally teachers with qualifications are better than those without. They draw on their own experience to argue that academia gives them an advantage. However, they also write that the Dogme forum has furthered their knowledge from academic study.

## 6. Discussion

This section attempts to integrate the findings so far with related literature to generate theory. Because space is limited, this is primarily focused on the relationship between teachers and research. I will argue that the findings of this study present a challenge to what I will term a 'teacher research deficiency' (TRD) view. I define this view as having two components:

- 1) That there is a lack of communication between teachers and researchers
- 2) That this is detrimental for teachers

This view is perhaps typified by Paran (2017) who argues that the lack of engagement between the research and teaching communities has caused issues for teachers who may be slow in putting into place ideas that have research backing and that “All things being equal, a teacher whose teaching is congruent with research findings must be more effective than a teacher whose teaching is not” (p. 506). For Paran, this lack of communication also causes problems for researchers whose research agenda are not always driven by what is useful for teachers. He offers a list of ways teachers can be informed by research, such as through initial teacher education, ELT materials and ‘go between’ who straddle the teacher-research divide, and advocates for a widening of these channels. While there may be disagreement in the literature on the origins and solutions for the teacher research gap, there is some level of agreement that this is a problem that needs to be solved.

However, this identification of a TRD was not evident in the forum. The general attitude towards research was that it is of use for engaging in discussions about research and to justify practice. However, it was not seen especially as a useful way of informing practice. Furthermore, teachers in the forum were wary of having practice dictated to them. On the other hand, *experience* was viewed far more favourably in the forum *vis-à-vis* how it is viewed in the literature. It was also viewed favourably in the forum compared to research. The statement from I2 that even if there was definitive proof that Dogme was more effective than other approaches “it wouldn’t change anything for me” is particularly revealing. While, ‘experience’ was not particularly revealing of attitudes as a search term, ‘reflection’ as a search term revealed strong attitudes.

While Paran (2017) warns that teachers learning from other teachers risks a “vicious cycle of received wisdom which is never questioned and which blocks change” (p. 500), *interaction* was viewed positively in the forum. Despite the group being gathered around a teaching philosophy, disagreement was an important element of interaction in the group with defence of Dogme against challengers being identified as “very good practice” for its defenders by I2.

## 6.1. Knowledge building as postmethod

One of the ways the forum self-perceived its knowledge building was as postmethod (see § 5.3.1). This section compares knowledge building in the forum with Kumaravadivelu's (2001) postmethod pedagogy which is defined with three 'P's: particularity, practicality and possibility. Particularity means that pedagogy must be constructed in response to the local conditions where teaching happens. If pedagogy is not particular the teacher risks alienating their students. Particularity in pedagogy:

starts with practicing teachers, either individually or collectively, observing their teaching acts, evaluating their outcomes, identifying problems, finding solutions, and trying them out to see once again what works and what does not. Such a continual cycle of observation, reflection, and action is a prerequisite for the development of context-sensitive pedagogic knowledge. (Kumaravadivelu, 2001, p. 539).

Furthermore, he argues that pedagogy should be practical. To do this he posits a difference between professional and personal theory. Professional theory is how the word 'theory' has been used so far in this paper: it refers to theories generated by experts in centres of higher learning. Personal theories arise from the application of professional theory in the real world. He argues that personal theories have typically be undervalued and that if we are to achieve particularity in pedagogy:

This objective cannot be achieved simply by asking teachers to put into practice theories conceived and constructed by others. It can be achieved only by helping teachers develop the knowledge and skill, attitude, and autonomy necessary to construct their own context-sensitive pedagogic knowledge that will make their practice of everyday teaching a worthwhile endeavor. (p. 541).

Kumaravadivelu (2001) writes that final 'P' of postmethod pedagogy is possibility. This refers to a pedagogy that is aware of the dynamics of power and domination in the classroom setting. He cites Giroux that "the need to develop theories, forms of knowledge, and social practices that *work with* the experiences that people bring to the pedagogical setting" and argues that such practice has the "potential to alter pedagogic practices in ways unintended and unexpected by policy planners, curriculum designers, or textbook producers." (Kumaravadivelu, 2001, p. 543).

Based on a postmethod understanding, the relationship between research and practice is more complex than just that there is a deficit. While research can inform practice, talk of

teachers “whose teaching is congruent with research findings” (Paran, 2017, p. 506) ignores that it is possible for research to not be applicable to practice in a certain context. While practice might be more or less informed by research, to determine that practice is incongruent with research ignores the importance of personal pedagogy and that research might not be applicable in a certain context. Furthermore, postmethod pedagogy recognises that research is one of the many things that can inform changes in practice. This was also seen in the findings of this inquiry with a wide range of knowledge sources being drawn upon.

## 6.2. Practical and symbolic activity

This distinction between practical and academic work in ELT literature is also discussed by Kramsch (2015) who cites Bourdieu (1990, p. 30) who writes that:

There are in every activity two relatively independent dimensions, the technical dimension properly speaking and the symbolic dimension, a sort of practical metadiscourse by which the person acting ... shows and indeed shows off certain remarkable properties of his or her action. This is also true in the intellectual professions. Reducing the proportion of time and energy devoted to this show means increasing considerably the technical output: but in a world in which the social definition of practice involves a proportion of [symbolic show], it also means exposing oneself to the possible loss of the symbolic profits of recognition which are associated with the normal exercise of intellectual activity.

In the case of academic work in ELT or applied linguistics, there might be a great deal of metadiscourse that essentially exists to show that the work deserves to be considered an academic text. For example, when we cite texts in academic work we do so because it has a practical purpose in aiding others in finding sources and to help people check if a source has been misdescribed. However, citing texts is also important because it “shows and shows off certain remarkable properties” of the researcher’s actions. Namely, citing texts demonstrates that the researcher has put effort into reading around the topic and is well versed in issues around the field.

This perspective is echoed in the forum posts cited above. For example, in [505] the poster laments the time commitment of fully engaging with academic literature, especially when a single book can have over 500 citations. They write “It’s not surprising that few teachers write theory. How can they have the time to read and understand it let alone write it?” Put in Bourdieusian terms, for the time commitment for a teacher to demonstrate “certain

remarkable properties of his or her actions” (in this case reading and understanding 500 texts) is simply too much for the poster.

Kramersch (2015) goes on to argue that the symbolic activity around applied linguistics has increased its standing vis-à-vis other subjects in the humanities but at the same time this symbolic activity has increased the amount of jargon teachers must contend with. This point is echoed by McKinley (2019) who writes that in the past journals included contributions from in-service teachers reflecting on their experiences, these have lately become uncommon and been replaced by empirical research. He argues that in recent years there has been an increase in pressure amongst academics to publish in the highest-ranked journals and that that this can in turn create a pressure towards more controlled research that fails to embrace the ‘messiness’ of real-life teaching. A similar point is made by Bourdieu himself who writes:

The main function of a theoretical education [...] is that it enables one explicitly to take into account this theoretical space, that is, the university of scientifically pertinent positions at any given state of scientific development. This space of scientific (and epistemological) stances always imposes its order on modes of practice, and in any case on their social meaning, whether this fact is realised or not. (1990, p. 30).

In the case of applied linguistics and ELT, this would mean that people who become educated in the more theoretical aspects of applied linguistics theory do so to engage in academic discourse. However, because applied linguistics has a set of stances about what good applied linguistics looks like, new research in the sphere of applied linguistics will always be shaped by those stances.

The comparison between symbolic and practical activity is mirrored in the attitudes towards research in the forum. For example, post [503]’s description of academic work as not impacting but that “It just made it a lot easier for me to justify what I do/did, and to talk the talk....”, viewed through a Bourdieusian lens, appears to be an admission that the main benefit of academic study for the poster was the ability to engage in academic discourse. It also highlights the distinction between symbolic and practical activity.

This split between symbolic and practical activity also helps explain knowledge building in the Dogme forum vis-a-vis in the research community. The research community generally places far more value on the symbolic activity demonstrated by a text while the Dogme forum was generally agnostic. This helps explain the significant disparity between the strong

interest Dogme received in the teaching community and the near indifference in the research community. The discourse around Dogme did not demonstrate the symbolic activity necessary to garner attention.

This also helps explain the complex relationship with research in the group. Group members were willing to use research when it demonstrated practical benefit. However, because the group was relatively indifferent to symbolic activity, research wasn't privileged over other knowledge sources. This allowed for this the flexible approach to knowledge building seen in the group. Furthermore, if types of knowledge allowed in the 'theoretical space' of the Dogme forum is broader than in academia, it follows that less 'theoretical education' is required to participate in the forum. As a result, while Dogme may be viewed as less worthy of attention by the research community, the forum is easier to access and was able build knowledge from a broad range of sources. Finally, this Bourdieusian lens raises questions of if the TRD view is criticising a deficit of knowledge or a deficit of symbolic activity within teaching.

## 7. Conclusion

### 7.1. Limitations

This inquiry is limited in that grounded theory is always bound by author perceptions. During the research process, several steps were taken to mitigate this as much as possible including method mixing, peer debriefing, method mixing, member checking and the calculation of inter-rater reliability. Nevertheless, the findings of this inquiry are still based on the author's construction of the forum and this will, of course, be different to if the study had had a different author.

The second limitation of this inquiry is that the forum studies a group which is particularly unrepresentative of teachers. An online forum for teachers positioned against the status quo of coursebook driven classes is perhaps likely to attract teachers who are more motivated, iconoclastic and idiosyncratic than the norm. The findings of this study should not be generalised or presented as true of all teachers. However, it may be appropriate to transfer findings to other groups based on how similar they are. Furthermore, an examination of how a teaching group *can* construct knowledge could potentially act as a guide of how knowledge *could* be constructed in other groups.

Finally, this study attempts to represent an amount of information that is simply too vast to be fully analysed in a paper. In addition, it fails to capture data from around the forum. For example, I3 mentioned that often conversations might continue in online messaging services or in person. In other words, while this study reviewed over 169,000 words of data, this should be seen as a slice of a much larger pie.

### 7.2. Suggestions for further research in this area

The use of teacher writing is worthy of consideration for future studies into this area. As discussed in §2-3, this type of text allows for a view of teachers constructing knowledge ‘in real-time’. Further studies could potentially explore the same data set, which as it is in the public domain can be shared with others. Such an approach would allow for a conformation of or challenge to the findings of this study. If other researchers presented with the same data arrived at similar findings, this would help alleviate concerns around author subjectivity. There is also potential for studies to take a similar approach with different teaching groups. This would allow for a greater understanding on how group specific the findings of this study are.

I have argued in this paper that text analysis is an effective way of examining teacher beliefs where those beliefs are expressed in an accessible way. However, I1 commented that much of the activity that took place in this forum now takes place in the comments section of blogs and on social networking sites such as Twitter and certainly these offer a huge amount of data ripe for exploration. Given the limitations of stimulated recall methodologies, this has potential for the further exploration of teacher cognition and knowledge building in different contexts. I believe that this methodology has uncovered attitudes that might not have become apparent through other research methods.

### 7.3. Recommendations for practice

The findings of this inquiry have potential implications for how the relationship between teachers and researchers is conducted. The findings of this study suggest that, at least in the context of the Dogme forum, useful professional development took place without a great deal of reference to research. Indeed, there is little indication that many in the forum were seeking more research. If it were to be shown to be true more widely that teachers do not feel their practice is research deficient, it would be somewhat paternalistic for the research

community to insist that its output is needed by teachers. In such a situation, this would be an argument against further attempts to 'bridge the gap' between teachers and researchers. Furthermore, if, as this inquiry suggests, useful knowledge *is* being generated by teachers, this would be an argument for altering the relationship between teachers and researchers. Much of the literature in this area has focused on the knowledge flow from research to teachers. When the research discusses a flow of information from teachers to researchers, it is typically a flow of information about what teachers would like to see researched (see, Davari Torshizi, 2018; Gutiérrez & Penuel, 2014; Rose, 2019). Teachers guiding research is a good step towards making research more interesting to teachers; however, while teachers guide researchers in this scenario, researchers are still treated as knowledge creators and teachers as knowledge recipients.

To treat teachers as equals in knowledge creation is necessary to treat the knowledge teachers create as equal to the knowledge research creates. While some research does draw on, for example, the experiences of teachers, this type of study is often not treated equally to more 'scientific' studies. If a study into teacher beliefs found a particular practice was common among teachers, a common reaction in the research community might be to test that practice against other practices and a control group in an experimental study before recommending that practice. However, to truly treat teachers as equals in terms of knowledge building, it would be necessary to take this practice as valid without further testing.

For teachers, the findings of this study indicate that online forums can be a boon for teachers. While drawing on one's own *experience, ideas and resources* is valuable for teachers, this inquiry has suggested that access with other teachers doing the same is also of value. Furthermore, the frequency of *interaction* in the forum as well as the attitudes towards it belie its value for professional development. While the nature of online forums has changed since the Dogme forum was active, it is likely that similar types of interaction are still available for teachers. Seeking such forums can be of benefit for teachers and these forums should also be supported by those who are seeking to support teacher development.

## References

Allen, M. (2017). The SAGE encyclopedia of communication research Methods. In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*.



<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483381411>

- Andrews, S., & McNiel, A. (2005). Knowledge about language and the “good language teacher.” In N. Bartels (Ed.), *Applied linguistics and language teacher education* (pp. 159–178). Springer.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education*. Wadsworth.
- Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers’ stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 243–272. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.2.243>
- Belgrave, L. L., & Seide, K. (2019). Coding for grounded theory. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of current developments in grounded theory* (pp. 167–188). Sage.
- Borg, S. (1998). Teachers’ Pedagogical Systems and Grammar Teaching: A Qualitative Study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587900>
- Borg, S. (2009). English language teachers’ conceptions of research. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(3), 358–388. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp007>
- Borg, S. (2015). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. Bloomsbury.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *In other words: Essays towards a reflexive sociology*. Stanford University Press.
- Bransford, J. D., Barclay, J. R., & Franks, J. J. (1972). Sentence memory: A constructive versus interpretive approach. *Cognitive Psychology*, 3(2), 193–209. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285\(72\)90003-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(72)90003-5)
- Breen, M. P., Hird, B., Milton, M., Oliver, R., & Thwaite, A. (2001). Making sense of language teaching: Teachers’ principles and classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(4), 470–501. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.4.470>
- Britton, J. (1978). The composing processes and the functions of writing. In C. R. Cooper & L. Ordell (Eds.), *Research on composing. Points of departure* (pp. 13–28). National Council of Teachers of English.
- Burns, A., & Knox, J. (2005). Realisation(s): Systematic-functional linguistics and the

- language classroom. In N. Bartels (Ed.), *Applied linguistics and language teacher education*. Springer.
- Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research*. Deakin University Press.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12868-016-0320-5>
- Charmaz, K. (2012). Grounded theory. In *Rethinking Methods in Psychology* (pp. 27–49). <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199753697.001.0001>
- Clarke, A. E. (2005). *Situational analysis: Grounded theory after the postmodern turn*. Sage.
- Cook, G. (2015). Birds out of dinosaurs: The death and life of applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 36(4), 425–433. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv038>
- Corbyn, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Sage Publications.
- Davari Torshizi, M. (2018). Revisiting the form of teacher–researcher collaboration in the field of TESOL. *TESOL Journal*, 9(3), 573–579. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.382>
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. McGraw-Hill.
- Dey, I. (2007). Grounding categories. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 167–190). Sage Publications.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 55–85. <http://www.zoltandornyei.co.uk/uploads/1995-dornyei-tq.pdf>
- Dunne, C. (2011). The place of the literature review in grounded theory research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 14(2), 111–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2010.494930>
- Earl, B. (2014). The biological function of consciousness. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5(AUG), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00697>
- ELT Journal. (2020). *About the journal*. <https://academic.oup.com/eltj/pages/About>
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2016). TESOL, a profession that eats its young! The importance of reflective practice in language teacher education. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching*

*Research*, 4(3), 97–107. [www.urmia.ac.ir/ijltr](http://www.urmia.ac.ir/ijltr)

- Galloway, N. (2017). Global Englishes for language teaching: Preparing MSc TESOL students to teach in a globalized world. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language* (pp. 69–86). Multilingual Matters.
- Gass, S. M. (2016). Stimulated recall methodology in applied linguistics and L2 research. In *Stimulated Recall Methodology in Applied Linguistics and L2 Research*.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315813349>
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gatbonton, E. (1999). Investigating experienced ESL teachers' pedagogical knowledge. *Modern Language Journal*, 83(1), 35–50. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00004>
- Golombek, P. R. (1998). A study of language teachers' personal practical knowledge. *Journeys in Narrative Inquiry*, 32(3), 38–58. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429273896-3>
- Graden, E. C. (1996). How language teachers' beliefs about reading instruction are mediated by their beliefs about students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3), 387–395.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1996.tb01250.x>
- Greene, J. C. (2015). Preserving distinctions within the multimethod and mixed methods research merger. *The Oxford Handbook of Multimethod and Mixed Methods Research Inquiry*, April 2018, 606–615.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199933624.013.37>
- Gutiérrez, K. D., & Penuel, W. R. (2014). Relevance to practice as a criterion for rigor. *Educational Researcher*, 43(1), 19–23. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X13520289>
- Hadley, G. (2017). *Grounded theory in applied linguistics research*. Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315758671>
- Hadley, G. (2020). Grounded theory method. In J. McKinley & H. Rose (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 264–275). Routledge.
- Holton, J. A. (2007). The coding process and its challenges. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 265–291). Sage Publications.
- Johnson, K. E. (1994). The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of preservice English as a second language teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 10(4), 439–452.

- Johnson, R. B., & Walsh, I. (2019). Mixed grounded theory: Merging grounded theory with mixed methods and multimethod research. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of current developments in grounded theory* (pp. 517–531). Sage.
- Kelle, U. (2007). The development of categories: Different approaches in grounded theory. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Grounded Theory* (pp. 191–214). Sage Publications.
- Kramsch, C. (2015). Applied linguistics: A theory of the practice. *Applied Linguistics*, 36(4), 454–465. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv039>
- Krippendorff, K. H. (2004a). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Sage Publications.
- Krippendorff, K. H. (2004b). Reliability in content analysis some common misconceptions and recommendations. *Human Communication Research*, 30(3), 411–433.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(4), 537. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588427>
- Kuzborska, I. (2011). Links between teachers' beliefs and practices and research on reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 23(1), 102.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.
- Mackey, A., & Glass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*.
- Maley, A. (2016). 'More research is needed' - A mantra too far? *Humanising Language Teaching*, 47(3), 1–17.
- Mangubhai, F., Marland, P., Dashwood, A., & Son, J. B. (2004). Teaching a foreign language: One teacher's practical theory. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(3), 291–311. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.02.001>
- McAllister, M. (2001). Grounded theory in genetic counseling research: An interpretive perspective. *Journal of Genetic Counseling*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10897-009-9270-8>
- McKinley, J. (2019a). Evolving the TESOL teaching-research nexus. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(3), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.509>
- McKinley, J. (2019b). Evolving the TESOL teaching–research nexus. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(3),

1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.509>

McKinney, W. (2010). *Data structures for statistical computing in Python*.

Meddings, L., & Thornbury, S. (2009). *Teaching unplugged*. DELTA Publishing.

Medgyes, P. (1986). Queries from a communicative teacher. *ELT Journal*, 40(2), 107–112.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/40.2.107>

Medgyes, P. (2017). The (ir)relevance of academic research for the language teacher. *ELT Journal*, 71(4), 491–498. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx034>

Mitchell, R. (2015). *Web scraping with Python*. O'Reilly.

Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological Review*, 84(3), 231–259.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.3.231>

Paran, A. (2017). “Only connect”: Researchers and teachers in dialogue. *ELT Journal*, 71(4), 499–508. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx033>

Riazi, A. M. (2016). The Routledge encyclopedia of research methods in applied linguistics. In *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315656762>

Richardson, L. (2007). *Beautiful soup*.

Rose, H. (2019). Dismantling the ivory tower in TESOL: A renewed call for teaching-informed research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 94–99. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.517>

Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.

Spivey, N. N. (1997). *The constructivist metaphor: Reading writing and the making of meaning*. CA: Academic Press.

Thornberg, R., & Dunne, C. (2019). Literature review in grounded theory. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of current developments in grounded theory* (pp. 206–221). Sage.

Thornbury, S. (2000a). A Dogma for EFL. *IATEFL Issues*, 2.

Thornbury, S. (2000b). *Dogme ELT Discussion List*.

<https://groups.yahoo.com/neo/groups/dogme/info>

Thornbury, S. (2001). Teaching Unplugged (or that's Dogme with an E). *IT's for Teachers*, 1(February), 10–14.

Thornbury, S. (2017). *M is for manifesto*. An A-Z of ELT.

<https://scottthornbury.wordpress.com/2017/06/25/m-is-for-manifesto/>

von Trier, L. (1995). *The vow of chastity*.

## Appendix 1: CUREC Approval Form

Dear \*\*\* and \*\*\*,

### **What we talk about when we talk about teaching: Teacher knowledge sources in an online community of practice - Approval reference ED-CIA-20-195**

The above application has been considered on behalf of the Departmental Research Ethics Committee (DREC) in accordance with the procedures laid down by the University for ethical approval of all research involving human participants.

I am pleased to inform you that, on the basis of the information provided to DREC, the proposed research has been judged as meeting appropriate ethical standards, and accordingly, approval has been granted.

Should there be any subsequent changes to the project which raise ethical issues not covered in the original application you should submit details to [research.office@education.ox.ac.uk](mailto:research.office@education.ox.ac.uk) for consideration.

Good luck with your research study.

With kind regards,

Dr. Sandra Mathers  
Department of Education  
University of Oxford

## Appendix: Sampled Posts

Posts 1-500 below are the randomly sampled posts. When these were coded, this is indicated in italics at the beginning of the posts. Posts numbered 501 and above are posts that were found through keyterm searching as a part of purposive sampling. It is worth noting that these posts are not always easy to interpret. Because the forum could be interacted with by email, in many cases messages come with a great deal of additional text. Messages that come from earlier in an thread are often indicated with a 'greater than' sign (>) or by an email style header. I have made efforts to clean up this data as much as possible (it was originally twice as long) but, due to the amount of data, it was not practical to do this perfectly in every instance. Anonymised data is indicated with a triple Asterix \*\*\*. If you are reading an electronic version of this document, it is recommended to search the document for 'Post x' rather than manually scrolling for the post you are looking for.

### Post 1

"Hi, \*\*\*...wanted to have a look... but got this message  
The requested file or directory is not found on the server.  
...help!  
etc etc

\*\*\*--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, dogme@yahoogroups.com wrote: >  
> Hello,  
>  
> This email message is a notification to let you know that  
> a file has been uploaded to the Files area of the dogme  
> group.  
>  
> File : /Evaluation of write yer own.doc  
> Uploaded by : \*\*\*  
> Description : Student evaluations of a project that involved them  
writing their own coursebook units. >  
> You can access this file at the URL  
>  
> <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/dogme/files/Evaluation%20of%20write%20yer%20own.doc> >  
> To learn more about file sharing for your group, please visit  
>  
> <http://help.yahoo.com/help/us/groups/files>  
>  
> Regards,  
>  
> \*\*\*

### Post 2

*Coded as other forum post.*  
*Coded as questioning and answering.*



*Coded as non-teaching text.*

"Hi \*\*\*

Thanks for the echo. I remember seeing a comedy film in which a drunken scots singer sang ""If you think I'm sexy (Rod Stewart)"" accompanied just by a lone bagpipe player. It was a brilliant rendition, proving that communication and meaning are everything and the method more or less irrelevant if the communication channel exists.

Anyone know the film title?

Regards

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:

>

> Hi \*\*\*,

>

> Yes, what you describe sounds very much like inducting learners into a

> new discourse community by introducing them to certain 'rites' and

> practices of the community. I usually associate genre-based courses

> with ESP, but I'm sure genre is part of every language learning

> course, in one way or another, however unwittingly or overtly. And

> your experience with German is another fine example of what Krashen

> cites as the difference between learning and acquisition.

>

> Dogme has been described as an approach that lends itself to certain

> methods, which frustrates anyone who'd like to pin down just what

> dogme is, does, and aims for, I suppose. At the same time, it's been

> made pretty clear that it's conversation-driven, etc. by \*\*\* and

> \*\*\*, which doesn't seem to make teaching unplugged any less appealing.

\*\*\*

> Thanks for the demo!

\*\*\*>\*\*\*

> On Dec 31, 2011, at 8:06 AM, \*\*\* wrote:

\*\*\*> > Hi

> >

> > The discussion here is quite interesting pertaining to individual

> > methods. Could the appeal of dogme thus be that it is perhaps 'not a

> > single method' as such?

> >

> > I've been posting elsewhere about how humans learn to read (L1 or

> > L2) and propose that we actually use a multitude of methods. These

> > include phonetic, graphical and even predictive. It seems to me that

> > learning L2 with only direct translations is somewhat like only

> > using phonetic knowledge to read a text, i.e. prone to errors and

> > extremely demanding.

> >

> > Can it then be that learning L2, like L1, is heavily tied to

> > contextual interaction and gradual correction of errors through

> > multiple experiences of learning to adapt phrases for own use in new

> > situations? Also identifying by experience and feedback from more

> > experienced speakers? That's what most small children do naturally  
> > with L1 after all.  
> >  
> > Of course many teachers have to teach to help students pass exams,  
> > which often test grammatical knowledge before the learner has even  
> > had a chance to naturally assimilate much target language. e.g. I  
> > never 'got' German grammar (despite 3 years evening classes) before  
> > I moved to a German speaking country. It then rapidly fell into  
> > place nicely.  
> >  
> > My suggestion to compromise between these conflicts, is to teach  
> > language within 'Genres'. That is, focus on a particular useful  
> > context and use as much real original material such as readers,  
> > videos, audio etc.. Learning takes place in cycles with the teacher  
> > and peers offering suggestions rather than 'red-line' corrections.  
> > Computer Wikis are great for this as students only see their final  
> > improved versions, whilst the teacher can monitor the corrections in  
> > admin mode. I've posted up a brief demo version of a genre based  
> > course if anyone is interested <http://manxman.ch/moodle2/course/view.php?id=21>  
> >  
> > Best regards and happy new year everyone  
> >  
> > \*\*\*

### Post 3

*Coded as other's teaching experience.*

I promised another posting on that German teacher's English class.

The teacher herself is convinced that the children's lack of progress in English is largely because of their lack of concentration and their general chaoticness.

How do the children see it? I began this mini project by filming a class discussion on why they themselves thought English was difficult to learn. I still have to transcribe that discussion and examine it in detail but they did seem to be saying that yet another foreign language, on top of German, was difficult to absorb. They also grinningly agreed, most of them, that they didn't invest too much effort in this subject and preferred sport and mathematics.

I would suggest that the problems come from the fact that although most of them are bi- or trilingual, English is the first school foreign language with which they have been confronted, and school English is not the same as English. As my German stepson memorably said years ago : ""The trouble is I'm picking up English English from you and to do well at school I need to learn school English.""

I think these kids are under-achieving, at least partly, because they aren't really learning English, they are playing around with school English. The system is requiring them and their teacher to ""do the syllabus"" by reading the passages in the prescribed textbook , go through the accompanying exercises and write the monthly tests.

And there's a further fact I've forgotten to mention, I think. The class in question is a C class. They are in the C class because it has been decided they are not bright enough (for English at least) to be in a B or A class. What's the message to the children here? "Of course you are going to find English difficult. You are a C child."

I suspect, \*\*\*, that for these children, at least, and children like them, whether A, B or C , the tyranny of the textbook (and all that that implies in what language is treated and how it is treated - reading passages, exercises etc. ) has more explanatory force than psycho- or neuro-linguistics.

\*\*\*"

## Post 4

*Coded as teaching text.*

"I recently came across the following passage in a Chomsky publication. Apart from his reference to materials I find most of what he has to say very sympathetic.

People who are involved in some practical activity such as teaching languages, translation, or building bridges, should probably keep an eye on what is happening in the sciences. But they probably shouldn't take it too seriously because the capacity to carry out practical activities without much conscious awareness of what you are doing is usually far more advanced than scientific knowledge... I don't think modern linguistics can tell you very much of practical utility.... The truth of the matter is that about 99 percent of teaching is making the students feel interested in the material. The other 1 percent has to do with your methods... Learning doesn't achieve lasting results when you don't see any point to it. Learning has to come from the inside; you have to want to learn. If you want to learn, you'll learn no matter how bad the methods are.

Lecture 4, discussions, Language and Problems of Knowledge: The Managua Lectures, MIT Press 1988, ISBN 0 262 53070 8

\*\*\*

## Post 5

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Fellow dogma revolutionists,

I need your assistance while trying to assault the impenetrable walls of the fortress steep and mighty which mere mortals would know as ""the ministry of

education's instructions for teachers of foreign languages"" . I am writing an article to one of Polish educational periodicals in which I would like to lay bare the false assumption that testing gives an accurate picture of any student's level of language competence. I know my feelings and conclusions based on observations - but I also know that any such article will benefit if the writer can roll of a list of names, references, sources etc. While I will search, perhaps there's some name that comes to your more learned heads off the cuff? Thanks,  
\*\*\*"

## Post 6

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Hello Again!

Well after a week of thinking about Dogme and the silent learners and \*\*\*'s (as well as many other useful comments), I've got another question! MMmmOooh Ha Ha Haaaaaaa!

If A. is a factor:

...the social context of the classroom itself, and the learners' expectations and previous experience of classrooms and of what is supposed to happen in them.

Then B.

How do we deal with learner's expectations (coursebooks and grammar playing a key role and the likes) while trying to go Dogme? While I understand that there needs to be some negotiation between the learners and the teacher that involves a level of trust - just as they are afraid of my criticism, one of my fears is that students will have a negative critical reaction to me while conducting a Dogme lesson. I recently started a new class and gave a needs analysis with some sentence stems to finish. This class is different from others I've taught and there are some very conservative opinions. One student said ""I don't like it when the teacher...wastes time."" I thought wow, is this girl going to get angry if I don't do what she expects (she comes to class having completed all of the activities in the book BEFORE the lesson!!!).

Has anyone in this group received criticism from learners while doing dogme? How did you react? How did the learner(s) react?

Finally, I wondered how do YOU introduce the idea of Dogme to your students? Do you do it slowly, as if to ween them from their strongly held beliefs about the roles of teachers and students, or do you just jump right in on day one? There needs to be some trust first, right? (Yes \*\*\* , I'll get to that group dynamics book a.s.a.p.)

\*\*\*"

## Post 7

*Coded as other's non-teaching experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Hi \*\*\*,

Lots of interesting things you have said.

I think that many English teachers feel they are forced to choose between speaking the target language (and knowing many pupils will not understand them), or not speaking the target language much. This is good for social cohesion but results in passing "the exam being out of reach for many pupils. One reason I'm interested in dogme is because of the difference teaching methods and techniques can make to help everyone in the classroom. (Teachers are obviously included in everyone.) A school my children went to in Zambia was in an area where it was common knowledge that Zambian teachers cannot teach Zambian children to learn to speak and read English in two years. But at this school, it was possible, and speaking English in English class was part of what was different at this school, compared to other schools in the area. Using a code of gestures to teach languages is something I think is also fascinating. Just like teacher expectations, gestures do not cost money, if the copier breaks, gestures still work etc.

I'm not in a situation where I have to prepare students for high-stakes exams. If knowing grammar rules was the only thing that counted, then using the L1 often would probably make sense. Can't really speak to this from personal experience. I also completely agree that speaking English in the classroom needs to serve the purpose of learning, and isn't justified only because it is the policy. Policy and pedagogy need to go together.

Does oral fluency improve reading comprehension? When comparing students who go abroad and those who learn in classrooms, Segalowitz and Freed (2004) wrote that the variables that determine performance gains and oral fluency are so complex, that it doesn't make much sense to study them in isolation. (If they shouldn't be studied in isolation, maybe it is not a great idea to think about them in isolation either.) This is my understanding, when students are orally fluent, they have many multiword units or proceduralized chunks to fall back on. If you know a chunk, it is easier to recognise it while reading. If there are many chunks you can quickly recognise, the cognitive mechanisms which underlie your performance will be efficient and put less of a burden on your working memory. This makes it easier to learn more or think about the ideas in what you are reading. There are studies that show that morphemic abilities predict reading comprehension, for example, (English, Deacon and Kirby, 2004).

I like what you said about asking students to describe what they have done, or why they made a certain decision. These requests are not very glamorous, but I think students often learn the most from them. Thanks for reminding me again.

So many ideas and so little time.

\*\*\*"

## Post 8

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Hallo Everyone

Thanks to \*\*\*,\*\* and \*\*\* who replied.

I suppose the first thing to do is define what I mean by a language lab.

This is the actual scenario that I am faced with.

I have been asked to put together a programme to enhance participants speaking skills, focusing on pronunciation and fluency. The programme should also help with listening skills, especially attuning to the different dialects and accents the participants will encounter during their work. Most of the participants have had years of English language training in their own countries and are quite proficient when it comes to completing gap fill grammar exercises. But they can't speak! And they have only been exposed to RP when learning English.

As an aside to this, I was asked what I thought of the language laboratory, which is currently not being used as it needs repairing/upgrading. Figures of between 30,000 and 80,000 Euro have been mentioned. (Mindblowing, isn't it?) The lab currently consists of 8 stations, partitioned off so users can't see each other, fixed so the stations cannot be moved and a central console where the teacher can monitor, interrupt and generally oversee what is going on. To me, this is rather Skinneresque and Big Brother ish.

My view is, based on what they want the programme to achieve, is that they can use perhaps 4 mobile PC workstations with internet access, a projector and screen, and perhaps a TV. Use the PCs as \*\*\* has suggested, to record themselves and self evaluate as the programme progresses. They can also listen to other recordings that I will make of volunteers from their work place, who will be other NNS and a mixture of NS from different countries. They can access anything on the internet which can be used to stimulate discussions (mobile stations can be moved so participants can get into groups to talk to each other) amongst themselves, with monitoring and guidance from the teacher.

I reckon this would cost no more than 3,000 Euro.

I am not against using technology to help in the classroom, but I can't help thinking that the language lab

is more like a torture chamber. I attended a military German language course in 1980, which was set up in a similar fashion. Yes, it was good for some exercises such as verb conjugation etc. but I reckon I learned a lot more down the pub in the evenings.

Cheers

\*\*\*

---

From: dogme@yahoogroups.com [mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of  
\*\*\* To: dogme@yahoogroups.com  
Subject: Re: [dogme] Language Laboratories

Actually, I think they're a pretty good idea...although it may be a case of the grass being greener as I have never worked in a place that had them. As part of seaking involves being understood and language labs offer a relatively secure means of trying out strange sounding intonation and so on, I would have thought that used properly they can be confidence building. Similarly, they offer students a perfect opportunity to try out shadowing without worrying about what people might think about them. I believe that language labs can offer people the chance to communicate with each other as if on the telephone - providing a context that might not be exploited outside the classroom. Can these interactions be recorded? If so, it would give people something concrete to work on. Provides students with a means of assessing their speaking skills etc. Another substantial part of speaking is listening to someone - language labs obviously offer this facility.

In short, I can see how language labs can develop /some/ speaking skills. They might not be great for all of the skills: interaction is much better. However, they offer people the opportunity to try out new things, record them, listen back and analyse them...all in a fairly safe, secure and guided environment. I went to Google Scholar and searched for +benefits +""language laboratories"". I came across this (which I haven't read yet): <http://www.ittmfl.org.uk/modules/ict/2d/paper2d3.PDF> but I see that it includes a literature review (albeit somewhat dated). Hope this is of some help.

\*\*\*

El 30-nov-06, a las 13:53, \*\*\* escribi:

> Dear List Members,

>

> I meant to write ""with different accents""

>

> Sorry about that.

>

> \*\*\*

>

> Dear List Members,

>

> I would be grateful to hear your views on the pros and cons of

> language

> laboratories. I am particularly interested in the use of such

- > laboratories
- > in developing (or not) speaking skills. And if you know of any
- > scholarly
- > articles I could read, so much the better.
- >
- > I am engaged in a difference of opinion with a colleague over the
- > usefulness
- > of language labs as regards helping students develop speaking skills.
- >
- > I accept that computers could be useful to help listen to people with
- > different aspects, but just cannot see how they can help with speaking
- > skills.
- >
- > I look forward to your usual insightful comments.
- >
- > Thanks
- >
- > \*\*\*

## Post 9

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

It's not that I think Headway is such a fantastic course, but why vent spleen in its direction why there are other course books which genuinely stink the classroom out? Euro-centric? Maybe, but it seemed to work very well here in Japan, today.

What do I do with it, \*\*\*? Nothing particularly amazing, just plan my own presentation of the material, follow the grammar and vocabulary syllabus and try to use it as a spring board for students to express their own experiences. Why don't I just start with students expressing their experiences and go from there? Well, for ideas on that I come here. Care to share any?"

## Post 10

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

Hi all

For me, once again this is all about ego, power struggles and power relationships and, unfortunately, it is what every human life seems all-too-frequently to boil down to, whether consciously acknowledged or not, whether one is/feels like a victim of it or not, whether one feels like a member of a group or not, even whether one is a woman or not.

Perhaps sometimes foolishly, I tend to sympathise with the underdog me, and I do believe that, ultimately, particularly when you have accumulated years of experience, what goes on in a classroom should essentially be between you, the students and the odd - privileged - invitee, if they're lucky.

\*\*\*

\*\*\* wrote:

\*\*\*,

I also posted something on the Blog. However, as far as most of the Blog



content goes, I cant remember when I last read so much drivel purporting to be from rational adults.

Cheers

\*\*\*

\_\_\_\_\_

From: dogme@yahoogroups.com [mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of

\*\*\*

Sent: 10 April 2006 18:39

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Subject: [dogme] \*\*\*'s Guardian Unlimited blog

I looked for and found, following a reference, what is called a blog - by

\*\*\*.

I was rather surprised to find there a discussion (this time in the form of statement (blog) plus comments) between \*\*\* and that old, immature rabble who write regularly to Guardian Unlimited.

\*<http://tinyurl.com/m6mcu>

I wrote a few sentences myself, though my anger robbed me of accuracy a couple of times.

I don't actually think, personally, the ""Guardian lot"" are worth responding to. It is a fascinating fact, though, that there are a group of people, however unbalanced one may feel they are, who are so obsessed with dogme that they still follow the list (without being members) with great attention and continue to ridicule it from elsewhere.

\*

For the record, for those new to this list, it's perhaps worth mentioning that there are members of dogme who have been or still are members of the Guardian Unlimited crowd. So? Nothing in the sense that I'm implying anything should or should not be done. But an awful lot of constructive, positive discussion has gone on in dogme over the years and I thought all members should at least be aware of what is going on.

\*\*\*

--

\*\*\*

## Post 11

Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.

Coded as other forum post.

Coded as teaching text.

Hi \*\*\*

I read your detailed reply to \*\*\* with great interest.

For anyone following this I think it's worth pointing out that we don't 'attack' technology in 'Teaching Unplugged'.

As interesting as the debate on technology may be, I find the one around people just as interesting. It's funny how the people often seem to be the problem. I haven't taught in all the environments discussed in your dialogue with \*\*\*, but I do know that the supposed 'problems' with people in adult multi-national classes - to do with age, or with nationality, for example - proved to be imaginary once a genuinely conversational approach based on their needs, interests and personalities was adopted.

Finally, the focus on emergent language is at least as important an element of dogme as how that language is generated. I think it's potentially the most interesting element of dogme.

You teach by explaining, exploring and extending (the three exes! all my exes live in Texas..) the language the learners use to talk about the things that matter to them. If an element of technology helps people to talk, so much the better. If not, it probably isn't necessary.

\*\*\*

## Post 12

How aprops what a (former) student of mine just sent me. Don't agree that only 'smart' people can make it our though.

Can you read this?

Olny srmat poelpe can.

cdnuolt blveiee taht I cluod aulacly uesdnatnrd waht I was rdanieg. The phaonmneal pweor of the hmuan mnid, aoccdrnig to a rscheearch at Cmabrigde

Uinervtisy, it deosn't mtttaer in waht oredr the ltteers in a wrod are, the olny iprmoatnt tihng is taht the frist and lsat ltteer be in the rghit pclae. The rset can be a taotl mses and you can sitll raed it wouthit a porbelm. Tihs is bcuseae the huamn mnid deos not raed ervey lteter by istlef, but the wrod as a wlohe. Amzanig huh? yaeh and I awlyas tghuhot slpeling was ipmorantt!

if you can raed tihs psas it on !!

\*\*\*

## Post 13

"In reply: yes I do stack them (so to speak) because the system allows for that (ESOL C&G in the uk). I also know when they are ready because I happen to be trained as an assessor and an IV person for a couple of examining boards. I guess I'm lucky in that respect.

\*\*\*

## Post 14

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*  
well.....

It certainly must be nice to live in such cool places, where all the latest equipment and software are plenty and easily available... and '""computer problems"" are more related to restricted sites. '

Sorry, rich kids ( who usually can't see/aren't interested beyond their perfect world...), but in MANY ( Most ? ) places around the world, computers themselves,( let alone that do NOT crash AND/OR have a fast and reliable internet connection ) are still a far, far away dream for the majority of people.

What still strikes me as pretty odd, though, is that in the LWC list ( to which I also subscribe), for example, nobody, ever, talks about IWBs, etc...

But, here, at the ""back to BASICS"" list, it frequently seems to dominate the debates. (Please, note: NOT that it cannot or shouldn't ... just ODD.)

In the beginning, the view that attracted me most to this group was just that... BASICS. (Which is pretty much all I (and most teachers around the world ) have...)

It did make a lot of sense then.

Wonder where that idea's [""back to BASICS"" ] gone... Maybe, ""Back to Basics 2.0 & 1/2"" ?

Has anyone gone ""back to basics"" recently?

\*\*\*

From: \*\*\*

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Subject: Re: [dogme] Re: Dogme 2.0

Wow, do people still talk about ""losing"" information because of ""crashing"" computers? I have not had this problem in years.

a) get an external HD and save every evening (or at least every week)

Latest versions of documents? Why would you save more than one version of your own doc?

And if it is collaborative, why aren't you using googledocs so that only the most recent is available with previous versions visible?

What exactly do you mean by not being able to open docs? What kind of programs are you expected to use on the DELTA? (beyond word, excel and powerpoint or possibly PSE?)

I don't mean to sound condescending... I am seriously wondering if these things are STILL problems for some people, then I hope my comments above solve some problems. I find it really interesting and had just assumed that all those were problems of the past.

My students do not experience such problems... their ""computer problems"" are more related to restricted sites. Because of security they can no always see certain links I may send them. One of my clients is a ministry and we can not go online at all during the lesson. :( However, with screen captures and video captures I can still bring video in. Any online exercises they can do at home.

Interested in hearing from others if/how often their computer ""crashes"" (my last computer did it a lot, I got rid of it two years ago and have had ZERO problems since).

My two bits.

\*\*\*

## Post 15

Dont'w worry \*\*\*,

Both columns are quite defined, at least for me. I would like to have to have time to have a look at that book, because what you shows is great!

Regards and happy new year,

\*\*\*

=====

## Post 16

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

"Hi \*\*\*, \*\*\*, and \*\*\* whose msg appeared on a separate thread,

I suppose one of the posts \*\*\* is referring to could be mine:

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/dogme/message/14937>

which refers in turn to my blog post

<http://advancededucation.blogspot.com/2010/01/is-dogme-for-advancededucation.html>

in which I write:

""I wish here to drive home the point nevertheless, that technology is capable of enhancing what Thornbury declares is the thrust of dogme: ""to restore teaching to its pre-method 'state of grace' - when all there was was a room with a few chairs, a blackboard, a teacher and some students, and where learning was jointly constructed out of the talk that evolved in that simplest, and most prototypical of situations."" Why not, then, a few rezzed furniture objects embedded in a holodeck in Second Life, that do marvelous things when clicked on, giving learners that much more to wonder at and talk about?""

I suppose if dogme has to be conducted in a room with chairs then it can only be done face to face, but I assume that it can be practiced online as well (in SL for example, as is mentioned here), can't it?.

If dogme were to apply in an online environment, then it would have to entail social networking, in which case social networking would facilitate the practice.

This is what I was asking this group, if I have conceived dogme correctly, how my perspective fits in with the zeitgeist of the group.

There are almost 15000 messages posted here. I would love, as \*\*\* suggests, to be not only referred to particular msgs where troublesome aspects of social networking are mentioned, but also to some of the better ""gems"" that might help me and others to get a better fix on what dogme is, in case we're getting it wrong.

Thanks,

\*\*\*

--- In [dogme@yahoogroups.com](mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com), \*\*\* wrote:

>

> ""Dear All,  
> I've been reading some of the early postings on this `long  
> conversation', going back to the start in 2000, with great interest.  
> However, it seems a shame to me that the original `dogme' idea should  
> be morphing into 'social networking dogme'.  
> Best regards,  
> \*\*\*\*\*  
> Hi \*\*\*,  
> There are some real gems in those archives, I agree. I wonder if you  
> would mind specifying which posts or threads have given you the  
> impression ""the dogme idea"" is ""morphing into 'social networking  
> dogme' ""?  
> Thank you for any details you can provide.  
> \*\*\*  
>  
> "

## Post 17

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

This all makes perfect sense to me \*\*\*, except the references to L2.  
Maybe Ive completely lost the plot here, but I take L1 to be the  
students native language (Spanish in their case) and L2 to be English.

When you say:

\*The students listen to a tape of their conversation and give the L2 translation.

and

\*\*\*\*\* reviews phrases, giving the L2 equivalents himself only when no one volunteers to  
give the meaning.""

...shouldnt that read L1 in both cases..or not?

\*\*\*

"

## Post 18

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

\*\*\*

Thanks for your words of support. You too, \*\*\*. Just to put things a bit  
more in perspective, here's a rough record of the lesson:

10mins chit chat whilst waiting for all students to arrive. How are classes  
in China? How are teachers? Light hearted banter.

5 mins dealing with latecomers. (not as drastic as it might sound!)

5 mins setting the task. The letter was to be a PET style task that some  
people had done for homework. I asked Ss to share their ideas together and  
choose the parts that they thought would be best and dictate them to a  
classmate who would write the letter on the board.

20 mins Task

10 mins Break

5 mins I point out strengths of their letter. Explain what I m going to do.

Rewrite letter on other half of board.

10 mins Ask Ss to call out any major differences that they can see. Ask why  
I might have made these differences.

5 mins Mark their writing with correction codes. Answer question about what mark they would get in an exam.

5 mins Explain that they will be asked to write a friendly letter in their end of term exam (out of my hands!) Ask for suggestions about how to begin a friendly letter. Write suggestions on WB and add my own.

5 mins Do the same with ends of letters. Add more of my own than Ss contributions.

5 mins Ask Ss why they are not noting anything down. Check that they appreciate the use of these and possible value in coming exam.

2 mins Ways of concluding letters.

Rest of class abandoned due to apathy/frustration. Tutorial.

Incidentally, this class was followed by a computer class with the same group. One student turned up! In a previous class I had shown the students a story I had written using Powerpoint. They were given a short time to play with the program and in the next class they were set a challenge: write a short story using the program. Help was available as and when they wanted it. The following week, most people said that they didn't want to use Powerpoint. It was boring; it was unnecessary; they would learn how to use it when they wanted/needed to. I asked them to come up with suggestions for what they would like to do. They opted to surf the net, write e-mails, go to chatrooms and some decided to take on the Powerpoint project. In this week's class I had sent them an e-mail voicing my concern at their readiness to abandon the project before they had started it and asking them if they felt they had gotten anything out of their chosen activity. Obviously, as only one person turned up...

As for the Tenth Commandment, it's a tongue in cheek reference to \*\*\*'s hopefully equally tongue in cheek 10th commandment:

'10. Teachers themselves will be evaluated according to only one criterion: that they are not boring.'

I'm far too busy questioning my worth as a teacher these days to covet anybody's ass!"

## Post 19

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\*,

Thanks for the explanation and the suggestion for an in class activity.

I notice that people often suggest doing this or that in class here but do not often explain why it should be done. You say that when put into pairs to do this activity students interact with the text and with each other in a useful way. Can you explain this a little further. What kind of learning objectives might be achieved though this kind of activity?

\*\*\*

On Fri, 11 Mar 2011 13:19 +0000, ""\*\*\*\*\*"

\*\*\* wrote:

No idea what tool was used I'm afraid \*\*\*- I wasn't involved in the technical side of things. I just wrote a sort of model text in English which was then adapted by a teacher of Hindi, Chinese and Vietnamese to make it more relevant to the context of that language.

I love the way these kind of activities give repeated exposure to language areas in quite a motivating way. The electronic version is good for self study but in many ways I prefer to use a paper version, with the texts stuck up around the room, and learners working in pairs. If you emphasise that each pair has to agree on what course of action to take they often end up interacting with the text and with each other in quite a useful way.

\*\*\*

--- In [1]dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*\*" wrote: >

> Hi \*\*\*,

>

> These reading mazes are really interesting.

>

> I found a lot of other teaching resources at the SOAS website

> that appear to have been created by students. Are these from

the > MA plus language pedagogy track? I was at SOAS in the early 90s

> but this option was not offered then.

>

> What tool did you use to create the reading maze activity?

>

> \*\*\*

>

> On Fri, 11 Mar 2011 10:35 +0000, ""\*\*\*\*\*"

> \*\*\* wrote:

>

> Not completely forgotten \*\*\*!

> Here's a free electronic version of the the kind of activity

you > seem to be referring to, which I developed when I was working

at > SOAS.

>

[1][2]<http://www.soas.ac.uk/lwwcetl/materials/other/reading-mazes>

.ht > ml

> They are actually made for learners of Vietnamese, Hindi or

> Chinese as a foreign language, but I guess they could also be

> done in English (since the reader has the option of seeing the

> English version of each text too) There is also the option of

> hearing the audio version of each text.

> \*\*\*

> --- In [2][3]dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* <\*\*\*> wrote:

>>

> > Branching path activities, which I have just learned about  
from > \*\*\*, sound  
> > exactly the same as certain books which were published in the  
> 60s called:  
> > ""Programmed books"". They were, indeed, based on branching  
> programs. I still  
> > have several of them, including one on the use of commas, one  
> entitled  
> > Modern English Sentence Structure and an excellent one on the  
> phonetics of  
> > English. In all of them you read a certain amount of text,  
are > then give  
> > three or four multiple choice questions and where you are led  
> to next in the  
> > text, which branch you follow, is dependent on your answer  
(the > interactive  
> > part). I've always thought such books were ready made to be  
> turned quickly  
> > into electronic material. But they seem to have been  
forgotten. > > One could certainly learn from them and they also encouraged  
> the writers of  
> > the texts to write clearly and logically.  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> > \*\*\*

## Post 20

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

This should be on the home page of our group in some form, \*\*\*. Really!

\*\*\*...?

I like the analogy of uncovering, which reminds me of why teaching grammar sounds so strange; it's already there, and we use it to communicate. So why try to reinvent the proverbial wheel? Just let it roll.

\*\*\* ----- Original Message -----

From: \*\*\*

To: <dogme@yahoogroups.com>

Subject: Re: Re:[dogme] Pedagogic orgasms/dogme forms

> Just a pedantic note: as far as I'm concerned (and I think we have to accept that dogme...like everything?...is a personal thing), ""putting dogme"" into practice is a bit of a misnomer. To pinch a phrase off \*\*\*, it's more about uncovering dogme. It exists in one form or another and to one extent or another in every single classroom. I don't know \*anyone\* who teaches the book as if the students weren't there. Neither should we waste our time trying to achieve a pure dogme form. Far better to just keep trying to be more dogme. I think this should make it less threatening to people. Anything that doesn't accept that what we are blathering on about is nothing new and that most teachers (if not all) are engaged in it anyway is likely to



alienate us from our colleagues.

>

> \*\*\*

## Post 21

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Re: ""is the 'argument' that 'PPP driven syllabuses' are the best way for them to do this?""-\*\*\*

No, I don't think he'd go that far. But he's very big on substitution drills, making sure every ss uses a particular structure at least once before fluency work, and those sorts of PPP-ish type activities. I guess it's just a personal grudge. I don't like to see CELTA trainees come off a course believing PPP is how it's done; that refininf that 'technique' will improve their teaching and ss' learning. I think PPP is around to support the ESL/EFL establishment, frankly, and wish it would find it's final resting ground. Again, a personal grudge. I also like the analogy. Perhaps we are weaving a thread of our own here in cyberspace? Cyber-couturiers (not just for femmes. :-)

For something more constructive perhaps: I read an interesting paper ("Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction", Skehan, P. in "Challenge and Change in Language Teaching (Eds. Willis, J. and D.) which really confronts the inherent difficulty in making TBL a viable alternative to PPP. The balance of accuracy, complexity/restructuring, and fluency can seem daunting. I think some teachers might have the impression that TBL means sort of warming ss up to a topic/task, then letting ss talk it out, and, finally, having them report on their findings. Such an approach can lean too heavily towards fluency at the expense of complexity/restructuring even though there may be a focus on form/accuracy in the report phase. So, it seems vital that during the task stage, ss are either asked to produce ""cutting edge"" language. It depends, of course, on the particular task, processing needs of the learners, etc. Does anyone have a specific example of how they've made this work, ie adjusting the task to 'push' ss to the edge of their 'linguistic comfort zone'? It seems tricky and requires a lot of fancy footwork in my mind. Also, there seems to be a lot of debate over when to introduce the TL into the mix; some say early on, others (Willis's model?) prefer to do this after the task completion stage. Thoughts?"

## Post 22

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Thank you very much to all who have replied. It is much appreciated and certainly provided with plenty of food for thought. If anyone has any further advice or guidance, I would still love to hear/read it.

Once again, thank you.

\*\*\*

## Post 23

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\*wrote: >Which raises the question, yet again: Is dogme-style spontaneity >compatible with professional practice? And, another one, what KIND of >spontaneity is dogme promoting?

MD :

Professional practice and spontaneity are not incompatible. The belief that they are is one of the plagues of teaching, because in many learners' heads a good lesson equals many worksheets, transparencies, flashcards, and ready-to-fill-in written exercises.

But spontaneity is life \*itself\* ! How can you expect a lesson to be deprived from life ? A professional teacher is ready to respond and react and provoke reactions from the learners. To be ready he/she must have anticipated some of the reactions that could arise, some of the themes that could be triggered off.

IMHO, spontaneity means being prepared to react and to promote reactions, interactions, communication. To achieve this it is necessary to be in the "right state of mind". The latter point is difficult to get through to language schools managers. A language teacher cannot rush from one class to another as if he was going to pick up strawberries in the field. To have the "right state of mind" you must be relaxed and have a few guide lines in mind, to guide you through the lesson without being a hindrance. If a guideline becomes a hindrance, then it must be forgotten. Oh, yeah, so what shall I do next ? Choose another guide line !!

Consequently, to answer \*\*\*'s question, I would say that the spontaneity that dogme is promoting is the kind of spontaneity a teacher can provide with the right anticipatory and relaxed "state of mind", with a battery of guidelines in mind to promote communication, not to imprison or stifle.

\*\*\*

## Post 24

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

"In answer to "Puzzled of north Germany"

"Imagine for example this situation. It is a monolingual group of, say, English mother tongue students. You have to substitute for the German teacher who has fallen ill. You know lots of English but no German and there is no coursebook or photocopier. Could you make a go of it? A social constructivist says "Yes", a very confident affirmative."

\*\*\*, it was me that wrote that, not \*\*\*. I wrote it in answer to what \*\*\* had written previously.

I also tried to express some general ideas on how you might go about this. \*\*\* mentioned some more specific ideas in a subsequent message.

So we're certainly not starting out from zero here. Have you read those messages?

I liked your story about the Marxist-Leninist pilot, but hardly felt that you were addressing the issue. Is the teacher the fuel? Is that what you're implying? Hmmm.

Or are you simply implying that an expert (A and B knowledge) teacher is as essential to successful class procedure as fuel is to an aeroplane?

Well, that's just where I venture to differ.

You finish with ""How in the name of Dogmist-Dogminist approaches could a non-German-speaking English teacher teach any English pupils German?""

Would anyone else care to answer this?

Regards,

\*\*\*

## Post 25

"Hi \*\*\*, \*\*\* and \*\*\*

Thanks for sharing your ideas, I'm managing to have an experimental course of Dogme on reading comprehension in a few months, will let u know about the results and experience.

Best

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:

>

> Hi \*\*\*,

> Thanks for these interesting ideas on reading. This seems to be casting  
> ""real"" reading as instrumental reading where the need is conjured up by  
> an imagined need. I like the ""novel/story"" thing. It may be interesting  
> to cast this as self-narrative that students construct in various media:  
> print, audio, film, image, mobilizing a broader view of literacy than  
> the traditionally receptive, print focused one.  
> A student self-narrative could be individually or group focused and  
> might help students to re-negotiate personal and shared identities in  
> English. This would integrate their reading and writing and give them a  
> real reason to read. It would be interesting to see the types of things  
> they choose to read, and since this reading would likely be directed  
> giving them the tools and inspiration they need to create their own  
> personal narrative, they would be motivated by a genuine need.  
> Recently, I've been moving more toward self-directed reading in my  
> classes. It takes many weeks for students to understand what this is  
> about, and why they should do it, so, to pull it off you need to have a  
> long time with them. I realized that when I selected readings, no matter

> how careful I was, or how well I knew the students, what I chose would  
> not interest more than 5% of any group, and when students are not  
> interested in a text, their reading is distant, perfunctory, and  
> disengaged. When this is the case, I cannot justify asking them to read  
> anything at all. Reading is not something that you do for a class, or  
> because someone told you to do it. Reading is part of who you are. And  
> while people are building new identities in a new language, we have an  
> opportunity to integrate reading into that identity.  
> I think that the self-narrative would work with any level student. With  
> lower levels, the focus would probably be on audio and image, moving  
> gradually towards textual expression as students' language competency  
> grows. In many contexts, reading and writing are the most accessible  
> forms of engagement with a language and it is engagement that builds  
> competency.

> \*\*\*

>

> On Tue, Oct 23, 2012, at 09:46 AM, \*\*\* LEYS wrote:

>> Dear \*\*\*, \*\*\* and others

>>

>> I totally agree with how \*\*\*'s stresses the importance of a ""real need  
>> to read"". I quite like the movie descriptions activity. You could also  
>> deal with TV programmes (use a TV guide and decide what to watch  
>> tonight).

>> Similar activities can be holiday/hotel brochures where students choose a  
>> programme of activities / or discuss which hotel they would choose  
>> (taking into account price, facilities, other traveller's reviews ...).

>>

>> I also quite like the 'Wall Papers' (reading a newspaper together)  
>> activity from ""the book"" (p. 55). I have tried it out several times  
>> myself and each time it turns out to be a great lesson.

>>

>> News stories with catchy headlines (like 'The boy who came out from the  
>> cold' in 'A Framework for Task-Based Learning' - Jane Willis) make the  
>> students formulate their own comprehension questions (This is what I'd  
>> like to find out in this article, text...

>>

>> It can also work with a novel/story. You start reading an exciting part,  
>> taken from in the middle of the story. The students discuss what might  
>> have preceded these events, formulate ideas on relationships between the  
>> characters, etc. Quite often they will want to read the whole story to  
>> see if they were right.

>>

>> Kind regards

>> \*\*\*

>> talent@work

>> Van: dogme@yahoogroups.com [dogme@yahoogroups.com] namens leonitanz

>> \*\*\*

>> Verzonden: maandag 22 oktober 2012 22:27

>> Aan: dogme@yahoogroups.com

>> Onderwerp: [dogme] Re: Dogme and reading comprehension

>>

>>  
>> Hi \*\*\*,  
>>  
>> I am also interested in how the Dogme approach looks in a classroom. Have  
>> you had anyone contributing ideas for your thesis? For me, teaching  
>> reading goes hand and hand with writing, we have a shared experience,  
>> write about it, then read and share stories that we all have prior  
>> knowledge of the content, comprehension easily follows. Reading  
>> comprehension alone represents more of a challenge as the material is  
>> from an external source. So as a teacher I have to create a real need for  
>> the students to want to comprehend the information. For example, we are  
>> going to make something in the class, I give them written instructions to  
>> follow, we are going to watch a movie so I give them different movie  
>> descriptions so they can choose which one they want to watch, from our  
>> conversation we need to find information so we access the material to  
>> find answers. All reading in my class has a real purpose for everyone. So  
>> I would be interested in anyone else sharing some of their techniques for  
>> creating a ""real need to read"" in the classroom!  
>> Thanks  
>> \*\*\*  
>>  
>> --- In dogme@yahoogroups.com<mailto:dogme%40yahoogroups.com>, ""\*\*\*\*\*""  
>> wrote:  
>>>  
>>> Hey everybody  
>>>  
>>> I wanna know more about Dogme kind of teaching reading comprehension in upper  
intermediate levels, you know I'm working on this project ""The effectiveness of Dogme  
language teaching on EFL learners' reading comprehension"" as my thesis in MA TEFL, and  
would appreciate it if you share your ideas or experiences with me? I seriously need some  
help cause my professors at Uni don't know so much about Dogme.  
>>>  
>>> Thnx  
>>> \*\*\*

## Post 26

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Dear \*\*\*,

Haven't read the other replies yet but I'd like to reassure you.

I teach (most of the time) at an FE college in the UK.

Early this year we underwent a British Council Quality inspection (for what they are worth - I did work for the BC for over 3 years). My boss was extremely worried about my teaching Dogme/unplugged especially from the point of view that I refused to put together a syllabi or scheme of work (+ my lesson plans were sparse - 15 hours on less than one side of A4!). In the event the inspectors were asking management to get me to run some TD sessions for my colleagues!!!!

Secondly, many of my students take CAE - I must admit that so far in my

Exam preparation classes I have used materials etc but in the 'General' classes with the same students I haven't. It appeared to have little direct impact on their results.

+ all the students said how much more they enjoyed the classes!

\*\*\*(with positive vibes!)

\*\*\* wrote: >

> I'm about to go back into the classroom after a good spell out. During this  
> spell, I've had ample time to reflect upon my teaching and my beliefs and,  
> as a consequence, I have roughly fallen in line with something  
> approximating the spirit of dogme. However, in this, my induction week, I  
> have been glancing through the materials on offer, reading the 'Welcome  
> to...' packs and talking to my new colleagues.

>

> I am intimidated to death by the central role of grammar and grammar  
> syllabuses (syllabii no, please...) in my workplace. As we sorted materials  
> into files, my prediction that the grammar file would be bursting and that  
> the learner training file would be near empty were proved true. I read an  
> article written by a well-meaning teacher about how my new students (largely  
> Chinese) needed the safety net of grammar to reassure them and give them  
> something to hold on to. I watched as my new colleagues typed up new  
> worksheets to be handed over to the Reprographics Man (not copyright, Marvel  
> Comics). And I panicked.

>

> I am going into a new educational institution, in a new country, with new  
> students from a cultural background that I am completely unfamiliar with and  
> I had planned to exploit my ignorance by learning all about them, the  
> country, their country and their culture whilst at the same time giving them  
> the English they ask for to talk about these things. It had seemed logical  
> to me to do it this way. But as I look at the Treasure Hunts asking them to  
> write down how many post boxes there are in the village, how much it costs  
> to dry clean a jacket and a pair of trousers, where to buy a newspaper etc  
> etc etc, I am beginning to worry that my beliefs are built upon dodgy  
> foundations.

>

> Am I wrong to assume that free and equal learning is what my students need?  
> Am I putting their IELTS exam at risk? Are my woolly headed liberal ideals  
> going to condemn my students to failure and repeating? Am I a fool to let my  
> beliefs interfere with my students' study? And a hundred and one other  
> concerns that I am not articulate enough to include here.

>

> And so I turn to you, my colleague, and ask for advice, personal stories,  
> assurance and kind words. Don't let me down! Please!!!

>

## Post 27

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

I feel I am somewhere in between the two positions here. I have seen students react very often in the pattern described: give them controlled practice, they want free practice, give them free practice they get bored.

After 8 years of teaching, I have decided to operate (sometimes) just his side of 'accepted' limits of ELT: I decided to have an almost 'provocative' (in a good way) approach, without being insulting of course, but seriously rubbing students against their ideological grain (I teach in Egypt, so challenged some of their perceptions of love, marriage, sexuality). Challenged, not insulted. It's a fine line sometimes but...

The result I got was a group of 3 students coming to me saying that they really appreciated the lesson because it had 'given [them] the confidence to speak up'.

The point is, that the controversy below highlights the fact that what motivates learners is the feeling of authentic communication as opposed to 'imagine you're a business man'

It shouldn't be this way, I've learned more than 8 foreign languages and as such I understand and appreciate the value of 'artificial' communication exercises and just wish I had access, as a language learner, to a fraction of the communicative exercises available to students in classroom using the communicative approach.

Students often forget that to progress they need to be pro-active. It's a shame, but maybe it's my fault, that the only way I managed to get them to be pro-active was to provoke them.

In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\* "" wrote: >

> >>> \*\*\* 26/01/2006 18:15 >>>

> Why is that so, that when you set students to work, give them controlled

> exercises, they are concentrated and cooperative?

>

> I don't find that it is so. So, rather than a conditioned response, maybe it's a perceived response.

> >>Then you ask for their feedback, they demand 'more free talk', you shift to

> open-ended discussions, and before you know it, they're all yawning (except > for the guy talking).

> Again, I don't recognise this description.

> >>Is this another one of these examples, when patients need the doctor to > decide FOR THEM about the favorable treatment?

> Don't doctors deal, largely, with the physical, whereas language learning is more to do with the psychological? Where doctors recognise that all that the patient wants to do is to talk, have their concerns listened to and be recognised, don't some of them at least try to do that, rather than telling them to get out of the

clinic because there's nothing wrong with them? >  
> >>Do we need, as teachers, to take heed of our students' remarks,  
or should we > run the lesson 'autocratically'?  
>  
> Is there any way that we can force students to learn a language?  
Or can we just force them to perform well in tests? Or are the two  
things really one and the same? >  
>

## Post 28

*Coded as other's non-teaching experience.*

Two days ago the fate of every high school senior in Korea was fixed, during a single all-day examination that decides, once and for the rest of your life, which university you attend, who (and what class) your friends will be, what kinds of doors will be opened to you and which ones will be slammed in your face.

It's a multiple choice test, of course. Yet at the end of the first hour, a young woman named Song wrote the following in the margin of her question sheet: ""Dear Grandpa, dear Mom, dear Dad, please live happily...."" She then left the testing centre, went home, climbed to the eighteenth floor landing where she lived and pushed a filing cabinet under a window. When the cameramen arrived for the evening news, the police were washing her off the parking lot with somebody's garden hose.

I've got a copy of the test paper on my desk. The following is fairly typical of the English section:

""Some teenage girls are too expressive, talking and laughing loudly, playing to their unreal audiences. They gradually realize, however, that others are not really interestd in them. Teenagers' behavior changes when they realize others are too busy with their own lives to be watching them.""

""Our parents cast long shadows over our lives, and we become aware of their existence when we are infants. Parents first teach us essential ways of living by cautioning 'Don't touch' or 'It's not nice to do that.' We may think we learn these lessons through independent efforts, but it's not the way we obtain them at all.""

""Some star players believe that their role is to be a great player (sic), not a role model for young people. On the contrary (sic) other star players disagree.""

And that's it. The entire purpose of the ten years of your English education is to understand the (unmistakeably hostile) meaning of these passages and demonstrate that you did so on the answer sheet.



I'm sure Daedalus didn't want Icarus to fall, just to crawl through life like a man. But parents and teachers cast a very long shadow over our lives.

\*\*\*"

## Post 29

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

After a lively lesson full of language mostly coming from the students themselves, \*\*\* wonders (11/23 ""negotiation and discovery..."" ): ""should I be giving conventional wisdom the 'benefit of the doubt' by following at least loosely a linear, pre-ordained, 'disciplined' syllabus?""

What is behind \*\*\*'s wondering? Is it a fear of not giving students all they need, in the way that they can most easily learn it. Or the understandable doubts of finding oneself in a minority: ""Who am I to oppose conventional wisdom, ELT academia and the rest of the business?""

What is a syllabus that conventional wisdom suggests we use? It's the language the students need, listed and ordered (""linear""). A syllabus isn't usually available as is, because an ordered list of words, grammar patterns, and/or functions (""Can I...?"" ) or situations would be almost impossible for a teacher to make use of. Teachers need guidance in how to teach this language. And so the syllabus is woven into contexts--charts, texts and tasks for the classroom (i.e., a coursebook).

But I think the truth is, syllabus writers have hardly begun to scratch the surface of describing and ordering language, even the most basic parts of it. The complex web of vocabulary collocations, for example, hardly figures in current syllabuses. In addition, any one syllabus is a partial, not complete catalog of language. From this crude, partial skeleton of a syllabus, woven into the quasi-reality of coursebook contexts, students must learn language, even basic language, in its full complexity.

\*\*\*'s approach to teaching is to deal directly with the reality of language from which syllabuses and coursebooks are derived. I think that if she carries on encouraging and facilitating her students' use of English, using their lives, or games like ""My favourite \_\_\_ is \_\_\_ because \_\_\_."" or texts; giving the students the language they need when they need it (""a shoe shop"" ""I enjoy myself"" ), her students not only have a better chance of meeting all the language they need, but they also have a better chance of internalizing (learning) it, too.

\*\*\*"

## Post 30

Dear \*\*\*,

Would you say 'Teacher of Maths'? or 'Teacher of Chemistry'?  
I fear not!  
\*\*\*

----- Original Message -----

From: ""\*\*\*\*"

To: <dogme@yahoogroups.com>

Subject: Re: [dogme] Thou Shalt Not Say 'Thou Shalt Not Say'

> Hello All,

>

> En/Na lifang67 ha escrit:

>

> snip...

>

>> We language people have committed the same sin, perhaps even more  
>> recklessly. We have to go through a long self-righteous period of  
>> linguistic prescriptivism (Say ""teacher of English"" and not ""English  
>> teaacher"" or ""Say ""tell me your name please"" and not ""What's your  
>> name?""). This period is often punctuated by exclamations of ""But I  
>> would never say that!"" or ""But that would never occur in a  
>> conversation"".

>

> snip...

>

>>

>> \*\*\*

>

> Just to clear up that the phrase ""teacher of English"" is not principally  
> a linguistic question but the suspicion of cultural ignorance: the  
> confusion between being English and being a teacher of the language. It  
> is part of the bigger cultural confusion that England is The United  
> Kingdom or that the British are the English.

>

> I think that as teachers of the language we should be aware of its  
> background(s) and not fall into the simplicity of equating numbers or  
> power with linguistic rights. (What was that about NO WAR?)

>

> Regards,

>

> \*\*\*

## Post 31

"On reflection, what I really mean by 'deal with' is 'respond to'; does that help?

\*\*\* >of course, I understand what \*\*\* means, but (being a bit literal like), I  
>can't ever imagine feeling that I can deal with whatever comes up; open to

>it (the whatever), willing to go with it, eager to understand and share and  
>react and learn from it;

## Post 32

*Coded as other forum post.*

I got laughed at once when I described myself as a 'trainer'. Apparently, in the country concerned, the word 'trainer' was what they used to describe people like dog-trainers and such like. Jumping through hoops, eh?

And then there's the 'trainer' with sport and athletics connotations, as in 'coach', etc. Maybe we should be calling ourselves 'communication coaches'? Sounds sort of catchy, dunnit!

\*\*\*

--- \*\*\* wrote:

> Dear \*\*\*,  
>  
> Yes you are totally right! In my opinion, the title of  
> ""trainer"" came about  
> because of the development of in company training programs in  
> the 1980s. It  
> sounds a bit like jargon, but I think that it emphasises an  
> important point  
> about Business English training, which is the emphasis on  
> functional  
> language. In 1996 Mark Ellis and Christine Johnson wrote:  
> ""Users of Business  
> English need to speak English primarily so that they can  
> achieve more in  
> their jobs."" I think that this means that Business English  
> training goes  
> beyond normal teaching into a rather grey area! People end up  
> learning  
> transactional Business English when they need to learn the  
> tenses properly.  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>  
> From: ""\*\*\*\*\*" <\*\*\*...>  
> Subject: Re: Re: \*\*\*: Free downloads from OUP  
>  
> \*\*\*,  
>  
> Glad the download tip was of use. Typical that Widdowson  
> teases out a  
> difference between ""teacher"" and ""trainer"". All I've noticed,  
> and I never

> worked in the private arena, is that at some point friends and  
> colleagues  
> who did work in the private sector started calling themselves  
> ""trainers""  
> rather than ""teachers."" I always assumed it was just a bit of  
> jargon -  
> talking up their image. And I got the feeling that business and  
> industry  
> took trainers more seriously than teachers and offered them a  
> bit more cash.  
>  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>

\*\*\*

## Post 33

I feel the urge to answer \*\*\*, but have decided my answer won't be centrally relevant to the dogme list, so I'll answer off-list, and gladly send a copy to anyone who wants one.

\*\*\*\_

\*\*\* (retired)

## Post 34

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

The whole idea of a dogme coursebook is decidedly dodgy to me. It's a bit like the idea that you only destroy the parliamentary system by taking part in it; or like those bands who rant against exploitation and muzak whilst in the employ of some exploitative muzak merchant (yes, Mr Rotten, I'm looking at you!).

The only real dogme coursebook is the one that is written by the class (students & teacher). If we stand by our convictions and they are seen to work, the change will take place. It may be gradual but it will happen. How we can convince people to throw away the coursebook by using OUR coursebook is beyond me. Dogme, above all else, is not about mass production. It is individual; it is local and it is indefinable. I can already hear the pedants hissing about oxymorons...

## Post 35

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as teacher training.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*\* wrote:

> Hi everyone,  
>

- > Geoffry wrote:
  - >
  - > 'Every teacher I meet defends the PPP approach, why is this so?
  - > Why do students feel that they are wasting their time if they
  - > simply 'talk'?
  - >
  - >
  - > But is PPP totally incompatible with dogme?
- followed by a brilliant example.

Ok, I am do not contribute much to this list, but I read it avidly and find it very helpful. I teach in China. I am a teacher trainer for poor, rural schools in the Western part of China and I am funded by a British NGO. I also teach ""methodology"" in the local university. Much of the experiences of some of you in the Western world is interesting but not very relevant to my experience here - it was very relevant when I worked in Spain, but China is ... well, another kettle of fish.

Here PPP is - when there is any teacher training at all - the norm, but they call it the 5 Step Method - step one. review the previous lesson, step two present the new language, step three drill it, step four practice it, step five consolidate it. - leave out the first and last steps and basically you have PPP with slightly different jargon. If teachers actually know how to do PPP in a reasonably interactive way, and connect with the learners in front of them in even the smallest dogme-ish ways, it wouldn't be so bad. Here, they really teach mostly the old Confucious method - or as a Chinese colleague charmingly put it, the confuse method. That is, the teacher is meant to be a font of all knowledge which she/he simply pours into the vacant skulls of the recipient students in front of him who soak it up word for word, and memorize. Amazingly, many do.

The result in the university where I teach is students who do not have a clue how to think for themselves, how to formulate an opinion of any kind at all, (even in Chinese - I have worked hard to find out) who use the word ""interesting"" or ""colorful"" to mean anything at all vaguely nice, and all food is ""delicious"" and all friendship is ""lovely"". They do not work well in groups unless there is a clear leader they can copy, they do not know how to solve problems, personal problems are seen as ""my fate"" and they have a hard time grasping concepts to do with process towards a goal. I thought maybe a lot of this might be language difficulties but have asked innumerable questions of those whose English is quite good to find out how much is cultural and a lot is.

ok, I will get to the point. I teach them a sort of dogme.- watered down a bit due to necessity - there is no way they will be able to abandon the textbooks, their ONLY resource but I work at teaching them how to use their very own students as a resource. I work hard at doing this myself in my methodology classes while working to help them discover for themselves as much as I can, what teaching principles and

procedures and methods will help them deal with a real class. The idea that you start where your students are instead of where you want them to be is radical.

The idea that students can be guided to discover something rather than have it crammed down their throats is radical to the point of revolutionary -revolution of the kind this country is not used to. And they light up - you should see their faces when something like that hits them. Isn't that what dogme, in essence is? To guide discovery?

I am teaching them how to use the 5 step method. They need a method they can hold in their hands, so to speak, to tell them to go into a class and use students to develop the lesson alone would be to run before they can walk. But PPP, or 5 step or almost any other set ""method"" can be dogmetised. For some this is just a little, and they have to go step by step. I have to guide them to discovery in a way that won't overwhelm them, let them have the crutch of the set method long enough to be able to let it go. It will be a while yet, but China seems to do everything else the West does 3 times faster, maybe this will take off sooner than predicted as well.

Yes, it is compatible, and so are - if we can publish it somehow, specific ideas of procedures, techniques and model classes as given by Geoffry. Thanks, it is all helpful. So, please, when dealing with your fellow teachers who do not want to listen to you, who are frightened, please don't write them off as narrow minded fools, who cannot see the light - remember that some of them need help too, need a bit of encouragement and may well have to take great changes in small steps.  
cheers,  
\*\*\*

## Post 36

That's the trouble with the internet, one quick click and then ""oh crap did I really write that?!"" Yikes!

Happens to me all the time!

;-) \*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahogroups.com, \*\*\*  
wrote: >  
> sorry, pleaseread: ""you cannot avoid to realise that you are  
evaluated as a teacher""instead of the messy sentence I wrote. >  
> --- En date de: Mar 2.12.08,  
\*\*\* a crit: >  
> De: \*\*\*  
> Objet: Re : [dogme] Re: On second thought...

> : dogme@yahoogroups.com  
> Date: Mardi 2 Dcembre 2008, 11h52  
>  
>  
>  
> I do see the value in asking oneself all types of questions. This is very important to be able to question oneself. Teaching is interacting, interacting and stimulating interaction. You cannot avoid to realised to areevaluated as a teacher, so the question of credibility is to be asked. Communication goes both ways : how on earth can I be credible in the eyes of others if I am not credible to myself ? >

> --- En date de: Mar 2.12.08, \*\*\* <zpd.english@virgin.net> a crit: >

> De: \*\*\*

> Objet: [dogme] Re: On second thought...

> : dogme@yahoogroups. com

>

> I don't see the value in teachers asking themselves whether or not they  
> are credible. It seems to me that the people who are best fit to judge  
> are their students. A worthwhile question might be, ""How can teachers  
> seek to build on whatever credibility they might have?""

>

## Post 37

I follow you, \*\*\*. With my tongue in cheek, too, I propose we petition for a change of the name of the group to:  
The revolutionary dogme list

\*\*\*\*"

Post 38

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Hi, this is \*\*\*.

I live and teach EFL in Lugano, Switzerland. It's my first time on this list, which I bumped into just a couple of days ago and I am not sure about how to proceed, what the etiquette is like and so on. I don't even know If I am in line with a dogmetish approach, but since it looks as if it's about ""being yourself"" I don't very much care. I spent two days reading your mail before writing this message, I guess I feel shy.

I've always been the kind of teacher who gets easily bored with books and spends lots of time concocting self made materials. Over the last two years I have been using computers a lot, more to creative purposes, I must say. My last year students produced a three minutes video clip basing on one scene - the creature's birth- from M. Shelley's Frankenstein. I would like to send it to you, but it's 38MB.

Now I am looking for literary texts circling around the theme ""water"".

I already have some clues, shipwrecks, death by water and so on, but what comes to my mind is pretty aged stuff. Does anybody have an idea about modern literary texts connected to water?

I am preparing first lessons as well and I enjoyed The ""me, not me"" and the ""names"" activities a lot.

With pre-intermediate students, I draw four symbols, the circle, the triangle, the squiggle and the square and I ask them to choose two, the first representing their open self, the second their hidden side. I then ask them to draw the two symbols on a piece of paper which they mustn't show to the rest of the class. For each of the class members all must guess which picture their mates have chosen. I tell them it has to do with telepathy and keep a record of their predictions. In the end the two pictures are shown we see how many have guessed right.

After all students have been interviewed I pass round a leaflet with an explanation: If you chose the circle, you are sociable, talkative.... if the square you are solid, practical...etc. It's a good starter with a class you already know, to revise personality vocabulary and to understand a little more about them. I usually take part as well.

I've got the square- circle idea from a Cambridge book for first certificate, the rest I've made up drawing inspiration from similar activities. Maybe someone can improve this activity. It's all for now, I'm glad I found this list

\*\*\*

## Post 39

*Coded as own in class experience.*

I've noticed something about the origins of dogme in our classroom. As I recently indicated (message #8748), I've been less dogmatic in my lessons lately. This seems to have spawned a more dogmatic tendency in the same students who requested less dogme only weeks ago. It's interesting to note how the same learners who wanted less emergent grammar and open conversation now apparently want more. It's as if my supplying the antithesis of dogme has conjured up dogme itself; a bit like homeopathy when I consider the possibly untraceable amounts of dogme I still 'inject' into every lesson.

\*\*\*

"

## Post 40

Dear \*\*\* of little faith:

""Does anybody have an etymological dictionary out there?""

Out there? \*\*\* beat with me with getting to the in here online etymological dictionary. So, as often happens, ""cohort"" is an example of a word that's been around since the Romans but is coming back into use now.

See you around, amicus.

\*\*\*

## Post 41

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\* wrote:

> So, my markers (in a nutshell) include sociolinguistic appropriacy to a



great extent, listening ability, and, to a lesser extent, > phonological competence (pronunciation).

So how would you mark someone who said:

Aah's gaan yem.

or says,

'Axe' instead of 'Ask'. i.e. I axed you before.

or

Ay-up midduk

Dr E"

## Post 42

*Coded as teaching text.*

I was thinking along the same lines as John N Q Warner so I see I am not alone in my thoughts. We do need 'research' of whatever nature, just to keep ideas flowing. Wouldn't we stagnate or lose hope of any progress otherwise? I live on hope!

\*\*\*

## Post 43

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Last Friday, I was explaining the contents of the weekly quiz to everyone. Along the way, I reminded students to write 'T' for true, not 'V' (Spanish equivalent) on the quiz as some had been doing.

As usual, going over the answers to the quiz generated a lot of discussion and debate. Here's a summary of one debate and its outcome:

Someone had written 'V' instead of 'T'. The answer was correct, but the form was not. My first reaction was not very humanistic at all; I reminded the person correcting the quiz in question that I had gone over the bit about not using 'V' for 'T' right before we'd started. Most students agreed with me; however, P. spoke up to say that the mistake was an honest one and simply showed how old habits die hard. As a teacher, he had had the same experience with students who couldn't express their answer in Spanish and, wanting to say something, wrote in Garifuna.

Only a couple of students were on P.'s side though; the rest said the answer was patently wrong because it did not represent English, even if the contents of the answer were correct. One student insisted that other teachers wouldn't take a second to consider whether the answer was right or not but mark it wrong immediately. This was America, and the language

used here at this college in America is English. One girl told us how she'd lost 20 points on an exam in another class because she'd written 'V' for 'T' on the exam.

I managed to reel in everyone's attention after the debate seemed to be going nowhere by relating a story about a basketball game I'd once seen: the score was tied 98 all, with seconds to go. A young man had the ball literally fall into his hands right before the final buzzer had gone off. He caught the ball, saw the basket and shot the ball without hesitating an instant... And he scored! Unfortunately, this young player had put the ball through the opposing team's net, which meant they won and his team lost.

""What did the coach do then?"" I asked the class. F. was pounding his fist and looking angry.

""Actually"", I said, ""the coach walked over to the player and embraced him. What else could he reasonably do? It wasn't really anyone's fault; it was an honest mistake made under intense pressure.""

""That's how I feel about the person who wrote 'V' instead of 'T' """, I explained. There was applause from the students who had been following this line of reasoning the whole time.

When the students got their corrected papers back, M. was laughing so hard she had to cry. She had been the one who wrote 'V', not 'T', which came as a complete surprise to her. This fact also made me doubly sure that I had made the right decision.

But, my, how many of these learners wanted to punish the quiz-taker for his/her honest mistake. In what way have I contributed to this mentality? Why was I also so quick to judge? The slip M. made was just another example of how teaching does not equal learning (or acquisition), something that I consider a basic tenet of ELT pedagogy.

Another point of reflection for this practitioner.

\*\*\*

## Post 44

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Does dogme really need to submit itself to investigation to be valid? Can it be investigated, given how ephemeral it appears to be? If it can be investigated, I think we should be careful that we don't sound apologetic when we put forward our learners' opinions about their learning. After all, that, combined with our professional judgements on their progress, seems to be the best kind of evaluation that we can hope for.

\*\*\*

## Post 45

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Hi

Is it possible to 'dogmatise' when the class focus is EAP/academic writing skills? I've discussed this before, but thought I'd put up this afternoon's lesson for interest (and comment).

A class of only 6 (at the moment, the rest are stuck in transit with visa problems, so I understand), who are studying on an MA Studies in Education. 3 women from China, 3 from Saudi Arabia. Last week we negotiated what they wanted to do this semester (more on that later), which largely revealed a wish to understand UK academic writing conventions and develop their skills in this area. This would involve an thinking critically about stylistic issue as well as the nitty-gritty of linking ideas, paragraph formation etc. Ability-wise, their level isn't great certainly no more than IELTS 5.0 (sub-Cambridge First certificate level/TOEFL 530-ish I think), perhaps less (despite being on an MA... no comment from me on this point).

Last week, one of the learners gave me a piece of writing which was problematic in the style which tutors are looking for here ('I want to talk about...', 'we want to get confidence and power...' etc). It also had pretty major grammatical problems (e.g. as a sentence - 'Help student do everything well in different fields'). I had encouraged the learners to give me any work they wanted to form a basis for future classes, and they seemed to quite like this idea.

Based on last week's negotiation, I wanted to provide the learners with an very brief overview/awareness raising of style; work a little on her accuracy (practice proof-reading etc); and use the learners' work (obviously directly relevant to her, and the topic was relevant to the rest of the class).

Therefore, I reformulated her writing into a couple of clearer and more 'academic' paragraphs. We then used this as a dictogloss (I read it once and the learners listened for content, and a couple more times whilst they took notes content, and if they were ready, language). In small groups, they then formulated into short academic-style, grammatically accurate texts (helping each other and with help from me). The texts were then shared, and any stray language problems were looked at and discussed (most notably, how to make generalisations using no article plus plurals). The language they had written become the basis for discussion - we didn't look at their problems/difficulties in any great detail at this point (future lessons I think), but raised awareness of areas to look at.

They were then given a copy of the reformulated text which I had read out, and asked the following questions:

>How many personal pronouns are there and why? (highlighting the absence of such words in this kind of writing) >How many linking words are there? What are they? (typically quite a lot)

>Does the text use words like 'always' and 'all', or does it use words >such as 'usually' and 'most'? (highlighting the hedging of opinions) >Can they find any gerunds and participles (which seem to me reasonably

prevalent in academic writing, rather than verb clauses)

Having discussed the style required, I finally asked them to put away my reformulated text and gave them the learner's original piece of work - same topic, same content, but pretty difficult to correct. I had highlighted most problem areas, but asked them to proof-read it and improve it wherever appropriate. This proved to be pretty successful.

Clearly, the lesson did use materials, but these were from the learners themselves, and as much as anything, this was a lesson about language itself. As I've said before, my EAP lessons do tend to be language awareness lessons. And although there were only a few learners in this class, I think it would be an appropriate lesson for far bigger classes, and will be trying it out with them soon.

There is of course the question of exposing the student whose work it is, but I hope that the classroom is that 'safeplace' that we've mentioned before. With all the students were at the same level, it didn't seem too likely that anyone would be too exposed by showing areas of language which they needed to improve on.

Cheers

\*\*\*

## Post 46

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\*,

Mentions, in his account of L1/MT acquisition, the idea of grammar being missed out, as \*\*\* in 'Uncovering grammar.'

In \*\*\*'s examples e.g. ""Me want food"" there is grammar, surely, but it is the child's grammar rather than adult grammar. It works well as communication. [In communicative, informational terms, I wonder what the superiority of ""I want (some) food"" is over ""Me want food."" Is the child, by moving from one to the other just learning to conform - like learning to eat with its mouth closed?]

SC's examples (UG) include:

Woman off to jail for sex with boys  
City's first mayor to be born in Cuba

Isn't it the case not that these bits of language have no grammar - though, as written, that appears to be the case - but that the missing grammar is assumed to reside in the knowledge of the reader, which explains why the NS can understand these abbreviated statements and many learners, who haven't got the grammar in their heads, can't.

\*\*\*"

## Post 47

*Coded as own in class experience.*

For some time I have remained a silent dogme-tist; heaps to do, veery unwise - I should be the one to teach how NOT to organise one's life... anyway, in spite of all the ""drum-und-dran"" (a very apt german phrase) still avidly reading the postings. Hence my plea: in my capacity as the editor of the Newsletter of one \*\*\* Special Interest Group. Came to my attention there's a wealth of material for an article focused oin the issue of lesson plans. Wanted to use your postings - promise to quote appropriately and to insert an additional sub-headading about the article being based on the dogme list... thing is, I don't know at the moment whose words in particular would be taken... is it OK to sort of just ask for a general permission of all those who articipated in that one thread and later, after I have drafted, I will get in touch once more in re? thanks in advnace (how cunning!)

I have been sorting through my files from the previous year, all the notes (I strive to write a short comment after every class) - they yield wonderful reading. Given more time I would like to share with you, only it's out of the questions at the moment... even the 1-2-1 with a woman whom I eventually advised to stop as her professional and family commitments stood so much ""in the way"" - so you might say, a failure there... but it was sweet until it lasted.

On the basis of these notes I can vouch for the value of the dogme approach - at least with the adults and teenagers. Whenever there was ""a current issue"" or a topic of interest, the conversation is so engrossing and there's so much emergent grammar afterwards.

I still have not enough experience and self-assurance to seriously practise with young learners... in spite of some examples and hints... mostly I get discouraged because they positively love having a ""special"" course book - they feel as if honoured, admitted to some special rites... so it's an affective bonus.

\*\*\*"

## Post 48

So we made it - today is the tenth anniversary of this group (which must make it about 50 years old, in 'group-years'), and it seems as healthy as ever. Thanks to all who over the years have nourished the 'long conversation' - this has been the most fertile teacher development experience of my life.

Meanwhile - and perhaps not accidentally - dogme is being critiqued from all sides, and yesterday I must admit I felt a bit like Horatio defending the bridge as I tried to keep track of the various criticisms being lobbed at it - some thoughtful and informed, others entirely preposterous.

Check out these blog sites if you want a flavour of the way dogme has permeated the blogosphere:

<http://marxistelf.wordpress.com/2010/03/08/romantic-comedy-with-a-sinister-twist-a-marxist-critique-of-dogme-elt/#comments>

<http://sjhannam.edublogs.org/>

<http://jasonrenshaw.typepad.com/>

Meanwhile the 'cava' is on me. Felicitats!

\*\*\*"

## Post 49

*Coded as teacher training.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

As a teacher trainer in Flanders, Belgium my students often ask me which English accent I want them to go for. For most of them this is a question about an American or a British accent. The tradition in Flanders is to teach British English.

I know that some people in the EFL-world are proponents of a kind of accent-less World English. At the same time I notice that students enjoy trying to get an accent right. They, for instance, love imitating the different 'Simpsons' or 'Allo Allo' characters. We often pick up language chunks, together with the accent.

I personally do not like a neutral, accent-less language, as that kind of ""Esperanto"" does not feel like a living language to me.

I wonder how colleague dogme-posters deal with accent.

\*\*\*, Belgium

## Post 50

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Thank you for the input. \*\*\*'s comments on copying interest me because I can count the times a student has come to me with a question about the homework he/she has just copied and directed my attention to a notebook where I notice several inconsistencies with my words on the board.

I think we all agree that academic/scientific writing incorporates different lexical words and grammatical formulae, e.g. a wealth of words derived from Latin and Greek, the passive voice (if you consider it a voice).

Here are excerpts from the letter I sent in response to the professor of Ecology. I hope they outline some of my own thinking on the subject of writing and further our discussion, which I'm learning from as we proceed.

\*\*\*\*\*

The product was well worth the process in sharing this valuable and thoughtful information.

Speaking of product and process, continuing to monitor and encourage \*\*\* students' writing as a process seems like a good idea. As writers, whether in our inherited language or another, those of us who come to a blank page from environments in which writing has been relegated to rote learning of schemata for the sake of filling space often write a single draft, revise perhaps once before submission of our work, then wait for feedback which, in an academic context, we usually receive as a score.

This short-cut approach is especially difficult for \*\*\* students to take since it generally does not provide sufficient feedback. An essential element in language learning, according to many practitioners and learners, is what the jargon of my profession refers to as noticing. Therefore, peer feedback, i.e. more competent users of English assisting less competent users, in combination with a steady revision process is critical, as this interaction can be conducive to negotiation of meaning in an atmosphere that decreases learner anxiety.

Of course, we can only recommend students make a concerted effort to support each other academically outside of class, and time constraints can play a role in determining the effort given. Nonetheless, \*\*\*students have a proven record of excelling in this endeavor. I am sure you and others reading this have taken steps to capitalize on the group dynamic of the \*\*\*program. In our English language class, I promote feedback among peers. I also believe that extensive reading and writing (journals, library books, magazines, letters to English-speaking friends, e-mail to our online discussion group) can help scaffold language learning, so I incorporate that into our curriculum as well.

As for editing/correcting, I have read studies that suggest students self-correcting their work on the basis of feedback such as correction codes, highlighting or even short prosaic responses can have greater value than simply correcting work for them. The reason for this is that this form of editing requires more cognitive depth, which means the writer has to analyze and consider an error before attempting a correction, instead of simply looking at a correction provided by the reader.

My preferred method is to respond to each student's writing individually, recasting their errors into what is sometimes called positive input. A crude example would be:

Student writes: ""Yesterday, we played soccer. The soccer is the sport most favorite for me.""

My feedback letter includes: ""You wrote that soccer is your favorite sport. What is your least favorite sport?""

This kind of ""parent-ese"" mimics the way parents speak to their children, teaching them the language through positive input, which has been offered as an alternative to feedback that can decrease motivation to learn by pointing out every error in an utterance.

I would like to take a look at the rubric you use for weekly texts. I am familiar with several from the world of ELT (English Language Teaching), but not the one you have mentioned (from Diane Ebert-May and colleagues at the University of Michigan).

\*\*\*

## Post 51

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Logic forces me to agree with \*\*\* that 'dogme' and 'textbook' are contradictory words; but 'dogme' and reader or compendium = a collection of writings aren't.

As I see it there are two ways to go - we could carry on trying to select postings to the dogme list from the archives and make those the main part of a book, or we could commission specially written sections from selected members of the dogme list (or anyone who wanted to submit a piece to an editor or editorial group). Indeed, there is no reason why a book shouldn't consist of both selections from the archives and specially written pieces - and I'm assuming that there would be introductory bits from \*\*\* and \*\*\*.

\*\*\*.

You had a similar idea some time ago and I know that \*\*\* wrote a piece for you. Did anyone else contribute?

We need a steering group, don't we, if there is a wish and a will to put together a publication?

\*\*\*"

## Post 52

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Thanks for your post, \*\*\*, which was far from boring and will be put into practice before too long. Yesterday, in the class that kept me awake pretty much all night, I tried brainstorming with the group. As you may remember from yesterday's veiled cry for help, I asked them to brainstorm solutions to help them improve their listening. The problem was that they hummed and hawed so much that the brainstorm was more like a brain-few-spots-of-rain. As they did so, they agonised over 'how to spell



vocabulary' and other such things. As the braincloud passed over, there were a few smudges on the windscreen but it wasn't worth putting the wipers on, if you see what I mean.

My questions: has anyone else experienced this? Is brainstorming a technique which is ill-suited to any particular type of student; was I out of my mind in asking them to brainstorm a subject like this?

It was one of a series of setbacks that gradually undermined my (shaky) confidence. By the time that we got to the listening itself, I think I must have looked deranged. If anybody wants to play Doctors and Patients, or if there are any amateur shrinks out there, I'm yer man. But then I'm forgetting, we have our own Doctor in Residence..."

## Post 53

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

Hi all,

Having focused on film for ELT over the past year, I have to agree with \*\*\* that film is no more passive than many educational contexts and when used properly can actually be a wonderful source for creativity and interaction. I've been making films with high school students in the San Francisco Bay Area as a focus for a coursebook (yes, a coursebook) and it has been amazing how much you can do with all of the student-generated material. It is a very organic process, actually, and while we have a topic and basic structural framework for each film, we usually let the students determine a lot the actual language.

In addition to this, there are also some recent online tools out there that make film a more interactive process (e.g. they allow you to access any video on YouTube and then add your own questions during the film clip which you can then send to your students who add their questions and comments. They can also choose their own film and build commentary).

Great discussion.

\*\*\*

---

From: \*\*\*

To: dogme@yahooogroups.com

Sent: Mon, October 24, 2011 11:00:27 AM

Subject: Re: [dogme] Re: Occupy Dogme: Time for a new manifesto?

\*\*\*,

Film is no more passive than many educational contexts, including many

classrooms. After all, you usually choose to go and see a film (and many students don't actually choose to attend class). You do this based on reading reviews, seeing trailers, talking to people etc. These are all active things.

Once you're in the cinema you are actively engaged in interpreting the film, referencing it to previous knowledge etc - hardly passive. There's also the semiotic nature of film, just ask any film maker, as well as the cultural context.

\*\*\*

On 24 Oct 2011, at 18:50, \*\*\* wrote:

- > \*\*\*, you have done it again! I love the way that dogme endlessly
- > revisits its origins and reassesses its integrity. This constant
- > reflection is an excellent model for professional development,
- > especially since it is informed by cycles of classroom practice,
- > which again, \*\*\*, you have been so generous in contributing.
- >
- > Personally, I love the way that dogme morphs and evolves, constantly
- > changing shape and even direction - dynamic, emergent, adaptable,
- > and maddeningly (for some) elusive.
- >
- > This fuzziness is for me its strength - how else could it have
- > survived for so long? I'm constantly amazed ay the way dogme is
- > being picked up by a whole new generation of teachers and
- > appropriated for their own contexts and purposes. Just when you
- > thought it was dead in the water....
- >
- > So, while I love the way that you have teased out another very
- > suggestive metaphor (remodernism) I'm not sure that a new manifesto,
- > or a definitive statement (of the kind that \*\*\* hankers for) is
- > either necessary or advised. This doesn't mean that the exercise of
- > extrapolating dogme principles from another medium isn't useful - in
- > fact, it's through the creation of new metaphors that sciences
- > (including the social sciences) advance. But, as I say, I'm a bit
- > wary of the impulse to nail yet another manifesto on the
- > establishment door.
- >
- > Also, I'm wondering if the cinema is the most fruitful source of new
- > metaphors, for an educational movement that is predicated on
- > interactivity, above all? Film, after all, is a curiously passive
- > medium - from the point of view of the viewer at least. Maybe - like
- > James Gee - we should be looking at more interactive media - even
- > video gaming - for our inspiration?
- >
- > (That really was tongue in cheek!)
- >
- > But thanks once again for thinking outside the box (and keeping us

> on our toes)!

>

> (And this is offered with the intention of continuing the  
> conversation, not stifling it. Apologies if it reads like the latter)

>

>\*\*\*

>

> --- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:

>>

>> Times have changed since \*\*\* wrote the original ELT Dogme  
>> 'manifesto' <http://www.thornburyscott.com/tu/Dogma%20article.htm> It  
>> seems ELT Dogme has changed, too. Teachers have tried out 'teaching  
>> unplugged' for themselves and, to a large extent, have shaped it by  
>> feeding back to it's 'founders', largely through this forum.

>>

>> Through time, and, on occasion, 'tempest' (ie, 'stormy' debate), ELT  
>> Dogme, inspired by the manifesto of the Dogme 95 filmmaking  
> movement,  
>> has, in my opinion, become something much more representative of  
> this  
>> filmmakers' manifesto:  
><http://jesse-richards.blogspot.com/2008/08/remodernist-film-manifesto.html>  
>>

>> In the spirit of the times, and in the spirit of Dogme, I therefore  
>> feel compelled to reify (or (Occupy?) Dogme by drawing an analogy  
>> between ELT Dogme today and this new manifesto, suggesting it  
> might be  
>> more befitting our 'movement'. I'll also include notes\* and excerpts  
>> from \*\*\*'s 'Vow of Chastity' (aka 'Dogme manifesto'), published  
> over  
>> a decade ago.  
>> Remodernist Film Manifesto (accessed at  
><http://rogerebert.suntimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20100608/LETTERS/100609980>  
>

>> on 10/23/2011)

>>

>> 1. Art manifestos, despite the good intentions of the writer should  
>> always ""be taken with a grain of salt"" as the cliché goes, because  
>> they are subject to the ego, pretensions, and plain old ignorance  
> and  
>> stupidity of their authors. This goes all the way back to the Die  
>> Brcke manifesto of 1906, and continues through time to this one  
> that  
>> you're reading now. A healthy wariness of manifestos is understood  
> and  
>> encouraged. However, the ideas put forth here are meant sincerely  
> and  
>> with the hope of bringing inspiration and change to others, as  
> well as  
>> to myself.

>>  
 >> \*This first 'tenet', however ironically, instructs us to consider  
 > even  
 >> it's source and progenitor with a 'healthy wariness'. Proponents of  
 >> Dogme have suggested 'The Vow' not be taken too seriously and always  
 >> read in the context of the state-of-the-art pedagogy at the time  
 >> during which it was written. In that sense, this new manifesto  
 > adopts  
 >> a more critical perspective on itself than does 'The Vow'. This  
 > first  
 >> principle also applies to coursebooks, I believe, although I don't  
 >> like the harshness of the word 'stupidity'. Perhaps \*\*\* should  
 > have  
 >> included a similar disclaimer back then. Please understand I do not  
 >> mean to imply \*\*\*, or coursebooks writers for that matter, are  
 >> driven by ego, pretense or stupidity!  
 >> 2. Remodernism seeks a new spirituality in art. Therefore,  
 > remodernist  
 >> film seeks a new spirituality in cinema. Spiritual film does not  
 > mean  
 >> films about Jesus or the Buddha. Spiritual film is not about  
 > religion.  
 >> It is cinema concerned with humanity and an understanding of the  
 >> simple truths and moments of humanity. Spiritual film is really ALL  
 >> about these moments.  
 >>  
 >> \*Detractors have compared the enthusiasm for ELT Dogme to religious  
 >> fervor, while others have patently denied any evangelizing. In the  
 >> classroom, dogmetic teachers continue to explore humanist principles  
 >> and perspectives on education and language learning by giving  
 >> prominence to the lives of students, creating a space for 'moments  
 > of  
 >> humanity' among the people in the room, rather than by serving up  
 >> Grammar McNuggets. Understood in this way, there is no 'state of  
 >> grace' to be attained, and Dogme seeks a sort of 'humanist  
 >> spirituality' in the art of pedagogy.  
 >>  
 >> 3. Cinema could be one of the perfect methods of creative  
 > expression,  
 >> due to the ability of the filmmaker to sculpt with image, sound and  
 >> the feeling of time. For the most part, the creative possibilities  
 > of  
 >> cinema have been squandered. Cinema is not a painting, a novel, a  
 >> play, or a still photograph. The rules and methods used to create  
 >> cinema should not be tied to these other creative endeavors. Cinema  
 >> should NOT be thought of as being ""all about telling a story"". Story  
 >> is a convention of writing, and should not necessarily be  
 > considered a  
 >> convention of filmmaking.  
 >>  
 >> \*\*\* asked in his manifesto, ""But where is the story? Where is the

>> inner life of the student in all this? Where is real  
> communication?"" ,  
>> which suggested that time in natural setting of the classroom was  
>> being misspent. I think it has been realized that the emergent  
>> language arising from communicative and meaning-oriented interaction  
>> or tasks must be supplemented by some sort of attention to form, in  
>> order for the story, and the students, to find new meaning and  
> carry on.  
>>  
>> As for the 'rules and methods used to create' ELT Dogme, \*\*\*  
>> initially wrote ""A Dogme school of teaching would take a dim view of  
>> imported methods, whether the Silent Way, the Natural Approach, the  
>> Direct Method, or hard line CLT. No methodological structures should  
>> interfere with, nor inhibit, the free flow of participant-driven  
>> input, output and feedback."" But it seems clear that the unplugged  
>> teacher takes less than 'a dim view' towards these and other methods  
>> (eg, CLL and TBL). It is quite possible that the original manifesto  
>> (ie, 'Vow'), based on a rather strict code established by a group of  
>> Danish filmmakers, would squander possibilities afforded by the more  
>> tolerant and inclusive Dogme we see today.  
>>  
>> 4. The Japanese ideas of wabi-sabi (the beauty of imperfection) and  
>> mono no aware (the awareness of the transience of things and the  
>> bittersweet feelings that accompany their passing), have the ability  
>> to show the truth of existence, and should always be considered when  
>> making the remodernist film.  
>>  
>> ""The point is to restore teaching to its pre-method 'state of  
> grace' -  
>> when all there was was a room with a few chairs, a blackboard, a  
>> teacher and some students, and where learning was jointly  
> constructed  
>> out of the talk that evolved in that simplest, and most prototypical  
>> of situations.""  
>>  
>> \* As mentioned above, there really is no 'state of grace' as far as  
>> Dogme is concerned, and a time without technology is also  
> unimaginable  
>> to tool-using creatures like us. Unplugged learning can be co-  
>> constructed out of the talk that emerges from extraordinary  
> situations  
>> just as well as it can out of simple and prototypical ones. Thus,  
> this  
>> Remodernist Manifesto propels Dogme toward a post-method 'state of  
>> grace'.  
>>  
>> 5. An artificial sense of ""perfection"" should never be imposed on a  
>> remodernist film. Flaws should be accepted and even encouraged. To  
>> that end, a remodernist filmmaker should consider the use of film,  
> and  
>> particularly film like Super-8mm and 16mm because these mediums

> entail  
 >> more of a risk and a requirement to leave things up to chance, as  
 >> opposed to digital video. Digital video is for people who are afraid  
 >> of, and unwilling to make mistakes.\*\* Video leads to a boring and  
 >> sterile cinema. Mistakes and failures make your work honest and  
 >> human.\*\*\*  
 >>  
 >> \*As with the author's reconsideration of the merits of video (cf,  
 > 6.),  
 >> Dogme has, I think it's fair to say, assumed a less hostile stance  
 > on  
 >> the use of digital technology in the classroom. Nonetheless, the  
 >> smaller formats (Super-8 and 16mm) of a 'stripped down, technology-  
 >> free kind of film making' are still best suited to a 'poor  
 > pedagogy'.  
 >> Moreover, flaws are commonly seen as opportunities rather than  
 >> imperfections by dogme enthusiasts.  
 >>  
 >> 6. Film, particularly Super-8mm film, has a rawness, and an  
 > ability to  
 >> capture the poetic essence of life, that video has never been able  
 > to  
 >> accomplish.\*\*\*  
 >>  
 >> \*Just as Dogme, in my view, prefers, indeed thrives on, raw  
 >> communication, there can be exceptions \*\*\*, so that whereas Dogma 95  
 >> dictated that ""Temporal and geographical alienation are forbidden.  
 >> (That is to say that the film takes place here and now)"" , this new  
 >> manifesto mandates that, as long as ""Learning ... takes place in the  
 >> here-and-now"" , the means of interaction might be asynchronous and  
 >> create geographical distance among the learners.  
 >>  
 >> 7. Intuition is a powerful tool for honest communication. Your  
 >> intuition will always tell you if you are making something honest,  
 > so  
 >> use of intuition is key in all stages of remodernist filmmaking.  
 >>  
 >> \*This seems wholly in line with Csikszentmihalyi's concept of flow,  
 >> cited by \*\*\* here:  
 >> <http://scottthornbury.wordpress.com/2010/05/30/f-is-for-flow/>  
 >> Perhaps by no coincidence, Dogme has often been associated with flow  
 >> by, among others, \*\*\*  
 >> <http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/mortarboard/2006/jul/28/letitflow1?INTCMP=ILCNETTXT3487>  
 >  
 >>  
 >> 8. Any product or result of human creativity is inherently  
 > subjective,  
 >> due to the beliefs, biases and knowledge of the person creating the  
 >> work. Work that attempts to be objective will always be subjective,  
 >> only instead it will be subjective in a dishonest way. Objective

> films  
>> are inherently dishonest. Stanley Kubrick, who desperately and  
>> pathetically tried to make objective films, instead made dishonest  
> and  
>> boring films.  
>>  
>> \*I'll admit to liking some of Kubrick's films and apply this point  
> to  
>> attempts to situate Dogme within a standard framework of qualitative  
>> scientific research.  
>>  
>> 9. The remodernist film is always subjective and never aspires to be  
>> objective.  
>>  
>> \*Likewise, I think Dogme, as \*\*\* has suggested in his most recent  
>> posts to the discussion forum, will benefit most when ""Research  
>> methodologies ... include action research, interaction analysis,  
>> ethnographic and narrative inquiry, and curriculum evaluation"".  
>>  
>> 10. Remodernist film is not Dogme '95. We do not have a pretentious  
>> checklist that must be followed precisely. This manifesto should be  
>> viewed only as a collection of ideas and hints whose author may be  
>> mocked and insulted at will.  
>>  
>> \*Not sure \*\*\* has been mocked and insulted because of his 'Vow' -  
>> only he can tell us how he feels - but the fact remains that, just  
> as  
>> ELT Dogme has been criticized, the original manifesto (link to  
> article  
>> above) has been drawn into question and more or less diminished, at  
>> times by Dogme enthusiasts themselves. This post is no exception  
>> though it aspires to offer a more rigorous analogy.  
>>  
>> 11. The remodernist filmmaker must always have the courage to fail,  
>> even hoping to fail, and to find the honesty, beauty and humanity in  
>> failure.  
>>  
>> \*Read for yourself how the classroom accounts shared on this forum  
>> attest to this.  
>>  
>> 12. The remodernist filmmaker should never expect to be thanked or  
>> congratulated. Instead, insults and criticism should be welcomed.  
> You  
>> must be willing to go ignored and overlooked.  
>>  
>> \*While certainly not 'ignored and overlooked' entirely (and never, I  
>> hope, on the discussion forum), the unplugged teachers I've  
>> encountered, as with the ELT community in general, typically invite  
>> criticism - 'insults', not so much. This new manifesto reflects this  
>> humility much more than do the 'Dogme-like' prescriptions of 'The  
>> Vow', however tongue-in-cheek.

>>  
>> 13. The remodernist filmmaker should be accepting of their  
> influences,  
>> and should have the bravery to copy from them in their quest for  
>> understanding of themselves.  
>>  
>> \*Need I say more than Sylvia Ashton-Warner, Paulo Freire and Leo van  
>> Lier? See Anthony Gaughan's Unplugged Public Library for more at  
><http://teachertrainingunplugged.wordpress.com/unplugged-public-library/>  
>> , all of whom have been mentioned time and again since \*\*\* drafted  
>> the original manifesto.  
>>  
>> 14. Remodernist film should be a stripped down, minimal, lyrical,  
> punk  
>> kind of filmmaking, and is a close relative to the No-Wave Cinema  
> that  
>> came out of New York's Lower East Side in the 1970's.  
>>  
>> \*Still materials-lite at heart, after all these years. This new  
>> manifesto retains the minimalist call to 'chastity' with less dogma  
>> attached.  
>>  
>> 15. Remodernist film is for the young, and for those who are older  
> but  
>> still have the courage to look at the world through eyes as if they  
>> are children.  
>>  
>> \* I leave you alone to mingle with that last bit. For the record,  
> I no  
>> longer consider myself young, but I'll be rubbing elbows right  
> beside  
>> you just the same.  
>>  
>> \*\*\* (The position on digital/video has changed since this manifesto  
> was  
>> written in 2008- the group is inclusive toward use of any motion  
>> picture format. See recent essay here).  
>>

## Post 54

*Coded as teaching text.*

You might be interested in this entry in TEFL's version of Wikipedia. I didn't write it, and am not sure who did, but there is an open invitation to adapt/edit/supplement:  
<http://teflpedia.com/index.php?title=Dogme>

## Post 55

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as teaching text.*



\*\*\*,

""This is exactly what the ZPD is, n'est-ce pas?""

Well, maybe not. See \*\*\*'s posts on the subject, and, speaking of self-promotion, read my thesis on the subject (which I believe I've sent you already ;-)

Stepping on the devil's toes while dancing with her,  
\*\*\*

## Post 56

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\* wrote:

> Thanks for sharing this, \*\*\*. I think you should go in 'top(ic) less"" more > often.

>

> Would it be a good idea to recycle these lexical items, which originated so > wonderfully from a pamphlet that happened to present you with an elephant > composed of what artists call found objects (found art) --- sort of the > artists equivalent of dogmatic filmmaking.

>

> \*\*\*

>

\*\*\*, several interesting things came up when we recycled these items. We used dictionaries to find examples (found few) and definitions, then wrote example sentences ourselves. In responding to \*\*\*' examples I found myself relying almost entirely on intuition to say whether they felt 'right' or not. This was great because we were researching relatively uncharted (for both of us) territory and I had no pat answers to get in the way of a more direct experience of language.

What also emerged was that words like 'widen/broaden/deepen/heighten' occur in very specific contexts, with very specific references. 'Widen' for example can refer to widening a road, a simple physical context, but also refers to experience; 'deepen' refers to knowledge, understanding, emotion, 'heighten' to awareness and emotion, etc. Dictionary examples for 'heighten' all came from theatre/cinema, etc. All of this proved difficult for \*\*\*, a fluent speaker, to understand. My feeling is because we weren't relating our work to holistic text, and deriving collocation, colligation etc from this.

Even though we were working in a discrete-itemy way, the examples we produced were drifting relentlessly towards real language use, ie in-context discourse. 'Deepen' etc appears to collocate with very

specific items in very specific contexts, no doubt typical topics & genres. Further research would turn these up and complete the movement towards whole language.

\*\*\* >

----- Original Message -----

> From: ""\*\*\*""

> To: <dogme@yahogroups.com>

> Subject: [dogme] crushed elephant

>

>

>> Hi everyone, it's me again.

>>

>> I had a fascinating lesson (for me, with good feedback from the

>> student!) the other day, which I'd like to share.

>>

>> I have a habit of picking up flyers. At home I've got millions of

>> them. One happened to fall out of my file when I started a one-

to->> one with Dolors, a hospital pharmacist and uni teacher, very

fluent >> speaker. It showed an artwork in an exhibition which had been

made >> out of junk from the street, flattened out and montaged together

to >> make what was recognisably an elephant.

>>

>> \*\*\* and I started chatting about it and trying to identify what

>> the bits were. One was a tiny key, another a bent hat- or broach-

>> pin - all excellently specific and challenging vocab for a post-

>> proficiency type learner. The elephant's body was problematic,

>> looked a bit like a little hinge, and we started talking about

badges >> and things. We looked on the back where there was a blurb in

Spanish >> and started translating the items. We got stuck on 'latas

>> aplastadas' - crushed/flattened cans/F58tins; \*\*\* came up

>> with 'crushed' but for some unknown reason I wanted to push her to

>> get 'flattened', starting with 'flat'. Turned out she didn't

>> know 'flat', so we put the word in the middle of a spidergram and

>> started a naming of the parts which yielded: N: flatness and flat

>> (apartment), As: flatter & flattest, Adv: flatly + collocation: he

>> flatly refused, and V: flatten + past part. flattened. A

wonderful >> yield for a single simple adj and a revelation to me when we

started >> investigating similar patterns with 'high', 'wide', 'deep', and a

>> long list of others, all apparently deriving from single syllable

>> anglosaxon root adjectives (mostly) referring to physical

>> characteristics of the objective world and with very common

>> collocations: a notional set which generates a grammatical, word-

>> generating pattern and encapsulates a fragment of the language's

>> history!!!

>>

>> You can imagine my excitement. \*\*\* seemed to find it pretty

>> exciting too. Pity the lesson had to end. To round up we looked

at >> least/last/latest/less, which brought us full circle to

V: 'lessen'. >>

>> Interesting too that there wasn't a topic here, that we were

purely >> investigating language through the medium of English. So I broke one >> of my cardinal rules, which to always have a topic. But what the >> hell, a little living dangerously...

>>

>> \*\*\*

## Post 57

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

\*\*\*,

In the absence of the SCC working for you, here's a gallery of some of the possibilities. As you'll see, it does allow for quite a large degree of creativity and imagination....

<http://www.spore.com/sporepedia#qry=all>

Best,

\*\*\*

From: \*\*\*

Subject: [dogme] The spore creature creator

I can't get the spore creature creator to work on my computer, but I'm wondering about the situations where it might be more appropriate than simply drawing anyway? What do you mean by 'to move and roar properly'? Is there a proper way for a monster created by children to move and roar? What is 'a decent monster'? One which fits in with what the site is able to 'create', or one which is created by children? As \*\*\* recently said 'Imagination is more important than knowledge' (or something like that). Is imagination being developed with a site like this?

## Post 58

I have reread \*\*\*'s posting about stupidity and I disagree with your evaluation, \*\*\*. It is rude through-and-through and I am honestly appalled that it is at all defended by others. We can discuss anything (including dogme, of which there is less of recent) but shouldn't we do it in a civilised manner? a list where members call others stupid is not provocative, it is just uncouth. Incidentally, why did \*\*\* answer all other postings but mine? why didn't he defend his ""provocative manner""?> perhaps he feels my postings horrendously stupid? personally, I would be proud if that were the case.

\*\*\*

dogme@yahogroups.com \*\*\*:

As usual, \*\*\*, we are in agreement about more than might appear. I know what you mean entirely, and I understand perfectly why you wrote. However, I don't think \*\*\*'s barbed criticisms should be taken overly seriously. He writes that he is happy to be proven a fool, and I think that there are several ways of responding to that. Personally, I think that anybody should be happy to be proven a fool, but that's probably Bakhtin talking.

I like this group because, from time to time, the group gets to argue about how it moderates itself. That can only be a healthy thing. I agree that racist and sexist tripe is unwelcome here, but believe that it is better to confront it directly rather than ban it. My enemies say I'm a liberal...As for unsolicited advertising, Yahoogroups is awash with it!

I don't think \*\*\* was being rude, as such. I think that \*\*\* is a persona who believes that he can speak great truths in a provocative manner. At times he may be right. I don't think he was this time. I maintain that it is quite right to take testing to task because the premise that it is fair to test everyone using the same test fails to take into account that there are many ways to skin a cat. As I hinted before, I think that Derek Rowntree has much more interesting proposals to consider.

\*\*\*

-- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*\*" <\*\*\* ...> wrote:

>

> \*\*\*,

>

> I hadn't really got the assessment issue in mind, I was thinking more of the

> issue of being rude to people who have sent messages. As for not having

> guidelines for what goes and what doesn't I'm as against rules for a list as

> I am against teaching grammar rules, but I still think there are a few

> things one can frown on severely - racism, sexism, un-sanctioned

> advertising.

>

> \*\*\*

## Post 59

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

Hi Everyone,

I just think that Yoda is proof that the syntax can be all over the place, but the meaning is still conveyed.

In fact, considering establishing I am, the first ""Yoda School English of"". Where syntax more than leve just a on having fun is.

Cheers

\*\*\*

.

\*\*\* wrote:

> Well, friend Two-cents,

>

> I think what worried me about Fish's argument was that:

> -. He began by saying that students can't write well because they

> don't know what a

> sentence is, they don't know the form of a sentence. This was his

> basic premise.

> - This implies that you can only convey meaning if you get the form

> right.

> - That's the equivalent for me of saying: ""Your thoughts must be

> conveyed in correctly

> formed i.e. conventionally correct grammatical sentences otherwise

> they won't be accepted.

> Dreadful. Sack the man. Make him take early retirement.

> - If his article had been about how to teach structural linguistics

> it would have been much

> more acceptable. ""Get into groups a create a new language"" is quite a

> ploy.

>

> \*\*\*

## Post 60

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\*:

Imagine--this shouldn't be too hard--a learner who has spent virtually all his/her academic career on the receiving end of exchanges like this:

T: How's the weather?

S: Sunny.

T: That's right. It's a sunny day.

(Neither looks out the window, where it has begun to rain on Seoul.)

What will happen when this learner becomes a teacher? All his/her life he/she has slotted one-word one-turn answers to long, laboriously grammaticized, three turn exchanges which are firmly closed, and which can and do randomly change topic every three turns. Suddenly the tables are turned, and it is the learner who is now completely responsible for grammar, topic choice, and even nomination

of interlocutor.

That's not too hard to imagine either. Here are three examples from oral exams yesterday:

1) T: How was your weekend, \*\*\*?

S: So-so.

T: So-so?

2) T (pointing to a picture of a turtle and a rabbit having a race)

What is he doing?

S: Running.

T: OK, OK. Now, listen and repeat.

3) T: What did you do on Friday night?

S: I go to a movie.

(T plus Ss): Oh--aaaa---oh!

Pragmatically, these three responses convey three completely different things. The first one, of course, implies that the student has said something wrong, because that is how teachers normally invite a reformulation.

Originally this fake ""comprehension check"" was supposed to be a gentler way of saying that a mistake has been made, but of course through overuse kids figured out the true function and it now has roughly the same pragmatic force as ""No...Dummy!""

The second one is even more misleading. The use of ""OK"", the repetition of the word, and above all the tone of mild irritation all imply that the response is marginally acceptable but time-wasting.

The third is, in some ways, the most misleading of all. ""Ooo-aaa-oooh!"" is a peculiarly Korean choral response which rises and falls in pitch a little like a siren; it's used on talk shows and is meant to mark extreme audience interest but does not necessarily constitute an invitation to elaborate, as it is choral, and it's used in situations where the burden of continuing or changing the topic is entirely on the talk-show guest.

All of these responses are misleading--even disingenuous--because they all really cover up the inability of the teacher to think of the next thing to say.

This is all the more astonishing because the answer is right there in front of the teacher's nose. Or rather, the teacher's next question is in the learner's answer.

Why change the topic at all? Korean children have a song called ""Monkey's bum"", which goes like this in English:

A monkey's bum is red  
red like an apple.  
An apple is delicious.  
Delicious like a banana.  
A banana is long.  
Long like a train.  
A train is fast.  
Fast like an airplane.  
An airplane is high.  
High as Baekdusan (a volcano on the border between Korea and China  
where Koreans are supposed to have originated).

This principle of repeating old information and varying it in some way is a key principle of many children's games, such as ""guttmalitki"", the word ending game:

A: Monday.  
B: Daytime.  
A: Timely.  
B: Lycos.  
A: Cosine.  
etc.

But it's also a fair principle for conversation, and even music. Topics (usually indicated by stress) get repeated, and varied, and rather than either party being particularly responsible for topic choice, the topics are allowed to vary freely.

Chafe (1994) argues that conversation does NOT take place in sentences at all--instead it takes place in TONE groups, and that these are really limited to ONE new idea. Sentences correspond to ""areas of interest"" and these are very often co-constructed, giving rise to the ""Hughie, Dewie, Louie"" phenomenon we noted earlier. (""Discourse, Consciousness, and Time"", W. Chafe, University of Chicago Press)

He also argues that Mozart and even American Indian music is constructed the same way. One melodic line introduces exactly one new idea. This is picked up by another ""voice"" and another new idea is added. And so on.

Compare:

T: How's the weather?  
S: Sunny.  
T: Still sunny?

T: What is he doing?  
S: Running.  
T: Hmmmm. What do you think he's saying?

T: What did you do on Friday night?

S: I go to a movie.

T: Tell me more about it.

So why doesn't this happen? Well, one obvious reason is that it's too difficult for learners to continue. Yet it's not hard for the teacher to make it easier. Many teachers instinctively know the old ""menu"" trick, where up-down intonation is used to provide secret cues:

T: How's the weather?

S: Sunny.

T: Let's have a look. Sunny or rainy?

T: What is he doing?

S: Running.

T: Hmmmm. What do you think he's saying? ""I'm winning"" or ""I'm going to lose!""

T: What did you do on Friday night?

S: I go to a movie.

T: Yeah? Tell me the ending. Was it happy, or sad?

(Yes, \*\*\*--this IS a kind of scaffolding, and it WILL hang you if you do it too much!)

But actually it's not just the learner's fault. Another reason that the topics don't develop, and the teacher has to frenetically keep thinking of the next topic is that the TEACHER is changing the topic. Check it out:

T: How's the weather?

S: Sunny.

T: Good.

What's good? The weather, or the response? The response, of course! So instead of talking about the weather, we are now talking about the acceptability of the learner's response! Who can blame the learner for thinking that the weather topic is dead?

In the early days of dogme, one constant topic of discussion was how to introduce the part of dogme where you have to defocus the topic and concentrate a bit on the formal properties of the language that the learners are missing in their enthusiasm.

Practically (in defence to those with theory allergies) you can put it like this. What do you say when you want to talk about language? Do you simply say ""stop the conversation I want to get off"" or do you say ""And now for something completely different--let's look at some mistakes you made"" or do you use those fake comprehension/confirmation checks or do you recast or what?



And how often do you do it, if not once every three turns? Actually, I think that \*\*\*'s idea of team teaching is very useful here. As he points out, it's based on the idea of ""have a go--now watch this--now it's your turn again"".

T: How's the weather?

S: Sunny.

T: Not where I live, though. Just ask me.

T: What is he doing?

S: Running.

T: Now, what do you think he's saying? Ask me.

\*\*\*

PS: \*\*\*, I'm speechless. The idea that immigration laws might somehow constitute motivation for kids who have the money to buy their way past them would appear to be belied by the classroom facts in front of your eyes.

Bourgeois immigration laws are tools of racist, class repression, not learner motivation. The two things are very different, or I'm a policeman.

Let's imagine that I am not a policeman or a teacher, but instead a marriage counselor. One of my clients is a young Englishman who would like to marry an Indian woman. At Heathrow, she is asked if she is virgin and even physically inspected like a piece of imported meat.

Now, of course, when I first heard of this practice, I bethought me let us not to the marriage of true minds admit impediments, but now, after years of seeing forced marriages, arranged marriages, unhappy marriages....

No, sometimes the first impression is the right one.

\*\*\*

## Post 61

\*\*\* wrote:

>it is my perception that I am far more of a crusty conservative than  
> others on this list (if I am wrong.. email me; conservatives are in  
> fact a lonely and persecuted bunch in the field of education.

Don't beat yourself up about being a conservative, \*\*\*.

There's no harm in conservat[iv?]ism, as long as the right things get conserved. I reckon.

[Ok, ok. Disclosure: the movie buffs among you will notice that I've plagiarised and bastardized Clint Eastwood's classic line to Hal Holbrooke in Magnum Force. Here's the original: ""No harm in shoot'n, as long as the right people get shot"". A conservative mantra if ever there was one.]

None of *\*this\** has got anything to do with dogme, either, I dare say. Just trying to help \*\*\* to feel better about having come out of the closet.

That's all,  
\*\*\*

## Post 62

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

-----Mensaje original-----

De: midill@... [mailto:midill@...]

Enviado el: lunes, 05 de enero de 2004 14:46

Para: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Asunto: Re: [dogme] Accents

In a message dated 1/5/2004 6:39:56 AM Eastern Standard Time, halima@... writes:

Should we punish someone who can't make a particular sound even because of this?

We shouldn't ""punish"" them, but perhaps teaching EFL or ESL is not their calling.

\*\*\*

I would say, even that depends on who and what level exactly they are teaching. One sound only missing or ""wrong"" could be minor enough to overlook. I have known native teachers with a slight lisp and habitually pronouncing ""th"" sounds instead of ""d"" or something (can't remember now) but this person was nevertheless a good teacher and his students did not adopt his pronunciation - maybe they would have if he had been the ONLY source of English pronunciation.

I am not sure about this. Many Spanish people learn English here and then teach it (mostly badly, but the reasons for that is another whole topic) - much of their pronunciation is not quite up to standard, but they allow for this by using tapes, and videos and other sources, and the ones who are good, (not many, unfortunately) manage to overcome the obstacles while improving their pronunciation.

I don't think one sound alone would be enough to disqualify someone from teaching. Rather the whole pattern of pronunciation and dealing with pronunciation issues.

\*\*\*"

## Post 63

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\*, I've got to repeat what has been said before. Few people (if any) would argue against coursebooks per se. The target seems to be the depersonalisation that they carry in their wake. It seems that everybody who posts to this list uses or has recently used a coursebook in their classes. Wasn't it yourself who coined the phrase 'materials light' as opposed to 'materials free'? Have you changed your opinion? What brought about the change (if any)?

Dogme is a challenge. It certainly doesn't seem to be working very well for me. My students want more serious, more IELTS-based stuff (despite being a long way from the exam). I try to maintain some Dogme principles and I do the best I can. Today, incidentally, was one of those bad days. I stuck to the book and found myself 'teaching' something that was completely unnecessary to the students...Dogme provides a forum for me to discuss my beliefs about education and to offer me a different perspective on things I may not have thought about and keeps my spirit up when I think that I'm failing and I should just go back to the coursebook and the old way of doing it all.

As for the teacher who wrote the exercise, one could say that it's not as bad as it looks. After all, the biggest problem seems to be that some of the answers are possible in more than one situation. Another problem might be found in that the teacher has used written English (meant to be read) in a listening text (meant to be heard). As for the English, well, the world is full of ambiguous signs that serve their purpose.

One might also wonder where the teacher got the ideas for the construct and whether the English would have been so flawed if she had been using it to express her own reality or to help her students express theirs?

## Post 64

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Im interested in a sort of sub-thread thats been going on because it chimes with stuff Ive been trying to get my head round for a book Im doing on text.

\*\*\* said: As I see it, dogme is about getting language off the dead page and into the living lacework of people's minds - a more fragile environment, but a truer one, as language is not a fact but an experience.

And \*\*\* picked up on this by speculating that The Creative Child, true to type, says, ""Experience the moment. Draw meaning from the immediate experience.""

How does this connect with text? In a new book of papers (Trust the Text, Routledge, 2004) John Sinclair outlines a radical theory of coherence. Because text processing (either listening or reading) happens in real time (yes, even reading), from a psychological point of view, readers or listeners do not indeed cannot process the whole text at once (unless it is a one-liner, like a public notice). Instead, they have only the text-of-the-moment, the immediate sentence or utterance, in their sights, so to speak. Coherence (i.e. sense) is achieved because the text of the moment either carries with it an encapsulation of the previous sentence, or it fulfils an expectation inherent in the previous one. That is to say, each sentence is contingent on either the one before or the one ahead. The occurrence of the next sentence pensions off the previous one, replaces it and becomes the text. The whole text is present in each sentence. Which later, he re-phrases in this way: The text at any particular time carries with it everything that a competent reader needs in order to understand the current state of the text And later still: A text does not consist of a string of sentences which are intricately interconnected, but of a series of sentence-length texts, each of which is a total update of the one before.

Ergo, the text (in the traditional sense) is an artefact. In reality, the text is the immediate sentence or utterance. Like those hot news updates that scroll across your computer screen. That is really the text.

Ok, no prizes to guess where Im trying to take this. Substitute lesson for text. Lessons, too, happen in real time, and leave only traces or echoes. For the learner, what is going on right now is the lesson-of-the-moment. Only the teacher, perhaps, has a sense of the whole lesson, the lesson-as-artefact. For the learner it is simply scrolling by. But for the lesson-of-the-moment to be coherent it needs to be both in the here-and-now, and to connect to what just happened and to what is just about to happen. It needs to be contingent. The lesson of the moment must carry with it everything that a competent learner needs in order to understand the current state of the lesson. Again, a lesson lifted out of a coursebook is perhaps perhaps less likely to have this sense of contingency than a lesson that is being collaboratively borne along by the learners, with the teacher as cox. (My metaphor is clearly influenced by the Olympics).

To paraphrase \*\*\*, the lesson is not a fact but an experience.

And this harks back to a long-lost thread which used as its text the much-quoted insight of the art critic (forgotten his name) who said Presentness is grace.

\*\*\*."

## Post 65

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

I don't think that dogme is for post qualification teachers. After all, it's the virgin teachers (titter titter) who come to dogme with the state of grace that we are all yearning for. And before the cynics comment, let me rephrase that first sentence by changing 'is' for 'should be'.

How can you assess teaching effectively? Now we're getting back to that topic close to my own heart, assessment. Well, when I say close, I mean I still have to write an essay on it (which had to be handed in last Thursday...). How can we assess anything effectively? Rowntree comes to the conclusion that summative assessment is not all that desirable anyway. He recommends that students leave courses with portfolios and references, all of which carry a govt health warning stating that 'Relying too heavily on other people's opinions can seriously damage your sense of reality'.

And to answer \*\*\*'s question, no, I have never heard from a student that they were paying me to be doing more than I was. Draw from that what you will, but I certainly don't mean to imply that all of my students have been satisfied and delighted with my classes. Far from it (as a look at my CPD log would tell you!).

## Post 66

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

\*\*\*'s excellent effort reminded me of many lessons where I used on of th Beatles's lyrics to illustrate some point of grammar; I even at some stage attmpted to put together a whole grammar book so based. remained a dream, but who knows? only point is, contemporary students prefer other lyrics so it is more natural to let them bring in their own songs.

\*\*\*

dogme@yahoogroups.com \*\*\*:

The second law of thermodynamics can also lead to an appreciation of Flanders and Swann or develop a budding engineer who designs a machine that could revolutionise the world.

Let's sing together:

The Second Law of Thermodynamics:

Heat cannot of itself pass from one body to a hotter body  
(scat music starts)

Heat cannot of itself pass from one body to a hotter body

Heat won't pass from a cooler to a hotter

Heat won't pass from a cooler to a hotter

You can try it if you like but you far better notter  
You can try it if you like but you far better notter  
'Cos the cold in the cooler with get hotter as a ruler  
'Cos the cold in the cooler with get hotter as a ruler  
'Cos the hotter body's heat will pass to the cooler  
'Cos the hotter body's heat will pass to the cooler

\*\*\* who sings ""If I were a rich man ..."" if conditionals come up LOL

On Sat, 2008-05-17 at 09:05 +0200, \*\*\* wrote:

- > Learning about valency in chemistry or the second
- > law of thermodynamics in physics does not call for change, it calls
- > for
- > understanding and memorizing.
- >
- > \*\*\*

## Post 67

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Hi,

Have only found time to gloss each paragraph, but, yes, I see dogme in there, especially the learner- and learning-centered focus of Tolstoy and his insistence that learning should be intrinsically motivating by addressing the needs and interests of students. Tolstoy's work with peasants reminds me of Freire's work.

Thanks for sharing that.

\*\*\* On Nov 17, 2011, at 6:05 AM, \*\*\* wrote:

- > Hello everybody. I have recently discovered some interesting
- > articles written by Tolstoy about education. Here is the link.
- > <http://www.ourcivilisation.com/smartboard/shop/smmnsej/tolstoy/chap4.htm>
- > There are better ones that resume his work as a teacher but I wanted
- > your opinion on whether what he was doing was following the Dogme
- > lines or not. I personally believe that what he was doing is Dogme
- > AND a lot more. He applied it to a higher level of education, not
- > only languages.
- > So, what is your kind opinion?
- >
- >

## Post 68

Hi \*\*\*,

Thanks also to you for responding: I'm not sure I have enough humble pie in the house and will shortly have to go shopping (I pause to smile).

Contrary to how my post will have read, I really did appreciate the commitment you brought to the conversation and hope you will continue to join in. I think what frustrated and annoyed me really was my inability to find in myself that piece or key that you say you were hoping for, because I was hoping for it myself. Trouble was, while I was occupied with my thoughts and their failure to germinate, I lost sight of the fruitful discussion that had started elsewhere. Schoolboy error, and one that I am actually laughing about now, between slices of humble pie, that is!

\*\*\*

On 26 Oct 2011, at 09:50, "\*\*\*\*" wrote:

- > Crikey, I'd better go to bed later and get up earlier.
- >
- > \*\*\*, thank you for raising the topic, as I was a little mystified where
- > it had gone.
- >
- > \*\*\*, I'm not sure if or how your thoughts have evolved since your
- > initial reply to \*\*\* last night. But from what I remember of our
- > conversation and the rest of the discussion, we were indulging in exactly
- > the thought experiment you regret not having. I admit that I made reference
- > to publishers and ministries because they feature highly in my professional
- > work.
- >
- > More importantly, on a local, personal level, I'm concerned about the needs
- > of the learners just as much as anyone on this list. But I have to insist
- > that pragmatic considerations may influence decisions about material design,
- > which may be the reason you don't see me among the 'necessary starting
- > points in a thought experiment (or, indeed, in a real-life endeavour of this
- > kind). Well, that's put me (back) in my place!
- >
- > But in fact we spent five evenings in an extended discussion - a thought
- > experiment would be a good term to describe - during which my scepticism
- > about a Dogme coursebook was put on hold, while we discussed the matter.
- > While there were many turns and suggestions, to which I replied, I was both
- > looking and waiting for a breakthrough moment when a single practical or
- > theoretical idea could flick the switch on for the project. On Tuesday
- > evening we discussed the theoretical side, on Wednesday we then explored
- > some excellent material, and on Thursday we also explored some of the
- > publishing questions which began to arise. After that, the discussion
- > disappeared.
- >
- > Two thoughts occurred to me. The first was I could have gone about
- > theoretical and practical issues much longer before I'd exhausted all my
- > ideas about something that I was taking very seriously. Secondly, I didn't
- > get any sign of the breakthrough or voices in unison that I was looking for.
- >
- > As a guest to this list, I then thought as much out of politeness as
- > pragmatism that it would be best to let the matter rest, especially as by

> the weekend, there was only one person joining in the discussion.  
>  
> In my experience, thought experiments and Socratic dialogues don't produce  
> books on their own. Books get formed through a series of stages each of  
> which has an outcome, albeit only one of many along the very long road to a  
> publication.  
>  
> Best  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>  
> From: dogme@yahoogroups.com [mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of  
> \*\*\*  
> Sent: 26 October 2011 00:25  
> To: dogme@yahoogroups.com  
> Subject: Re: [dogme] a coursebook rejoinder  
>  
> Thanks, \*\*\*, thanks very much for your reply.  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>  
> On Wed, Oct 26, 2011 at 1:08 AM, \*\*\* Gaughan <anthony.gaughan@...  
> <mailto:anthony.gaughan%40gmx.de> >wrote:  
>  
>> Hi \*\*\*,  
>>  
>> I see little future in that thread (but am ready to be contradicted).  
>> My reading of the comments on that topic were either:  
>>  
>> 1. the notion is ""perverse"" and therefore not valid for discussion in  
>> theory  
>> 2. the notion is worth discussing in theory but the practicalities need  
>> to be worked out first  
>> 3. the notion is less interesting than the other ideas it spawned  
>>  
>> As for (1), I'm a touch disappointed in this but that's my problem and  
>> I'll get over it. The comment you posted from a friend represents  
>> precisely what has disappointed me - a rejection of an idea without  
>> direct dialogue with the proposer or engagement with the idea on its own  
>> terms (sorry, but can't be bothered to trawl the thread now for the  
>> link). I thought this is precisely what Dogme was supposed not to be  
>> about (at least, in part).  
>>  
>> I also thought (think) the idea is ""perverse"", but saw that as no  
>> barrier to indulging in a thought experiment. After all, what is a  
>> thought experiment for if not to explore ideas which do not (or could  
>> not, or perhaps should not) exist in reality? A couple of people  
>> engaged in it but only a couple. So it seems the list is not interested  
>> in discussing ""the thing that should not be"". OK...  
>>  
>> \*\*\* suggested the idea was ""misconceived"" - maybe it is, but in what



>> sense? The notion of a Dogme coursebook may be an oxymoron in an  
>> absolute sense, but does that make the pure exploration of this idea for  
>> the sake of testing the limits of Dogme as theory and thereby making  
>> clearer why exactly such a thing could not in fact exist (in  
>> pedagogic/theoretical not political/bureaucratic terms) ""misconceived""?  
>> You might say ""the reason it's 'misconceived' is clear as day!"" - well,  
>> obviously not to the person who posited the question in the first place,  
>> and that at least validates a serious engagement with the question.  
>> That said, the engagement should (I think) be on Dogme's terms, not on  
>> the publisher's or government's, which leads me to...  
>>  
>> As for (2), as my interest was in it as a thought experiment in the  
>> truest sense, I was less interested in working out how to make such a  
>> proposal acceptable to ""the powers that be"" (be they publishers or  
>> ministries: important as they may be in the real world, they needn't  
>> count in a thought experiment - at least, not first and foremost) so I  
>> have little more to say about that (also because I have no experience on  
>> which to make a case!)  
>>  
>> This particularly goes out to \*\*\*, whose sharp insights and  
>> pragmatic questions I value, but do not see as necessary starting points  
>> in a thought experiment (or, indeed, in a real-life endeavour of this  
>> kind - but that would explain why he is the successful author he is and  
>> I... er....)  
>>  
>> As for (3), I think the ideas for online or otherwise teacher support  
>> are promising, and I see no reason for anyone to wait for a centralised  
>> or ""patronised"" institution to move this on; anyone with a YouTube  
>> channel and the requisite drive can do it tonight.  
>>  
>> Cheers,  
>>  
>> \*\*\*  
>>  
>>  
>> On 26/10/11 12:39 AM, \*\*\* wrote:  
>>>  
>>> \*\*\* and \*\*\*,  
>>>  
>>> Suddenly there seems to be silence about the notion of a Dogme  
>>> coursebook.  
>>> Have plans evaporated, or are there continuing discussions off-list?  
>>>  
>>> \*\*\*

## Post 69

*Coded as teacher training.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

> I fear most of you won't find the time. If you do, however, please

> share what happened today in class. Let your voices be heard! :-)

>

> \*\*\*

>

Taking this up. In my ELT methodology class at the university today, last one for the semester, I had nothing I needed or wanted to do with the hour so I asked my students to think of a doubt/worry they each have about beginning teaching some day. I gave them a minute to get an idea and then rather noisily pulled a chair over and sat down among them and asked them to tell the rest of us their concerns. I had their classmates comment on ideas they had to offer them and I only participated minimally. Without a doubt the best class of the semester. They must be getting the dogme message (I've mentioned it several times, brought in a post or two, shown bits of \*\*\* talking about it on youtube) as they expressed a concern about how much or little to use a textbook and referred to the dogme approach specifically.

For the previous class (nothing that had to get done then either) I had copied for them the recent post about information gap activities (coming out of the quote from Schrivner) - after reading through it, they could differentiate between the traditional, the more communicative and the emergent, more dogmatic types and then I asked them to think of other emergent information-gap situations that might come up in the classroom and of ways they could use them. Great ideas they had.

Maybe the second best class of the semester.

\*\*\* >

## Post 70

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Ummm,

I see what you mean \*\*\* and I'd agree to some extent but ....

- it still doesn't tell us how adults really learn.
- it still ignores the similarities between L1 and L2
- what about bilingual kids?

and finally,

- I started learning Sign Language last year and I certainly had a (biologically-driven) motivation to learn BSL as a part of discovering the world (of deaf people) and myself.
- L1 didn't really interfere (a little in respect of word order).

Some of the other points you made

e.g. 6. On the level of sound perception many adults tend to hear all foreign languages through the filter of their mother tongue sound system.

were irrelevant.

and, finally

7. Babies and very young children have an absorption ability and rate and retention for new lexical items that no adult has or can have.

Where's the proof?

\*\*\*

## Post 71

"Dear \*\*\*:

When I started reading your post in this thread, I saved it to my local disk. I often do this with posts of yours and others on this group for future teacher training purposes.

The first six paragraphs looked like they were going somewhere interesting, but if I read you correctly this post is just an off the cuff jab at folks on the list.

\*\*\* isn't asking the right questions. People criticise you. We don't realize that the depth of our analysis on this list is insufficiently deep. You don't like my politics.

What's the point here, \*\*\*I?

\*\*\*

PS. I promise you will never have to endure my facile anti communism again if you keep your loopy revolutionary socialism off this TEACHING ENGLISH discussion site. I'm looking forward to reading your well written and thought provoking ESL EFL related posts in future.

Post 72

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

These days I wonder if I should wear more black to hide the curves that have come my way. Your comment about ""thank you"" put me in mind of something that \*\*\* poted recently in her twitter thingy: a quotation from Malcolm X, ""if you have no critics, you'll likely have no successes"". Not that I was meaning to criticise you in your MJ work.

I think what you do is admirable and should be encouraged - you prepare materials and put them ""out there"" for people to use. That's a good thing. I have no right to criticise you for

doing that nor to criticise you for your choice of topics. My intention was to highlight how we could use this topic in a critical fashion.

My interest here is how dogme it is to lead people up the path of critical approaches. \*\*\* asks (quite rhetorically, I suspect) whether he has strayed off the path of dogme. To ignore the rhetoric, the answer is clearly NO! \*\*\* has become as dogmetic as one can be. He has achieved Dogme Nirvana and I wish I had the skills necessary to persuade my students to take this up. Maybe next year I'll give it a bash.

I am much more active in classes and take the role of a participant. That is, I chip in with my thoughts and opinions. I also am accorded some authority in the classroom and it is therefore inevitable that if I show an interest in something that someone has said, it becomes the focus of that section of the class.

I believe that education is about questioning people's values and opinions and hoping that this will, at some point, cause them to reexamine their truths. Dogme provided a focus for me in that it created space for people to talk about their truths and move away from the mundanities of the coursebook. But am I being too much of a puppet master here? I'm beginning to suspect so...

Can dogmetics (ever not) go into the classroom with a hidden agenda?  
Write at least 250 words..."

## Post 73

\*\*\*, you've hit the nail on the head with this:

""Although the arguments for keeping the list as it is have got stronger since this discussion began, there is a sense in which it might seem somehow disappointing, at least to the 34 who bothered to write to Fiona if there were now no changes at all.""

That is EXACTLY how I feel. The messages were very encouraging (and I owe some cheesecake ;-)) so.... maybe there's a two birds-one stone solution. But let's see how it goes and think about solutions in a few days' time. Perhaps just continuing this list IS the solution, perhaps adding a Ning list. There weren't any messages saying 'yay, let's form a splinter group!', obviously; the feeling was one of wanting to continue this discussion even if on another group. Anyway, yeah, the chickens haven't hatched yet, so we ought to wait to count them.

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* <\*\*\* ...> wrote:

> \*\*\*, \*\*\* and everyone else...

> Just 'For your consideration'

>

> If we end up with two lists it might be worth considering having the ur-list

> on Yahoogroups and the other on something else - Ning, perhaps. Suggest

> lists be perceived as divisions of the same list, not competitors. In fact

> we could retain one Dogme list, Dogme Yahoo and a new associated list or

> sub-division list - Dogme Ning.

>

> @\*\*\* . How do you see it?

>  
> Although the arguments for keeping the list as it is have got stronger since  
> this discussion began, there is a sense in which it might seem somehow  
> disappointing, at least to the 34 who bothered to write to \*\*\* if there  
> were now no changes at all.

>  
> \*\*\*  
>

> On Sat, Mar 6, 2010 at 6:21 PM, \*\*\* wrote:

>  
>> Dear \*\*\* and everyone,  
>>  
>> I think a new list is unnecessary, but I can see why it seems  
>> exciting. And, if it's what subscribers to this list want, then they  
>> should have it. If this list stays, I'll probably just stick around  
>> here to post my classroom experiences, etc.

>>  
>> Don't mean to be a stick in the mud, I'd just like to keep my life,  
>> especially my cyber-presence, as simple as possible.

>>  
>> \*\*\*  
>> On Mar 6, 2010, at 6:46 AM, \*\*\* wrote:

>>  
>>> Dear all,  
>>>  
>>> a quick up-date.  
>>> Having suggested starting a new group IF I received about 25 off-  
>>> list posts backing up the idea by 9pm 1st night, the situation is  
>>> that 34 posts popped into my in-tray, so I am going to start a new  
>>> group.

>>>  
>>> HOWEVER. I am going to wait and see how the poll turns out. If this  
>>> group continues, I'll give the new group a specific focus, so that  
>>> it doesn't detract from the main 'Original Flavour' group. The  
>>> obvious thing to do is set up either a dogme 2.0 group or a dogme-in-  
>>> the-classroom group which focuses on individual classroom  
>>> experiences or how to tackle situations like (oh dear, I can't check  
>>> the name without deleting this!) literacycross's situation in Japan.  
>>> My personal inclination is to do the latter, and say that both  
>>> grassroots and 2.0 dogme are ok topics, and that the 'clash of the  
>>> titans: to go techno or not to go techno' threads won't be really  
>>> appropriate, as both will be taken as acceptable in their contexts.

>>>  
>>> Does that sound alright? I know that some people prefer non-theory  
>>> discussions, but there have been some fascinating threads on both  
>>> theory AND practice on this main list, so that's why I feel that the  
>>> new group could be the place for both types of dogme and the more  
>>> hands-on classroom focus.

>>> By the way, this is the conclusion I've reached after reading the  
>>> flood of recent posts - it's not just me and my opinion.

>>>  
>>> Some may think that the old list with new management is enough, but  
>>> if we start a new one with a slightly more specific angle, you'll  
>>> have choice.  
>>>  
>>> See you on the 9th March  
>>> \*\*\*  
>

## Post 74

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Would it be more motivating to let the learners choose their own reading material? I've done this with 'my beginners' and it's worked out well so far. Maybe that's not practicable in your context, Helen. I'd be interested to learn more about these learners and why they are in your class. I'd also like to know how much, and what, they read in their L1s.

\*\*\*

## Post 75

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

I took my wif....., sorry, the regular teacher's class today as planned. For those of you who missed the beginning - this is a class of 16 11/12-year-olds in a German state school, 13 of whom are bi-lingual but, notwithstanding their demonstrated linguistic ability, have ended up in the ""C"" class for English.

I repeated: ""I believe in dogme"" before I slept last night, took no handouts, objects or pictures with me, couldn't look at the textbook because the teacher, as a matter of principle, never brings it home, but I must confess I did have a couple of aims : to get the children talking as much as possible, using only English and to have the whole 45 minutes oral - no writing and no reading.

The lesson was fun. I started by getting them to practice sounding cheerful instead of mournful saying: ""Good morning!"" , apologised for being slightly late, explaining that I'd cycled - ""But not on my cycle. On Frau \*\*\*'s. My wife's."" Lot's of basic stuff was recycled// sorry about that // but the questions were genuine i.e. I didn't know the answers - ""What time is it now? Who's got a watch? Seljuk - What time is it? And what times does this lesson end?"" And I got them to ask most of the questions - ""Mario was born in Osnabrueck, but do you know where his parents were born? No? Ask him, then."" And so on and so forth.

At times I got them, in two groups or all together, to parrot me - because I wanted them to stop speaking like this.... I

(pause) ....was (pause).....born....(pause).....in ( p a u s e)  
Osnabrueck. "" I even (Sorry \*\*\*) did some backchaining when \*\*\*  
kept stumbling over: ""What do you like doing best?""

We ended up learning and singing (such originality) ""One man  
went to mow"".

They did speak a lot of English, though if they thought someone  
had got stuck, they'd whisper help in German. I'm pretty sure it  
would only be a matter of time, however, before they stopped  
grabbing anxiously for German instead of walking quite steadily  
in English.

After the lesson their regular teacher commented: ""Well, of  
course, they loved it - no book and no homework. ""

I wanted to suggest that the book could be ""taught"" if it has to  
be, but establishing certain strict principles:

- never ask them to read what they can't already say (and  
understand)
- get them used to using English only. Forget, intrusively,  
using German. It really isn't necessary.

I was thinking this and about to say it when the teacher said:

""Of course, it is the old conflict. They could be taught like  
that. But at such a speed, they would never cover the programme.  
(syllabus) ""

The obvious points went through my mind. What does ""cover"" mean?  
Are they supposed to be following a programme or learning a  
language?

But that will do as the account from my point of view.

Over the evening meal I talked to my wife. She had done a bit of  
videoing, but, more importantly, she observed.

She knows each child well . She went through the class one by  
one saying, for example, that she felt rather sorry for the  
Albanian boy, \*\*\*, because she could see that I suited him and  
that he'd learn a lot from me; \*\*\* the Turkish boy, too,  
perhaps even \*\*\*, the Chinese boy; and \*\*\* and \*\*\*, the  
Lebanese girl because she is a talker from a talkative family  
where little reading is done. But there are others who need the  
security of a book, or who need to write, or who need to see the  
written word or who need to be taught by someone who knows them  
well, \*\*\*, the Greek boy, and \*\*\* and \*\*\* and  
\*\*\*. What I managed to get across was that learning a  
language could be great fun. But she predicted that, on my own,

I would run into discipline problems perhaps as early as the next lesson and certainly by the end of the first week.

Somewhat crestfallen I reflected that I'd made a typical mistake - I'd focussed on the language and given that priority. My wife, as ever, was focussing on the children.

\*\*\*

## Post 76

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Thanks \*\*\* and \*\*\* for your comments, which make sense to me and had also crossed my mind before they popped up in my dogme folder (not that they are therefore any less relevant or appreciated).

Because of this information processing gap, \*\*\*, I often let students just sit and chat with classmates or read something they've written for a spell without doing any overt "teaching". I imagine \*\*\*'s students and others might view this as an "abdication of duty". Timing seems to be the key. When it feels right, it's interesting how one can see students turning the information over in their minds, and it is definitely a physical process, as you've said. I sometimes reflect on the many faces of learning, how I have recognized learning by physical cues in students and myself. The cues I don't pick up on must be interesting, too. What might I missing and how can I tune in to it? Professional development springs to mind immediately.

Are we each more in tune with the certain learning cues/signals? Why? Do we (students and teachers) use these signals as a violinist uses sheet music, memory, rhythm, ambiance and the dynamic of a group to participate in a concerto, or do we make use of them as we would traffic signals on our way to the conservatoire? Both, of course, and the signals are part of how we communicate. I think this explains some of the frustration teachers and learners feel when they are confronted with a class size of 30 - 100 or involved in Distance Learning --- we have much less to go by as communicative creatures that rely on our senses to guide us through the world, not to mention our inner-world.

I don't think we have to kid ourselves into thinking we've had an effect on our students learning, \*\*\*. We have influenced learning in some way, I'm sure. My "quest", it seems, is to maximize (Supersize?) the learning potential of the classroom experience. Maybe that's a singularly American, consumerist obsession. However, I see it more as opening the floodgates to shed water wherever the profile of the land has been naturally shaped to receive and absorb the flow. Enough saturation means the roots might get some water. I can't make it rain or shine, but I can conserve, be resourceful and recycle what's not been completely absorbed.

Metaphor has gotten the better of me once again --- time to go...

\*\*\*



## Post 77

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, "\*\*\*\*" wrote:

> Sorry \*\*\*, but I can't see the relevance of the different Ns to my learners. I'm not going to worry too much if my students mispronounce a phoneme in a word if that word remains intelligible.

Wait a minute, first I'm asked to take a phrase such as 'good evening' said as 'good edening' and help the learner correct it, even though I said this might well be intelligible. Now I'm being asked to accept that if 'impossible' were pronounced 'ingpossible' or 'inpossible' you'd accept it. So what about illegal? Would you accept inlegal or imlegal? Oops, and what happened to the phoneme in that case? Does the /l/ sound a lot like a /n/ to you?

I think you need to back up, review what you've learned, and try again.

\*\*\*

## Post 78

\*\*\*,

No, you are not obliged to consult. Nobody ever is. Strange though that such an an approach is so typical of ESOL management who love to shut down honest debate about real issues and just waffle vaguely about minor admin concerns. It is certainly typical of how Skills for Life was imposed on everybody ( and before that other things)

I sincerely hope the ESOL people will be able to look honestly at the political problems and attitudes which lie at the heart of this teaching area.

Group Think will not solve the issues.

\*\*\*

>Dear \*\*\*,

> I was very sorry to read this post - forgive me but I did not realise  
> that the setting up of the list was something that required  
> consultation. I simply thought the best thing was to get the list set  
> up as quickly as possible so that we could get things going. I have  
> tried not to be prescriptive in my description of the scope of the

> list - people are free to discuss any ESOL topic there.  
>  
> I hope you will reconsider, \*\*\*, because you were one of the  
> people who played a large part in the development in the initial  
> thread and, as someone clearly involved in ESOL, your posts would be  
> very valuable over there. It is, of course, your decision.  
>  
> For the record, I will not be deserting the dogme list either!  
>  
> Best regards,  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>  
> --- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:  
>>  
>> \*\*\*,  
>> I will not be joining. There wasn't a lot of consultation before you  
>> started this group. Typical insensitive ESOL management tactics, I  
> should  
>> say!! Good luck with your debates.  
>> \*\*\*  
>>  
>> Dear all,  
>> >  
>> > The ESOL group has now been set up. Find it at  
>> >  
>> > <http://uk.groups.yahoo.com/group/esoluk/>  
>> >  
>> > and please join if you wish.  
>> >  
>> > Please don't feel you have to be working in the sector to join - those  
>> > with just an interest are also welcome or those who are perhaps  
>> > contemplating joining.  
>> >  
>> > Regards,  
>> >  
>> > \*\*\*

## Post 79

Coded as logic and hypotheticals.  
Coded as questioning and answering.

Bonjour \*\*\*,

I think I am very much in touch with the squid in me !

I would like to point out that the poor babies who have not been stimulated enough and exposed to enough human language have therefore poor vocabulary, and yes, experience less complex emotions.""

Quite an assumption, I'd say, that lack of stimulation means lack of human language. Could it be that the lack of touch and intereraction are the key factors here? Parents can leave the TV and stereo on all day but never hold or interact with their child --- God forbid! --- so this child would have been exposed to human language, but I doubt it would develop in a healthy way. I would claim that it's interaction, e.g. touch, eye contact, that contributes primarily to a babies development. Language is \*one\* component of that interaction.

By the way, what constitutes a poor vocabulary?

\*\*\*

## Post 80

Coded as questioning and answering.

Is it generally assumed to be correct that non-native speakers do not have the ability to read as quickly in their second language as native speakers?

On Mon, Sep 6, 2010 at 10:22 PM, \*\*\*wrote:

- >
- > Pinker is a linguistic lightweight--very little original thought, certainly
- > not the next Chomsky. He got to Harvard based on some research work in
- > psycholinguistics and then used his Harvard post to write bestsellers
- > (something encouraged under Bok I guess). But he is a best-selling author,
- > so perhaps it is best to say that he is a very good teacher of linguistics,
- > psycholinguistics, cognitive science etc. to a general audience.
- >
- > The 'mentalese' concept is a good case in point. Not original at all.
- > Pinker is a popularizer of the ideas and concepts of others and little
- > else.
- >
- > What is vexed in the issue of 'Does language shape how we think?' includes:
- > 1. In what medium do we think? Language? A type of language?
- > 2. When we use language, do we think? To what extent does using language
- > require thought, and what sort of though (metacconscious, conscious,
- > sub-conscious, etc.)?
- > 3. How could any of this be put into a question that could be explored
- > under the current research paradigms (most likely not at all)?
- > 4. The Whorf-Sapir hypothesis might seem outlandish now, but structuralist
- > analysis took on metaphysical implications in many ways, not just this. See,
- > for example, the work of Derrida (after Heidegger). So in the case of
- > structuralist linguistics, the difference between 'langue' and Chomsky's
- > 'competence' is the former might be considered an external, subsistent
- > system of language that controls us. Much of structuralism was akin to
- > behaviourism and highly deterministic.
- >
- > 5. It seems to me that the relationships between language(s) and culture(s)
- > are very interesting but difficult to analyze. But if you look at the some
- > of the research I cited earlier in the discussion, you see that there is
- > research and evidence that points to some sort of causal relationship
- > between social structure and complexity of language, with the related
- > thought that, for communicative practicality, languages that get used over

- > larger populations simplify for efficiency's sake (with contact between
- > cultures often resulting in grammatical simplification of the emergent
- > language, with English a good example, it being possibly a literary creole
- > that emerged from the contact of a form of Norse, W. German, and then Norman
- > French, who themselves were Frenchified Danes).
- >
- > On the other hand, the mirror neuron and other research like this point to
- > the idea that we might not well be in full control of the languages that are
- > in our head, and this could be evidence to support a form of the old
- > hypothesis. If, for example, reading a SL text makes you involuntarily call
- > up words and associations from your native language, this seems to be
- > happening outside of conscious control. It could also explain why SL and
- > FL learners rarely get to the sort of reading speeds attained by native
- > speakers who read their language.
- >
- >
- > \*\*\*

## Post 81

\*\*\*,  
 'Pax', as a friend of mine always signs his letters.  
 \*\*\*

## Post 82

*Coded as teacher training.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Hi \*\*\*

Glad your doing the dogme on the DELTA.

I can't remember but do you have to hand in a lesson plan for this section of the DELTA. If so, this could be a little difficult if dogme means letting the lesson emerge and take form as it happens? If it is not forgive me.

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*"" wrote: > Hello everyone,

>

> I am currently writing my DELTA experimental assignment on the Dogme > method - and loving it. I've taught for the past 3 days (not long I > know, but a start) with absolutely nothing and the difference in my > classes is quite amazing - what a buzz. I asked students to write me > emails over the weekend telling me what they thought of the lessons - > they all said they really enjoyed it and felt they were actually > speaking and being listened to, without interruptions.

>

> I was just wondering whether anyone out there had any ideas or

- > examples of a Dogme DELTA lesson plan - or a flow chart as \*\*\*
- > suggested in his talk at St Giles last week.
- >
- > Regards from a much 'lighter' ESOL teacher in London,
- > \*\*\* "

## Post 83

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\* and others on this thread,

I have read this thread too quickly to be sure that I am not about to state the obvious or miss the point, but there are some really fundamental issues here, aren't there - like:

1. To what extent do you agree with the theoretical, conceptual statements, assumptions of any course you teach or facilitate? Were you involved in its formulation? Were the students?
  2. To what extent do you personally believe in academic research in your own field?
  3. How free, unfree are you in the system in which you work and your students learn to work from their genuine needs, aspirations, interests as opposed to do your best by them in their attempts to accept the rules, play the games and do what their future assessors require of them?
  4. Notwithstanding a liberal dose of political correctness - latest update automatically downloaded - do you also believe that a trained, professional, responsible facilitator/lecturer/teacher/trainer is morally bound to present his/her informed, considered convictions based on experience and study on matters like: most effective ways know to acquire new vocabulary, do research, read books etc.etc.
  5. How would you apportion lack of motivation amongst your amongst the following categories:
    - > Deficient student learning/studying techniques?
    - > Students clearly studying wrong subject for wrong reasons?
    - > Your own lack of enthusiasm for the subject being thought?
    - > A whole contributing raft of reasons, social, economic, political that neither you nor your students can directly influence or rapidly change?
    - > The (generational?) clash between the legitimacy of a course of study you see in academic and educational terms and the students view of it as: ""Great because it does not start until 11 in the morning, ""Dead boring but it is worth 8 points, just what I need"", ""Takes place on Thursday, which is great because it means I can go away for the weekend.""
- \*\*\*

## Post 84

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

Hi...

Still suffering from 'discourse envy' \*\*\*? \*\*\*? Nah... didn't think so.

I'm gonna go (not far) out on a limb and claim that:

While we might disagree as to technology's role(s) in education (and society) none of us contributing to recent threads - and probably the whole lot of us for that matter - would consider him-/herself 'anti-technology'.

So can we at least put that one to bed everyone? If not, please, let me know.

\*\*\*

## Post 85

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\* wrote:

""Academia is a game, really, and most of the researchers and writers about ELT are not from the place where so many learners are to be found - high school classrooms. What happens in language schools and university-based language centres has almost no relationship to what happens in mainstream schools. Unfortunately, those at the sharp end don't have a lot of time for research and reading because we're busy doing duty, attending swimming galas, attending discipline team meetings.....""

I'm very sympathetic to this point of view, though it's always necessary to reign-in the urge to over-generalise from personal experience.

\*\*\*, it is not that I am against research or theoretical discussions - on the contrary. I find the difficulty is convincing busy teachers that these things are important. Here is a role for teacher trainers/educators who have to be the go-betweens, mediating between interested teachers and researchers/theoreticians who the teacher trainers/educators believe have insights or viewpoints that could possibly be of some help to the classroom teacher, facilitator, dogme scaffold builder, marker of tests, organisers of fund-raising marathons etc. etc.

I'm just about to upload to the files section a review I wrote some time ago for the CETEFLL list on the Ellis book I mentioned yesterday or the day before (Learning a Second Language Through Interaction).

This is what Ellis has to say in that book about research and the teacher:

""...research findings cannot be used to prescribe, proscribe or even advise teachers what or how to teach. Research findings are best treated as 'provisional' specifications...which

teachers can choose to act on or ignore, in accordance with the exigencies of their own teaching situation. In cases where they decide to act, the specifications should be treated as hypotheses about teaching and thus subjected to critical scrutiny through teaching accompanied ideally by some form of action research." (p248)

\*\*\*

Post 86

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as own out of school experience.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

I think you misunderstood me \*\*\*. I am not referring to the 'Skills for Life' programme or the teaching of ESOL for that matter. All I'm referring to is the fact that people can be taught to enhance their listening and reading skills through the learning of some techniques. I know that because I did the same and it stood me in very good stead in both my studies and my personal life.

\*\*\*

Post 87

*Coded as own out of school experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Dear \*\*\* (I believe it's you \*\*\*)

Just to answer a question you had \_ to add a comment about what you said regarding Maley etc.

> (IATEFL Issues just arrived, \*\*\*vil--I liked your little tidbit,  
> but didn't quite get the example! Are those teachers, or ideas...?)

They're teachers! The ideas need to come from them. In the article all these people are made up (I hope) and it probably shows my terrible sense of humour!

With regard to your comments on Maley ...

> Now--this guy tells me that he sees ""no hope"" in the efforts of Third  
> World local teachers who are untrained or poorly trained. AND he  
> sees ""no hope"" in the whole of state-funded education. BUT he  
> sees ""some hope"" in...First World volunteers (many of them equally  
> untrained and all of them poorly trained in local conditions).

I have long been the advocate of local teachers and highly critical of unqualified (or under-qualified) NESTs. I also cannot see how many NESTs can ever be able to do the same job as they will not have the cultural background and knowledge to assist them. In my experience the longer I lived in a country the more I realised I didn't know, and the more I had

to learn. At the start you are blissfully ignorant of many factors.

I'm now going to sin on this site!! I sometimes think that publishers get too much stick. As most of you know I've recently been to Uzbekistan. This trip was on behalf of a UK publishers and the aim was for me to put together a group of local teachers/EFLs to write course materials for the local education system. Here they are trying to nurture local talent and to take into consideration local needs and cultural considerations. My role is simply to help these people fulfill their potential - and certainly not to dictate what is right or wrong. To me, this is a very positive step.

Many of you will be saying, but they don't need coursebooks.

Well, a) they want them, b) wait until you've gone there, and c) don't dictate (they've had enough of that!).

\*\*\*(awaiting the hissing and spitting!)

- > Our response to this thinly-veiled patronizing, condescending
- > claptrap (again, to use a polite name) has been conciliatory in the
- > extreme. We have focussed exclusively on his rather petty (and
- > completely contradictory) dig at dogme.
- >
- > Let's take the issue of publishing, then. Copyright. Royalties.
- > Moolah, in other words.
- > The first two terms reflect the inequality in the control of
- > knowledge which ELT imperialism has foisted on our classrooms. The
- > latter reflect the mundane, everyday, practical struggles of local
- > teachers to get around that monopoly.

## Post 88

Coded as questioning and answering.

Coded as teaching text.

Never underestimate etymology: Duden's Etymological Dictionary of the German Language (the one I have anyway) traces ""auswendig"" back to mean ""aus dem Gedächtnis"" (out of/from memory) which seems to offer some insight.

""wenden"" is related to the English word ""wend"" (went), e.g. ""To Canterbury they wend"" --- Chaucer.

\*\*\*

----- Original Message -----

From: <\*\*\*...>

To: <dogme@yahoogroups.com>

Subject: Re: [dogme] Learning by heart

- > The German for to learn by heart is to learn ""auswendig"" - to turn something outwards
- > - to externalize. An interesting difference compared with English, not that I'm sure that
- > such etymologies are anything more than moderately interesting facts. They



don't offer  
> any insights, do they?  
>  
>  
> \*\*\*

## Post 89

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

----- Original Message -----

From: ""\*\*\*""

To: <dogme@yahooogroups.com>

Subject: [dogme] lesson plans

\*\*\* asks: ""Are lesson plans just for teachers/ observers/ external forces?"" Probably, though I can imagine an argument that claims lesson plans are for students.

""Do students ever, perhaps, expect lessons to be planned?""

Of course they do.

Do students ever notice when lessons are not planned? Maybe. And to what extent does it matter to them and the lesson?

\*\*\*  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>

## Post 90

*Coded as own out of school experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

When the school I still notionally work for was looking for a slogan around which to base a new marketing campaign, I suggested, a bit sheepishly, ""Our Teachers Talk to You"". This was partly to counter the stiff competition we were facing from large chains of so-called ""multimedia"" schools, that is, language schools where you pay a fortune to be sat in front of a computer most of the time and, occasionally, to attend (optional) conversation classes. (Happily, most of those schools have since gone to the wall). And partly because of my colleague Neil's story of an encounter with an ex-student who said, of her new teacher, ""She's very nice, but she doesn't talk to us"". (To \*\*\* this was tantamount to someone saying ""My wife/husband/son etc is very nice, but he/she doesn't talk to me"".)

Needless to say, my suggestion was totally disregarded. Instead they chose something like ""Our Teachers Ram Grammar down

your Throat"".

\*\*\*\*

## Post 91

Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.

Coded as other forum post.

--- In dogme@yahooogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*"" wrote:

>> I just meant that certain higher-level language functions such as understanding semantic/syntactic relations are understood better by adults than children, because they require a more mature brain. College level students can learn more words/structures in a given period than younger students. <<

I'm not really sure we are talking about what psycholinguists would call language here. Could we expand on what a semantic/syntactic relation is. It seems more we are talking about metalinguistic and metaliterate behaviour than actually psycholinguistic ability with a language.

I could be wrong though.

\*\*\*\*

## Post 92

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

"I'm very sceptical about the whole notion that we should be teaching reading at all. Most students can already read (like they can walk, type, boil an egg). The fact that they don't do it in English is not a reading problem - it's a language one. Spend time on language, and less on skills. Besides, I always feel it is a bit patronising to teach grownups how to skim and scan (more on that later).

Ok, so some students have to learn to read certain kinds of specialist texts that they may never have read in their L1 (academic, technical, etc). Or survival texts: forms to fill in, public notices, etc . Then we isolate those language features that are specific to those texts and without a knowledge of which the reading would be difficult - e.g. discourse markers, etc - and focus on these a bit, while giving them lots of examples of the sorts of texts that they will need to get used to. The same applies to preparation for exam-type reading - which has probably little or nothing to do with ""real"" reading.

But coursebook texts seem a monumental waste of time, apart from their value a) as springboards to other activities (like speaking) - as springboards most coursebook texts are seriously wanting in ""spring"" - or their language-embedding function - e.g. as a trove of topic-related vocab - or as models for writing.

I'm not sure, either, that the classroom is the best place to read in. I can never make sense of a text that's handed out in a conference talk, for example. There's the pressure of time, the distractions, the fear of being asked a question about the text, realisation that someone has already finished when you're still on para 1 etc. Much better to have the students read at home, on the bus etc. And use the valuable classroom time for more interactive stuff, like talking. (I wonder if the popularity of reading texts in classrooms owes to their usefulness as timewasters).

If you ARE going to use texts in the classroom, use them for their language potential, which means focusing on EVERY WORD. (My least favourite classroom command is ""You don't have to read every word."" As a learner my question would then be: Well, which ones don't I have to read?). It seems that this obsession with skimming and scanning (a by-product of the ""discovery"" of the value of authentic texts as part of the communicative approach) is counterproductive. Skimming and scanning is exactly what BAD readers do all the time. They fail to engage with texts in anything but the most superficial and trivial way. Much better to train learners to unpack a text IN DETAIL, including every nuance, so as to achieve that state of grace that Frank Smith calls ""a state of zero uncertainty"". How many classroom readers really feel that - as they are rushed on to the next exercise - they really UNDERSTOOD a text? (To do this, only very short texts should be used, or else nothing will ever get done).

My disaffection with classroom reading was clinched when my Catalan teacher Number Two brought in a whole chapter of Orwell's Homage to Catalonia, translated into literary Catalan, and photocopied on to recycled paper, which we then proceeded to take turns to read aloud, sentence by punishing sentence. Ironically, the chapter she chose is the one chapter that Orwell himself recommends you skip, if you want to get to the interesting stuff. Extreme, I know - but I suspect a lot of classroom reading of coursebook texts is equally misguided.

\*\*\*.

## Post 93

*Coded as other forum post.*

Yo, \*\*\* (sorry for the hip-hop shtick, I am consorting with students who just love this angle and I guess it rubs off)

ten times cheers for all the good job you have done. (also in awakening the board... well me I was vacationing in Hawaii and imagine, came back with the most awful cold... punishment for taking it easy? but back to the grind it is, so reading your post gave me a good reason to start thinking again!) Whenever I try to tackle teaching/learning skills, I am always at the most awful loss at how to separate them since after all practising living language means using them all, they sort of mesh together... on the other hand it is good for students to know them in order to asses their own progress or/and performance in a slightly more analytical fashion than just saying ""I did well"" or ""I stank"". and with listening, what you have done is almost to the letter (phoneme...) what I do. Plus you seem to have experienced all my agonies and committed all the same mistakes - so possibly the agonies are inevitable and the mistakes just the natural necessity? when you are talking about giving them the websites which they hardly used or found boring - well, we are all different and that is what should happen in a healty PARTNERSHIP where your partners don't shy away from telling you where their opinion is not yours. I find that you have passed the test with flying colours, esp. as you teach in the culture where a teacher is purely because of his position endowed with such terrible authority that for a student to tell him that he the student doesn't like something the teacher recomended, means that you have really broken the cultural barrier.

and think about it: they have listened in a discerning enough fashion to be able to form an opinion on Mr Obama's oral production fireworks! Isn't that a learning feat in itself?

and where you mention that you were clamping down as a result of the first experience - well, it is exactly the kind of reflectivne teaching that makes or breaks us as worthwhile teachers! Look - we can never tell in advance how a given group of students reacts to any task since all humans so differ. What behooves us to do is to observe, reflect and introduce appropriate changes. which you did.

I will not come forward with any advice because you do not need any. I will just thank you for your wonderfully candid and insightful report!

\*\*\*

## Post 94

*Coded as questioning and answering.*  
*Coded as teaching text.*

I know that Grammar is far from the most important thing in the world but I have always found 'A Teacher's Grammar', by R.A. Close very useful for the language teacher.

I'd also recommend:  
'Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms' by J. Richards & C. Lockhart.

\*\*\*, Belgium

Quoting \*\*\*:

- > I'm compiling/kicking around a list of ""must-reads"" from the ELT
- > repositories....books which have been overlooked by today's generation
- > of ELT professionals, but which still retain validity and
- > relevance.... to start the ball rolling:
- > English in Situations by O'Neill
- > Bring the Lab back to Life by Julian Dakin
- > Developing Reading Skills by Francoise Grellet (yes, still available)
- > Stress Time et al by John Mortimer

> Any suggestions to add?

>

>

> best wishes

>

>

> \*\*\*

## Post 95

*Coded as own out of school experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Hello All,

I teach in a public sector school probably similar to \*\*\*s workplace.

\*\*\* interprets \*\*\*s problem to be ""hostile circumstances"" meaning bosses, politicians and general interfering bureaucrats. I think this is true, but only in part. Imagination can usually bypass rigid rules, but it cant bypass dismotivation. If you stick 100% of teenagers in classrooms until the age of 16 to keep the unemployment statistic low, then you are going to get trouble.

\*\*\* also poses an interesting question about bridging the gap between ""real English"" and school English.

I interpret the teaching of real English to mean educating students beyond the confines of a language, setting the sights on bringing out the best in each one (which is after all the root of e-ducation).

Learning about self through the foreign language seems to me to be a feasible aim.

We might discuss how...

Regards,

\*\*\*

> \*\*\* and \*\*\* seem to be writing about an aspect of the  
> problem a teacher of my acquaintance in Germany faces: How  
> can > teachers, dogmeists or not, bridge the gap between teaching  
> ""real English"" and teaching school English? How can \*\*\* and  
> her friend's dedication, self-respect and convictions about  
> foreign language learning survive in the state school system?  
> How can dogmeists everywhere deal with learners who believe  
> they > need (or who have parents or head teachers or Ministry  
> officials > or examination boards who believe they need) what dogmeists  
> don't believe they need?  
>  
> There was a 60s' classic with the title, as I recall it:  
> ""Teaching English in Difficult Circumstances"" . Could it be  
> useful to gather on this list recommendations for "" Dogme in  
> hostile environments"" ?  
>  
> \*\*\*

## Post 96

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

I'm with \*\*\* on this one! I think all kids need magic in their lives (not just kids, either), and Santa is magical. I admit to adopting his persona annually; I also double as Easter Bunny, and have been known to act as a scribe for the tooth fairy... I probably do it more for myself than for my sons, in fact - it's a real pleasure. (there was also a time when I was the 'magical book deliverer' who repeatedly left Mr Men books in our flat for my older son when we were out)

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahogroups.com, ""\*\*\* "" \*\*\*  
wrote: > Go on \*\*\*, as a father, I can assure you that the love of a wee 5  
year old is more than likely to be different to the love of an  
adolescent for a fraulein. >  
> The chances are that you are going to have to deceive your son many  
a time in his life. You might as well make it a deceit that brings  
some enjoyment. >  
> Wasn't it Bernardo Atxaga or somebody similar who wrote that book?  
I've never read it but I'm sure I remember hearing that it was the  
first ever novel to be written in Euskara. >  
> \*\*\*  
> (who will be donning red suit, white beard and lying like a cossack  
on Xmas day). > ----- Original Message -----

> From: \*\*\*  
> To: dogme@yahoogroups.com  
> Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 6:31 PM  
> Subject: [dogme] Dogme and my life - Agony Column  
>  
> At present I work in Bournemouth Monday to Friday, and go back to  
> my home in London for the weekend. While I'm away, I write a  
> letter to my son, who's five years old. He always writes back.  
> This is, of course, a cunning teacherly ploy to encourage him to  
> read and write.  
>  
> Now he's written a letter to Santa. Should I reply, posing as  
> Santa? It's still a nice really communicative exercise, but I  
> feel I would be deceiving him.  
>  
> I am reminded of the story in 'Obabakoak' (look, this is dogme,  
> so there has to be a gratuitous exotic reference somewhere),  
> written by some Basque writer whose name escapes me (sorry!), in  
> which a Father writes over a period of years to his son, posing  
> as a German girl. Eventually the son goes to Germany, only to  
> discover the awful truth. Now I can't remember - does he end up  
> hating his Father, or appreciating that through his letters he  
> effortlessly learnt German?  
>  
> Yours in trepidation,  
>  
> Daddy \*\*\*  
>  
>

## Post 97

BTW,

anyone interested may try this:

<[http://www.dimdim.com/registration/Dimdim\\_Signup.html](http://www.dimdim.com/registration/Dimdim_Signup.html)>

Righ now we are trying to learn how to work it together, B. and I.

(more to come)

-----  
From: <pannazosia@...>  
Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2008 2:23 PM  
To: <dogme@yahoogroups.com>  
Subject: Re: Re: [dogme] Class account 01  
> webcam on, please! (just joking, but on other hand... who knows? perhaps  
> one day... someone... )





>  
>  
>  
> "

## Post 98

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

\*\*\*,

Thanks for that.

I'm trying to recall an argument of Chomsky's, in his Managua lectures, for example, where, using examples in Spanish, he seems to demonstrate that a learner being subjected to hearing the language alone could never work out that to form questions what has to move to the front of the utterance is not a lexical item, but a category. Q.E.D., as far as he is concerned, that there is a LAD which aids the learner in such cases.

\*\*\*

## Post 99

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

Keeping a retrospective account of what you did as opposed to notes on what you intend to do has often been mentioned on this list as good dogme practice. Interested that you chose Wordpress as opposed to Blogger.

\*\*\*

## Post 100

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*

I think \*\*\* battered the nail over the head when she pointed out that some language is going to have to be learnt outside the class. After all, part of our job is certainly to teach vocabulary but, I hope, a bigger part of our job is teaching our students how to react when they are confronted with (a need for) vocabulary that they don't know (Allen key!!!!...sh\*t, where would one begin!). Hence all those pernicky little games in books where they get a card with a corkscrew on it and have to define it..

But, as to a dogme lesson. Imagine, if you will, a classroom full of exam-orientated adolescents:

T (for it is s/he): Hello. How are you?

Ss (as a body): Fine thank you.

T: Really? everybody's ""fine""?  
 Ss: [silence]  
 T: Nobody's ""OK"", ""Fantastic"", ""A bit down"", ""Not too bad"", ""the Dog's whatsits""?  
 Ss: [Silence].  
 T: Ok, let's have a look. Everybody always says ""fine"". But what happens if you were out drinking last night? Do you feel ""fine""?  
 Ss: No.  
 T: How do you feel?  
 Ss: Bad.  
 T: OK, but would you say, ""I feel bad""?  
 Ss: [guessing] No?  
 T: What might you say?  
 S: Very bad?  
 T: Possibly...but does anybody know a word that means ""very bad""?  
 Ss: Terrific.  
 T: Hmm...I think you're half way there...terr...terr...? Terrific means 'wonderful'. Would you feel wonderful after a night in The Cricketers?  
 Ss. Ha ha. No.  
 T: Probably not. You might feel 'Terrible'.  
 Ss: Terrible.  
 T: Does anybody feel terrible today?  
 Ss: Jonny!  
 T: Jonny, you feel terrible?  
 J: No terrible. No fine.  
 T: Aha! So, how do you feel?  
 J: So-so.  
 T: EVERYBODY always says ""so-so"". What does it mean?  
 Ss. No terrible. No fine. In the middle.  
 T: OK, what about 'Not too bad'?  
 Ss: Not too bad.  
 T: How are you today, \*\*\*?  
 S: Fine.  
 T: Really?  
 S: really.  
 T: Can you think of another way of saying, 'Fine'?  
 S: Good.  
 T: Hmm...OK, but I'm not sure how often I would say, ""Good"". Have a look at your Tallgent Activate Or... and find some more words for 'good' and terrible.  
 Ss: Grrr....

Time passes...as it usually does...and after a while the Eager Beavers look up to see that Teach has drawn some faces up on the board. One has a wide (T is tempted to teach 'sh\*t-eating') grin; one looks a bit down in the dumps and the other looks fairly non committal...some (many) would say So-So. Ss are invited to categorise their new language according to the face...

That's the first part of the class out of the way. It could be followed up in any number of ways. How do the students say 'How are you?' in their own language? ""Have you eaten yet?"" We could go off in any number of ways with that one. What if a foreigner interpreted it literally?

A record of the proceedings would need to be kept. This might be Teacher's record, handed out in the next class and submitted to criticism. Alternatively, the students might attempt to piece together the whole previous lesson. T would almost definitely make a big deal of asking Ss how they were in the next class.

Whatever happened, Ss would be producing language that they knew or dredging up language that they felt they needed. Records would be made of new language or language employed to aid the emergence of new language. 'Allen key'" might come up, or alternatively it might not. However, the whole experience would be aimed at creating confidence and security in those students who might otherwise think that the safest answer is the answer already learnt.

Hope this all makes some sense...

## Post 101

*Coded as own out of school experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\* wrote:

>

>> On a lighter level, you know, I find it extremely curious and frustrating > to realize that, within about 15 minutes of talking to >> any non-native speaker, I have a darn good idea of his/her communicative > level (especially compared with the thousands of >> others I have talked to and taught in my life). What surprises me and > frightens me the most is that I am rarely very far off the > mark--

I > hardly ever discover that my initial assessment was very wrong.

And I can do > that with no real formal test, almost > with my eyes closed.

>

> Two things caught my attention here. Firstly, 'any non-native speaker', I > wonder how you know they are 'non-native'? I have met hundreds of > non-natives (sic) whose language ability is better than most native > speakers. Secondly, what 'markers' are you using for this assessment? I > wonder if these 'markers' are grammatical?

>

> \*\*\*

\*\*\*,

You wrote: > Two things caught my attention here. Firstly, 'any non-native speaker', I wonder how you know they are 'non-native'? <

First point: as an (albeit slovenly) rule of thumb based only on neurolinguistic and psycholinguistic research findings, I tend to classify anyone (myself included) whose acquisition of Language X has principally taken place after puberty as a ""non-native"" speaker

of that language. It has nothing to do with how well or how poorly that speaker's use of the language approximates a norm or standard, nor the particular variety or varieties of Language X that person happens to speak.

You also wrote: >I have met hundreds of non-natives (sic) whose language ability is better than most native speakers.<

I enjoy thinking about what you mean by someone's language ability being better than someone else's. That's the crux of it, and any and all descriptions you and everyone else in the group can provide will be of enormous use to us as we untangle the DOGME testing question. It's a scary one to answer, since I think we're all aware that it reveals a lot about our perceptions, opinions, and misconceptions. For my part, I'll say in answer to your second point (You wrote: >Secondly, what 'markers' are you using for this assessment? I wonder if these 'markers' are grammatical? <) that grammatical competency indeed is one of the many pieces of the puzzle. It's also the piece that has been put most under the microscope, discussed the most in all corners of the Earth, and most successfully been encapsulated in test design and procedure. Too bad it's just one piece. What the other pieces are is what we need to speak about here.

So, my markers (in a nutshell) include sociolinguistic appropriacy to a great extent, listening ability, and, to a lesser extent, phonological competence (pronunciation). My feeling is that what we like so much about DOGME are all the things that fall under the realm of sociolinguistic competence. It's what has too long and too often been shirked off in more ""traditional"" language teaching approaches. It's the most elusive and least understood of the competencies, and yet, many sincere testing experts are concurring that it may be the biggest single contributor to general language proficiency. So what is it, folks? What is DOGME enabling our students to do well at? Go ahead and dive in with your views, whatever they may be, as long as they are sincere, so we can start to see what pieces of the puzzle we're looking at.

\*\*\* in Madrid

## Post 102

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Interesting ... I often get the response when I question why my learners aren't on task ' ... I'm thinking ....'. I think (...) that sometimes we as teachers don't give our learners enough space to actually think, it is a process that takes time and is variable, it is certainly not instant for everyone. It can also be very tiring.

Wendy

----- Original Message -----

From: \*\*\*  
To: dogme@yahooogroups.com  
Sent: Wednesday, May 19, 2004 2:22 PM  
Subject: RE: [dogme] Student issues with Dogme

-----Mensaje original-----

De: \*\*\*[mailto:@...]  
Enviado el: mircoles, 19 de mayo de 2004 0:10  
Para: dogme@yahooogroups.com  
Asunto: [dogme] Student issues with Dogme

In a recent class three students voiced almost the same 'issue' with Dogme. One girl had stopped participating and opened a workbook which she was completing. I asked her what the problem was and she replied. ""It's too hard, I have to think"". Then two other students said, ""It's easier working with a book you don't have to think so much"".

Does anyone else have students who feel that learning shouldn't require thinking?

Perplexed

\*\*\*

-----

I find it a rather common perception, in fact.  
\*\*\*

---

## Post 103

*Coded as other's teaching experience.*  
*Coded as own in class experience.*  
*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*, you wrote:

[SNIP] I approve of the slogan ""Think globally act locally"" as you know. I guess you are right. I have slipped over into imagining a

worldwide TEFL/TESL/TESOL teacher revolution. [SNIP]

Maybe it was something I had written that led you there in the first place since I've been claiming that global and local are intertwined and cannot really be disentangled from each other.

[SNIP] Let me dismount from my hobbyhorse (I've got several). [SNIP]

(Horse whinny sound effect) Yes, well, see you back at the corral, pardner. Several of those horses belong to yours truly. ;-)

[SNIP] Here is an actual example of something involved in dogme teaching - doing what the learners say they want and need.

On another list someone has just reported that they successfully did a lot of drama work as part of an EFL/ESOL conversation class. The confidence of the 18-19-year-olds increased significantly. Then some learners who did not want to do drama started converting the enthusiasts saying there were no benefits and they stupid to be engaging in drama - so they began to withdraw. In summary, the teacher is convinced drama is beneficial peer pressure has forced some of the enthusiasts to back out.

What does the dogmeist who believe he/she should do what the learners want - what does the dogmeist do in such a situation? [SNIP]

\*\*\* saves me much writing by succinctly composing my thoughts in her own words on the subject of turning conflict into conversation and disconttet wirh drama into dialogue. It's easy to forget how much power we teachers can exercise by making a simple suggestion that \*feels\* very diplomatic. Often students will go along with it just because it cme from us. Have to be careful and, as \*\*\* says, let most of the dialogue come from the students. I try to ask questions and avoid declarations as often as possible. Hey, I should try that outside the classroom. :-)

A thought, \*\*\*. In addition to drama, peer teaching can provide a more level playing field for students and teacher to engage in learning outside the confines of a traditional setting. I have a student who loves drama - we (and she) call her Drama Queen - but she's so over the top that it gets to be too much in conversations, which she sense and either clams up or gets even more dramatic - like tears and all. When we do peer teaching, however, she shines. I've shared my experience of involving the 'audience' in the 'grammar presentations' the students and I have negotiated as part of their call for 'grammar' and presentations this term. The Drama Queen is a natural at this; she knows how to capture everyones attention and keep us focused on simple, comprehensible pieces of information. Somehow, the context of being up there with all eyes upon him/her (Yes, I know the gender, but maybe you shouldn't.) keeps the Drama Queen on a more even keel and allows her/him to blossom so that we all come to

appreciate what's on the inside much more than during class conversations. Follow the blossom metaphor further, to pollination, and you can see how learning can happen this way.

With no bee in his bonnet, but plenty of honey in the pot,  
\*\*\*

"

## Post 104

*Coded as teaching text.*

I leafed through ""Teacher"" again the other day and was struck again by the genius of Sylvia Ashton-Warner. Here's a passage I thought might be relevant here.  
DF

### WORKBOOK

Teachers say they need their workbooks. They say, I can't rely on myself in the melee of a lesson to work out the sequences on the spot. When the time comes I need everything at my fingertips. I've got to have it all thought out beforehand. Conception in tranquillity can range from the conscious condensation of material and method up to the level of prayer. All the great teachers of the past have drawn their action from non-action. From Christ upon the high mountain, through Lo Tung over his tea, down to us. And I can never see that these names are too big to be used side by side with today. The intention is the same - teaching. It's not this conception in tranquillity that is the point of departure.

I know that the preparation of a workbook may clarify to a teacher what he is thinking about. I know that the order and method of it reflect inescapably upon the minds of the children. And I suspect from what I see that the very fact of a workbook evokes on the mind of a teacher a reliable peace. And this its notes mean that necessary stepping-stone between his conception and its execution. I indeed, I can believe comfortably enough that the assessment of a workbook can be truthfully close to the assessment of a man. It is neither the fact of a workbook nor its phase in teaching that is the point of departure. It's the incorrigible variety in man himself.

For some teacher just don't see a workbook in this way. True, they see it in the same place between conception and execution, but not as a stepping-stone. To some teachers the workbook is the middleman

intercepting some of the energy and glamour directed upon the canvas. Leonardo da Vinci cut straight into his marble, Rabindranath Tagore wrote his verses neat, and I didn't hear of Jesus making notes. Teacher, all of them in one medium or another, who mistrusted the middleman.

To the extent that a teacher is an artist, and according to Plato there should be no distinction, his inner eye has the native power, unatrophied, to hold the work he means to do. And in the places where he can't see, he has a trust in himself that he will see it, either in time for the occasion or eventually,. And he would rather risk a blank in his teaching than expend cash on the middleman . He wants the feel of the glamour of direct engagement. He wants to see in his mind, as he teaches, the idea itself, rather than the page it is written on. He wants to work from conception itself directly upon the children without interference from the image of its record on a book. He wants to work in a way that to him is clear, without conflict and without interception.

Sylvia Ashton-Warner (1963) *Teacher* Penguin p.72

## Post 105

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Dear \*\*\*,

It may be worth noting that most (all? dangerous word in English..) verbs that 'throw' the action into the future viz: need, want, aim, plan, wish, hope, be (to) etc take the to form, rather than the more generic noun/gerund. Would like (as opposed to 'like') seems to confirm this tendency, as does 'go' with 'to' (cf go and...).

I think be going to is probably just a case of a chunk being taught as it's fairly manageable and equates to a lot of the Latinate languages at least. English really doesn't have a future form per se, but at least with this 'chunk' you can express future meaning early on without getting into the psycholinguistics/sociolinguistics of 'will', 'going to', 'might' 'be to' et al.

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*\*" wrote:

>

> Dear all

>

> I have been absent from the posting part of this group as life has been very busy, but I have tried to keep up with reading (""lurking"" the main stories here.



- >
- > I was lately wondering about a grammatical issue (I know, not very dogme! ;-)) and would like to hear what people think about this.
- >
- > In most coursebooks and grammar books ""going to"" is treated as a future modal, followed by a bare infinitive.
- > I have the feeling (and I found some support in Swan's 'Practical English Usage') that this is basically the present continuous of ""to go"" followed by a ""to-infinitive"".
- > In that way it is similar in form to:
- > ""I am trying to open."" (am trying=present continuous + to-infinitive)
- > ""I am hoping to start tomorrow."" (am hoping=present continuous + to-infinitive)
- > ""I am beginning to understand."" (am beginning=present continuous + to-infinitive)
- >
- > The consequence would be double:
- > 1 There is no such thing as a ""going to"" future, but only a ""to be going"" future, which is (in form) very similar to the French ""future proche"" (""Je vais nager."").
- > Form: present continuous of going to + to-infinitive
- >
- > 2 In the gerund/infinitive grammar chapters, we should add that present continuous structures, when followed by a verb, are (generally?) followed by a to-infinitive.
- >
- > Forgive me for posting this grammar-based reflection, but it's not because we don't believe in teaching a grammar-based curriculum, that we're not interested in language, is it?
- >
- > Kind regards
- > \*\*\*

## Post 106

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*, belated thanks for the Larsen-Freeman 'taster', and for what they're worth, my views on assessment have only been held back for lack of time (it's well after midnight now, but you pricked my conscience!)

But what is being assessed?

\*\*\* said recently: >And the semi-dogs got a lot more in  
>things not measured on exams (confidence, motivation, practice in  
>speaking in front of a group etc.)

Personally, I think the most important function of assessment should be to help the learner. The learner should be actively involved in assessment, not be a mere recipient of it. It should take the form of ongoing dialogue and feedback, opportunity and reflection. It does not involve numbers or percentages, or token questionnaires. It involves trial and error participation, by the learner, assisted by others involved (teachers, peers), and an increasing

awareness of one's own learning without having to rely entirely on others to (often spuriously!) provide an evaluation or a 'mark'

Formal, moment-in-time examinations and tests play an enormous part in many learners' and institutions' views of assessment and achievement (as, for example, \*\*\* 'run for cover' pointed out). I see this as a separate issue - in many ways a side issue to the real one of learning a language (but I don't teach in Germany, as \*\*\* 'up and over' does). Current reality requires these tests, but they are getting almost too good at (standardising) what they do, and ever better at ignoring what they don't do.

When learners feel more able and confident about self-assessment, and are involved in the negotiation and creation of ongoing learning/assessment opportunities - also outside the classroom where possible - the less they fear and rely on formal tests as evaluations of their progress or ability; and the more they see formal tests as a particular PART of assessment, and understand what that part is.

The Larsen-Freeman part you quoted mirrored the views more prosaically held by many who are immensely frustrated by the limitations and short-sightedness of testing and assessment methods (from the humblest teacher trying to get brilliant learners into the strait jacket of a CAE, to a scientist like Howard Gardner trying to put IQ testing and all it's spawned into its proper place, to a brilliant learner trying to get into the strait jacket ... etc and so on).

I suppose I'm making a distinction between assessment and formal/'objective' testing; the latter has limitations which have to be recognised by all involved (exam books nowadays seem to be more about 'exam strategies' than language learning....), whereas assessment can/should be more reality-based, more personalised, more valid.

I've rushed this (pretty obvious stuff) off, hoping to make some sense; but what I'd also really like to know is \*\*\*'s own views on assessment!

\*\*\*

## Post 107

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Hi \*\*\*

Like \*\*\*, I am not sufficiently well-versed in SLA (although Rod Ellis weighs down by bag every day now on the way to work). I'm making guesses now, but as Dogmatics have praised the work of van Lier and van Lier is also in Ellis' book on SLA, it would make sense to read around this ecological theory of SLA. As \*\*\* says, there are many theories of how we acquire our second languages. I suspect you will find that Dogme draws on several of them.

As far as materials go, the fact that schools and college market themselves on the strength of their materials does not imply that dogme is irrelevant, because dogme is not concerned with marketing strategies! It is primarily concerned with helping learners learn and it holds that this is best achieved by engaging them fully in the learning process. What better way to

do this than to make their lives and their experiences central to the process? As such, it is part of the constructivist school of thought which posits that all newly-acquired knowledge must be built on to already existing knowledge.

Any help?

\*\*\*

## Post 108

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

(The following reflections are characteristically longwinded but even more abstract than usual--it is an attempt to redeem my promise to put together a Brechtian defense of the concept of alienation in materials development. Teachers with no time or a strong aversion to literary theory are counter-indicated....)

Textbooks seem to feel that, like novels, they have to conceal their origins in order to succeed; that is, they must conceal the fact of their fictitiousness.

In the great pre-19th century realist tradition, novels do this by creating one or more hermetically sealed fictitious worlds which are internally consistent. However, since Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and the great psychological Russian realist novels, internal monologues in direct or indirect speech are implicitly contrasted to dialogue, creating a world within a world (Colin McCabe), and adding to the ""realism"" of the outer most layer of reality in the same way that painters like Van Eyck included paintings within paintings. A contrast between the thoughts of Anna Karenina and the actual words she speaks to Vronsky is an essential part of the illusion; Anna's indirect speech is in implicit ""psychological"" contrast to her ""social-realist"" direct speech. With one, Tolstoy appeals to us on a personal level: you know this woman, you are this woman, you are involved in her life and have a stake in her destiny. With the other, Tolstoy shows you her both her distance from and her powerlessness in front of the other people in her life.

If anything, her most ""authentic"" voice, at least according to Tolstoy, is that which is furthest from the surface structures of the dialogue. (John Lyons points out that Tolstoy uses a completely different language for dialogue--French--to accentuate this, and uses this to argue for the complete untranslatability of the novel.) The truth of Anna's person is

not revealed in her language to others but in the contrast between these and her thoughts and actions, her words and the layer of her mind that is furthest from her tongue.

The great Russian psychological novels (like affective approaches to teaching, which I'll get to in a minute) have to pursue a kind of "bottom up" road to authenticity; they must first seek reader involvement as a person and then seek to add on a layer of social language use. The assumption, which I would like to question, is that the most personal and internal of truths is the most "authentic" one.

Applied to textbooks, this psychological realist attitude produces assumptions which we know to be untrue: that meanings exist in linguistic form pre-created in the mind and are not in fact the dialogic creation of mouth(s) and mind(s), and that linguistic ability exists in a homunculus within each learner and is not the product of interaction. Above all, there is the assumption that language at its most authentic is expressionism rather than interaction with others, and that the sociolinguistically appropriate language must be made to conform to egocentric speech rather than vice versa.

Thus two complementary fallacies in textbook development: the realist fallacy and the affective fallacy. In the realist fallacy, the textbook developer invents a cast of characters (these can be something like the individual learner, but not too like, because you need to guarantee a wide market and individual learners are most inconveniently different from each other). These characters promptly turn their backs on the learners, except when they are required to comment on bits of language for the slow learners, and proceed to have their own adventures. The reader tags along, like a little child trying helplessly to keep up with the big boys. If the writer is conscientious, he will become bored with his own book (though usually long after the reader does, for the writer, at least, is enjoying a certain level of interactive involvement in his own characters.) Instead of turning to the learner, though, the textbook writer, confusing himself with Tolstoy or Raymond Chandler, will probably turn to a new character, a romantic interest, or a man walking through the door with a gun.

Why do we all do this? Because personalization of the material actually goes against its marketability, and also against the realist literary assumptions of the writer. Interest, when waning, can only be stimulated by the introduction of suitably graded quantities of sex and violence, carefully disguised where necessary as "romantic interest" and "action". Since classrooms are normally sexless and peaceful places, learner interest actually depends on excluding learner involvement, on ensuring the learner a safe passive role in the textbook. The world of the textbook must be hermetically sealed or the realist illusion will shatter

But Brown and Yule point out that what really interests people is not sex, violence, and death per se, but rather their own sexuality and of

course their own death. The affective fallacy at least realizes this much; hence the sometimes apologetic use in language classrooms of horoscopes, fortune telling, personal advertisements, life insurance life expectancy charts, etc. Although the affective approach does not accept the trade off between interest and involvement guaranteed by the realist approach, it does--fallaciously--accept the implicit trade-off between interactiveness and situational authenticity. The only difference is where the realist tendency in materials design will slaughter interactiveness for the sake of situational authenticity, the affective tendency will murder situational authenticity for the sake of interactiveness.

Bachman and Palmer define ""interactiveness"" as being the degree to which learners are personally and individually involved in and committed to a language task. ""Authenticity"", however, is something different. It is the correspondence of the language they use to the target language they are aiming at, and this is often quite alienated from the individuality and personality of the learner.

As teachers and textbook writers, we are faced with two contrasting and even conflicting tasks: we must personalize and individualize our language, anchor it in the here and now and the me and you, to keep learners on line and on task (indeed, we must do this to decide the level of the language in the first place!). On the other hand, we must bring in language which is profoundly alienated from the present in order to bring in the target language uses, future uses of a language from a world in which the learner is now (and probably will always be) relatively powerless and uninvolved. Every teacher has run up against this problem: what is useful is not interesting, and what is interesting is probably not useful. So, like shady travel agents, we bait with individual involvement and personalization and then switch to English for Waitresses.

Of course, there is a certain sleight of hand in my way of presenting things. A novel isn't a class, and the language we use to personalize and individualize in class is not at all equivalent to the rich inner life of a Tolstoy character or even that of the learner.

But this sleight of hand is not original to me; it is implicit in a lot of textbooks, and (arguably) in ALL materials which take ""affective methods"" as their starting point. There is a constant contrast between the useful and the interesting, target language use and personalism, situational authenticity and personal involvement.

In Ken Jones's first book on language simulations, he tried, rather unsuccessfully, to make a distinction between a role play and a language simulation; a role play involved simulation of character as well as simulation of situation, while a language simulation was ""reality of function in a simulated environment"". His idea was that a learner should not be encouraged to change his character in a simulation; he/she must remain in character and simply project his/herself into the novel

situation. I think this extremely naive in its assumption that we are so easily able to disentangle our "characters" from our social roles and even more so in its assumption that "reality of function" is so easily on tap in the classroom.

You can easily see that this does NOT empower learners. On the contrary. By forbidding them to create characters, you are restricting them to helpless puppets in the situation created by the teacher.

One of the key pedagogical advantages of simulated job interviews over the real thing is precisely the alienation from society which the classroom provides, to wit, the lack of stakeholders and stakeholding. The fact that a prestigious job or devastating period of unemployment does not in fact hinge on the outcome of a classroom activity allows the learner greater involvement in the language (consider: the provision of these things would not necessarily ensure greater involvement in the task; it is perfectly possible to be alienated and detached from society itself and all of its rewards and punishments). As every teacher who has tried a job interview simulation knows, learners have a tendency to ham it up, and this tendency has very useful pedagogical applications, including humor and most definitely including the maximalization of learner involvement in the task. Anyone who has ever used a simulated job interview as a class activity and then used one as an oral examination can see the pedagogical usefulness of unreality (and the uselessness of "authenticity") for his or herself.

The alternative is treat the rules of the interview as another thing which can be broken; to frankly, gleefully acknowledge alienation and artifice, as Brecht did in the theatre, to share the power of artifice and alienation with the learner. Why? We accept that alienation is an inevitable, nay, desirable part of language learning. Instead of behaving like shady travel agents, we act as savvy but sympathetic fellow travelers.

To do this, however, we must treat the dogme rules as another thing to be broken. Actually, dogme offers the possibility of letting the teacher go through the transition from personal involvement to target-like language use alongside the learner--but only if the teacher accepts that alienation from personal involvement is at some point inevitable, and instead of seeking to deny this alienation, frankly acknowledges it to the learner and puts it to pedagogical use..

Right now, I think dogme risks falling into the affective fallacy. The rejection of artifice, of temporal and geographical alienation, and an exclusive concern with the presentational (in the sense of "present", here and now, not future) rather than the representational aspects of language all tend in this direction. For this reason I am a little uneasy at \*\*\*'s expression of relativist tolerance of the affective point of view (despite my own muddleheaded defense of the "wounded healer" metaphor).

But there are a number of strands of the dogme thread that lead in the opposite direction as well. I think the tendency of dogme teachers to not take anything too seriously (which I have been abusing here) and the relish they have of packing several meanings into a single space ("poor teaching", "dogme", etc.) and above all their eccentricity is incompatible with the affective fallacy but very compatible with the kind of alienation from language that I am talking about (as an essential reflective step in teaching and learning). I think the insistence on the classroom, rather than the individual, atomized learner, the insistence on dialogue, and the intense interest in the social situation of the learner and the classroom all lead away from the affective fallacy.

But not necessarily back to social realism. Sometimes it is very useful to pretend that one thing is another. But at other times it is useful to remember that it is not. The truth of the matter is that materials are not realist novels or psychological dramas or TV chat shows, in which the learner's consciousness represents the personal-but-mass marketable underlying truth that validates the thoughts and actions of the characters.

Good materials are Brechtian, going back and forth from the story to the learner's experience, pulling the audience into the action. To the extent that we need pre-prepared language, what we are doing is really much more like Brechtian theatre; we present language in an artificial situation, and then gleefully shatter the illusion with a direct appeal to the audience as an audience..

Good materials are probably more like comic books than 19th century novels. Text in comic books does not function like pictures in Van Eyck paintings, or internal monologue in Tolstoy, a layer of unreality to lend reality by contrast. There is the suspension of disbelief in that every comic book reader has to accept that language does not actually appear handwritten on two dimensional balloons. But the payoff for accepting this convention is immense: it is a book which actually appears to talk to you, which can comment on the pictures and even the language. Such language is not a story within a story; in the mind of the learner, it is the story itself.

\*\*\*

## Post 109

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.  
Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\*!!!

Grammar - your hobby horse.

One of the problems is the way YOU (and everyone else) defines grammar. You have one definition, but another person has a different definition.

For example, I love grammar. To me grammar = language (and language = grammar)!!

Words have grammar.

2 words together = grammar.

The problem occurs when people assume that knowing grammar = knowing the language. Or, that knowing grammar = being able to speak (write etc).

I may be wrong, but I think that to you grammar is part of the structuralism approach from the 60s.

For me it isn't.

\*\*\*

## Post 110

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

<http://www.thornburyscott.com/tu/Dogma%20article.htm>

On Apr 21, 2010, at 8:26 PM, \*\*\* wrote:

> \*\*\*, anyone,

>

> Where can I find (can I find) an online copy of \*\*\*'s 2000 article

> that

> started dogme ELT? I need it urgently for a presentation.

>

> \*\*\*

>

> --

> \*\*\*

## Post 111

*Coded as teacher training.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

I'm going to propose giving a talk to the ESOL teachers at University of Texas at El Paso, about possible use of Dogme in their ESOL classes. The department chair (Languages & Linguistics) is a fan of no-books-in-class. I will couch my talk in a curriculum/methodology that starts language study with students choosing vocabulary in their native language that they do not know, and want to know, in English.

With just an MA in Linguistics (and a lot of teaching experience), I'm looking



for concepts and terms that might convince other Phd linguists in the department (who are for the most part formal linguists) that a curriculum/methodology like this might work.

Can anyone direct me to specific journal articles that might provide me with ideas that would seem reasonable to a formal linguist, in support of such a curriculum/methodology?

Thanks.

\*\*\*

MA Linguistics

---

From: \*\*\*

To: dogme@yahooogroups.com

Subject: Re: [dogme] Dogme in Second Life?

Thank you for the enhanced recording, \*\*\* - a vast improvement! I've listened to/watched a half-hour of it this morning. Some things that struck me during that time (I am paraphrasing, so please correct me if I get it wrong):

\*\*\*\*'s point about the teacher's ability to monitor is a good one! For example, I could see \*\*\* raising his hand, but he was not called on to speak. I can't see how using voice or chat would help a teacher, or teachers, get around not having a full view of the classroom. One of my students told me a couple of days ago that I am very observant because I always seem to pick up on whispers, comments under one's breath, quizzical faces, etc. This ability to monitor is, in my view, crucial to Dogme.

As a side note, I've recently heard SL is still used mostly, ie 80-90%, for pornography. Which learners might be excluded, say for religious reasons, from participating in SL Dogme sessions for fear of coming across something they deem inappropriate. I was approached by two rather forward avatars when \*\*\* was showing me around during one of my first visits to SL, for example.

\*The American who likes Disneyland (sorry I can't remember the name) commented that the performances in Cypress 8 (?) follow the basic PPP lesson. I didn't really see the connection to Dogme there. Did I miss something? He also commented that SL is not, in his opinion, for people beyond the Beginner stage because of the language needed to help people fuff with their inventory as well as the need for face-to-face contact. I'd say all learners benefit from being in the same room together, not just Beginners.

\*The technological prowess, time, and money required to properly operate SL seems to leave traditionally underserved populations out of

the picture.

\*I agree that Macs are better for SL and just about anything one does on a computer. :-) Still, as the man whose daughter made that comment said, the technology of SL is beyond your average person.

\*\*\* is right that for some people, under some circumstances, if they've got access, SL a la dogme could work.

As human nature would have it, people who get excited about SL, and Dogme, want to marry the two, despite difficult pre-nuptial circumstances. It is still quite apparent to me that Dogme in SL, as it stands, favors a select group of relatively socio-economically privileged technophiles. I don't mean that disparagingly. The same could be said of other educational platforms as well.

Thanks again to \*\*\* and everyone who participated in the forum. I look forward to catching up on the rest soon.

\*\*\*

On Oct 21, 2010, at 3:54 AM, \*\*\* wrote:

> Dear \*\*\* and list.

>

> The technical glitch was simply \*\*\* doing some shoddy copying and

> pasting. I see that the address had the http:// chopped off. Sorry

> about that. I know, I know. Too many messages, more haste less speed.

>

> I have just tried the URL below , and it worked. But before you

> click, read this which was just sent t me. I prefer to keep it

> anonymous:

>

> ONCE MORE EXTRAORDINARY BUT THIS TIME FRUSTRATING BECAUSE IT WAS A

> BABEL OF NOISE ENDLESS REPEATING OF BITS OF PHRASES AND ALL IN AUDIAL

> DISHARMONY AND NO SUPPORT FROM THE VISUAL BECAUSE IT WAS AN ATTEMPT TO

> TALK ABOUT AN IDEA UNRELATED TO WHAT CAN BE SEEN.

> ANYWAY...THAT WAS MY EXPERIENCE OF IT....PITY...I DO WANT TO HEAR WHAT

> DOGME HAS TO SAY FOR ITSELF...WHAT I DO HEAR IS WHAT I DO IN EVERY

> LESSON I TEACH...SOLIDLY...IE I SHARE TIME, EXPERIENCE, IDEAS AND

> FEELINGS WITH MY STUDENTS WITH ENGLISH AS THE MAIN MEDIUM I NOTE DOWN

> WHICH BRICKS HE NEEDS TO BUILD HIS HOUSE OF IDEAS AND TRY TO SUPPLY

> THEM OR HELP HIM FIND THEM.

>

> I think I pointed out in my last message that the recording is not

> state of the art. This is a recording from the cutting edge, so mind

> your fingers. :-)

>

><http://lancelot.emea.acrobat.com/p51293195/?launcher=false&fcsContent=true&pbMode=normal>

>|

>  
> ( A Tinyurl would be prettier, but tinyurls do not always work).  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>

## Post 112

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Provided the teacher guides the whole process all the way, yes. But dogme activities and tasks sometimes won't ""unfurl"" smoothly by miracle, the teacher being always there as a facilitator makes it all possible, even if not uttering a single word.

--- En date de: Mer 11.2.09, \*\*\*a crit:

De: \*\*\*

Objet: [dogme] Re: dogme teaching/learning  
: dogme@yahoogroups.com

\*\*\* asked: ""Could it be that dogme activities and tasks reveal themselves as the interaction between learners unfurls, so that only when all is said and done can we fully recognize the shapes and patterns of the lesson (session)?""

Nicely put. From a complexity theory perspective, global patterns emerge out of the net effect of various local interactions.

""El camino se hace al andar"" as the poet said: the path is made by walking.

\*\*\*

## Post 113

Pun of the month for dog(me)-eared, surely  
If you can bring the textbook to life, you're on the  
first stage towards chucking it (the book) out for  
good. There is, of course, no substitute for life  
itself, is there? Certainly nothing that a  
dog(me)-eared copy of Headache can offer.

Regards to all,

\*\*\*

## Post 114

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

\*\*\*, you say

> Language is a skill--a complex human behavior like walking that must be learned.

Is walking learnt? I'm sorry but I think it's part of an 'Instinct' - just like language.

Are there any W2s out there?

\*\*\*

## Post 115

*Coded as other's non-teaching experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

I think part of the p\*\*\*lem is that the ""How is everyone today?"" intro, or ""What did you do on the weekend?"" is really rather lame and not particularly different or novel. I bet 50% of teachers start lessons this way and probably aren't interested in the answers. Then, when a teacher comes along who is genuinely interested in the answers it's too late because the students have become bored and apathetic to these (false) starts. Why not start with something controversial or novel? Statements that are just a bit too risky can be a great thing.

And, only answer students who say something in English, but keep asking questions to the ones who don't.

I'm often reminded of my godfather who taught history at an inner-city school in Liverpool in the 1980s. He was often given the really difficult classes and he'd teach them about Ghengis Khan - kids thought it was really cool and decided that history could be pretty interesting. First lesson - a picture of thousands of horsemen sweeping across the steppes!

\*\*\*

## Post 116

\*\*\* is correct in writing that I was putting together a compendium of messages from dogme. The list of messages suggested for inclusion by a number of members still exist.

At some point, though, I discovered a program, one that you have to buy, that can easily copy all the messages from a Yahoogroups list at astonishing speed. With some work, these can then be copied and transferred to a CD-ROM, for example.

As the technical possibilities improved and the choices increased I became a little less clear

whether to go for the compendium or the collected works.

I suppose the sensible action would be to invite members to vote in a poll, but if members voted for having a CD-ROM, of selections or the full Monty, we would have to consider costs of CD-ROMs and postage.

\*\*\* and list. Do we want (i.e. do you want me) to produce a CD-ROM of:

- (a) Selections from .....
- (b) The complete messages of ....

Perhaps we need a poll. Perhaps a few posting will do.

\*\*\*

## Post 117

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

I would make HER send you a typed list of all the new words/idioms/phrases that were new in the lesson. Then at the start of the next lesson, you have the list and quiz her via reverse definition or create a sentence and leave a word out (all orally) or actually create a short quiz for her to write. Then she can see percentages from week to week. That might be enough for her to mark her progress (at least in vocabulary). Otherwise, just test her every 5 lessons with an actual test.

Not very dogmatic maybe but if this is what the S wants....

\*\*\* in Berlin

---

From: \*\*\*  
To: dogme@yahogroups.com  
Subject: [dogme] Notes for one-to-one class

Hi,

I have a one-to-one student with whom I have begun quite relaxed, conversation- based lessons. Unfortunately she is also a high-powered businesswoman with a need to see 'results' and a 'return on her investment'.

I feel that it's difficult to combine conversation- based lessons (with some focusing on the language and structures that happen to come up) with this kind of expectation of 'results'. I've tried asking my student how she herself would define 'progress' or 'results', but she hasn't been very helpful.

I remember reading at least one poster here who sends typed-up notes of a one-to-one lesson to his / her student. This seems like one good way to create a concrete record of my

lessons with my student. However, what kind of thing would one put in such notes? I'm trying to make a list:

- topics of conversation covered
- particular vocabulary that came up
- student's and teacher's plans or requests for the next lesson.

Can you think of anything else? Does anyone have an example of typed-up notes that they'd be willing to share? I don't want to spoon-feed this student; I'm just looking for a way ahead.

Thanks,

\*\*\*

## Post 118

*Coded as teaching text.*

I don't know if McCourts [ I have joined Barnard Shaw in dropping apostrophes because my email program or my browser will not do them ] storytelling was dogme, but his book *Teacher Man* convinced me that he was a jolly effective teacher. And he was a teacher cast in the dogme mould - he combined what he was good at with what he thought his learners needed. He taught what he believed in, not what someone told him he had to teach.

\*\*\*

## Post 119

re reductionism (See \*\*\*'s twirling Gardner post) - I have a book here somewhere (perhaps I've mentioned it before) that purports to teach you English and typing together - by getting you to practice typing Chomsky kernel sentences.....

\*\*\*

## Post 120

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\*... wrote:

What is the blue-blooded dogmetist's take on the search for standards in language learning and testing that will produce results accepted by employers throughout the ECC? (For a forthcoming conference I've been looking at the Common European Framework, the CEF).

Is it a question of arguing:

(1) If we proceed a la dogme you will achieve your personal best, however that is measured.

(2) Is it a question of saying: ""OK. Now let's turn to some examination practice, because, naturally, I want you to do as well as you can in the forthcoming test."" ?

(3) Is it a question of working with people like those who worked on the CEF to ensure that dogme thinking is represented. ?

I'd be interested and grateful to hear some views on this.

\*\*\*

Well, if my students are to take ""official"" external tests, I would give some tests to them and we would examine them together. My idea it to make them aware of *\*why\** the test maker chose *\*such\** or such exercise and not another one. What des he want to test ? What does he want to know that you can/can't do ? When they are able to say ""ok, here, they want me to use the past tense and they are going to look at this specifically"" then half the work is done !

## Post 121

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*, I think the Chomsky sentence is indeed memorable. And I once had a conversation with \*\*\* about it after I had used it as an example of something we can't process easily as we cannot connect it easily to the world we know and I was proposing the use of ""image rich"" language for learners. He agreed with you that it is a great sentence and saw my alternative - something rather trivial like ""Sleeping little children dream peacefully"" - as much less interesting. Yes, indeed it is, but I was trying to see what would be the type of language that learners (not creative native speakers who love to play with language) could process better because they could make a mental image of it.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*escribi:

> I must admit that I've come to find:

>

> ""Colourless green ideas sleep furiously""

>

> striking, memorable and ""poetic"". It has come to suggest meaning -

> or I have begun to abscribe meaning to it - along the lines that

> some ill-defined idea, green yet colourless, aparently innocuous

- > (sleeping) are charged with possibly dangerous energy - they are
- > sleeping furiously.
- >
- > What's this an example of - my gullibility, our urge to make meaning
- > out of the seemingly meaningless, or the suggestibility of words?
- >
- > \*\*\*

## Post 122

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Hi!

Of course there is a difference between learning English as a language and learning English as a school subject - but on the other hand - what if students are not interested in either of these?

I have students in this category - they have no interest in either. I can't particularly see why they should have an interest in either. Some of my students are forced to take a language course in order to graduate but actively dislike English. ;->

\*\*\*

## Post 123

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Hi \*\*\*,

I agree with you about burn out and that taking an interest in your students and trying to match what you're doing with what they think they need is one way to keep yourself fresh and engaged and learning more all the time.

Your GED student is typical of the exam focused ""learner."" I've come across quite a few of those and when I find them I usually make them into my personal project. I don't think it's possible to learn effectively and prep for an exam at the same time. These are diametrically opposed goals. Directed learning can improve exam performance, but exam prep, on its own, is too narrow and too limited a goal to produce anything more than headaches and frustration. I speak from actual experience. I spent a year ""prepping"" myself for A Level Italian, worked at it 40 hours a week, did all the wrong stuff, made a ""D"" on the exam, then learned Italian later by reading stuff I wanted to read and



talking to Italians I found ""in the wild.""

The GED guy needs to decide what he wants to do: fail the exam or learn English. It's a pretty easy choice, given the options. The GED is a gate keeper. My students have a different gate. They're desperate for a TOEFL score. They do not always realize that this score will get them into higher ed but it won't keep them there. To stay, they need skills and skills are the things that they do NOT need to pass the test. So, test prep reminds me of teaching condemned prisoners to tie a noose. When you learn to do it really well, you can exit the program. Escape and survival would be more appealing to me - but maybe that's just me.

If someone is struggling with sixth grade textbooks it's unlikely that the language is really the problem. They are probably just to mind-numbingly boring to stay awake for. Let him read what he's interested in reading and get him away from that ""state standard"" curriculum BS. I'm home schooling a 6th grader and the content is feather light anyway. The core is math and literacy skills with some general knowledge of society and history. The language arts component is a challenge because it is so incoherent, anyone with half a brain (adults for instance) will be totally flummoxed. You really do have to be 12 to do it well. Or, find an alternative strategy for thinking people. Have him look at Ed Vavra's ""KISS"" materials. He could well master that in three months and ace any language arts ""grammar"" question on the GED.

I'd park that guy in a corner, set him off in a direction or two then ask him, ""What are you doing"" from time to time and let him explain it to me - what it is and why he's doing it. I'd offer unwelcome advice and lots of support and encouragement. That's what I generally do with everyone and it seems to work well for them - and me.

\*\*\*

On Fri, May 4, 2012, at 07:10 AM, \*\*\* wrote:

regards being too burnt out after ten years.....perhaps a dose of dogma early on would help. A guy who brings in the same xerox copies year after year has no concern for the diversity of students. My thought is this; give the students something personal to write and talk about. If there is theory to be built around dogme, let's see what it is about dogma that works. I would not consider dogma an excuse not to plan, rather, it is the planning around what you already know about your students that might make a boring lesson come to life. I will consider what is motivating my students.

On another note, I have a non student studying for a GED test. He has not really accepted my help yet. I think the reason the studying is difficult is two fold. The first is personal

motivation, and the second is the fact that he is suddenly reading 5th 6th grade American school work and trying to do so in a second language which he is not fully competent in. Considering dogme, I have offered my services, but can't make a language plan until he is ready to accept the help. I would then have him read through something he is studying and try to discover why he thinks learning is difficult. Chances are he is struggling with the language, but won't admit it. As a speaker, he could be stifled, so dogma ask the teacher to find a way out of the predicament. First he might have to admit needing the help. Second, the language instruction should be tied to what he is already motivated for, getting that GED and being able to enter community college.

When he is finished with his class, he is no longer interested in studying. It's as if the classroom efforts have overwhelmed him, and he wants to retract from study. The classroom in my opinion should try to motivate him to be competent and confident. I don't have an answer for him at this time. In terms of dogme, it seems a way around instruction that students find difficult, by refocusing the content.

\*\*\*

Sorry...as for the burn out, I say, Quit, and let someone more motivated do the job, otherwise, as Jack Richards says, reflect, before, during and after. what goes right and wrong. Where does frustration stem from. don't blame lazy students or spoiled students, or make these kinds of judgments, lest they be stuck in your mind. Instead, take a field trip, command a movie for homework, a passage from a novel, make time for diversity, and talk about the things that students are interested in, better yet, be sure your students get a moment to express themselves. The thing about this non student I mentioned, is that he can express himself if I keep the questions open, such as, How long does it take you to get home from school? Then he is communicating with me. if I ask him to rehash what he did in the classroom, he is not interested in that conversation. He is more interested in telling me about family affairs, family situations, hardships and needs. If all teachers had to do was to engage in conversations about real life, students might not fall asleep and teachers might have less burn out.

To me, burnout is an unacceptable syndrome which hurts the students more than the teacher. Dogme ask us to see if there is anything else in the box that we didn't notice before. Teaching may be a skill to master, but it is also a very natural skill which mirrors early childhood interactions at it's best, or so I am thinking. Children interior and expect to be listened to. They also wait patiently for a response to their questions. Staying on their topic gives them the chance to express themselves more fully.

Forgive me if I am off topic. This topic is also diverse.

\*\*\*

Sent from my iPad

On May 3, 2012, at 7:37 PM, ""\*\*\*\*"" wrote:

> \*\*\*,

>

> Very well put. The guy in the account clearly did none of the things you mentioned, but still arrived (from the sounds of it) with a decent outcome. Maybe it was luck. Someone once said to me a teacher needs to think about what they're doing and why. Your post reminded me of that.

>

> \*\*\*.

>

> --- In [2]dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:

>>

>> Hi \*\*\*,

>>

>> The account resonated with me because it's what I see so often

>> where I work. I think this person is a good teacher. Simply writing this up shows a lot of care and initiative. We don't know

>> whether this comes after a year, or two, or ten, in Korea.

That

>> could also be a factor, but I expect that after 10 years, a

>> person would be too burnt out to write such a thing or to take

>> the action described at the end.

>>

>> What it does show me is that we, as teachers, need to be clear

>> about what we are doing and we need to understand how our subject

>> areas fit into the local ecology of education. We also need to

>> understand how students perceive their own needs within the

>> context of that local ecology. This understanding is essential to

>> our own mental health.

>>

>> This is aside from Dogme, perhaps, or perhaps, it is in addition

>> to it. In any event, dogme is a lot about context - in my opinion

>> - so to do it well, we need to understand who we are, what we are

>> doing, and how that fits into the environments we work in.

>>

>> \*\*\*

>>

>> On Wed, May 2, 2012, at 03:51 AM, \*\*\* wrote:

>> \*\*\*,

>> An interesting response. He was incredibly negative. I saw

> > similar things when I taught in Korea. You're absolutely right in  
> > what you say. It sounds like he tried to understand nothing.  
> > Cultural differences, student motivation and so on. And yes, it  
> > sounds like he was in a pretty difficult teaching situation.  
> > Furthermore, you're right in that he didn't seem to care at all  
> > about what was important to them. He wanted an easy life and he  
> > didn't get it! The only thing I like about the account is how he  
> > dealt with the situation he found himself in. And how even though  
> > he doesn't talk about it positively in any way, he ended up doing  
> > good things with the the classes (from the sounds of it).  
> > \*\*\*  
> > --- In [1][3]dogme@yahooogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:  
> > >  
> > > Hi \*\*\*,  
> > >  
> > > Thanks for this interesting account from Korea. This  
> > > description  
> > > of students and their educational and social culture is very  
> > > similar to what I see in Saudi Arabia today - especially in the  
> > > larger, public institutions.  
> > >  
> > > This teacher is struggling against two things: the first is a  
> > > very obvious, judgemental attitude toward Korea. The account is  
> > > negative about most aspects of Korean education: the teacher  
> > > does  
> > > not understand either institutional expectations or the  
> > > expectations of students. I also see this among colleagues in  
> > > Saudi Arabia and it's a source of great frustration to both  
> > > instructors and students alike.  
> > >  
> > > The other problem I see here is very large classes. The account  
> > > describes a deliberate attempt to avoid time-filling, control  
> > > activities - sentence pattern drills, dictation, and so on, in  
> > > favor of student-led work as all-class or smaller group  
> > > activities, sometimes using student generated sources.

>>>  
>>> The thing that struck me most though, is the frustration at not  
>>> being able to affect things that are not a teacher's business  
>>> anyway. All students work to maximize marks and minimize  
>> effort.  
>>> All educational institutions subvert education. People have  
>> real  
>>> needs and concerns that transcend their need to master the  
>> ""three  
>>> conditionals"".  
>>>  
>>> If we allow ourselves to see the world through our students'  
>> eyes  
>>> for a moment, then we might be able to relax a little and work  
>>> with them toward what they believe is important. As foreigners,  
>>> we are unlikely to be able to assess their views of importance  
>>> anyway.  
>>>  
>>> \*\*\*  
>>>  
>>> \*\*\* wrote:  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> I just found this on a blog about teaching in Korea.  
>>> It's from 1965. I don't know if I'm allowed to pinch it or not  
>>> but if you skip to the end it sounds to me like the perfect  
>>> unplugged lesson.  
>>>  
>>>  
[1][2][4]<http://brianddeutsch.blogspot.co.uk/2008/11/must-read-account-t-of-teaching-english.html>  
>>> This is where I found it. I hope he doesn't mind.  
>>> From ""towards the end of the semester..."" in the second to last  
>>> paragraph. I'd love to read any other early examples of  
>> teachers  
>>> just doing what seemed naturally right.  
>>> It's strange that he seemed a little disappointed with his  
>>> approach. Sounds brilliant to me, and with a class of 60!  
>>> \*\*\*.  
>>> What is less easy to sympathize with [than economic  
>>> considerations] is the acceptance of an appreciable number

of  
>>> students of the pressure and their using it to avoid  
>>> 'unnecessary' work. The willingness of the faculty to  
assist  
>>> graduation by generous marking has the deplorable effect in  
>> class  
>>> of making many students complaisant towards their work. Why  
>> work,  
>>> after all, if examination passing is more or less  
automatic?  
>>> Students have frequently come to me with their names and  
vital  
>>> statistics written on a piece of paper and asked me to give  
>> them  
>>> an 'A' or a 'B' grade because they had been unable (or  
>>> unwilling?) to attend any classes during the semester.  
>>> Most frustrating of all in this respect is what my friend  
and I  
>>> have called 'the conspiracy of mediocrity.' This is a  
>> description  
>>> of an apparent tendency to control the amount and the  
quality  
>> of  
>>> work done in class in order to facilitate revision for, and  
the  
>>> passing of, examinations. The 'conspiracy' manifests itself  
in  
>>> complaints that work is too difficult, failure to do  
>> assignments,  
>>> the arranging of class picnics for weekdays instead of  
weekends  
>>> and numerous delaying and diversionary tactics in  
class---the  
>>> favourite being to ask one to tell the class all about  
England  
>>> and English university life. This is made the more annoying  
by  
>>> the fact that there are many excellent students in class  
who  
>> went  
>>> to get on but find that their loyalty to their classmates  
is  
>>> stronger.  
>>> An offshoot of the economic handicap is the business of the  
>>> education industry in Korea and its effect on classes, on  
the  
>>> students, and hence on the teacher. Koreans tell me with  
pride  
>> of  
>>> the widescale interest in, and concern for, education here.  
>>> Everybody either wants to have or wants to give his

children as  
>>> extensive an education as possible. The pressure upon  
>> university  
>>> students does not merely come from the need to present a  
>>> graduation certificate to their potential employers. It  
also  
>>> comes from parents and relatives and the social atmosphere  
in  
>>> Korea that insist that a university education is necessary  
for  
>>> one who wishes to become an acceptable member of society  
>>> regardless of whether he is equipped for university or not.  
I  
>>> find this objectionable if only because it is bursting with  
>>> snobbery. I also find that it adversely influences the  
>> atmosphere  
>>> in class.  
>>> I used the phrase 'education industry' advisedly and  
>>> unpejoratively. There is an enormous demand for education  
and  
>>> therefore it is supplied on what amounts to a commercial  
>>> basis---unlike in England where education is largely in the  
>>> state. Subject of certain government controls universities  
must  
>>> think in terms of fees paid for services rendered of profit  
and  
>>> loss. Classes are large and for the reason given in the  
>> previous  
>>> paragraph, they are often filled with students who,  
perhaps,  
>>> should never be in a university in the sense in which one  
>> usually  
>>> understands a university. They seem to be willing cogs in a  
>>> credit-card filling machine. Other students for one reason  
or  
>>> another find themselves studying a subject in which they  
have  
>>> lost interest but in which they must continue since to  
change  
>>> faculties is so difficult. The two kinds of student were  
neatly  
>>> blended for me in a student who once told me that he  
enjoyed  
>>> English literature very much but hated reading books.  
>>> Naturally enough this contributes to the casual approach  
>> towards  
>>> study that is often found in class, to the ever-ready  
cutting  
>> of  
>>> classes by all students for slight excuses like  
>> inter-university

>>> football matches (even though few students from the class may  
>>> actually go to watch the game), to the attitude that if  
there  
>> is  
>>> a street demonstration in the morning then there can be no  
>>> classes in the afternoon, to the slipshod work that is done  
>>> during the five minutes before, and the first five minutes  
in,  
>>> the class in the name of assignments and finally to the  
feeling  
>>> on the part of the teacher that the students are for these  
>>> reasons schoolchildren not students.  
>>> There is another totally different handicap that students  
>> suffer  
>>> when learning English at university, especially from a  
foreign  
>>> teacher. It is the totally inadequate instruction given in  
>> middle  
>>> and high schools in the practical use of English. Students,  
>>> through little fault of their own other than lack of  
private  
>>> initiative, are unable to read English quickly enough for  
>>> university purposes. When I asked some graduate school  
students  
>>> to read a short book as background material for my lectures  
one  
>>> of the students said that it would take a fortnight to do  
so.  
>>> This I think represents average ability. The problem is  
>>> aggravated by the difficulty of obtaining books. Students,  
as a  
>>> rule, are unable to borrow books from the university  
library.  
>> The  
>>> choice of books available in city bookshops is limited and  
>> those  
>>> books which a student can afford are even fewer in number.  
>>> Students are not by English standards well read. One  
sophomore  
>>> class of English Literature department students had no t,  
when  
>>> asked, heard of a poet called Alexander Pope.  
>>> Few students have a sufficient mastery of the language to  
>>> understand a lecture given in English. Most classwork has  
to be  
>>> done on the blackboard---what I wrote on the blackboard  
>>> constituted the whole of what a sizable number of my  
students  
>>> learned---and literature and other texts had to be selected  
>>> according to whether they could be conveniently duplicated



or  
>>> not. All these are very constricting to a foreigner who  
>> initially  
>>> expects to be able to do much more advanced work. It is a  
>> little  
>>> depressing to reflect when one marks examination papers  
that  
>> all  
>>> that has been understood of one's lectures has been the  
notes  
>>> one wrote on the blackboard, and that therefore one might  
just  
>> as  
>>> well have written up a term's notes, have had them  
duplicated  
>> and  
>>> distributed, and then simply not to have bothered to hold  
the  
>>> classes.  
>>> The answers to the problems that these handicaps cause are  
hard  
>>> to find, and it is quite possible that I never found them.  
>>> Inattentiveness in class I ignored though other professors  
say  
>>> that they throw daydreamers out of the classroom.  
Noisiness, a  
>>> perpetual problem, and petty cheating during class  
>>> assignments---students here do not look upon work done  
>> communally  
>>> as dishonest, let alone see that it does them individually  
>> little  
>>> good---one had to stop schoolmaster fashion and to me it  
was a  
>>> loathsome business.  
>>> Most of the work I had to do was under the vague title  
'English  
>>> Conversation' and I know that the university  
administrations  
>> had  
>>> little idea of what they wanted me to do. One thinks  
>> immediately  
>>> of small classes and interesting discussions, but in  
practice  
>> one  
>>> is foiled by the large size of most classes---classes  
sometimes  
>>> contained up to sixty or seventy students---and the almost  
>>> negligible grasp of spoken English by the majority of the  
>>> students. The better students often implored me to have  
>>> discussions in conversation classes, but less than a  
semester

> > of  
> > > this---my first---showed me that the discussions were held  
> > > primarily between myself and a handful of good students,  
and  
> > the  
> > > weaker brethren, even when called upon to speak, seldom  
said  
> > more  
> > > than that they could not speak English very well.  
> > > There is in fact almost no way to bridge the large gap  
between  
> > > the able and the poor that exists in the average class.  
Many  
> > > people sing the praises of sentence-pattern study, but,  
though  
> > > most of my students needed it, most thought it was too  
> > elementary  
> > > after seven or eight years of English. The kind of work I  
did  
> > was  
> > > basically oral so that there was some advantage in my being  
a  
> > > native speaker of English. At the beginning of each  
semester I  
> > > did a lot of dictation work. The dictations grew more  
difficult  
> > > later and then were turned into story reproductions---I  
read a  
> > > story two or three times and they had to reproduce it in  
their  
> > > own words. A permanent fixture throughout the semester was  
> > > pronunciation exercises, based on pairs of similar words  
chosen  
> > > to contrast both vowels and consonants that Koreans find  
> > > especially difficult in the English language. Towards the  
end  
> > of  
> > > the semester I had students---usually volunteers---tell  
stories  
> > > of Korea or explain things that peculiarly Korean and  
then,  
> > > using this as a basis, I asked questions of the whole class  
in  
> > > the hope, sometimes realized, that discussion would follow.  
For  
> > > the rest I did oral exercises based on miscellaneous  
features  
> > of  
> > > the English language. I used any opportunity to broaden the  
> > > exercise out into free discussion if any seemed likely to  
be

>>> forthcoming and wrote everything that the students found  
>>> difficult on the blackboard. This kind of work met, if it  
did  
>> not  
>>> answer, the problem of large classes since it was possible  
to  
>>> refer two or three times to every member of the class in  
every  
>>> class. Moreover it gave the students something tangible to  
>>> revise, and me something to mark out of a hundred, when it  
came  
>>> to the examination which pure discussion classes never  
could.  
>>> The bulk of my teaching was, therefore, a compromise  
between  
>> the  
>>> ideal and what I actually found in Korea. It was only for  
my  
>>> students to say whether my compromise was adequate, useful,  
or  
>>> successful. Some may have better answers to the problems  
>>> discussed here, others, Koreans, may say that I have shown  
>> Korean  
>>> education in an unjustly bad light. From the first I can  
learn,  
>>> to the second I apologise and to both I can only say that  
this  
>>> has been my experience.  
>>>

## Post 124

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

I don't know if you all saw the message circulating on the internet in September apparently revealing that the order of letters in a word were not very significant for comprehension as long as the first and last letter were correct.

\*\*\* has just posted the URL below to CETEFLL giving more information about this:

<http://www.mrc-cbu.cam.ac.uk/~matt.davis/Cmabrigde/>

That word at the is CORRECTLY written.

\*\*\*

## Post 125

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\*,

You wrote:

""However, adults (especially young ones) are much better at processing information about grammar than kids.""

Did you mean us to read anything into the way you put that: ...better at processing INFORMATION ABOUT grammar? That could imply they don't get any better at using grammar but know a lot about it.

\*\*\*"

## Post 126

Coded as teaching text.

\*\*\* asks: > 3. If \*\*\* did enroll at Dogwarts, let's say for one-to-one classes for one > hour a day, how do you imagine working with him?

\*\*\* quoted: > At the same time, Wes knows that he > speaks 'funny English', that there are many things he wants to say > that he can communicate only with great difficulty, that people do > sometimes have a difficult time undersatanding him, and that his > command of English is not adequate to his needs"".

here's a short extract from \*\*\*'s FSI link which relates to this situation:

QUOTE

""This need is especially acute in the training of many ""fluent non-beginners"" -students who perhaps majored or minored in the language, and/or lived for an extended period in the country and who attained communicative fluency, but without grammatical or lexical accuracy. One typical example is a returned Peace Corps Volunteer who spent 2-3 years using the language in the country and who developed fluency and near native-like idiomaticity. Very often, such individuals do not have the nuanced control of the language necessary for such professional work as explaining American policy, questioning someone in detail, taking part in cultural seminars, or being interviewed by the press. And as a result, their language usage does not have the effect that they require. At the same time because they are recognized as fluent and idiomatic, the need to improve may not be apparent to them. (See Clifford and Higgs.)

In some such cases, we have to, in a sense, help the learner to "take the machine apart and put it back together again." That is-to become sufficiently aware of their production that they are able to notice how it differs from truly professional-level speech. This often also involves needing to speak less fluently at first, in order to-excuse the expression-monitor their output for the needed accuracy. Our observed reality in this important respect directly contradicts Krashen's claims."  
UNQUOTE"

## Post 127

Coded as own in class experience.

Coded as Dogme ideology.

Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.

\*\*\* wrote:

I'm a little perplexed, as it seems that 'dogme' is seen as a methodology ...yet I can't fathom what the > methodology IS.

I am sure there will be a spate of postings but I suggest reading the introduction piece and the famous Ten Commandments (infamous, according to some participants of the Guardian discussion thread in the summer!) allows one to sort of form one's answer to the question. For me it is not so much a methodology as a resolution which suits my personal concept of what good teaching is: to not burden the students and myself with stacks of worksheets which reflect someone else's opinion on what they (my students) should learn and how... but rather to trust that the needs will emerge naturally. They invariably do and it is surprising what a weird mixture they are - they DO come from the students so they MUST be authentic yet how different the "typical set" is from the orderly flow of a course book! How different the tasks we work out for ourselves from the mental contortions suggested by the aforementioned authors of language worksheets!

An instant example: just finished a class with a 1-2-1 student, a pulmonologist planning to open a doctorate for which successful completion there is an added condition: the candidate must prove a working knowledge of English. We started last year and she asked for a course book so I agreed and she bought "Reward" but then we gradually steered away from the rigid structure and right now Ewa is ready to admit that the course book is irrelevant to her needs. We have worked for two full hours today (she's got a day off, same as me, so it was a luxurious, unhurried meeting). Started by telling me of her meeting with the professor who's supervising her doctorate and managed to relate all events but I noted down a lot of basic mistakes for future reference ; past forms of verbs mostly absent and wrong time prepositions etc.). Then we sort of branched into "pronunciation class" as she complained how difficult it was to suss out the proper pronunciation from looking at a word alone. We ended up practising various phonemes for which the graphemes are "o" and "oo". The hilarious moment was when she said "oh, that's the sound Tarzan makes when he is leaping amongst the apes!" (short "o"). Then she started talking about a story she was

reading and she owned up to having been using that activity to "revise Past Tense" - which triggered off a review of her earlier "report from the meetings with the Prof". Somehow we ended up writing sentences with "go" in various tenses and I have found asking her to imagine where she is while uttering every sentence (I go to aerobic classes twice a week; Last time I went ; Next time I'll go...; I've gone and the children are alone; I'm going right now so I can't talk to you any longer; etc.) so she said she could draw a series of pictures showing her speaking, a kind of a cartoon with "speech balloons". Then she wrote a conversation between her and her patient (describing her field-testing for the thesis) but in Polish as a way of searching for words and phrases specifically necessary for her future doctorate work. We decided to put off translating it into English for the next class as it was beginning to get cold in the room (she commented on it in English) and anyway, we had been at it longer than we had planned. So that would be dogme (I hope). Is it a methodology?

Does anyone else in the group teach large packs of adolescents in a local secondary system?

And yes to this question; I teach classes of thirty-odd in a typical state school which is fully into - as you have very nicely put it - "the exam-driven, marking-crazy system". Only I give out the marks at the beginning of the semester on the "you ask you get it" basis so later students can just choose whether they really want to learn or not and there are no hung-ups about who did homework and who was cribbing at the tests (typical tests are one of the things they are still very much dependent on but we agreed that in order to save precious contact hours they will be given the tests to take home and check against an answer key enclosed). And as for exams, we often check against the particular needs of the exam format to see whether there is something we must concentrate on. That's mostly their initiative. And I will not pretend that I am not mortally scared of doing it this way but at least I feel alive contrary to most of my colleagues who march out to the next class with the grimace of lethal boredom on their faces...

\*\*\*

## Post 128

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\*- and any other new arrivals. If you click on the MAY postings on the homepage at [groups.yahoo.com/group/dogme](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/dogme) and go to postings 639 and 640 you will find a) a list of representative postings that will save you having to wade through all 600 plus and b) a copy of the original article (A Dogma for EFL). Alternatively, go to the website [www.teaching-unplugged.com](http://www.teaching-unplugged.com), where you will find more of the same, albeit less representative and recent as some might wish. Good luck!"

## Post 129

\*\*\*,

Thank you for your response. I've responded off-line.

\*\*\*

## Post 130

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

I have found whole-class conversations in our class of 18 to be different in content than smaller group conversations (3 - 4). As a class, a recent conversation about fireworks prompted lots of anecdotes of students nearly blowing themselves to bits as children (I was the only one not really laughing) with mortars and rockets. This seemed to be one of those topics where everybody's got a story to tell and enjoys comparing theirs with others but wants everyone to listen. Because I'm part of the group, the students tend to use English.

One story had students roaring with laughter: P. had put some fireworks in the oven to dry out; later, his mother came running out of the house screaming when the fireworks started going off in the kitchen where she was cooking.

I asked everyone to write the story (about a paragraph in 5 - 10 minutes) as I did the same. I read my story once for comparison after students had compared with each other in smaller groups (2 - 3). I read it a second time and students stopped me to clarify vocabulary. The third time was for consolidation. I should probably send the story to them each by e-mail today. They could also re-write it from memory as optional homework, then compare with their original and my version.

Religion, sex and death have been topics that the whole class seems eager to discuss. Again, as \*\*\* pointed out, there has to be 'traffic cop' or 'conductor' direction/orchestration at times.

Back to my point, I think that in a whole-class discussion there can only be spurts of language from each student or a story that's drawing us all in, which is more of a presentation. The communication is different in smaller groups, which are more intimate (spatially) and provide safer environment to try out new things because there's less risk of mockery or laughter when it doesn't go right.

\*\*\*

## Post 131

*Coded as teacher training.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

I am experimenting with bringing reactive, materials-light teaching on board on the CELTA that I work on at the moment, \*\*\*.

Since you've only just got trained up, I would heartily recommend getting a couple of courses under your belt doing it with a coursebook just like the other trainers. First, you need to learn to walk before you can run: it's a good idea to put reflection before enthusiasm. Also, this way would avoid making unnecessary waves. Remember, you'll have to justify to your colleagues and course director that it's both desirable and appropriate on an initial training course (it could be, but for me the jury's still out yet) but right now as a rookie you'll need to gain their trust. Going all experimental with them is likely to raise a few eyebrows, at least, if not generate outright resistance or hostility. You'd presumably need their support too, rather than their skepticism.

Additionally it requires, I believe, a lot of skill and patience and actually turns out to be lot more work for you, the trainer! More than anything, if you intend to do such a project justice) it requires giving a lot more support to your trainees than you (and other trainers on this list whom I know from personal experience who will remain nameless) might be prepared to give. Do you have the time within the course structure to \*demonstrate\* the approach and relevant techniques? In such a time-intensive course, with so much else going on and so much to absorb, it's pretty useless \*explaining\* the idea of reactive, materials-light teaching to your trainees. In my experience, they need to see it action to make sense and see the need for it.

You questioned in your message if may pre- or even post-DELTA teachers have the relevant language analysis skills to teach reactively and with little/no material. The fact is that rookie teachers definitely do NOT. This is partly why the extra support is necessary - once trainees have seen it demonstrated, they can usually have a go and usually do quite well reacting to obvious errors/juicy bits of language. Detailed feedback helps them to focus on other, deeper areas of language which they missed and they can (and do!) then build on that.

As for the materials-light approach, well, what I've done is use a coursebook-free approach really. The material is brought in by the students who follow a 'reading rota', with one student bringing in a text or something they'd like to talk about in the next lesson. Trainees build the lesson around the text or realia, so they still have something to clutch to. We also try out dictogloss techniques and discussions with detailed language feedback and so on to hone their reactive skills.

A couple more further words of warning. If/when you actually do have a go, be prepared for a heavy dose of 'whinge city' from trainees. They may stringently object and possibly hate you for taking away the safety-net of



the coursebook, and probably use this as an excuse for a tanked lesson, so beware and be prepared. That said, it's an enormous relief when, towards the end of course and afterwards, they see the benefit of having had some experience teaching without a coursebook and developing the skills/schemata they may/will need when out there teaching in the real world. In this respect, I think it may very well last beyond the course, at least insofar as the trainees will have the confidence to take on, say, a custom-made in-company course for which no coursebook is either available or desirable.

Also, as I intimated before, you'll need to liaise and co-operate significantly with tutors on such a venture, let them know what you're doing, ensure they'll back you vis vis the trainees etc., especially if they're doing the regular coursebook approach. That said it makes for a usefully and refreshingly varied course for trainees - on the one I'm currently doing trainees get to teach coursebook-PPP lessons, coursebook-TBL lessons, and reactive/materials light lessons in equal measure according to the tutor they're with at the time and their preference.

Take care, and good luck

\*\*\*

-----Ursprngliche Nachricht-----

Von: \*\*\* [mailto:\*\*\*@...]

An: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Betreff: [dogme] Dogme in the Guardian

After reading the article by \*\*\* and \*\*\* about Dogme in the Guardian today ("Dogme still able to divide ELT", <http://education.guardian.co.uk/>): I think even 'Punk Dogme' intimidates most teachers, especially those who cling to 'shrink-wrapped Grammar McNuggets', whether out of ignorance, fear or laziness.

It seems many teachers do a (per?)version of 'Talk Dogme', i.e. they chat and look for ways to get out of the coursebook during class, but they don't usually have the language analysis skills to do 'Full Dogme', an extension of 'Deep Dogme'?

How many pre-DELTA (or post-DELTA) teachers do you all know who have the ability to 'keep one eye on the language' while scaffolding and managing interaction among learners? I honestly believe one has to be somewhat of a language fanatic/nerd to pull off 'Full Dogme'. And I say that as an aspiring language nerd.

Question: Can teacher trainers (I seem to be one of them as of last month's training up) bring Dogme on board the CELTA? If so, would it

really last beyond the first external assessment?

After some absence,  
\*\*\*

## Post 132

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

Yes, \*\*\*, that seemed to be the case. I could be argued that when students leave the ""aquarium"" (ie classroom) and thus forget to ""learn"" English, the real learning begins. Ironic but true in my experience. Dogme --- you will remember the term but perhaps have forgotten that we are members the dogme discussion list --- seems to be a move on the part of the teacher to make the classroom less of an aquarium by blending inside and outside worlds as well as perhaps inner and outer worlds (of the learner and teacher). In short, I see my role as a dogmetic teacher as one of deconstructing traditional classroom interaction in an attempt to make the classroom feel less stiff and predictable, so that real (ie non-Headway) language emerges (there's that word again) from what's going on inside the learners hearts and minds as well as in the immediate environment.

Long-winded way of saying what must have been said a bazillion times already?

\*\*\* On Jul 9, 2008, at 2:49 AM, \*\*\* wrote:

> \*\*\*,  
>  
> I get the impression from your account that there was probably a  
> great deal  
> of learning taking place in interactions on the way out, outside, on  
> the way  
> to the bus top that are of substantial significance, but could never  
> be  
> tracked.  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>

## Post 133

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

I wrote a spontaneous and typically disorganised - and late night! - reply to \*\*\* (which I've sent anyway - after all, that's part of the point of a discussion group like this - or isn't it?!) before reading \*\*\*'s reference to posting 582. Just a couple of personal observations:

1) one of the 'problems' with unplugged is that you CAN'T really give DETAILED procedures or set pieces or write it all down linearly. 'Practical' unplugged equates more to response and intuition than to standards or 'how to' manuals.

2) in addition to all the techniques for using student language and 'throwing it back at them', I also feel/find/prefer the most unplugged moments come from none of that, but when it ALL comes from them, including the grammar and language questions. Rather than me pouncing on what they've said and throwing it back at them (which I'm not knocking in any way at all, and I do it a lot, and it makes tons of sense), I feel MUCH MORE COMFORTABLE when I don't even have to do that, because they're doing it themselves!

Hope that makes some kind of sense?

\*\*\*

## Post 134

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

\*\*\*. has written...

Mmm. You obviously haven't worked in the State sector in Britain. The 'proper' college that I worked in for a number of years kept most teachers on agency contracts. This meant NO holiday pay, NO sick pay and NO guaranteed work. It took 5 years for some staff to get even a basic contract despite the fact that legally after 2 years they had to be given a contract!!!

\*\*\*

In fact, I have worked in state FE colleges in the UK, and I can back up your statement absolutely. I guess I should have said ""Most private EFL outfits and some state FE colleges"" are likely to treat their teachers with contempt. I even walked out of one such FE college many years ago, after they'd cut my hours from around 18 to less than ten - just walked out the door, and kept on going, leaving a classroom full of students behind me.

Obscene, eh? Well, I reckoned it was justified at the time, an emotional reaction, but it gives me shivers when I think back to

it now. But how many other employers would treat such qualified and experienced professionals like that - does it happen to accountants, schoolteachers, radiographers?

It really annoys me that the so-called and self-proclaimed 'Thoroughly Professional' IH has teachers hanging on to monthly, even weekly, contracts, and all because they 'can't afford to give teachers permanent contracts' (straight from the horse's mouth - an IH DoS). I guess they just enjoy behaving like cowboys. And when FE colleges do likewise, you realise that the whole EFL thing in the UK is a despicable business, and the humble EFL teacher is the most despised of all!

\*\*\*

## Post 135

Coded as logic and hypotheticals.  
Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.  
Coded as other forum post.

\*\*\*,

That'll be 'World' of Warcraft, rather than the redundant 'War' of Warcraft - a game I have never played, as it happens (neither your new version nor the real one). I also do all my training without paper, and have done for the past four years (except for a handout or two once every eight or nine months) - so I'm afraid that your reduction of values on both sides of the argument to 'computer gamer' versus 'environmentally friendly and pedagogically sound trainer' just isn't going to hold water, as I suspect you knew even when you fired off the short response.

If we're left with that bald fact (as articulated by yourself earlier) that there's no proof on either side, and it's an article of faith, then this is pointless. I do, however, object to a blanket statement like this one:

"" What dogme rejects are the values inherent in the educational philosophy that these materials, methods and technologies serve.""

Which does not so much enshrine a 'hunch', but more of a series of assumptions, stereotypes and loaded suggestions that don't advance the legitimacy of any of your arguments either in favour of dogme, or against technology.

What exactly does that sentence mean? What values inherent in the

educational philosophy of technologies (broad, broad statement covering the entire planet and every educator, perchance?) can you list for me? And how do they show up in the lessons you've observed? And is it all that way, or is it simply a vacuous statement designed to put a cosy glow on dogme and a 'scarlet letter' on absolutely anything that goes against your grain?

\*\*\*

\*\*\*\_

From: dogme@yahoogroups.com [mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of \*\*\*

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Subject: [dogme] Re: On ideology and lifestyle

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com <mailto:dogme%40yahoogroups.com> , ""\*\*\* Dudeney"" wrote: >

> That's good then .. it cuts out the semi-religious fervour on both sides and simply says ( la wabi-sabi) that what is, is.

On the contrary: situating the debate in terms of values and ideology actually foregrounds ""the semi-religious fervour"". It cuts out any pretence that it is otherwise. It's your values (War of Warcraft etc) against mine (no handouts etc), I'm afraid. ;-)

## Post 136

Sorry not to be able to claim authorship of this - it was from Mark Andrews. I just saw and posted something of his that I came across when looking for the James Joyce bit and thought might be of interest

\*\*\* escribi: >

> Hello,

>

> \*\*\* posted about a ""dogme analysis"" of some of James Joyce's EFL

> instructional materials for his ""Triest"" phase. In this, he listed the

> 10 ""tenets"" of dogme;

>

> Could some earnest dogme practitioner help me understand how and why

> these 10 came to be, or at least how they think they relate to L! v

> L2-Ln acquisition.

>

> We still know so little about learning that despite how compellingly

- > similar much of what I see inside ""dogme"" is to what ""we've"" found
- > regarding a general model of cognition in the learning process. The
- > empiricist in me shudders to think that ""we"" are promulgating models
- > of learning that differ from one domain to the next before we
- > understand the process at the neural level.
- >
- > How can the manner in which we learn language differ from the manner
- > we learn that crying in a crib gets us more mother's milk? or that
- > challenging the veracity of long-held popular cultural truisms causes
- > public outrage? the former seems almost perfectly connectionist while
- > the latter seems almost wholly socio-cultural!
- >
- > In particular, I find (5) and (6) almost incomprehensible just as a
- > layman reading it. (5) seems almost certain, yet I don't see any
- > ""research"" in dogme to back it up; more like a correct ""a priori""
- > assumption with no proof or conduit to challenge it. And (6) is little
- > more to me than Sarah-Palin-esque ""word-salad""! ;D
- >
- > As for (9), much of my career has gone toward understanding the
- > components of relevance in behavior. imho, relevance is to
- > intrinsically hitched to context that as a guideline it seems almost
- > impossible to quantify? Is a weather conversation irrelevant to
- > students sitting inside a classroom? maybe yes, maybe no. to kids
- > wanting to go outside and play it might have strong reverse-context,
- > to adults thinking about catching the last bus back home from
- > night-school it has another seemingly different, yet cogent,
- > contextual impetus!
- >
- > Help me? Discuss this with me? I am so open to dogme that it does pain
- > me a bit to see how quickly some discussions here seem to get reduced
- > to what appears to be little more than ""territory squabbles"".
- >
- > 1. Interactivity: the most direct route to learning is to be found in
- > the interactivity between teachers and students and amongst the
- > students themselves.
- > 2. Engagement: students are most engaged by content they have created
- > themselves.
- > 3. Dialogic processes: learning is social and dialogic, where
- > knowledge is co-constructed.
- > 4. Scaffolded conversations: learning takes place through
- > conversations, where the learner and teacher co-construct the
- > knowledge and skills.
- > 5. Emergence: language and grammar emerge from the learning process.
- > This is seen as distinct from the `acquisition' of language.
- > 6. Affordances: the teacher's role is to optimize language learning
- > affordances through directing attention to emergent language.
- > 7. Voice: the learner's voice is given recognition along with the
- > learner's beliefs and knowledge.
- > 8. Empowerment: students and teachers are empowered by freeing the
- > classroom of published materials and textbooks.
- > 9. Relevance: materials (eg texts, audios and videos) should have

> relevance for the learners.  
> 10. Critical use: teachers and students should use published materials  
> and textbooks in a critical way that recognizes their cultural and  
> ideological biases.  
>  
> Thanks for the links, \*\*\*!  
>  
> \*\*\*

## Post 137

Which is one very good reason to reject them both!

\*\*\*

--- On Wed, 29/9/10, wrote:

From: \*\*\*

Subject: Re: [dogme] Re: Blog on unplugging teacher training

To: dogme@yahogroups.com

\*\*\*

The Lewis quote is indeed not based on research, but neither is the idea of sequencing everything in little digestible steps, I believe.

\*\*\*

Quoting \*\*\* <chalkfacehero@...>:

> \*\*\*, the Lewis quote is of course interesting, but did you point  
> out to your trainees that (as far as I am aware) it has no basis in  
> research? I believe it is just another of those bald , bold (and  
> bad) assertions about language learning and teaching that trainees  
> are expected to swallow without really looking at the basis for  
> them. In other words, it's an act of faith, rather than a fact - a  
> crucial difference, no doubt!

>

> But I might be wrong, and stand to be corrected (gently!)

>

> \*\*\*

>

> --- On Wed, 29/9/10, \*\*\* wrote:

>

>

> From: \*\*\*

> Subject: Re: [dogme] Re: Blog on unplugging teacher training

> To: dogme@yahogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*""

> Date: Wednesday, 29 September, 2010, 7:46

>  
>  
> Thanks \*\*\* for your kind words and especially for notifying me of  
> the fact that the comments function wasn't on.  
> I wasn't aware of that as in the admin viewing of the blog it was.  
> I think I handled that now so, please, feel free to talk back!  
>  
> Kind regards  
> \*\*\*  
>  
> Quoting \*\*\* :  
>  
>> Congrats \*\*\* and welcome to the 'sphere - it really looks great  
>> already, I enjoyed the sheets you posted but by the way, do turn on  
>> the comments function so we can talk back :)  
>>  
>> \*\*\*  
>>  
>> --- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:  
>>>  
>>> Dear all  
>>>  
>>> Just to let you know that I started my Unplugging Teacher Training blog.  
>>> \*\*\*leys/  
>>>  
>>> In this blog I will try to keep track of my attempts of unplugging the  
>>> English teacher training course at KHBO, Bruges, Belgium.  
>>>  
>>> Feel free to read along and post your (critical) comments.  
>>>  
>>> Best regards  
>>> \*\*\*  
>>>  
>>> --  
>>> \*\*\*  
>>> -----  
  
--  
\*\*\*

## Post 138

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Dear Friends:

I have to write an essay and create a lesson about functions at threshold level. Does anyone have ideas about lessons on specific functions at that level? telephone language, restaurant language, permission, suggestions etc?? Can anyone recomend articles, books etc?



Thank you  
\*\*\*

----- Original Message -----

From: \*\*\*...  
To: dogme@yahoogroups.com  
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2005 7:49 PM  
Subject: Re: [dogme] Culture Club

\*\*\*,  
,

English 901 tapes contains what the editors describe as the 900 base sentences of the language, by which they mean the basic structures exemplified in sentences grouped together situationally. The tapes are mainly drills of the ancient, language laboratory three-phase type.

\*\*\*

## Post 139

Or were they simply workers who'd been kept in an office too long?

----- Original Message ---

From: \*\*\*  
To: <dogme@yahoogroups.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2003 2:41 PM  
Subject: Re: [dogme] Chomsky (Was Re: Ahem....)

>

>> What I'd like to know is who are these people keeping pigeons in boxes

> until

>> they can't fly. Dk?

>>

>> \*\*\*

>

> I once read an article about pigeons in Lndon that don't fly, they take the

> tube. Apparently they hop on at their 'home' station, change lines and

> arrive at their work destination (usually Picadilly Sq or Covent Garden)

> without lifting a wing.

> Maybe they were kept in a box too long!

>

> \*\*\*

>

## Post 140

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Thank you \*\*\* for mentioning my ("Dogme 2.0") blog post.

Below I explain further why I see a natural connection between Dogme ELT principles and web 2.0 tools in language teaching.

My blog post sketches out how the web is becoming increasingly a normal part of our lives as well as an enormous source of both language learning content and opportunities to interact with others as part of the learning process. However, it is really the questions of relevance, meaning and motivation that are the key links between Dogme ELT and web 2.0.

If we see learning as a process of constructing meaning, and therefore one where relevance is key to enabling the learner to both find and create meaning, then the actual medium (be it online or offline) is not necessarily so significant. What seems more pertinent is the ability to create excitement and engagement such that language learning opportunities surface in class.

### French 2.0

I find my French classes engaging, precisely because I use topics such as "web 2.0 in language learning" as vehicles for the development of my French. I bring in texts from sites such as Apprendre 2.0 <<http://apprendre2point0.ning.com/>> and I write blog posts for a personal blog of mine. As I get better in French I hope to play a more active role in online communities such as Apprendre 2.0. I find these opportunities to use French in a way that is meaningful to me very exciting and enjoyable. Furthermore there are two observations about these classes that stand out for me:

1. the classes implicitly draw upon Dogme ideas: there are no textbooks; language emerges from my interaction with texts (that I read or write) and the activities are very real for me
2. the web plays a critical and highly enabling role in the lessons: the materials used in class can only be accessed online and the lesson topics are so real for me precisely because I am able to connect with others via online communities.

This is not to suggest that coursebooks should be avoided just that it seems difficult to see how a French textbook could satisfy my desire to communicate about what interests me most. Likewise I am not

suggesting that lessons must involve the internet just that drawing on the potential of the web helps me connect with others (in a specialized field), and therefore jointly create meaning, with other people who are also interested in the same topics.

#### Relevance, Motivation and Communication

I see communication as essentially being driven by a desire to be heard and understood. And that we are motivated to communicate what we find relevant to our lives: if something resonates with a student and sparks a desire to be heard on the subject, then she/he will be motivated to express themselves as best they can. This becomes a springboard for learning (through language emergence etc). As a teacher, how can I tap into this desire to enable the student to achieve more effective communication in a foreign language? How can teachers facilitate relevance in the classroom (virtual or physical) so that students are naturally able to engage in constructing meaning in our case in a foreign language?

As such, this question can be seen from both views (2.0 or Dogme). For a Dogme-inspired teacher, the question points to using the web to find greater relevance; to finding content and opportunities for online collaboration that will inspire the learner to engage. For teachers already keen on the internet, the Dogme principles offer a pedagogical structure for how best to draw on the web to ensure relevance and enable communication that leads to language emergence and therefore learning.

#### Ensuring Relevance for the Learner

Not all classroom teachers should use the web in class, nor should online teachers follow a Dogme dogma (although I am certainly sympathetic to the latter). Rather than focusing on the construction of meaning within the learning process, we are naturally led toward the question of relevance for the learner. And as our lives increasingly take place online and our learning becomes more and more specialized, the search for relevance benefits from using the internet.

Moreover, if two-way communication is seen as the central vehicle in language learning, then online communication (in a variety of forms) can help the learner connect with a far wider audience (or far more exact audience) than is possible within the four walls of a classroom. In its 2.0 form the web is highly interactive and the audience becomes a conversation partner indeed a collaborator in the process of knowledge co-construction.

For me the question is not about whether to use the internet; it is more about how to use the net precisely because the English teaching I do is entirely online. However the far more significant question is how to ensure relevance for the learner.

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*"" wrote: >

> Dogme is indeed in transition (all things are!)

>

> In this blog posting, for example, there is a very interesting, and I think insightful, attempt to marry dogme with technology: >

<http://www.avatarlanguages.com/blog/dogme-elt-web20-dogme20/> in which the blogger concludes: >

> ""...perhaps we are looking here at an opportunity for the Dogme ELT approach to evolve into a ""Dogme 2.0"", where the ""2.0"" tag represents the ability for students to engage, interact and create online."" >

> I have no quarrel with this, since I experience, on a daily basis (through my online teaching for the New School MATESOL, for example) engagement, interaction and creativity to a degree that certainly matches face-to-face instruction. My quarrel with the techno-nerds is the use of technology as an end in itself (hey, twittering is neat, let's twitter!) and as the vehicle for a transmissive, delivery-based, model of education. >

## Post 141

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

Celebrating my first post... as I haven't been a member for more than a couple of days.

\*\*\*:

You might also want to think of the input-output question - does it justify the efforts that you make and that your students make? You venture into an area that is very constructed (grammar lessons always are), confusing and not very interesting. And all for what? So they can handle something that you could probably already handle in the first place.

Take into consideration your audience here too. If it is a mono-lingual class then you should realise that the use of the passive in their native tongue is exactly like the English.

I also think it is a useless practice nearly. In the world of learner autonomy, some learners will be interested and ask you about it, which means that you can have an interesting chat about the passive and perhaps have a look at some newspaper articles or headlines. Some students might not be interested at all and the last thing they're looking for is something like the passive rammed down their throats.

\*\*\*

## Post 142

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

I think that if you were 'jumping on any interesting language that comes up,' in the phrase du jour, and the students were thoroughly engaged, and you were obviously giving it 100%, you could hardly be described as lazy. Unplugged teaching is a dynamic, iterative process, not a linear and repetitive one, so it demands a lot of commitment and effort from the teacher.

If you were to say, perhaps at the start of lesson for the benefit of our observer, that you have been thinking about what someone said yesterday and that it might be an idea to do x, or that you have been revisiting some of the language that came up last week and have got a task for them to do that will help them remember it, you could hardly be described as unprepared.

Inviting the students to prepare something for the class the day before would reinforce this.

Doing this would give you the opportunity to at least sketch your intended approach to the lesson, and discuss it with the observer in advance. If you were also able to link some of the work being done in class to the National Curriculum targets, they might be further reassured.

One should be prepared to make some concessions when doing an observed lesson, however one chooses to teach, just as there are occasions in life, however disagreeable, when one is obliged to wear a suit - unless eccentricity, rather than individuality, is the aim.

\*\*\*

-----Original Message-----

From: dogme@yahoogroups.com [mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of

\*\*\*

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Subject: [dogme] Unplugged teaching and targets.

Hello. I teach ESOL and I was just wondering if anyone can help me reconcile 'teaching unplugged' with the setting and achieving of National Curriculum targets given that this 'method' appears to be pretty much 'off the cuff' as it were.

I am new to this site but I am intrigued by this unplugged idea. I'm not sure, but if I were to teach it in an observed class, would I be described as a 'lazy' and unprepared teacher?

I would welcome even one comment.

Thank you

## Post 143

You could also obtain a copy from Amazon. I can't give you an exact address on that, but you can access it via <http://www.ihes.com/bcn/tt/trainerspublications.html>.

Amazon currently lists it as \$26.53 plus pp.

\*\*\*

## Post 144

Coded as Dogme ideology.

Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.

Wow. High altitude thinking, Mr. \*\*\*.'

... I've just lost my answer. Wretched electronics.....

Briefly, for the reprise:

1. Agree 'dogme is subversive.
2. EFL practitioners must be most modest about claims to contributing to world struggles for economic and social improvement.
3. Worried that such erudite discourse is too far removed from classroom practice.

Best wishes from Peterborough UK en route pour Cardiff, over the border.

Sent with the help of my new dongle - now there is a word for you.

\*\*\*

## Post 145

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*,

I don't think \*\*\* and I are trying to divorce the two. Certainly, I

think effective linguistic development is unlikely to be realised without the appropriate 'affective' conditions being in place. One can't help noticing that some teachers seem to be more successful with students than others. I would put this down to the difference in overall teaching craft, taking into account all the factors which feed into successful pedagogy.

\*\*\*

>I would argue that linguistic needs are secondary to affective needs,  
>because linguistic needs are couched within the whole person, within the  
>framework of the learner's world. therefore, if we fail to address the  
>affective needs as primary, focusing instead on the properties of  
>language, we have missed the mark IMHO.

## Post 146

*Coded as own out of school experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*, your post is not boring at all !! on the contrary, it deals with matters that are at the heart of teaching one's language as a foreign language. I had understood that you pointed out one of my mistakes in order to use it as an example in \*\*\*'s discussion about correctness in language. Nevertheless I am always thankful when people do correct me. I find there must be a cultural gap about correction and correctness. In the UK, people seem (to me) more anxious not to ""hurt your feelings"". Here in France I find that correction is viewed as a service, a kindness.

To answer your question, I think I would not stop the flow of speech or conversation if the meaning and intention of the speaker were clear to me. However, I would certainly stop the person if he/she had asked me to, or if his little mistake was repetitive, or if his level of French was good enough to benefit from an extra shade of meaning I could give him. But correctness and correction are delicate areas in the classroom. Because of all the school day memories attached to them, because correction has to do with confidence and maturity too. So I suppose the teacher must adapt his type of correction to the persons and the situations they are in, as they constantly do while teaching !

As for your tutor view : I do not see we study empty shells, remnants pieces of language. Because I see the actual \*act\* of studying the language, making it one's own, as a very lively process itself !

Bonne soire tous !  
(have a nice evening !)

\*\*\* a crit :

Dear \*\*\*, it looks and sounds as if the video was supposed to be edited after the footage had been shot. Another link in the chain of embarrassing

events involving the man some like to call The Evil Chimp. My co-worker rightly points out that such a term is an insult to primates everywhere, however, and it is probably risky for any of us to post such remarks on an open site like this (only half kidding). As you know, many Americans feel inferior when they compare their English with Standard British English (if it exists), and this video does not make matters any better in that regard. :-)

, I actually didn't mean to correct your English, which is obviously sufficient to make me have to guess as to whether it's your first language. I meant to give a relevant and concrete example (I hope) of what \*\*\* had mentioned about corpora not always 'covering' effective English. I suppose if we follow Crystal's line of argument in the 'interview' (it was really just a plug for the new book along with a lot of inference by Crean), that meaning and intention are essential for effective communication, then I can say that the meaning of ""We are 60 million..."" was absolutely clear to me; however, if you intended to imitate the language I might use to convey that message, your intention was thwarted by L2 influence. But, aside from exams, does it really matter? And ---according to the article \*\*\* directed out attention to, it's officially okay to begin sentences with 'And' and leave that preposition at the end of the clause --- Whew! Uh... \*And\* it might just be that more users of English would prefer your variety in this case than they would a more 'correct' form.

As for the living language, I've not been able to locate the online discussion my tutor and I had about that. As I recall, he was claiming that the moment we utter a phrase or set finger to keyboard, we've created text, which we can modify at will, but which is 'out there' if you will. To examine language then means to look at these instances of language, these remnants (or empty shells). It's not 'dead language' in the sense of Ancient Greek or Latin but rather the notion that we can only hope to describe use and usage by recognizing patterns. At the time, I was struggling to understand and incorporate corpus linguistics into my worldview, as I still am. I think I am more sympathetic to my tutor's view now that I've had time to digest the ideas he was sharing.

Gawd, this post must be boring to read!

\*\*\*

## Post 147

Coded as own learning experience.  
Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.

\*\*\*,

I'd like to offer the perspective from the coin's other side if I may.



I'm currently finishing up a Psycholinguistics course where the professor has been (perhaps unknowingly) teaching dogme-style. The class periods are full of student-centric discussions but include occasional guidance from the professor when direction is not clear or is clearly wrong.

It has been so exhilarating and refreshing to not be tied to lesson plans and busy-work that it is obvious *\*all\** of the students are putting forth extra effort in order to self-construct the knowledge that the field of study offers. Students who, nearly four-months ago, were obviously disinterested and only taking the course to fulfill degree requirements (most are elementary education majors) are now showing full enthusiasm. They each now contribute to discussions and their eyes are bright with excitement.

From my perspective, there is nothing more natural than training other teachers by modeling what you want them to do. I have said for years that the only valid form of teaching is example. Time and experience (to me) proves it over and over.

Off to Phonetics,  
\*\*\*

## Post 148

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*  
*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

Hi \*\*\*

You are absolutely right. It is a wild guess. The cynic in me was getting carried away. Sorry, I am not a fan of the man and never have been. There are/were so many other problems with the education system that you have to wonder why IWBs were such a priority and warranted so much investment. I'm sorry but we have to question these things and perhaps I should have put it as a question rather than slanderous statement. As I often do, I got carried away. After all, the British government is no stranger to corrupt procurement procedures and business practices and this is well documented.

Corrupt? Debatable. Short sighted? Certainly. But my point is still that many governments/agencies, etc. are more interested in shiny, new toys that look good on the TV news than good 'ol training. If you are prepared to invest millions in the hardware and not the people who will have to use them, you have to question the rationale and motives behind it.

I would like to point out that I am not against technology, but I fail to see the point in squandering millions in IWBs, laptops, etc. when this money could be spent in other areas which might have more impact and long term rewards. I am also in favour of technology being used to empower people. For example, if the government spent x amount of money buying computers for teachers, for you then to train these teachers online, and then they teach their colleagues face-to-face. This is investing in people. This will produce long term benefits, hopefully.

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:

>

> \*\*\*,

>

> On 26 Oct 2011, at 22:16, ""\*\*\*\*"" wrote:

> > Did Tony Blair honestly decide to put IWBs in every British classroom for pedagogical reasons, or was it that someone was getting a hefty kick-back somewhere along the line? Or, did someone just work out the benefits to the economy in the short term compared with the benefits that training teachers could provide in the long term and decide that they wouldn't be in power long enough to reap the rewards.

> >

> >

>

> Whilst I can't speak on behalf of Tony Blair, that set of observations/suppositions is nothing other than a set of wild guesses which would probably get you done for slander in the real world...

>

> \*\*\*

>

## Post 149

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*. again:

""Your answers are all very well but it still begs the question of who determines what is acceptable and understandable in terms of pronunciation.""

Point taken. Clearly - well, it's clear to me - there isn't one model of what is acceptable, and understandable - and I can see that it is very difficult (if not impossible) to measure 'acceptability' in scientific terms.

If we are discussing serious reservations about tests and testing - what kind of English for what purposes are we testing - I'm with you.

On the other hand, there are day-to-day situations where some kind of assessment is necessary.

As I may have mentioned here I recently wrote to the Airport Manager of Stanstead Airport, UK complaining that the announcements for proceeding to gate X and boarding were incomprehensible. The announcements were indistinctly articulated and read far too fast.

If I were asked to test the announcers I would simply play selected recordings of their messages to an international group of listeners and see who got the highest score for clearly getting across which passengers for which flight for which airport were required to check in at which gate.

\*\*\*"

## Post 150

*Coded as other forum post.*

I fully agree with \*\*\* : real communication first, talking to individuals : here is the start, the impulse, the beginning and purpose of learning and teaching languages.

\*\*\*a crit :

If we treat the students as people, which means talking with them, the language that emerges will become the shared resource.

\*\*\*

-----Original Message-----

From: dogme@yahoogroups.com [mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of \*\*\*

Sent: 27 October 2005 15:00

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Subject: [dogme] Using Students as a Resource

I am looking at Using Students as a Resource and capturing language generated in Dogme and CLL approaches. Any relevant postings? Thanks

## Post 151

*Coded as teacher training.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

First of all, sorry about all the typos in my message about the last class. A few of them caught my eye when the post popped up on my monitor later. No time to red through and correct, but C. looked at him (not home) and the girl who sometimes said I was mean (not she sometimes said) and... hope the others can be deduced from the context.

As for planning lessons, or not, my DELTA instructor liked to write up

lesson objectives at the beginning of class. With DELTA trainees, he'd sometimes negotiate the objectives a bit, but with classes he thought it was learner-centered to let everyone know where the class was headed and only stray if appropriate. I think this is the point Jeremy Harmer is trying to make in post 60. I think dogme can accommodate students writing up, perhaps even before the teacher shows up, their wishes and perceived needs on the board, which an then become fodder for discussion and negotiation during official class time. If that seems to autonomous for some groups, what about boarding objectives or an agenda to give the ""security"" of a planned lesson to those who need it, then let the class naturally stray from the plan when it feels right? If things start to falter, one always has the boarded agenda to get things back on a straight and narrow pathway if need be. This could suit both those learners who don't mind conversation and scaffolding along with those who need a more structured setting. My sense is that many classes follow a similar format. After such a class, teachers often say something like, Well, we got off track and started talking about such and such. It was rally interesting, because I had no idea that so and so used to be a plumber. It was funny because they joke about ""plumber butt"" (the unsightly white underwear --- and more --- when the plumber bends down on all fours to take a look at that nasty leak under the sink) in country X, too. It was all good for a laugh, but we'll have to get back to the present perfect tomorrow of the exam will be a disaster.

Something like that.

\*\*\*

## Post 152

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Multitasking is possibly the key, as opposed to pressure (although I suspect fighter pilots do have a teeny bit of that!).

How about doing something else - sporting (play tennis, chuck a rugby ball to each other), or mental (puzzle solving) while firing pre-prepared (anti-dogme? ) questions at him.

I was watching a Think! Road Safety campaign advert on their website, that flashes up a text, with a voiceover saying something different over the top, to demonstrate how hard it was to concentrate on two things at once (talking on your mobile and driving). Something like that any good? He could read a text, within a time limit, while you simultaneously spoke to him - then he reports back on both.

Just thinking out loud now.

I'll stop.

\*\*\*

\*\*\* wrote:

Dear List Members,

Apologies for cross posting.

I have a Greek military student, a pilot, who is quite fluent but has difficulty reacting to English spoken by American native speakers when he is under pressure in the cockpit. He is ok when other non-native speakers speak to him but he finds some of the American dialects difficult.

He is fine talking one to one so I feel I have to devise activities to get him to speak under pressure. Can any list member offer any advice?

I have thought of a 'Hot Seat'" where the student sits on a chair and one or two instructors fire questions at him. Each subsequent question is asked before he has finished answering the previous one.

Not really ELT I know, but would appreciate any input.

Regards

\*\*\*

## Post 153

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

I feel as if I am on the defensive, \*\*\*, but with no idea of why I should be! What you refer to as ""your take"" is surely the take of anybody who cares about education and so we seem to agree rather than disagree! It is worth pointing out that learners in ESOL do tend to have a very good reason for wanting to learn the language and are often more heterogeneous than the learners in UK EFL settings. I work in Manchester, a city with the largest Chinese community in Europe (I have been told). My students study with their compatriots, live with their compatriots and frequently work with their compatriots. Their exposure to English is limited (not strictly true) to 4 hours per day. Not many ESOL learners will be in such a situation. Many of my students are studying for an abstract reason and with no intrinsic motivation. Conversely, ESOL students tend to study for the practical reason of improving their language (as opposed to their IELTS score) and frequently have a great deal of intrinsic motivation.

Secondly, it is not an issue of whether or not I agree or disagree with students' personal targets! Of course there is a good reason for wanting what they want - their parents have sent them to the UK to get a degree to get a good job (I hesitate to use "they" but this is almost exclusively the reason I am given when I enquire). What I disagree with are the strategies employed to achieve that goal (which frequently fall far short of the mark - hence my disagreement) and, frequently, the unrealistic expectations - a student who is struggling to tell me that s/he needs a 6.0 in their IELTS exam within 3 months deserves to at least be told that they face a difficult time. This is not disagreeing with the reasons behind their personal targets, it is offering them a professional evaluation of what is possible and what might not be possible.

What criticisms have been made that are teacher-centred? This is not a rhetorical question, but a genuine one. It may be that the medium of e-mail has distorted the original intentions of whoever made the criticism. As for the "student-centred" learning that you refer to, would it not be better described as "exam-centred"? Many of my learners (I DO ask them!!!) are not at all interested in English, nor in going to university, nor in the subject that they have been told to study. In fact, many of them are interested in wildy different things to what they are studying, for example, the wannabe cartoonist who was studying Industrial Management and hated it or the or the would-be author who had been told to study business managment. To say that catering to the requirements of the IELTS exam is "student-centred" seems to debase the term when such learning is far from having the students at the centre.

I wonder if you are not viewing the "criticisms" expressed on this list through a filter of suspicion and defensiveness? We live in a racist world where people are often quick to decry The Other as Wrong, so such a filter would be understandable, but, I would argue, unnecessary. I mention this because the tone of your post seems to be that of defending your students from the unfair and unjust attacks of Western teachers. But why polarise between Western Teachers and Chinese Students as you appear to do? As I mentioned to you off-list, I think we frequently fail to see that the criticisms of the Chinese education system are equally applicable (to a greater or lesser extent) to the British education system (for example). But I don't understand what is to be gained from comparing the L2-learning achievements of Brit students with the L2-learning achievements of Chinese students or with arguing that the motivation that underlies many UK students' learning is the same as their Chinese counterparts. It may well be, but that doesn't mean it is effective.

I suspect that we would find huge failings in both countries education systems, but marks would have to go to the educational system that recognised that learning is personal and is constructed as opposed to uniform and transmitted. Of course, to get those marks, the educational system would have to put this theory into practice! In the UK, the theory seems to be wildy out of kilter with the practice. Nevertheless,

this thread seems to be more about the methodology of the teachers and the study strategies of the learners rather than a case of saying that Brits are better than Chinese. In other words, product is not the focus, but process; for that matter, nationality is not important either. So, the question should be: if we look at students who have chosen to learn a language and are encouraged to do so through a constructivistic, learner-centred and communicative experience how would they compare with somebody who wasn't interested in the subject, and who employed strategies such as memorisation, rote learning and continuous exposure to published exam papers that were beyond their capabilities. Would we really disagree about the predicted outcomes?

Apologies for both the length and the garbled nature of the above. We need a Dogme phone.

\*\*\*

## Post 154

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*  
*Coded as other forum post.*

More tosh...

What I also found interesting was her point about gatekeeping - what's considered acceptable and what isn't in learner speech is often seen as the privilege of native speakers to determine: learners themselves in this respect are, if you like, disenfranchised. This could be an area where publishers could make a difference, by featuring more NNS in the listening material they use in coursebooks, for example: yet few seem to be prepared to take such a bold step and legitimise intelligible, if non-conforming, NNS speech.

Great idea - let's have loads of coursebooks with foreigners making bad mistakes in English! This would be a real money-spinner for the publishers, I'm sure.

Only in the isolated world of academia, which thrives on new ideas but is unable to really examine them critically, can such ideas gain any currency. In the real world, they are recognised as what they are - crap.

What's next for the 'Emperor's New Clothes' award this week?

As for 'gatekeeping', 'disenfranchised', and 'privilege [sic]', these are of course high-frequency words in the academic world, but probably meaningless to the vast majority of speakers of ELF. what was that about 'intelligibility'?!

\*\*\*

## Post 155

Coded as logic and hypotheticals.

Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.

Coded as questioning and answering.

--- In dogme@yahogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*"" wrote:

> Which, by implication, means the short text about the prisoner  
(or was it > two?) in Durham is not good grammar. Why? because it lends itself  
to being > misunderstood.

>

> \*\*\*

>

Not at all, \*\*\*. A text which is misunderstood is still understood.

I wrote that a text which lends itself to being understood will be  
constructed with (just as) good grammar. The implication of this is  
that a text which cannot be understood (not ""which can be  
misunderstood"") will not use ""just as good grammar"". Note: what is  
understandable is obviously very subjective too.

\*\*\*\*"

## Post 156

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\* said: >

> I really like the idea of a webpage with resources with lots of photos, <<

which gives me the perfect excuse...:

Just to let you know that the teachers' photo resource eltpics

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/eltpics/> has a new baby.....

<http://takeaphotoand.wordpress.com/>

The original eltpics resource, for those of you who don't know it, is a collection of photos  
(currently 5,001 of them!) contributed by teachers for teachers to use ie crowdsourced  
creative commons material. Teachers are welcome to use any of the photos in their classes,  
blogs, training sessions or presentations, although if they publish, they should credit the  
photographer (the twitter names are under each photograph).

To contribute to eltpics, you just need to be able to tweet - or email me, I'm one of the  
curators, though not one of the founders, the brains behind it are Victoria Boobyer, Carol  
Goodey and Vicky Loras - and send your photos or links to your photos with the #eltpics  
hashtag.

The 'baby' was born today, which is eltpics' first birthday, and we hope you'll both enjoy it  
and find it useful.

End of plug ;-)



\*\*\*"

## Post 157

I'm with you, now, \*\*\*. It sounds as if \*\*\* is in a very tricky situation.

\*\*\*

--

\*\*\*

## Post 158

Coded as other's non-teaching experience.

Coded as logic and hypotheticals.

Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.

\*\*\*,

Believe me, I feel I'm still at the right party, too, but my Xmas guest, as some of you might have deduced, was my TEFL (Italy) daughter, and you can imagine what a thrashing fatherly cherished beliefs get from an offspring in the same profession.

\*\*\* wrote something like: ""In the unlikely event of there being a vociferous demand for a textbook...."" ""Unlikely? Unlikely? she snorted. ""It's normal.""

What I'm consciously about is trying to match my beliefs against ""reality"" as I observe it or have it reported to me - hence the 'down to earth.'

One thing that has become pretty clear to me is that we chattering discussing people are in a minority and are privileged. So many teachers (I'm thinking of NS teachers in Europe, the situation is even worse for others) can't afford a landline or their own PC and work in schools where, if they are lucky, there are a couple of online computers to share with students. They just don't belong to lists, even the ones seriously interested in their work.

If they are employed by private companies or languages schools, as is likely to be the case - they will probably be on the move from 9 in the morning until 9 or 10 at night. It's difficult to find the time to go to a doctor, let alone go to an internet cafe. And after cooking in the late evening I don't reckon there are too many who turn for a little light reading to Kumaravadivelu or Stevick.

\*\*\*

## Post 159

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\* wrote:

> I've come across some of the idiocies you have mentioned, and others. It has to be  
> pointed out, though, that the problem, as I see it, is not necessarily with IELTS itself (not  
> that you are saying this) but with the institutions who decide to use IELTS scores as a  
> criteria. IELTS must have a very good sales team.

<http://www.abc.net.au/rn/arts/ling/stories/s1404921.htm>

""One of the very serious problems with IELTS is that its ready availability has led to its being used for many purposes beyond what it was designed for.""

A recent speech by one of the exam designers.

~\*\*\*

## Post 160

And mysterious to ourselves! As if we know!

\*\*\*

-----Original Message-----

From: dogme@yahoogroups.com [mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of

\*\*\*

Sent: 16 November 2005 16:31

To: Dogme

Subject: [dogme] Multiple pigeonholes

It could be that I'm not well enough acquainted with MI theory, but from what I've read on the web sites provided by Arnold, MI is another example of American pop psychology trying to pigeonhole us while ignoring the individual as original and ultimately mysterious. Like Myers-Briggs, another way to make some money and make us feel 'understood'?

\*\*\*

## Post 161

...and the first (only?) country in Australasia to make some reasonably decent gestures of reconciliation towards the original inhabitants of the land? (Now sure.y THAT'S controversial!)

## Post 162

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Hi everybody.

I see a lot of value to be gotten out of the activity \*\*\* has outlined here. I'm gonna give it go.

I have never really done any proper focusing on dictionary skills; was never really sure about how to go about it. Now, though, I feel better equipped.

One thing that used to frustrate me a lot when I used to teach kids was that they'd put a lot of effort into their written work, (evidently) using their bilingual dictionaries extensively, only to hand the work in to me with every other line containing somewhere in there the word "vegueu", (= "see"), or "v.i. vegueu", and so on. This perplexed me no end. Then one day [stroke of genius coming up here everybody!] I looked up the Catalan word which so-and-so student seemed to be trying to express, and I saw that the words which followed it in the dictionary were indeed "v.t. vegueu", or whatever.

So, what was (and still is, to be fair) lacking in my teaching was precisely what y'all're discussing here: dictionary-use training techniques.

A lot of my learners (especially those kids, but a some adults too) seem to think of a dictionary as a mere translator. And the fact that so many words in Catalan transalte simply into the "English" [!] word "vegueu" doesn't seem to strike them as in the slightest bit odd!

Does anybody else encounter this phenomenon? How do y'all deal with it?

Anyhow, anyhow. Anyhow.

Good things,  
\*\*\*

## Post 163

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

I also with great interest went to the Dimdim site, but seem to have missed the lesson. Was it recorded? I've forgotten if you can record on dimdim, I think one can. Do, please, give us a relevant URL if there is one. Unless one is oneself participating, recordings are great in the difficult world of

synchronicity.

\*\*\*

## Post 164

Yes, let 'em know.

Would it be good to have some kind of synthesis of what we have been discussing for new members to read?

Bye the way I wanted to ask if the archives are available to all members. Is there a www address for it?

\*\*\*

## Post 165

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\*:

On Saturday I play my annual gig at the Korean Association for Primary English Education. Although I have learned to show up for classes without textbooks and lesson plans, I still can't bring myself to give a plenary without any data. So I am presenting that stuff from the T-Everybody, T-Somebody study we were talking about a year ago.

I'm trying to present it without any statistical tests, just pie charts and boxplots. The results are kind of interesting. Firstly, English classes (compared to Art, Korean, Music, and Korean History) have significantly less of both T-Somebody and closed pairwork. The current crunch in Korean education is to make Elementary English education more like Middle and High School English (because parents want to start getting their kids ready early for the college entrance exam). My data suggests we need to make them more like (other) elementary school classes.

Secondly, the observers do prefer lessons with more T-Somebody interaction and less T-Everybody interaction. They also prefer lessons with more closed pairwork, though! Not really dogme....

I'm not sure what to make of the closed pairwork results. On the one hand, there's this ethnographic study of Vietnamese classrooms by Sullivan that argues against pairwork and for a very Teacher-fronted, dogme style. On the other hand, Littlewood's big number crunching

study (in the latest LTR) suggests that there is greater variation within ""Asian"" learning styles than between Asians and Europeans and the myth of Asians preferring teacher-fronted classes is really just a myth. Of course, neither study looks at little kids' learning styles; that may be what I'm looking at.....

\*\*\*

PS: I got MUCH higher levels of reliability this time. Still, seven out of 35 groups had alpha of less than .7.

## Post 166

Coded as other's non-teaching experience.

You have certainly given me food for thought. My daughter, a stellar student who is reticent by nature, won a leadership contest in high school with an essay stressing that she led by doing and not talking. And she did!!!

\*\*\*

## Post 167

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.  
Coded as other forum post.*

I'm surprised to see that it was only on March 9th. that I reposted a message I had submitted to this list a year before on the work of Jens Bod, a Dutch linguist.

Anyone particularly interested can consult the whole message (# 13564) but I am struck yet again by how similar what Jens Bod is saying is to what \*\*\* has been saying and reporting.

---

DJN Feb 11 2008 to dogme

<snip>

""The knowledge of a speaker/hearer ...can be understood as a statistical ensemble of language experiences that change slightly every time a new utterance is processed.""

Here is a short extract from his book:

Beyond Grammar: An Experience-based Theory of Language  
Centre for Study of Language and Information Stanford, California  
1998 ISBN 1 57586 150-x

-----

DOP

""Data Orientated Parsing ....embodies the assumption that human language comprehension and production works with representations of concrete past language experiences, rather than with abstract grammatical rules . The models that instantiate this approach therefore maintain corpora of linguistic representations of previously occurring utterances. New utterance-representations are constructed by productively combining (partial) structures from the corpus. A probability model is used to choose from the collection of different structures of different sizes those that make up the most appropriate representation of an utterance. The knowledge of a speaker/hearer ...can be understood as a statistical ensemble of language experiences that change slightly every time a new utterance is processed.

.....

.... the main outcome of these tests suggests that the productive units of natural language cannot be defined in terms of a minimal set of rules (or constraints or principles) as is usually attempted in linguistic theory, but need to be defined in terms of a redundant set of previously experienced structures In particular it means the knowledge of a speaker/hearer cannot be understood as a grammar, but as a statistical ensemble of language experiences that change slightly every time a new utterance is processed.""

\*\*\*

## Post 168

*Coded as teaching text.*

Dear \*\*\*,

I've also written an iconoclastic book about English grammar (which \*\*\* has kindly read) and which can be downloaded in pdf format from my website <http://www.rbuckmaster.com> <<http://www.rbuckmaster.com>> . It's about 50 pages. I'd be interested in any comments you had.

\*\*\*

-----Original Message-----

From: \*\*\*

To: [dogme@yahoogroups.com](mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com)

Subject: [dogme] language awareness and bad spelling....

\*\*\*,

I was nodding through all the wonderful responses to your message. What I say below is not instead of what's been said--just a couple of additional ideas.

I'm also a bad speller. At one point, I had a list of words I misspell. After I'd gone to the dictionary yet again to see if, for example, it was 'calander' or 'calendar,' I added that word to the list, with the problem letters in red pen. That was it. I looked at the list sometimes.

Sometimes I mentally noted little rules to help me in the future (it's calendar--the e before the a--the opposite of alphabetical order). If I'd wanted to take it further, I could have put each word on one side of an index card, and a sentence with a blank for the word on the other (The months of the year are on the c\_\_\_\_, one page for each month), and tested myself on the train, discarding words I'd mastered. But that was too much trouble. I don't know where that list is now. At some point I lost interest in it.

Learning about grammar. I'm interested in how English works, but find standard tomes like Swan (a student's grammar) and Quirk and Greenbaum (a teacher's grammar) incredibly boring as reading material. But I LOVED Michael Lewis's *The English Verb* (LTP), with its fresh, unconventional, irreverent stabs at accounting for the way things are stated in English. And, yes, as someone said earlier in this thread, it led to some horrible classroom moments as I passed on to students my newfound insights into the present continuous. It was way over their heads, and all I did was confuse them. I enjoy the Ask Dr Grammar columns in our professional media (like the one in the 'TESOL Matters' newsletter). I don't think there's one thing I've learned in a grammar book or column that I use directly in my teaching. But as I gradually learn more ways of describing how English works, I have more ammunition to use in my trial and error attempts to present things to students and answer their questions. (BTW, does anyone recommend any other unputdownable, preferably iconoclastic books about English structure and meaning?)

When I do find things that are, for example, the right answer on a TOEFL test, and one of the distracters seems fine to me, too, I now say, rightly, that some native speakers also say it that (incorrect on TOEFL) way, but the right answer is preferred in formal written American English. I gradually learn these things as I go along.

\*\*\*

## Post 169

*Coded as other forum post.*

Hi \*\*\*,

I think \*\*\* and \*\*\* are definitely qualified to answer that question. Did you see \*\*\*'s recent post on how he goes about such sessions? Here it is in case you need it:

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/dogme/message/16740>

\*\*\* On Oct 23, 2011, at 3:22 AM, derek wrote:

- > I wonder if anyone has ideas, h/os, etc for an introductory session
- > on Dogma ELT? It would be for a 1.5 hour session on my celta course.
- > I have some key writings, a couple of sample lessons, and discussion
- > qs planned at the moment. Clearly there are a lot of options for
- > approaching a session like this, but i would like to hear some of

> your experiences.  
>  
> Thank you  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>  
>

## Post 170

*Coded as other's teaching experience.*  
*Coded as classroom adjacent.*  
*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

Hi all

It's interesting how the common view of IWBs is that they create teacher fronted teachers. In my view teacher fronted teachers are teacher fronted regardless of any teaching aid they might use (notice the word 'teaching' not 'learning').

I've heard a lot of criticism of IWBs that has come from people who've never used them or even seen them being used - in other words assumptions.

We use them where I work. Teacher sits in a corner at the back ready to help with anything if needed, students are typing, writing on the board and saving what they write to the computer, getting things off the internet, using the IWB to make a collage, adding their own stuff, and haggling with each other (in English) about what goes where, how you spell something, a bit of grammar they need and are stuck on. This is where the teacher comes in - as a language resource.

Doesn't sound too teacher fronted does it? We use them as a learning resource. They're particularly good with teenagers who are so used to computers etc that they teach the teachers a lot about using technology.

Basically I don't think an approach or aid can be blamed for bad teaching. Equally I don't think people should rubbish an approach or aid until they've fully explored its use.

All the best  
\*\*\*

## Post 171

\*\*\*\* and I are going to be working on putting together a short article for the informal education website. We have found that our communications to our individual email addresses bounce back so we decided to use this list to communicate.

All our messages will be preceded by infed: If you see this just delete it. Of course you can read the stuff (which we'd better keep in mind).



One other thing. All of \*\*\*'s messages come to me in a really wide format and I turn them into a reply to read them. What can be done to squeeze them into the normal screen?

\*\*\*

## Post 172

*Coded as own out of school experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

I don't think supporting a whole language presentation of foreign languages has much bearing on how five year olds should learn their first letters. Does this thread cross over with the learning styles thing...?

I remember being impressed by the example of a British person newly arrived in Moscow who thought it would be easier to navigate the underground system by memorising the interior decor of each station than by learning the cyrillic alphabet and comparing the names of stations with those on the map. Now that's really holistic!

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*\*" <\*\*\*@n...> wrote:

>

> Hail, St. \*\*\*! Long live \*\*\*! ...ahem.

>

> \*\*\* rightfully points out that children learn to read despite passing  
> fads and fancies. Meanwhile, U.S. teachers might be locked up for not  
> marching to the tune of phonics. (?)

>

> Cognitive science, like most science, enjoys dissecting our lives  
> (and our learning) into pieces that can be held under a microscope  
> and fit into tightly crafted schemes. So when it comes to reading,  
> scientists study what our brain (noodle in the head), eyes (orbs in  
> the head) are doing. All fine and dandy. Newton once stuck a pointed  
> object into his eye, by the way, in the name of science.

>

> When we read, is it not the heart that determines and interprets the  
> text? Compare the mechanics of reading (noodle and orb activity) to  
> how a good book makes you feel; how you anticipate, devour and savor  
> the lines and paragraphs. Not to mention the joy and enlightenment of  
> a second reading.

>

> Remember that first book? Can you recall the sound of the page  
> turning, how it felt in your hands, or even the smell of it? Maybe  
> you only watched and listened as another handled the book. Yes,  
> reading is a physical response to text, but without what James  
> Hillman calls The Invisibles, reading becomes as dry and miserable as

- > the reader trying to concentrate on what s/he'd rather not have to
- > look at.
- >
- > \*\*\*

## Post 173

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*  
*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*  
*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*  
*Coded as other forum post.*  
*Coded as non-teaching text.*

The gurus have gone from ""I take your point"" regarding the use of youtube videos as having potential for inspiring dialogic process, following dogmeic principles to an almost i-robot, let's all transition on over to 2nd Life..?

Now, don't get me wrong, experimentation is super and I have enormous respect for what the 2ndLifers are doing: how they are working etc -

I don't believe in a one size fits all methodology, and from what I've read and seen, grand stuff out there (good points made in numerous blog posts, again, this is not a critic of 2nd Life) but er, technical wizardry aside, what is provided in terms of the dogmeic principles of scaffolding, how is the emergent language being recorded/ revisited and most importantly re-used?

Who decides the themes or locations per class, is it student-centered in the same way that a random no chalkboard, ban the textbook approach is, the let's have a dinner party conversation is?

Has there been any clarification or research on my point raised several weeks back regarding intrapersonal learners and the effect on their using /associating their identities with an avatar instead?

\*\*\*, this is a serious question - you may scoff at lady lone bicycle clad avatars but the necessity of hiding behind a mask waves giant red flags for me.

Starting off, of course, with how beautiful everyone is in 2nd Life: check out those biceps of yours and \*\*\*'s rather deliciously handsome head, etc - if physicality is apt for change, what about personality?

What about socio-linguistical psychiatry?

Is it a good pedagogical approach to be the guy who drinks Guinness in Ireland while sitting in France? It sounds awfully nice but if we were face2face, or down the line on Skype, camera to camera on that platform Heike uses, wouldn't we instead be able to have an even lovelier conversation about our real lives and our real drinking locales in the countries we live in and have enormous fun discussing how different these are while reviewing some very vital emergent language?

What happened to freeing the classroom from third-party, imported materials (and don't forget, I don't do/agree with this entirely)... is it all AI in here now or are there others who are also thinking what the...???

Also, not to split hairs, but why is \*\*\*' approach called Dogme 2.0 instead of Dogme 3D?

2.0 suggests community-based platforms (i.e. Facebook, MySpace, Ning, Slideshare, Moodle, YouTube, etc), real people communicating with real people not avatars communicating with avatars (3D).

\*\*\*, you've been awfully silent.

As you're the other guru... thoughts?

And have I simply entered the Twilight Zone?

\*\*\*

<http://kalinago.blogspot.com> - and if you pop on over to my blog, you can check out my lesson 'tip' for having brainstorming session about how Twitter can create a financially sound business model: good for business English students at Uni with a specific interest or adult employees in the IT or financial fields.

p.s. It'd be really nice for the lurkers to pipe up a bit or \*\*\* ...

## Post 174

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

Hi \*\*\*,

I'm not sure I understand your question (at the end). Can you clarify?

I guess we just disagree about what makes us human. While I believe the physical part of us matters, I believe the metaphysical to be no less significant. I realize this view is usually considered romantic or irrational in today's world. I'll always believe we humans are more complex and valuable than the technology we use.

And I don't consider myself a Luddite even if I joke about being one. As I've stated before, I'm not anti-technology. Like \*\*\* and \*\*\* (I believe), I am for helping us understand the effects of technology and how we might keep our human interests ahead of the Technopoly.

I also believe myself to be something other than a bad teacher (not that you said that) who, rather than applies, creates the conditions for dogme to happen quite frequently, to the enjoyment of language learners. But that remains a purely subjective observation.

\*\*\*

On Feb 17, 2010, at 11:01 AM, \*\*\* wrote:

>  
> despit ethe fact that evidence is mounting that we are exactly that?  
>  
> a mass of muscle and neurons, the flesh and blood form of a laptop  
>  
> how to learn about ourselves until we strip away subjectivity and  
> look for physical processes at work inside ourselves.  
>  
> Frankly, while my tenets have been borne out of what you seem to see  
> as a soulless techno-morass i consider the heart and soul of getting  
> to what comprises what we all seem to glibly see as ""heart and soul"".  
>  
> Frankly, being such a card-carrying Luddite hardly qualifies you to  
> apply dogme effectively. in fact, i think that quality makes one a  
> bad teacher since it witness you, the teacher, presupposing  
> something about something else that might or might not be true with  
> little access to discerning which.  
>  
> How is me taking ""techno-output"" and relating it to a ""dogme"" such  
> that I, too, eschew all ""educational props"" other than the student's  
> intellect and ability to express it as the only tools in my  
> educational arsenal?  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>  
> --- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:  
>>  
>> Hi \*\*\*. Thank you for sharing your thoughts, without giving  
>> them a  
>> voice I might add, here in cyberspace. Despite the lack of vocal  
>> chords vibrating, lips and tongue working together, I think I know  
>> what you mean. I am post-green tea but in the midst of a head cold.  
>> Disclaimers aside, I've studied a bit of semiotics, and I interpret  
>> your posts as a reflection of the positivist, technology-driven  
>> modernity so prevalent in our society. I'm not sure time management  
>> and efficiency are as important as our corporate sponsors would have  
>> us think. There are other symbols that matter as much as script and  
>> sound. I'm thinking of Carl Jung's ""Symbols of Man (sic)"". I'm  
>> thinking of the wise person who says nothing but knows so much. Now  
>> you might not think that applies because it is not mathematical and  
>> scientific. I happen to think we humans are not mathematical and  
>> scientific; we've only come to look at ourselves that way in modern  
>> times. We are complex, creative, and mysterious. Our brains are not  
>> the center of our selves no matter what the latest neural research  
>> tells us, I'm convinced of that.  
>>  
>> So I say, leave some room for mystery in education, and don't expect  
>> to herd learners though a regimen without creating more clueless

>> conformists and rebels without a cause. I've looked into the  
>> Connectivist scheme of things, and it is technology-centered, ie  
>> machines come before humans. It's about the people in the room, not  
>> the organs in their heads or the clock on the wall. That's what I  
>> believe, and I know I am in the minority with my beliefs, but that  
>> doesn't make me any less convinced. We need a new revolution to  
>> counter the damage of the industrial revolution, and perhaps dogme  
>> will be a part of bringing it about although I certainly don't think  
>> it can happen when we reduce ourselves to a mass of muscle and  
>> neurons, the flesh and blood form of a laptop.  
>>  
>> \*\*\*  
>>

## Post 175

Coded as own learning experience.

Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.

Coded as other forum post.

Coded as questioning and answering.

Coded as teaching text.

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\* ""

\*\*\*wrote: > So, the latest issue in the staffroom is ""How do we teach  
>reading?"" How do we teach reading?

The single best way to learn to read most modern languages is to be able to speak a standard form of them (though I'm aware that can be problematic for some languages--like Arabic). I had no luck at all using written Japanese texts to learn Japanese, but once I got so I could speak a lot of Japanese, reading came much easier. Now I do use texts to learn Japanese. But not at the same time, fluent reading--150-250 words a minute--is not the same as studying a text to learn language from it. When I learn vocabulary or phrases or structure from a text, I do a lot of things with it, but it is typically too difficult to read it quickly.

>>My suggestion is that we tell the students to read as much as possible and give them lots of texts to look at. But no. It turns out that we should break reading down into little chunks. Skimming can be taught. Scanning can be taught. Exercises can be devised to test ability to guess the meaning of unknown words. Paragraphs can be jumbled up and jigsawed back together again (soooo authentic) etc.<<

This is a limited approach that seemed to have emerged in ELT back in the late 80s--I see it a lot in 'reading' books produced at Cambridge UP etc. One problem is skimming and scanning are not reading. And again, we have concepts that come from the academic side of things with few teachers

probably have a clear idea what they mean when they say 'skim' and 'scan'. They are ways of dealing with text, but they are not the way you would read an article in a news magazine. You might do them before or after you read the article, but if you read the article, you would be doing something different. BTW, I always thought text jigsaws are absolutely silly.

>>But as for becoming better readers...isn't that just down to practice and pointers? Isn't the real secret to reading a good lexical base?<<

A strong spoken base and extensive but 'fluent' (that is, fast) knowledge of a lot of vocabulary.

>

> Any more ideas for dogme reading will be welcomed in the staffroom.

I really think that reading out loud to students for short periods of time is good. I also enjoy 'social' activities for learning vocabulary at the board--such as a multi-step semantic map that requires students to pool the vocabulary they know to learn from each other.

\*\*\*

## Post 176

*Coded as other's non-teaching experience.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\*'s linguistic reports remind me of a conversation that took place between a psychiatrist and a student friend here and lose nothing in translation.

Psychiatrist: And where did we go to school?

\*\*\*: Well, I don't know where you went, but I attended.....

I'm not sure that affect is involved in \*\*\*'s and my examples, but usage as many people imagine it to be as opposed to language as it is actually used is.

J M Sinclair in Looking Up - An Account of the COBUILD Project : Collins ELT, 1987 - writes that it is probably generally assumed that the basic meanings of the verbs 'see', 'give' and 'keep' are the commonest. In fact searches of his data base corpus show that the commonest uses are as in - 'I see. (I understand); 'give' as in ""I gave a talk""; and 'keep' as in ""It's important to keep warm.""

\*\*\*

## Post 177

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

Well, \*\*\*, when I was at school we weren't taught grammar. That said, it's my generation who elected Tony Blair (I'd add "...and George Bush", but we all know he wasn't really elected...).

The steady decline in values (which apparently began around the Socratic era and have continued unabated since then) is all down to the failure to teach grammar.

Personally, I think we need to get over the big idea that grammar is in any way more central to the language learning process than anything else. It's just another aspect of the language. It may have gained its pole position because it's so damned easy to compartmentalise and pontificate about and it gives us native speakers who master it a big boost over the foreign johnnies who will never be able to use it like what we do. It also gives said johnnies the ability to pour information over (rather than into) the heads of their students, should they be that way inclined.

As I see it, grammar has a big role to play at the outset. It provides a good way of helping students see patterns when they know next to nothing about the language. Having progressed beyond a basic level, I think that grammar should take a back seat ("\*\*RIGHT\* at the back, grammar!") to actually using the language and it should only be hauled into the daylight to explain what has already been said, rather than what might be said if only the foreigners could speak proper. Which, if you think about it, is the answer to your question. \*Nobody\* (whether they were taught grammar or not) was encouraged to use grammar to create new language. It has only ever been used to describe language that already exists. And what's sauce for the goose...

## Post 178

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

That language is an "emergent complex system" seems like common sense to me. Of course, it's nice to have hard research to back up common sense. Too bad research usually concealed in layer upon layer of jargon.

"Impenetrable," to quote Humpty Dumpty.

So I'll add my own jargon to the pile.

The emergent complex system theory more evidence in favor of constructivism and constructivism is not well accommodated by canonical EFL with its ""communicative"" materials, vocabulary lists (aka ""lexical syllabus""), and canned reading assignments focused on gripping subjects such as my favorite pop star and plastic surgery in Korea.

Theory Threat Advisory Scale: Orange Alert

This view of language as a complex system is useful in many ways. One immediately practical application is in the teaching of grammar to non-native speakers.

The Santa Fe document \*\*\* posted says,

""We adopt here a usage-based theory of grammar in which the cognitive organization of language is based directly on experience with language. Rather than being an abstract set of rules or structures that are only indirectly related to experience with language, we see grammar as a network built up from the categorized instances of language use.""

The paper goes on to describe this grammar in rather technical terms.

I eschewed the teaching of grammar in my classes for a long time. I understand grammar's usefulness but I did not see any evidence that the teaching of pedagogical grammar had any impact on performance and believed that it absorbed great swathes of instructional time for little apparent benefit.

Recently, I have been teaching a ""usage based grammar"" devised by Ed Vavra, who is active in the ATEG ([1]Assembly for the Teaching of English Grammar), a child of the [2]National Council of Teachers of English. Vavra has written a grammar called [3]KISS.

Vavra has been teaching his KISS grammar for years to freshman composition students and claims that it is effective. I am not making any claims for it but only offering this as an example of an emergent systems approach to the teaching of grammar. The purpose of teaching grammar is to enable students to self-evaluate their own writing and self-regulate its quality. These are higher order cognitive skills, the teaching of which may be something of a holy grail itself.

Nevertheless, the system does not depend on the application of disembodied canonical rules of correctness, but rather on close analysis of the function of words that you write yourself. The purpose of this analysis is to determine whether your writing actually does what you expect it to do.



Although the method is directed and not "discovered" it accords with constructivist views of teaching that often focus on building strong "metacognitive skills," that is the ability to determine a goal, plan a path to achieve it, monitor progress toward its achievement, adjust processes along the way, and determine when the goal has been reached. We call this "self directed learning," "life-long learning," "independent learning," and so forth.

Success cannot be tested except by living.

And that's enough of that.

\*\*\*

On Sun, 06 Mar 2011 06:44 +0000, "\*\*\*\*\*"

\*\*\* wrote:

At the Sant Fe Institute, just about everything is an emergent complex system. But in the case of language, I think the metaphor sticks (however, we might also usefully differentiate across language as social system, language as cognitive system, language acquisition systems, and the classroom as nexus--or NOT). You might find this Santa Fe Institute working paper interesting: [4]<http://www.santafe.edu/media/workingpapers/08-12-047.pdf>  
Regards,  
\*\*\*

## Post 179

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

This might interest some of you.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/3569045/Words-associated-with-Christianity-and-British-history-taken-out-of-childrens-dictionary.html>

"\*\*\* Seldon, the master of Wellington College, a leading private school in Berkshire, said: "I am stunned that words like "saint", "buttercup", "heather" and "sycamore" have all gone and I grieve it. I think as well as being descriptive, the Oxford Junior Dictionary, has to be prescriptive too, suggesting not just words that are used but words that should be used. It has a duty to keep these words within usage, not merely pander to an audience. We are looking at the loss of words of great beauty. I would rather have "marzipan" and "mistletoe" then "MP3 player."

The changing (home) environment is something which might be mourned,

but I guess that lexicographers have no choice but to change with the times. They need to describe language which is commonly in use. As fewer children live in semi-rural environments, and instead live in cities, words related to nature are becoming somewhat redundant. It's a sad affair, but one that has to be reflected in dictionaries. Actually, a few days ago, my local library (in Tokyo) threw away large numbers of children's books. The majority were related to nature and I picked up several books on butterflies, ants, birds and flowers (all in Japanese). They were of interest to me as much as to my son, but though pleased with my find, I did think that it was a shame and a sad reflection of the times. They were in good condition, well-written but were obviously deemed surplus to requirements.

\*\*\*

## Post 180

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

The recent barrage of postings has been very interesting to read and has come at a time when I am once again going thru an existential crisis! I'm trying to use dogme in class, not because of any slavish adherence to a new idea but because I genuinely believe that it has all of the characteristics to encourage deep learning. That said, I feel that I'm coming up against a brick wall and to some extent I feel I'm failing in my role as a teacher.

The other day a colleague asked me for a list of words that she could include in our (shared) class test. I don't have a list of words from which to draw. If I was using a coursebook, ... Of course, I am well aware that there are other solutions and I've noted this for future reference. A small voice in the back of my head tells me to ask students to give me a list of words that they think would be useful for them to be tested about. What do you think?

Jon Butt's post raised a very interesting point. Perhaps dogme needs a set of criteria by which we can assess success. Is it possible? One last thing, am I the only one who is rigorously steering clear of the coursebook? Do other people trawl through the press etc to find other 'minimal materials'? What percentage of other people's teaching is dogme? And, because I can't resist it, has anyone else suffered Reward?

So, there it is. Another cry for help and reassurance! I know that these posts don't generate as many responses as more theoretical ones, but I would desperately love to hear people's responses and other stories of dogme difficulties.

## Post 181

*Coded as other's teaching experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Thanks \*\*\*, and so glad you DIDN'T give up teaching!

And it's always reassuring to know we're not alone.

A colleague wrote in his end of year evaluation this summer that he'd found how spontaneity and response was the key and it beats the 'stifle aspect of pathological planning' any day. He had just completed his very first year of teaching, so I don't think Dogme is only for 'experienced' teachers (a point I recall having seen raised once or twice).

Dogme is of course about much more than course books and planning (or rather the avoidance of them). It's perhaps that course books and (especially 'pathological!') planning are often the most common obstacles to people learning, when these things become more than moveable stage props and become the play itself (sorry, I'm ashamed to confess I've never seen a von Trier film, and over recent years have hardly seen a film at all, a real ignoramous as far as films are concerned, though I like them well enough when I do see them and have even been involved in the making of some semi-professional ones, I'm more familiar with the immediacy of theatre).

Which brings to mind - a friend told me that the Italians are famous in the all the world for being the masters of improvisation in television productions. He is often involved in musical and entertainment shows, and gets by turns excited (by the artistic values) and frustrated (by the lack of organisation). To underline his point, he quoted experienced FOREIGN artists who had variously expressed both marvel and anxiety at this stalwart aspect of Italian television (marvel - eg, it all comes out so beautifully in the end; anxiety - eg, you're not even Italian but you have to work without a script, and you never know what's going to happen next).

(Now I'm reminded of \*\*\*'s lovely article in ELT Journal 53/1 (Jan 99) - Lesson art and design. )

Back to the original point about course books, a colleague when he worked at a school in Greece was under strict orders to do at least 2 pages from the course book each lesson, and if he hadn't done them and written them in his register he got a real bollocking from his DoS. The result was that he took the students out on Friday and Saturday evenings so that they could all speak English together with him!

At the same time, it's very difficult to tell a teacher 'don't bother about the book'; they and their students decide. This is democracy in the current reality. One of my colleagues is quite an organised planner, and even keeps his annotated copies from teachers books to work from with subsequent groups, but he's also a flexible chap, and had one group this year who he called (and they called themselves) '\*\*\*'s bookless intermediates'; they had a book, but what was inside it nobody knew. In many ways, I feel \*\*\*'s approach is more flexible than mine - try as I might, I just can't use a book when I've got real live people there in front of me. (And if those people are feeling half dead rather than real live, the last thing that's going to stimulate them is eyes down looking, or listening to a dislocated voice on a prerecorded tape). (Just like, I always ask myself, how on earth can you 'plan' a lesson for people you have never met?)

But I suspect this is more a personal thing than a pedagogical one. What I mean is, some of us can mediate the course book well, some of us can't, it's just a question of props. Mediating the course book well, as a lot of teachers do, perhaps gives the students just as much learning, involvement and decision power as pure dogme; it's just that so often the course book is just 'done', not mediated, that it lends itself so easily to becoming the 'bete noir'.

Some teachers, however, have said to me things like ""But if you don't use the book, what do students say?"" or ""They want to know why we didn't do unit 6""; this type of thing worries me a bit (like students asking 'Am I making progress?'). Do we teach people, or do we teach books? But, pandering to expectations and norms and accepted practice, here's a translation of what I gave our school director last year for a new school brochure:

""Every student is given a course book, and this book is carefully chosen according to the age and level of the course participants. It is a useful reference point, but it is not the course itself, and it is not canonical! It will be used according to the needs and interests of the participants, and is one of many resources available to the course. It is not necessary to 'do' all the pages, and often you won't reach the end of the book. Coursebooks today are much richer and more interesting than they were in the past, but they are designed and produced for the mass market, not for your class; the most precious resources available to any class are the participants themselves, their interests, experiences, ideas and opinions.""

NB, I also realise that speaking about 'level' is another dogme issue - but that's another story, another posting.....

Back-quoting to conclude:

\*\*\* (63):

""If you've brought in all the materials and activities you don't leave much space for learners - unless you do. .... You can only improvise when you're extremely well-prepared. But preparation isn't material in terms of armfuls of books, handouts etc, it's not visible.""

\*\*\* (19 and ELT Journal):

""more important, it seems to me, is that teachers have a sound knowledge of their students' grammar - I don't mean their ... mother tongue ... - but a knowledge of their students' developing interlanguage and grammar - because this surely is what we should be teaching to, not to specifications laid down in some coursebook or syllabus.""

This is all startlingly and undeniably true and obvious, but it is far from simple! (""it's not the easy way out"" - \*\*\*63 again).

I do feel however that sometimes we unwittingly forget the students themselves in all this - have faith in your students and their ability to learn, because they nearly always seem to know a lot of the things that we as teachers don't know or struggle and rack our brains to understand even a tiny part of; even if they don't always know it in an explicit way, I think a lot of learners take far more control of their own learning than we - or even they - realise, but it's automatic and 'natural', it just happens, and isn't mappable or writeable or filmable - it's just triggered, and it just happens, perhaps regardless of whether the teacher is using a course book or not etc. It is often the 'invisible' factors that count most. (Perhaps one of the

many reasons I was so impressed by \*\*\* B (171) was that he found a way to make some of these processes 'visible').

Sorry this has got so long. I'd better sign off!

Thanks again.

\*\*\*

## Post 182

Hi everyone:

The technology proposed is exciting, no question about that, but -- although \*\*\* did try ("Could any of Mistry's inventions make a contribution to Dogme teaching and learning?") -- I'm really struggling to understand why, once again, the discussion has got hijacked by issues of technology...

However interesting it might be, surely there are more appropriate forums -- to which many of us probably belong -- for discussion of this?

On the other hand, I do have (a) this amazing recipe for making a traditional form of Thai bread in a brick oven and (b) a revolutionary idea for making bicycles with 3, inline, ever so slightly oval wheels -- which I think would be fascinating to discuss here on Dogme... Is it OK for me to bring the subjects up...? No, thought not.

\*\*\*

## Post 183

Brilliant \*\*\*. I am a great admirer of Sheldrakes.

\*\*\* | Director

From: dogme@yahoogroups.com [mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of \*\*\*

Sent: 08 February 2013 21:07

To: dogme

Subject: [dogme] Morphic resonance and the nature of language

I'm absorbed by Rupert Sheldrake's book *Presence in the Past*, and I find myself constantly drawing parallels and creating analogies between his theories and those of SLA. Here's an excerpt from the Introduction:

This book explores the possibility that memory is inherent in nature. It suggests that natural systems, such as termite colonies, or pigeons, or orchid plants, or insulin molecules, inherit a collective memory from all previous things of their kind, however far away they were and however long ago they existed. Because of this cumulative memory, through repetition the nature of things becomes increasingly habitual. Things are as they are because they were as they were.

Habits may be inherent in the nature of all living organisms; in crystals, molecules, and atoms, and indeed in the entire cosmos. A beech seedling, for example, as it grows into a tree, takes up the characteristic shape, structure, and habits of a beech. It is able to do so because it inherits its nature from previous beeches, but this inheritance is not just a matter of chemical genes. It depends also on the transmission of habits of growth and development from countless beech trees that existed in the past.

Yes, it echoes James Hillman's Acorn Theory, and Jung's collective consciousness and archetypes, so no surprise I find it rather enthralling. I know the so-called Hundreth Monkey Effect has been discredited, but there seems to be sound science behind this work.

As far as language learning goes, Sheldrake refers to Chomsky's "deep structure" ideas and Pinker's notion that we have a disposition to learn language. Sheldrake, however, presents a more organic view of language learning, explaining it in the context of what he calls morphic resonance, which he defines as:

The influence of previous structures of activity on subsequent similar structures of activity organized by morphic fields. Through morphic resonance, formative causal influences pass through or across both space and time, and these influences are assumed not to fall off with distance in space or time, but they come only from the past. The greater the degree of similarity, the greater the influence of morphic resonance. In general, morphic units closely resemble themselves in the past and are subject to self-resonance from their own past states.

Morphic resonance is a concept traditional science still grapples with although the eminent physicist Niels Bohr, and others of his stature have found Sheldrake's work appealing. With regard to language acquisition Sheldrake maintains:

The young child resonates with the speakers around it and with millions of speakers of the language in the past. Morphic resonance facilitates its learning of the language, just as it facilitates other kinds of learning. Likewise, morphic resonance facilitates the acquisition of sign languages by deaf people, who tune in to past users of these languages. There is no need to suppose that genes for ordinary languages or for sign languages lie latent in everyone's DNA.

Excerpts From: Sheldrake, Rupert. *The Presence of the Past*. Park Street Press, 2012-03-18. iBooks.

It is a far out notion, but reading how Sheldrake places his theories within the context of evolutionary biology and cosmology, I become less skeptical. I

I believe this all relates very well to the ZPD, social constructivism, and humanism, pillars of Dogme as near as I can tell. It seems worth considering if you have the time and Muse.

\*\*\*

## Post 184

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

As we seem to be in a month with a drop in the number of messages, I wonder if anything is to be gained from asking people for a (re) evaluation of dogme and what it offers - or doesn't offer - us? I'd be particularly interested in seeing some of dogme's detractors opening up the debate and challenging some of its claims. I'd be equally interested to hear from those list members who have yet to make their voices heard.

So, does dogme still do it for you? Did it ever?

\*\*\*

## Post 185

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Thanks for your reply, \*\*\*. I find it interesting to read what happens in other classrooms too, and one of the reasons I've always been an active member of professional organisations and have had a lot to do with various PD initiatives here and at home is that I enjoy the collegiality and the reflectiveness such things.

However, I'm still struggling with dogme. I don't recall asking for tips about teaching grammar ; ) I was trying to say, tho, that I haven't, in what I have read (and I confess having had no time for the archives), found anything that I haven't already done/tried to do. Does that make me a dogmetist? No, unless being a dogmetist just means being old enough to have tried everything! Perhaps it's more to do with the percentages of certain things that you do in your teaching - and that very much depends on where you are and where your learners are (in time and space).

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahooogroups.com, \*\*\*... wrote:

> \*\*\*,

>

> My reading of the situation is that there were never claims about the newness of the  
> dogme position. What has always been emphasised and described are ways of  
> reducing the emphasis on the use of textbooks and photocopies and recorded  
> materials.

>

> That's one way of trying to characterize what people on the dogme list write about.

>

> To quote the declaration from the dogme homepage once more:

>

> ""We are a mix of teachers, trainers and writers working in a wide range of  
> contexts, who are committed to a belief that language learning is both socially  
> motivated and socially constructed, and to this end we are seeking alternatives to  
> models of instruction that are mediated primarily through materials and whose  
> objective is the delivery of ""grammar mc nuggets"". We are looking for ways of  
> exploiting the learning opportunities offered by the raw material of the classroom,  
> that is the language that emerges from the needs, interests, concerns and desires  
> of the people in the room"".

>

> (It isn't surprising that there is no mention here of examinations).

>

> I also see it as a list where a number of dedicated individuals are prepared to open their  
> classroom doors and let us know what goes on in there. And they are also keen to  
> discuss the rationale of what they are doing in ways that can include theoretical  
> considerations, discussion of new ideas and goes well beyond: ""Any tips for teaching  
> the Present Perfect?""

>

> \*\*\*

>

>

>

## Post 186

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

I went to the original article and read through it. It seems to reveal a rather predictable 'naive positivism' about such research.

I quote an excerpt here and then discuss that.

<http://alevelpsychology.co.uk/news/latest/new-research-shows-learning-styles-are-nonsense.html>

excerpt >> Nearly all of the studies that purport to provide evidence for learning styles fail to satisfy key criteria for scientific validity. Any experiment designed to test the learning-styles



hypothesis would need to classify learners into categories and then randomly assign the learners to use one of several different learning methods, and the participants would need to take the same test at the end of the experiment. If there is truth to the idea that learning styles and teaching styles should mesh, then learners with a given style, say visual-spatial, should learn better with instruction that meshes with that style. << end of excerpt

Comment:

That wouldn't necessarily be a very good experiment because (1) it assumes learning styles are real, objective, identifiable at the outset (classic 'begging the question') and (2) that different learning styles only have to match learners and not the topic(s) being taught or the teacher teaching it. It also seems to take a leap of fancy over how any sort of assessment of 'learning' took place, and we might also add here, that we have to leap even further, if that particular concept of 'learning' is at all relevant to--at least in our case--second and/or foreign language learning (that is a big vexed issue in ELT, AL, SLA--is our learning part of 'general learning', 'language acquisition', a combination or something altogether different).

Another factor that has to be taken into account in any experiment but not mentioned here would be age and brain plasticity. It seems a generally reported factor is that after the age of 20, very fast, over-learned mastery-type acquisition of any 'skill' becomes more difficult, and after 30 even more difficult. After 30 one is often best served exploiting the skills and talents one has already developed earlier in life and finding new applications for them. I think perhaps learning style and multiple intelligences rhetoric held out hope to we 'over the hill' learners might best exploit our current abilities to make new learning more profound.

That doesn't mean learning is impossible after 30, but with one life to live you had best use it wisely in learning and re-training.

\*\*\*

## Post 187

Now, please don't slag off Melvyn Bragg. He is my cousin, after all. And if he could read all these nasty comments about him, I'm sure he'd be very upset...

\*\*\*

## Post 188

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

I'm about to go back into the classroom after a good spell out. During this spell, I've had ample time to reflect upon my teaching and my beliefs and, as a consequence, I have roughly fallen in line with something approximating the spirit of dogme. However, in this, my induction week, I have been glancing through the materials on offer, reading the 'Welcome to...' packs and talking to my new colleagues.

I am intimidated to death by the central role of grammar and grammar syllabuses (syllabii no, please...) in my workplace. As we sorted materials into files, my prediction that the grammar file would be bursting and that the learner training file would be near empty were proved true. I read an article written by a well-meaning teacher about how my new students (largely Chinese) needed the safety net of grammar to reassure them and give them something to hold on to. I watched as my new colleagues typed up new worksheets to be handed over to the Reprographics Man (not copyright, Marvel Comics). And I panicked.

I am going into a new educational institution, in a new country, with new students from a cultural background that I am completely unfamiliar with and I had planned to exploit my ignorance by learning all about them, the country, their country and their culture whilst at the same time giving them the English they ask for to talk about these things. It had seemed logical to me to do it this way. But as I look at the Treasure Hunts asking them to write down how many post boxes there are in the village, how much it costs to dry clean a jacket and a pair of trousers, where to buy a newspaper etc etc etc, I am beginning to worry that my beliefs are built upon dodgy foundations.

Am I wrong to assume that free and equal learning is what my students need? Am I putting their IELTS exam at risk? Are my woolly headed liberal ideals going to condemn my students to failure and repeating? Am I a fool to let my beliefs interfere with my students' study? And a hundred and one other concerns that I am not articulate enough to include here.

And so I turn to you, my colleague, and ask for advice, personal stories, assurance and kind words. Don't let me down! Please!!!!"

## Post 189

*Coded as other's teaching experience.*

*Coded as own out of school experience.*

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

Here's a link to the site I referenced in a previous post: <http://www.pbs.org/speak/> if you're interested in American dialects, slang and the controversy over whether American English is more impoverished than ever. Interestingly, it seems regional and local dialects are still alive and kicking, although television has facilitated understanding of many regional dialects in North America.

What's this have to do with grammar (and dogme)? Listening to Chicano English in Los Angeles made me question many of my assumptions about the role of grammar in coursebooks. In one classroom, the teacher was playing a game with groups of children who were competing for points by translating sentences like ""We ain't got nothin' to do."" into mainstream American English (the teacher's words) as ""We don't have anything to do."" One group lost points after guessing the correct answer as ""We ain't got nothin\*g\* to do."" Later, a successful radio personality said that ""isn't"" hurt his mouth and made him look foolish, so he always used ""ain't"" with his grassroots audience.

After the game, the teacher asked the class, ""Was it too easy or I taught you so well?"" Should the students get 500 more points to translate this sentence too?

\*\*\*

## Post 190

*Coded as other's teaching experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\* writes: > Hmmm.....

>

> Sometimes I use the students' first language a lot - sometimes almost

> not at all. It depends on the students and what they want to learn -

> why they come to the class. Are we teaching a subject (English) or are

> we teaching/learning with people.

>

> Some of my students don't have much interest in learning the subject

> that I teach; English, History or Computer Literacy. Some students do.

> What does Dogme have to say about the class called ""English"" where

> students might not be interested that much in the subject?

Hmmmm .... probably not that relevant, but something I often think is that English is not so much the subject but the (principal!) medium of communication in class; the subject can be anything that pools interest and knowledge.

not that that principle can extend so easily to History and Computer Literacy;

though I'll quote again one of my favourites from the Times Educational site, because it shows how the subject of History can be of far wider interest and learning potential than a syllabus might suggest:

QUOTE

""More objectives and targets, less learning for the fun of it. How do you assess one boy's obsession with falconry in the Tudor period, which gives

him expert knowledge of birds of prey, when the learning objective is to know the names and fate of Henry's wives?

After years of central control and intervention, what we need is more self-confidence to ignore artificial benchmarks. We know milestones are a useful guide, but just as I knew my daughter would eventually walk, we know our pupils will reach their potential, if not when they are seven, by the time they are 11. Forcing them could do more harm than good."

UNQUOTE

anyway, for me, whatever subject we teach, we're primarily teaching/learning with people, the 'art' is to learn better how to help and support learning, which means being as flexible as we can and as observant of and sensitive to individual learners as we can, not cram syllabuses or facts down their throats.

This is also a 'reality game' which has to adapt expectations and ideals to the needs and capacities of learners; otherwise, we're just saying take it or leave it, I'm doing my job by transmitting the subject, it's up to you; but were it that simple, there would probably be no need for teachers at all.

A friend of mine (\*\*\*) teaches math and physics to large classes of mainly male adolescents who are mostly from broken homes and generally rather fed up, angry, disillusioned kids; she says she mostly spends the first half of lessons just talking to them - or rather mostly listening to them - and not doing math or physics, because (a) they need to talk - about their problems, about their life, and (b) they're not gonna concentrate one iota on the 'subject' of the lesson unless they first feel they're in a reasonably sympathetic environment, have got some gripes off their chest, and also feel well-disposed to the person who 'represents' that subject in that moment. The perhaps not unsurprising thing is that her classes enjoy and do well in math and physics, and do a lot of worthwhile and interesting stuff in the second half of the lessons; and admittedly, \*\*\* is a genius who manages to make the subject seem like play rather than study.... Most the other teachers in her school, however, can't be bothered with the students themselves, and it's a dry 'shut up and open your books at page 12' type of approach; which even for a full lesson yields far less in attention, learning and interest than just a few minutes in the second half of \*\*\*'s lessons .....

\*\*\*

## Post 191

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

Surely what we've been talking about is 'cultural' values. And, one of the

major problems here is that people are judgmental.  
Pictures are painted 'Black & White' according to ones own set of values.

In France someone who kills because of love is 'protected' as it's a crime of passion.  
In the Arabic world a women who commits adultery is stoned to death and the man ...?

But who is to say that this is right or wrong. The problem with 'Parsnips' is that they can be too personal, too close to the bone. No coursebook writer could risk such areas BUT individual teachers can. However, the teacher in question must try and play with an open mind, asking why? but not being judgmental.

Can you do that?

\*\*\*

## Post 192

*Coded as other's non-teaching experience.*

*Coded as own out of school experience.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

I very much enjoyed reading your account. Thank you. As always, though, I cannot help wondering about focusing on ""grammar"". You wrote:

"" I focused on his use of the past simple, correcting or eliciting self correction. (He understands the concept but doesn't use it much yet!) ""

I was at a talk here in Germany last night where a Hungarian women explained that when, as a child, she came to Germany, neither she nor her mother spoke or understood a word of German. So, for the first few months, they simply listened and, after a while, they found they began to understand. That represents for me just another example of how languages are learned in ""real life"", with formal teaching playing little part. Of course I can hear the groans of long-suffering Dogme list readers saying to themselves: ' Here comes the anti-grammar statement' - but your description of what seems to have been a most effective lesson I would have thought was so because you and your learners were talking about real life, and focused on that and on getting across what they wanted to say somehow and not because of any grammar points referred to.

\*\*\*

## Post 193

\*\*\*,

I just wish educational institutions, administrations and MoEs had the same sensible approach.

\*

On 27 Oct 2011, at 10:25, \*\*\*wrote:

> \*\*\*,  
>  
> Whilst a big fan of technology and what it can do for learning, I have  
> long argued that we should first figure out how to train and pay  
> teachers better before spending the money on anything shiny. What I  
> don't really understand is people pretending technology is invisible  
> in  
> situations where it is present, nor do I accept the argument that  
> because it wouldn't work in 'situation xxx', it is a flawed  
> proposition  
> as a whole.  
>  
> In private on this list yesterday I was talking to someone who  
> wanted my  
> take in IWBs at his/her institution. My reply was simple: get the  
> institution to add up how much it's going to spend on IWBs and then  
> share it out as follows:  
>  
> 1) Unlimited, wireless Internet across the whole institution  
> 2) A supply of laptops and data projectors  
>  
> Spend the rest on teacher training and teacher pay. What this means,  
> in  
> practice, is the following (taking a relatively decent price on,  
> say, a  
> mid-range Promethean IWB):  
>  
> IWB - GBP 2,760.00  
>  
> If we don't spend that, we can do the following:  
>  
> 1) 4 x LCD data projectors @ GBP 250.00 each  
> 2) 4 x laptops @ GBP 250.00 each  
> 3) Wireless Internet access for a couple of years  
>  
> So, in exchange for one IWB you now have four mobile labs and wireless  
> access for everyone in the school to partake of the latest good idea -  
> BYOD, or Bring Your Own Device.  
>

> Once that's out of the way, you can spend the next lot of GBP 2,760 on  
> some decent teacher training in using the new technology. The next IWB  
> saving might go on salaries, etc., etc.  
>  
> It's certainly not rocket science.  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>  
>> -----  
>>  
>>  
>> I would like to point out that I am not against technology, but I  
> fail  
>> to see the point in squandering millions in IWBs, laptops, etc. when  
>> this money could be spent in other areas which might have more  
> impact  
>> and long term rewards. I am also in favour of technology being  
> used to  
>> empower people. For example, if the government spent x amount of  
> money  
>> buying computers for teachers, for you then to train these teachers  
>> online, and then they teach their colleagues face-to-face. This is  
>> investing in people. This will produce long term benefits,  
> hopefully.  
>>

## Post 194

*Coded as teacher training.*

\*\*\*

I recently had to do an assignment on the subject of inclusion for my PGCE in Further Ed (passed, by the way). If you (or indeed, anybody else) is interested in reading my this assignment, I will be more than happy to send it to you, once the computer on which it is saved is returned to me.

\*\*\*

PS I can't say I have heard of storyline, I'm afraid.

## Post 195

Thank you very much for your comments \*\*\* and \*\*\*. (I'll keep it brief this time!)

## Post 196

\*\*\* wrote: > These (I call them coaching) skills can be learned by observing (on video or audio) master teachers at work...

This sounds like a great addition to either the group's site or the TeachingUnplugged site. What do you y'all think?

Are any of you maestros/maestras out there willing and/or technically able to convert a video of some of your best classroom experiences to a digital format?

If your only obstacle is that you lack the technical savvy, perhaps I can be of assistance. Being a recovering "geek", I not only have the know-how, I have the equipment and software to convert VHS or D8 tapes (NTSC only - sorry, no PAL) to several formats suitable for publication to the WWW. Considering time, the formidable enemy it is, I'm not able to commit to a great number of conversions, but if anyone is interested, you can email me off-list.

\*\*\*

## Post 197

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

Hi \*\*\*,

check out Summerhill in the UK or Paideia, in Mrida, Spain. They're the most obvious 'spring-to-mind' schools. In adult education, in Spain during the Franco regime, there were clandestine escuelas libertarias (Wikipedia in Spanish has a reference) which followed an Illich model, close to Freire.

I agree with \*\*\* completely (of course ;-)) but I do feel that the democratic schools function outside the System (capital S), so the quote holds true at least here in Spain. Elective home education is, for example, illegal here, to make matters worse - you can't even opt out!

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahogroups.com, \*\*\* > wrote:  
>



> \*\*\*,  
>  
> I could swear you're an expert in the Brazilian educational system as well !  
> ;-)  
>  
> It's just the same around here...  
>  
> :-(  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>  
> P.S. Never heard of a democratic school.  
>  
>  
> -----  
> From: \*\*\*  
> To: <dogme@yahoogroups.com>  
> Subject: Re: Re: [dogme] Re: a quote  
>  
>> but \*\*\*, it doesn't mean that I don't agree with the gist of the quote  
>> which described the reality as Freire experienced it - and which happens  
>> to  
>> prevail in the world, excluding the fortunate but skant thousands  
>> participants of democratic schools... as we know, generalisations and  
>> stereotypes are adaptive survival mechanisms, so basically I should say  
>> ""go,  
>> Freire, go"". for example the Polish educational system (which I am expert  
>> on, but I must also say that the Canadian reality experienced firsthand  
>> albeit for only a year is perhaps more glam, but not less constricting to  
>> the students...), so the Polish one is perfectly devised to produce  
>> obedient  
>> citizens, bent either on skirting the edges of law or on cutting the  
>> corners of ethics or on indiscriminate scoring points and licking a...  
>> (scuse the language)  
>>  
>> \*\*\*  
>>  
>> dogme@yahoogroups.com \*\*\*:  
>>  
>> See what I mean? Thank you \*\*\*!  
>>  
>> --- On Wed, 24/2/10, \*\*\* wrote:  
>>  
>> From: \*\*\*  
>> Subject: Re: [dogme] Re: a quote  
>> To: dogme@yahoogroups.com  
>>  
>> there's a hole in the logic of this otherwise convincing quote, namely a  
>> hidden assumption that integration into the logic of any system equals  
>> conformity; as every system analyst knows, there are systems which  
>> demand

>> ability to free-flow and change idiosyncratically as the condition of  
>> participation in the processes; in more human words, let's remember the  
>> models of democratic schools where to function successfully as a member  
>> of  
>> the community requires the ability of free thinking and practising  
>> freedom  
>>  
>> \*\*\*  
>>  
>> dogme@yahoogroups.com \*\*\*:  
>>  
>> Brilliant. Thanks for that, \*\*\*.  
>>  
>> \*\*\*  
>>  
>> --- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*\*"" wrote:  
>> >  
>> > i came across this quote today, and i feel it is appropriate for this  
>> group.  
>> >  
>> > ""There is no such thing as a neutral education process. Education  
>> either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate the  
>> integration of generations into the logic of the present system and  
>> bring about conformity to it, or it becomes the `practice of freedom',  
>> the means by which men and women deal critically with reality and  
>> discover how to participate in the transformation of their world.""  
>> > ?\*\*\* Thompson, drawing on Paulo Freire, [2]  
>> >  
>> > found on <[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paulo\\_Freire](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paulo_Freire)>  
>> >  
>>

## Post 198

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*,

I can hardly keep my eyes open - much going on here - but I just want to record that I'd really like us to probe this lesson - and the next couple - because it seems such a crucial issue. I think you did absolutely the right thing, and you were being very dogmatic - following the needs and desires of the people in the room. The key issue though, surely, is what this all leads on to. They did a class in deductive Applied/Contrastive Linguistics - in educational terms surely well worthwhile. The \$ 64,000 question is whether it will have lead to any language learning - though, of course, increases in motivation, a feeling that their wishes count must be included in ""leading to"" - I'm not talking about simplistic ticking off of ""things learned"".

Without attaching too much importance to just a couple of lessons it would also be interesting to tease out the connections between their inattention, ""lack of respect"" and

your reaction to it.

Apologies to everyone on the list for a rushed message - but to put off, for me, usually means to forget.

\*\*\*

## Post 199

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

> \*\*\*,

As ever, an excellent contribution and a very accurate description of the boring ( and enforced) nature of teaching and learning in ESOL classes -at least in the UK...

Sorry, this not a very reasoned argument because of lack of time and probably just a reflection of extreme frustration with the extreme dogmatism and obsessive ""One Solution Fetish"" ( Marc Bloch ?)of the people who ""manage"" ESOL today

\*\*\* >

spirit is the skill of communication, as opposed to such things > as ""listening"" and ""reading"".

>

> Personally, I don't think that there's any truth in the teaching  
> of ""subskills"" such as skimming, scanning, listening for gist or any  
> other such nonsense.

>

> I think that skimming and scanning are skills that develop of their  
> own accord as one becomes a better reader and one becomes a better  
> reader by reading a lot of things that one is interested in and  
> having someone to encourage you to do so. One becomes a better  
> listener by listening to many different voices and needing (or,  
> ideally, wanting) to understand what is being said.

>

> The idea of subskills seems to me to have been borne out of the need  
> to demonstrate the pedagogical worth of language teaching. We need a  
> curriculum and it seems a bit ridiculous to suggest that language  
> development emerges out of some very simple precepts, so let's  
> complicate things by breaking things down into parts.

>

> I'd say that people who learn to skim and scan before they become  
> good readers run the risk of never becoming good listeners. And I  
> feel pity for those students who are still being asked to do some  
> ridiculous comprehension task having listened to an insultingly poor  
> recording of the drabest, dullest and dreariest conversation known  
> to humankind. Worse still when the task is squeezed into some sort  
> of ""Communicative Approach"" (TM) framework such as ""listen to these  
> people talking and complete the form with the best answers"".

>

- > So, how can listening be taught? By listening to films etc and
- > discussing difficulties with understanding and suggested solutions to
- > them; by pausing the film from time to time and asking people if they
- > can remember what has just been said, then trying to imitate it,
- > etc. And many other strategies. I find it hard to believe that the
- > teaching of ""listening for gist"" is any more effective than just
- > getting people to listen and then talking about things that were
- > difficult to understand.
- >
- > Where I teach at the moment, the biggest lesson that students need to
- > learn at the moment is that people listen to English for reasons
- > other than answering stupid exam questions; the next biggest thing to
- > learn is that you are unlikely to ever understand all that you hear
- > and that the good listener asks for clarification until they
- > understand as much as they need to.
- >
- > \*\*\*

## Post 200

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\* wrote

> Mmmm. All I can report is that German students working with a few  
 lines > of sung lyrics could 'hear' ( = identify as meaningful words as  
 opposed > to mere noise) after 20-30 minutes what they couldn't 'hear' at  
 first. > They were, as it happens, sitting in a language laboratory, though  
 the > lyrics were being played to them as a group through wall-mounted,  
 high > quality loudspeakers.

I'd say Mmmmmm, too. Confusion between hearing and listening, I  
 think, \*\*\*. You can train computers to recognise commands in  
 twenty minutes. But have you trained them to listen?

> Surely, too, Raimund, is quite right to answer his students'  
 requests > for listening to, working with other accents, because they are  
 shortly > going to have to do so in life outside the classroom?.

>

At the risk to repeating myself, is a few hours (more usually a few  
 minutes) of listening to a Canadian, or a Nigerian, or a  
 Singaporean, speaking English on tape in appalling acoustic  
 conditions really going to make any difference, especially for  
 students who have (like me) poor phonemic coding ability? I've  
 been in Spain for nearly twenty years and yet I still can't  
 distinguish a Canaries accent from either an Andaluz or an  
 Argentinian one. But it don't stop me being able to talk (and  
 therefore listen) to Canarians last weekend. Listening is not the  
 piecing together of individual allophones to construct meaning. It is

much more global than that. And it is interactive - you negotiate misunderstanding, even in your L1. Something you can't do with a tape.

\*\*\* (begging to differ)"

## Post 201

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

In the case of ""one of the most successful reggae artists"" surely this is a superlative not a collocation, whereas in the case of ""a most successful tour"" it is a collocation as the word ""most"" is a modifier along the lines of ""very"" or ""highly"".

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*\*"" wrote:

> \*\*\*'s question is a tricky (and good) one:

> >I guess I'm really asking where I draw a line between what is ""test

> correct"" and what is actually practiced in the language. Or is there

> such a thing?

>

> for example, on the back cover of the fairly recent Oxford Collocations Dictionary:

>

> quote:

> ""pass that exam

>

> how would you score in this exam question?

>

> He was soon launched on a ..... successful career as a film actor.

>

> a. greatly

> b. largely

> c. grossly

> d. hugely

>

> The answer is in the dictionary - check the entry for 'successful'.""

> unquote

>

> Frankly, (personally), I think it's almost morally wrong to say that 'greatly' is 'wrong' here!!! 'Largely'

> and 'grossly' would have different meanings/connotations to 'hugely' (and 'greatly' .....) - do we know where this sentence comes from? Who it's written by/for and their view point/tone? Is it a banal potted bio, a scathing film review, a formal lecture??

>

> Or are we just back on that old 'bandwagon' of 'language first' (second, third and last)? (with the

> added bonus of imperialistic frequency)

- >
- > I checked the entry for 'successful' and found, for example, it doesn't contain the collocation
- > 'most successful' (which I happened to come across several times today on some net research -
- > eg, he is enjoying a most successful tour ....one of the most successful reggae artists .....).
- > (I also checked the entry for 'success', which includes 'great')
- >
- > I'm a great believer in the value of collocation and collocation awareness, but worry that things
- > can be taken too far along the 'cline', and that (NS) frequency can become a sort
- > of unassailable and jealous god, rather than a guardian angel.
- >
- > I suppose, back to \*\*\*'s original question, a perennial problem is when and how the 'godliness' of testing washes back onto teaching and learning; I often do what I think \*\*\* once talked about - tell learners that for the exam, x is expected, but in the/our real world, y is fine/common; some learners fully accept and understand; others tend to feel/believe, underneath it all, that 'x' is really the 'right' way, cos it's the 'exam' way; they can decide what end of that particular cline they prefer to move towards in the meaningful worlds they live and experience.
- >
- > another problem with the strong lexical influence that has seemingly 'revolutionized' the \*content\* of many exams and ways of testing (with consequent effect on course book compilation in various guises/doses) in recent years is that it hasn't really revolutionized the basic \*testing methods\* - it's still all too often down to luck of the draw discrete items.....
- >
- > \*\*\*

## Post 202

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

\*\*\*, here's what reminded you of \*\*\*, and others, on this list:

The ideal Wikipedian in my mind is someone who is really smart and really kind,' Wales says, without irony. 'Those are the people who are drawn into the centre of the group. When people get power in these communities, it is not through shouting loudest, it is through diplomacy and conflict resolution.'

Sounds like a dogme bunch to me.

\*\*\*

## Post 203

There will be a change of e-mail address, though letters directed to the present address will be checked for several weeks. please direct all new mail to

\*\*\*

thanks

\*\*\*

## Post 204

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

I don't think we should necessarily get too upset by what \*\*\* has to say. After all, he is but a Caped Crusader battling against the mighty in the cause of justice. He also tends to have a proclivity for provocation. We can surely forgive him that...after all, wasn't dogme created, in part at least, to provoke. Like any court jester, he gets his message across by being unsociably brutal.

Does he have a message to get across? Well, not really. The question, ""What's the point of differentiated learning if the tests are all the same?"" is a valid one. It implies that if we are told to recognise that people learn in different ways, it's a bit rich that they are then tested in the same way. \*\*\* has conflated the test with the end goal and shrieks, ""DUH! But they're supposed to be at the same point."" And well they might be, \*\*\*, but it doesn't follow that this is best proved by administering the same test.

To put it in a way that you might understand: Imagine that we drag ourselves away from our remarkably dull lives of stupidity and ennui and go, like every other self-respecting TEFL teacher, to drown our sorrows in a pub. The mobile phones go and The Other Halves bawl, ""WHERE ARE YOU?!"".

The question is the same for everyone, but there are different ways of ascertaining our location. Some people might need to ask the name of the establishment; other people might nip outside to check the name; some people may say something like, ""Next to Woolies. In the pub."" In short, there are many different ways of answering the question - all of which would be right. Educational assessment, as it is commonly understood, doesn't give people the option of demonstrating their knowledge in the manner that may best be suited to them. And it doesn't do so, I venture, because it is not convenient to do so and it costs more. So, pedagogical principles are slaughtered on the altar of capital - which is usually grist to your mill, old chap.

Now, THIS, it seemed to me, is so obvious that it does not need clarification. Might it not be that you are misdirecting your pithiness and wit? Surely in this time of Summer School

Madness, there are better targets? In the meantime, keep it up. The world of ELT needs its jesters, and dogme more than most!

## Post 205

*Coded as own in class experience.*

\*\*\*, I have been beginning to wonder ..... ! Perhaps I should clarify and say 'understand a word in all its everyday contexts'; I'm not thinking of specialised fields. And of course, 'been' is a function word - as I recently explained to a German student. We then had to look at all its functions, as a by-product of which he began to understand the function of 'continuous' tenses and the formation of the passive in English - amongst other things!

\*\*\*

## Post 206

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as teacher training.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

\*\*\* 10/24/04 7:46 AM >>>

The postings about teaching English to certain of the Chinese now studying in England sends me straight back to what I was being taught last year, on a specialist PGCE ESOL course. Given that I did what is the standard 1-year teacher training course that everyone who wants to teach in the state sector in the UK has to do at the age of 56, and after about 8 years teaching (EFL mostly), I was giving a lot of thought to some of what was coming my way - and much I'm only now digesting.

One of my teaching practice classes was a group whose ages ranged from 18 to 56, and was made up of Spanish, French, a German, a Brazilian, a Chinese, some Pakistanis, several Iraqi Kurds, an Iranian, an Ethiopian, an Eritrean, an Angolan, two from Afghanistan, a Sudanese, a Vietnamese - and probably



other nationalities I've forgotten now. Given this mixture, I was being taught to find out as much as possible about my students, especially their previous educational experiences. The young man from Afghanistan, for example, had good English, but had never attended a formal educational institution until coming to classes in England. One Iraqi Kurd was a former primary school teacher. The range of experience was enormous, and the motivation levels varied considerably. Some were in full-time work, others were not working at all. For this sort of teaching to stand a chance, it seemed to me, the most important thing was getting to know the students so that as much as possible the classroom activity was genuinely student-centred and going in directions of interest and relevance to them. For some of them, too, getting a good IELTS score was a target.

My take on this is that it's not for me to disagree with a student about their personal targets, narrow as they may be, and different as they may be to my own (as language learner or teacher). If a student is exam-focussed, then in that student's reality there will be good reason for that. Are secondary school students in the UK really so different when it comes to

wanting to get particular grades to get into the university of their choice? This is really about student-centred, isn't it? which seems delightfully ironic given that westerners tend to see traditional Chinese teaching as teacher-centred, and the criticisms being made of the Chinese students seem to me to have a certain teacher-centredness about them.

For all the criticisms being made of English language learning achievements by Chinese students, how does it compare with the foreign language learning achievements of British school and college students?

When we compare, are we comparing like with like?

\*\*\*

## Post 207

Wikipedia a force for good? Nonsense, says a co-founder

Alexandra Frean, Education Editor

The founder of the Wikipedia online encyclopaedia criticised the Education Secretary yesterday for suggesting that the website could be a good educational tool for children.

Mr Johnson described the internet as an incredible force for good in education for teachers and pupils, singling out Wikipedia for praise.

Wikipedia enables anybody to access information which was once the preserve only of those who could afford the subscription to Encyclopaedia Britannica and could spend the time necessary to navigate its maze of indexes and content pages, he told the annual conference of the National Association of Schoolteachers and Union of Women Teachers (NASUWT) in Belfast.

But Larry Sanger, who helped to found Wikipedia in 2001, said that the site was broken beyond repair and no longer reliable.

Wikipedia is among the top ten most visited sites on the internet, containing more than six million articles contributed only by members of the public. But it has been criticised for being riddled with inaccuracies and nonsense.

Last month it was revealed that a prominent and long-standing Wikipedia contributor had lied about his identity, having claimed to be a tenured university professor, when he was in fact a 24-year-old college drop-out.

Concerned about the website's integrity, Mr Sanger left Wikipedia, and two weeks ago launched an online encyclopaedia called Citizendium.org, which he said would be monitored and edited by academics and experts as well as accepting public contributions.

He told The Times: I'm afraid that Mr Johnson does not realise the many problems afflicting Wikipedia, from serious management problems, to an often dysfunctional community, to frequently unreliable content, and to a whole series of scandals. While Wikipedia is still quite useful and an amazing phenomenon, I have come to the view that it is also broken beyond repair.

Nick Gibb, the Tory schools spokesman, said: A huge amount of the current curriculum, particularly in history, is devoted to teaching children to be discerning when it comes to information on the internet.

It appears the Secretary of State is not quite as modern as he needs to be in this information age.

Mr Johnson also used his speech to call on social networking websites to stop pupils posting inappropriate videos of and abusive comments about their teachers on the internet.

In one case a female teachers head was superimposed on to a pornographic photograph.

Mr Johnson said that the online harassment of teachers was causing some to consider leaving the profession. He called on the providers of websites to take firmer action to block or remove offensive school material, in the same way that they have cut pornographic content.

However, \*\*\* Keates, the unions general secretary, told Mr Johnson that his call was likely to have little impact.

## Post 208

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*,

I'd be very interested to hear how your experiments with teaching etiquette go for you. At the end of the day, I think that teaching has to begin with a strong social and moral foundation if it's going to have a lasting effect on learners. That's not to say that teachers unconcerned with this foundation won't succeed in teaching English successfully; but they won't succeed, as you say, in "making a real contribution to their growth". Perhaps that's not a concern for some teachers, but at the heart of my original post was the belief that it should be.

You said "I feel the overall culture of a community largely decides which way this question is answered"; but a classroom is a culture in itself (as has been discussed on this list in the past). As teachers we have a large part to play in the formation of that culture, just as your primary school teacher's advice contributed to the formation of a culture in your classroom.

\*\*\*

## Post 209

Hello,

This email message is a notification to let you know that a file has been uploaded to the Files area of the dogme group.

File : /Images/my romanian\_001 [800x600].jpg  
Uploaded by : \*\*\*<\*\*\*...>

Description : \*\*\* teaching 1:1 in his garden in SL

You can access this file at the URL:

[http://groups.yahoo.com/group/dogme/files/Images/my%20romanian\\_001%20%5B800x600%5D.jpg](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/dogme/files/Images/my%20romanian_001%20%5B800x600%5D.jpg)

To learn more about file sharing for your group, please visit:

<http://help.yahoo.com/l/us/yahoo/groups/original/members/forms/general.html#files>

Regards,

\*\*\*<\*\*\* ...>"

## Post 210

*Coded as other forum post.*

But it's like you said before \*\*\*, it's the use of experience (those tricks up your sleeve). + what you're 'planning' is ways to initiate output NOT what the output should be.

\*\*\*

## Post 211

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as teacher training.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\* asks: ""How much do the rest of you use them? Do students ever learn them? I'd love to find out what happens in practice.""

As a CELTA teacher trainer, trainees seemed to either pick up IPA (International Phonemic Script) straight away, or loathe it. As a teacher, my colleagues either know it and occasionally use it, or find it complicated and unnecessary.

I tend to believe that some people think it's fun to decode and use phonemic script while others find it a chore. I have even noticed that opinions seem to be divided according to personalities. Without going in to it, let me just say that it doesn't surprise me that \*\*\* and I learned IPA quickly and were able to use it. :-)

Most importantly, with students, IPA has helped some interpret the pronunciation guides in learner dictionaries, although \*\*\* is right about phonemic script providing approximations of an idealized form of spoken language (if that's an accurate representation of what you said, \*\*\*). In my experience, most students, especially those below what would probably be considered an upper-intermediate level by conventional testing scores, have found IPA to be 'another alphabet' to learn, especially when one enters the realm of multiple schwas --- yes, there are more than just one --- and glottal stops. And, again, personality appears to be a

determining factor in which students make use of phonemic script and which choose only to listen, look and learn.

\*\*\*

## Post 212

Sorry \*\*\*, only just read this message which had sunk to the bottom of an enormous pile (67 emails today alone) that have been gathering ever since Harrogate and augmented by this latest (disaster-prone) tour of the Middle East that I'm on at the moment (from which I escaped for two days to go down to Petra no internet in hotel!).

Thursday I'm busy all day doing stuff for the BC in Amman, and then on Friday am doing the crossing into the West Bank which is a day's work in itself.

So I can't help, as much as I'd like to. Has anyone else been able to come on board???

Good luck!

\*\*\*

Para: dogme@yahoogroups.com; \*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\*,  
Asunto: Dogme in SL Support needed!

Dear \*\*\*, dear \*\*\*, dear \*\*\*, dear \*\*\*, dear \*\*\*, dear \*\*\*, (a teacher educator friend and colleague from SL), dear \*\*\*, dear members of the Dogme list,,

Many of you will know \*\*\* of AVALON.

Yesterday I allowed my arm to be twisted to do a couple of workshops for her in Second Life on Dogme in Second Life. These workshops are to be viewable in Second Life, Elluminate or an Adobe platform called 'View' I think. (I will pass on further and confirmed details) as soon as I get them).

These workshops are next week. (I must have been mad to accept and I am passing on my madness). I agreed partly because for many months now I have been trying to organise a demonstration of TEFL in SL a la Dogme and this seemed an excellent opportunity. I must check up on the details but my notes say:

3 x 20 minutes presentations

2 workshops

Thursday 22 April 10 GMT

Friday 18:00 23 April GMT

These workshops are 45 - 60 minutes each.

\*\*\*. Is there any chance on earth (virtual earth in SL) that you could play some kind of role in this - preferably by teaching a small group of people - or, failing that - by making some short statement, interview on your thoughts about the feasibility, whatever, of teaching in SL a la dogme?.

\*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\*, are you interested and able to take part in one or both of these workshops? I could be wrong, but I think it could be a good occasion to present something of Dogme to the world of SL.

Have I forgotten anyone that should be included?

I'm sending a copy of this message to the Dogme list, it contains no secrets, and there may well be someone out there on the list who would like to take part. It also alerts them to a forthcoming event that might be of interest.

I am more than willing to Dogmetise in SL but it would be better for Dogme if I did not do it on my own!

In hope, with fingers crossed, which makes typing difficult,

\*\*\*  
--  
\*\*\*

## Post 213

\*\*\*,  
Extremely good argument yet again. I couldn't agree more. You are a teacher after my own heart.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*, I have also been fairly strict with myself when it has come to > L1 use in a foreign land. But, when it comes to helping learners, I > must confess I find it rather undemocratic and disrespectful to insist > that they utter not a word in their mother tongue. Who are we teachers > to insist on or stipulate such a thing? Forgive me if I sound too > ""hippie"" (seems to be a negative term in the UK) or soft on ""language > crime"", but our inherited language(s) is(are) such a deep part of our

- > person, it strikes me as, again, undemocratic and disrespectful not to
- > leave some wiggle room for students to use the language they are most
- > comfortable with, especially when they are first encountering the
- > target language.
- >
- > Perhaps if I were teaching in an EFL context I'd see things differently.
- >
- > Has anyone ever read Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom
- > (Doernyei)? He writes about ways to encourage students to embrace the
- > L2 without being too dogmatic. I wonder, what sort of punishment or
- > reprimand, if any, would you impose if a student used what you deemed
- > too much mother tongue in class?
- >
- > \*\*\*

## Post 214

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

Hi \*\*\*,

Thanks for checking the site out! To answer your questions: it's purely me who has decided to focus on genre. I've had a few other ideas about how to organize the course - e.g. simply setting the students a problem which I'd like them to solve, in a similar way to the way Sugata Mitra works with his hole-in-the-wall project. The task could be anything, from ""Find out who the 5 most expensive football players in history are"" to ""Decide on the 5 most important events in Omani/Chinese/Martian history"" - and then asking the students to present the results using the most appropriate tool. However, I decided on using genre simply because I felt that it would give the project a linguistic basis. I was worried that if I didn't find some way of focusing the students' attention on language, they may improve in other areas, but their English might make less progress than it could. I also felt that a focus on discourse was probably the area that students at that level would have the most room to improve.

As for the xtranormal video: I'm not bothered especially about the way the characters speak - the video is intended as an example of what's possible, not as listening practice. Later, the students may choose to script videos of their own, and this will be something I envision them getting practice from. Perhaps at that point, the oddness of their speech might be up for discussion.

\*\*\*

---

From: \*\*\*  
To: Dogme <dogme@yahoogroups.com>  
Subject: [dogme] \*\*\*'s wiki project

""Hopefully, as the course progresses, the students will pick up skills which will allow them to analyse the discourse of different genres themselves (organisation, preference for certain grammatical forms, lexis etc. - the students will be upper intermediate- ish level), so that they would be able to go through the entire process independently - select genre, analyse, select an appropriate tool, modify discourse according to that tool (e.g. podcasting tools call for a monologue, while xtranormal works best in an interview format), create text, upload to the wiki. Invite comments. So what do you think - is this dogme 2.0? How could I improve the framework? Is it relevant, or just boring in the extreme? : )""

\*\*\*, a cursory attempt to make my way through the wiki material brings up a couple of questions:

Who has decided that this course will focus on genre?

How do you think the slightly odd intonation of the movie characters (one with Ski-Doo hat) will affect students' uptake and production of the L2? Or will it at all in your opinion? Does it even matter?

I'll try to look at the project in more depth later.

\*\*\*

## Post 215

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\* writes about the ""I am..."" activity. I read about it in [I think] Psychology for Language Teachers (an excellently written book by Marion Williams and \*\*\* (?) Burden). The idea is to ask Ss to write ""I am..."" twenty times and then finish each sentence. Apparently, once the flippant sentences have come and gone, it can be an intensely revelatory exercise. Never tried it personally, but often meant to.

Post 216

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as own out of school experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Dear \*\*\* ,

We obviously seem to have different models of learning and listening.



At a physical level I can hear and my mind is trained to pick out English primarily - I notice that I hear the English conversations on the bus here in Germany when there are conversations going on in German, Turkish and Russian around me.

My learning is the learning not of physically doing the activity but to use a terrible ""hippy"" term ""tuning in"" to the students - I am generally good at it but I need to practise and to learn from each group.

Am I right in thinking that learning is a one off activity that you can or cannot do? This has an element of truth at some levels but say in advanced students of English - realising that they are learning more English at the same time as learning about engineering or management.

Still learning, listening and learning to listen,

\*\*\*

\*\*\*wrote:

> \*\*\*,

>

> I'm the one who is now amused. You are not learning how to listen as it is obvious from what you say that you know how to listen. What you have to do is concentrate and put into practise that which you already know.

>

> \*\*\*

>

>

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: \*\*\*

> To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

> Subject: [dogme] is listening a key skill in dogme?

>

> I am amused / bemused that \*\*\* as \*\*\* doesn't appear to be listening to \*\*\* in the discussion on listening.

>

> I have had to learn to listen and listen well several times every year.

> I have to learn to listen to each class and each student. I am not very good at it and so need to practise listening regularly.

>

> This is not listening as the silence of a classroom in rows where you can hear a pin drop etc. It is listening and responding to students in groups and as individuals and their needs. The music behind the words.

> This is not easy and takes a lot of practise - it is a skill and one that can be taught - in the sense of modelling it, using it, talking about it, getting students to try it etc.

>

> Am I hearing this dialogue correctly?

>

> \*\*\*

>

> Written in haste while I have a Spanish omelette on a low setting in the

> kitchen.

## Post 217

"Great posting \*\*\*. Thanks.

\*\*\*

## Post 218

"Hi, again!

Please ignore the previous question. I searched the group site and found your information. Once again, thank you.

\*\*\*

--- \*\*\* wrote:

>  
> Hi there, as previously mentioned, I did my  
> ""Teaching Unplugged""  
> workshop yesterday - it went very well indeed. It  
> was my first ever  
> workshop, I am a happy bunny.  
>  
> I've created a summary of what the workshop was  
> about (including some  
> stuff I didn't have time to do) to give out around  
> the staff room next  
> week, and thought you guys might be interested. It's  
> 6 pages of  
> activities and teaching ""concepts"". I'm not sure if  
> this is all 100%  
> dogme, but I'd think it's certainly relevant enough.  
>  
> Any feedback and/or additions are welcome!  
>  
> Cheers  
>  
> \*\*\*

## Post 219

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\* wrote:

> And this is, parenthetically, a reply to \*\*\*. If you think about it, \*\*\* you will see that language is LESS necessary in the here and now (where there is a sun to point to and water and wood to look at) and MORE necessary for the there and then. So the MOTIVATION to use language (and create language) increases when distance between > the stuff you want to talk about and the actual talk about it is increased. And so doth our languageness develop. At what point does it become language, though, and whence does its language-itude stem?

Sorry \*\*\* but I don't agree. It's not language that develops because of the there and then, it's grammar. To see this explained in a wonderfully articulate way just read \*\*\*'s 'Uncovering Grammar'. One of the best examples of this is the activity on pages 88 and 89 on 'Physical distance'.

\*\*\*

## Post 220

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Hi \*\*\*,

I wasn't 'attacking' you but rather trying to draw everyone's attention to one of the fundamentals of Dogme - that it's the students that are at the heart.

One thing I noticed with many peoples recent postings, including our \*\*\*'s, was that people were going in with plans as to what they wanted to find out from the students.

Wouldn't it be worth opening everything up from the word go and saying to the students - write down 10 things you'd like to be asked about (for example)

\*\*\*

## Post 221

Hi \*\*\*!

I will be there... By the way, there is a forum here:

<http://pub43.bravenet.com/forum/show.php?usernum=3657769699&cpv=2>

See you there!

\*\*\*

Post 222

*Coded as other's teaching experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\* quotes the once-popular PPP formulation, recommendation for teaching and, hopefully, learning (presentation, practice, product - is that it?)

By coincidence I've just come in from meeting a former student of mine who has recently done a 4-week, intensive course in Berlin in TEFL. As it happens, he also mentioned PPP. He'd been told that most schools in the workaday world were likely to favour PPP and TBL - task-based learning.

He was most impressed by the 4-week course. It was practically-orientated and he showed me a massive folder full of handouts making everything from motivation through assessment to grammar clear and memorable - all information contained in neat boxes, charts and lists.

I'm afraid that if dogme wants to rule the world (of course I know it doesn't) someone will have to set out dogme practices in neat boxes, charts and lists..

\*\*\*

Post 223

*Coded as own out of school experience.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

One thing I like about this group is that it doesn't, collectively or individually, give in to what would, in the prevailing paradigm, be seen as 'given', or 'written.' To summarise the thread I skimmed this morning...

\*\*\* gives a wonderfully Laingian response to \*\*\*'s concerns over the non-NEST teacher's matching exercise:

'As for the teacher who wrote the exercise, one could say that it's not as bad as it looks. After all, the biggest problem seems to be that some of the answers are possible in more than one situation. Another problem might be found in that the teacher has used written English (meant to be read) in a listening text (meant to be heard). As for the English, well, the world is full of ambiguous signs that serve their purpose.'

'One might also wonder,' \*\*\* continues, 'where the teacher got the ideas for the construct and whether the English would have been so flawed if she had been using it to express her own reality or to help her students express theirs?'

Well, these instincts may well have been proved right. \*\*\* identifies a possible source text (examples of which I have also seen pinned to staffroom walls, at heaven knows what remove from the original wordings which, as DK says, would in any case have been understood and served their purpose - they have the status of urban language myths) and indicates that it may reflect not on the user's own language but - ironically enough - on that teacher's urge to create 'materials' from other materials.

\*\*\* both positions this text in the world and repositions it in the classroom.

\*\*\* also asks:

'Is there any evidence to show that a teacher with a low level of English means that the students will not be able to overtake this obstacle? Is there any evidence to show that any input (of whatever quality) provides scaffolding for the students to build their own higher level language? In other words, is it really the teacher who calls the tune?'

This makes me think of being with children. My son likes reading and writing (so do I); we make little books. But in other areas I'm not much use to him on a factual level. When he asks me why the world spins, or how fast it spins, I simply can't remember. I don't think that will stop him finding out from books, or from his teachers. And if one day soon he wanted to write a book of science facts, I imagine we'd make some of them up. We wouldn't fall off the world. Kids develop our interests as well as uninterests; they pick up our strengths, as well as our weaknesses. They are, as \*\*\* suggests of our students, independent of us.

\*\*\* just posts on the site as I'm writing this, 'it's not what you know, it's how you share it.' I think that would be a sound instinct when with a child too. When my son asks me about things I don't know, I try not to put him off (like the expensively-schooled woman I heard tell her daughter not to bother with a Beatrix Potter book she was looking at curiously in a bookshop 'because I hated them as child'), and I don't pretend I know either. It's a shared mystery, at least. I'm assuming here that my own instincts in this respect are sound, but I suppose that's the only way to proceed... relating it to \*\*\*'s 3 areas of competence, maybe confidence in one's ability in one or more areas allows one the good grace to admit when one is lacking in another.

This relates to another spirit that exists on the group - a sort of punk approach, not to trousers, but to life. Do it yourself, even if it's rough and ready, don't just consume. You don't need to tell this to a child - when my son writes a little book it's as much a book as any he might see in a shop, and as real - but in an adult it may require a bit of lateral thinking. When my students come up with words that don't exist we welcome them into the class if we all like them - words like 'wide out' (phrasal verb, meaning - we thought, appropriately enough, something like 'think laterally'). This creates an atmosphere of freedom - it may in fact be a means to an end, like the lesson yesterday when a Colombian guy brought in a visual task from a business/self-improvement book (*The 7 Habits of Extremely Successful Nuns - no, People*) 'because you told us to bring in our own materials', led a session on it and then was happy to let it go in the direction of a poem quoted by an Italian guy in response to the exercise - which I then found on the Internet and printed out: Sonnet 18 by Shakespeare. Confidence in one area promotes confidence in another.

## Post 224

*Coded as teacher training.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\* - don't take it personally! I meant that we are ALL part of a system that trains us to believe that language can be separated into chunks (language for talking about holidays, the present perfect, etc) and that also trains teachers in a way that says, ""First you'll need to know about X; then you need to know about Y."" It's this kind of training (for both students and teachers) that can lead to dependency. Once the security of the framework is taken away, this might be what is causing your feelings of exposure. After all, it sounds as if they are caused more by the absence of structure rather than the presence of dogme. You don't have to make these intelligent decisions so fast. You can take your time and ask students for more examples of X. Then they can look at the examples and discuss what they have in common - they work out their own grammar rules or whatever. That is pretty much how the language was codified in the first place, wasn't it? And the fact that you write about ""all sorts of language input and problems"" seems to indicate that you have been affected by the chunkiness of modern language teacher training.

What would I do if a student said, ""I love my dog too much?"" Well, it depends on many things. If I felt that they were at a point when it needed addressing, I might put on a shocked face and ask worriedly, ""WHAT do you mean? Are you sure you don't mean sooooo much? Because ""too much"" could have worrying implications...What things can we love TOO much? etc"". Or I might refer them to the local counsellors...after all, it COULD be a cry for help...or a whimper...

## Post 225

Sorry to bother the list, but \*\*\*...by any chance, is your e-mail program treating my mails to you like spam?"

## Post 226

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

\*\*\* writes of approaches::

""entirely based on wishful thinking supported by personal anecdote(s).

Very scientific indeed!

1. I've read nothing in recent messages that bases anything on wishful thinking.
2. Personal anecdotes can encapsulate years of reading, thought and experience.

Who wants to be scientific in language teaching?

\*\*\*

## Post 227

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

I see within Cook's concern about the ""cult of the real"" a challenge to Dogme which seems to be a champion of that cult, to the extent that it calls for an abandonment of the artificial. Cook's book is interesting because he concludes that ""play"" is usually rule-bound, most often repetitive, by definition artificial. As such, he sees activities which have long been dismissed as traditional and old-fashioned, such as rote-learning, drills etc as being perfectly valid exercises in the acquisition of a second language. In fact, although I may be putting words in his mouth, I think he goes as far to say that such activities might well be essential in the L2 classroom. He appears to be dismissive of the current trend to focus on meaning over form, allowing errors to go unchecked as long as meaning gets across; he also appears to dismiss the need to have activities that mirror real world needs such as might be found in the Business English classroom. As such, Cook appears to argue that texts, as found in textbooks, can, in fact, be wholly constructive, despite their artificiality precisely because they artificially present (usually in repetitive form) the various rules that are to be focused on. All of which, of course, appears to undermine the fundamental tenets of dogme.

Or does it?

\*\*\*

## Post 228

*Coded as other's teaching experience.*

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Hi \*\*\*

Welcome out of the closet. Your post rang a bell with something I heard today. I've been lucky enough to spend Sunday being standardised for IELTS examining. Leaving aside the temptation to see how any exam can be reliable if properly trained people can perform better than others, I'm thinking of a conversation I had with somebody from London who teaches ESOL. He was telling me about what a nightmare it was with the govt's bureaucracy having done its best to destroy any educational worth. He told me that he would advise me against moving into ESOL for this reason. ""But you don't actually do what you're supposed to?"" I asked. He smiled. ""Only when the inspectors come round...""

\*\*\*

PS I won't post my communication essay on the files section because I don't feel it's directly relevant to dogme. But if anybody is short of stuff to read in the little room, I'm only too happy to send it on to all in exchange for comments.

PPS \*\*\*, sorry for the tardy reply. Note change of address!

----- Original Message -----

From: \*\*\*

To: dogme@yahooogroups.com

Subject: [dogme] dogme

Hello Group

From sitting on the side lines I have finally decide to speak because I so much admire the liveliness of the debate on this site.

I have just accepted a contract for a new group luckily only 4 or 5 students not for me the 50-60. The problem is the material I am being expected to use. Talk about being the complete opposite to the dogme approach it seems as if the content of every second is prescribed with full teachers notes and not even a book but loose leaf materials.

I do not think I will be working for this company for very long as I cannot imagine a class with no hope of a spontaneous moment. I have been trying many of your suggestions over the past few weeks and coming up with various amounts of success or lack of it! Especially the write your own questions idea some groups really liked that one.

OK so keep up the good work

Many thanks

\*\*\*

## Post 229

\*\*\* wrote:

- > At the very beginning of the list
- > some of the listers noted that it was a ""boy's club"", and of course this
- > can get pretty competitive, you know, particularly when boys start
- > discussing length. But with you (and Olwyn?) on board, it is really a
- > boys club no longer and we are immensely richer for it.

Nothing like a bit of flattery first thing in the morning  
(I've just got round to reading \*\*\*'s long message and



found this little gem at the end.) However I'm interested in a lighthearted way in the pragmatics of the ? after my name because I'm interested in this sort of creative use of punctuation.

Does it mean...

we're not sure whether \*\*\* really is on board?  
we're not sure how long she's going to remain?  
we're not sure whether it's to our advantage?  
something else altogether?

I'm not just interested in an explanation from \*\*\* as the writer but also in how other people interpreted it.

Does this count as a suitable topic for discussion in a dogme group? It is a prop found at the site ;-)

\*\*\*

## Post 230

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Dear \*\*\*,

I think I followed your argument all the way through, but this bit at the end:

quote:

Now, the first time the teacher elicits ""hot"" the kids answer in Korean with ""Deoweoyeo!"" But the second time they provide the English!

Now, suppose the kids are subsequently faced with a test item like:

Question 99: It was spring, but it felt like summer. It was very...

- a) cool
- b) cold
- c) warm
- d) hot

The kids will probably not be able to get it right. So this cannot be called learning.

Or can it? Which is closer to the glowing social core of language use, the ability to answer Question 99, or the ability to pick an item, or an idea, ""hot"" from your interlocutor's lips?

:endquote

Doesn't seem to me to follow logically. Why is it that you assume they \*probably won't\* get this item right on the test? Isn't the fact that they have used this item in a natural conversation going to help make it real for them, fix it into their memory banks?

If we do have to choose, of course answering Q#99 is less at the ""social core of language use"" (pretty much by definition), but what does that mean? Answering Q#99 might have much more riding on it (place at the good uni -> place in the right gov't dept -> President of Korea!) than an idle chat about the weather on a sunny day.

\*\*\*

## Post 231

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

I sit here reading all these musings, as my boss tutts at me for hogging her computer, denying her five minutes of chatroom glory, and I try and pretend (that's like a double pretend) to understand some of it (you can tell when that happens 'cos I either nod or huff).

Anyway, a couple of things spring to mind:

1. the phrase ""language learning"" keeps cropping up. Does this mean all these thoughts on grammar, function words, lexis etc are to be applied to, not just learning English, but EVERY single language in the world? Wow, you lot must have some deeeeeeeep knowledge.
2. Imagine someone came up with the definitive answer to all our ""language"" teaching/learning queries, and we all thought ""Aha, THAT'S what grammar is, THAT'S how we teach - it all seems so simple now."" A lot of us would soon be out of a job, wouldn't we?

Don't search too hard, or you just might find what your looking for!

\*\*\*

## Post 232

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

Mmmm around and around we go ... maybe for me the concept of dogme could be summed up with words such as 'balanced, eclectic, unpredictable, un presupposing ....' ummmmm and so on and so forth ...

\*\*\* :)

## Post 233

*Coded as other's non-teaching experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

I did some more videoing for my wife yesterday. It is International week here in

Osnabrueck, north Germany, and on Sunday groups of pupils from a number of local junior schools ( ages roughly 10-12 on average) have put together a programme of what amounts to bi-lingual drama. The Turkish kids (all boys) are doing a shadow puppet play with the classic figure Karagoez - good natured, but a bit slow - coming to terms with life in Germany; the Pinocchio group couldn't be at the dress rehearsal, but the German group (German here means English, Portuguese, Turkish and Russian) of animal hand puppets took over the Punch and Judy theatre and argued, in English, about what is best - the best way to eat, sleep, wash and so on. The Russians - in perfect German and Russian - did an incredibly accomplished (but far too long ) version of Cinderella switching between Russian and German from scene to scene - and the Polish group did a marvellous short production of Goldilocks with everyone played by two people - one in Polish, one in German. The most hilarious scene was when the two masked grandmothers, one Polish-speaking, one German-speaking, passed the microphone rapidly to each other from one side of the bed to the other.

#### Dogmeish observations

- The video of the kids performing is a mine of material for observing and hearing what went on in real time.
- It was the teachers, not the children, who argued violently at times about which group was getting the most time and had the best position in the programme.
- It was thrilling seeing groups of children switching effortlessly between German and Russian, or Bosnian, or Serbian or Turkish, or Italian or Spanish or Portuguese and speaking a foreign language with such elan.
- Sadly, the kids in the German hand puppet group (speaking English) although they had oodles of energy, had, in some case, such awful pronunciation it was virtually impossible to understand them.

\*\*\*

## Post 234

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*.

When you learned your own L1 you were at the zenith of your own human scientific capability. There wasn't one stick of technology involved in that exercise, just the family walking all around all the time talking to themselves and you as you observed them. Yet empiricism ruled its every moment.

All I've suggested here at yahoo:dogme is for the application of the empirical approach (observe, hypothesize, test, predict, re-hypothesize, re-test...) to a process shared by all humans due to our common biological structures after specifically witnessing this dynamic at work and seeming similar to both macro and micro level reinforcement at work in human learning. that's it. Why you choos to focus on the oword ""forced"" seems far more about

you than me. The great teacher himself, Confucius, suggested that if his students liked him too much he must not be doing right by them, educationally!

Since you clearly don't understand the difference between empiricism (not scientific) and technology, I suggest we end this thread! I suspect that both Cro-Magnon and Neanderthal were far more in touch with their inner-scientist than modern language educators if your jabberwocky grasp of "science v. technology" is even remotely typical among them.

;D

--- In dogme@yahoo.com, "\*\*\*\*\*" wrote:

>

> \*\*\*, you say: I simply don't see how, as a teacher, using all my guile as a facilitator and believer that out-loud speech reinforces learning far more than videos, books, or rote memorization exercises hence, "force" my student to verbalize their understanding of the 'fact at hand', isn't dogme

>

> My comment: I guess it's the word 'forced' and all its socio and psycholinguistic content that doesn't sit well.

>

>

> You say: We force students to attend class, we force them to adhere to classroom behavior standards, force them to come on time and not leave early...

>

> My comment: Do we? Not where I am. It depends on how you see the role of the teacher (ie your own role) I guess. My politics reject the authoritarian role of the teacher. It's their own personal responsibility and decision (and if we're talking mainstream education, it's the law, but not me - personally I'd rather they only came if they genuinely wanted to.) The class starts when it starts and finished when it finishes. If the student is late or doesn't turn up, well he/she misses something and it's up to him/her to decide if that's relevant or not. Adhering to classroom behaviour standards is also up to the student's own sense of self and ethics, of being "solidario" or not. This is true of belonging to any social group. Most students prefer to conform to the standards imposed by the group (which needn't mean 'by the teacher' - in fact, it should mean their peers NOT the teacher). If a system is forced upon the group, ultimately they are likely to rebel against it. If they themselves self-impose it.....

>

>

> You say: As a part-time educator who doesn't make his money that way, I feel so sad for professional teachers that seem ready and willing to consider any outside suggestions about "learning" to be "anathema to the DOGME cause"

>

> My comment: so sad? No-one has said anything about anathema. (or maybe I skipped that post?)

>

> You say: A point was made earlier that if you are all so altruistically true to this non-technological bent you seem to like to display here that you'd be living naked in a cave without even a flint to help you start a fire.

>

> My comment: Therefore we are all raw vegan. And all women with big feet are ugly.

- > A point you made earlier was that you prefer to be scientific. Relating a preference to not use modern technology to facilitate meaningful conversation in an ELT classroom to using flints and campfires while in a state of undress is scientific?
- > The brain perceives and reacts to colours in different ways - does that mean that if we use one colour of boardpen or pen to mark rather than another, we are showing something about our beliefs and lifestyles? It may do, in fact, but it may also just show what we had in our bag at the time.
- >
- > Anyway, there is a tired tendency around here to accuse the non-pro-techies of being cavepeople, but we're kinda getting over it. Aren't we?
- >
- > A big ;-) anyway, on a tiresome, rainy, fractious sort of day.

## Post 235

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

""I don't see how a

book can determine the WAY I teach! Or for that matter, seeing that textbooks are still largely organised around grammatical syllabuses, how can Akbari claim that they determine the methodology by which teachers teach!? That's weird. Are we zombies?""

To be fair to Akbari (the source of the quote about textbooks having replaced the concept of method) he is arguing that many teachers ARE - for want of a better word - zombies, and that this is what prevents them from joyfully embracing the postmethod, critical, transformative etc paradigm:

""Teachers in many contexts are not different from factory workers in terms of their working hours... The financial and occupational constraints they work within do not leave them with the time or the willingness to act as iconoclasts and social transformers, roles that will jeopardize their often precarious means of subsistence...""

Moreover, dealing with certain topics can cost a teacher his or her career in some countries. Then he goes on:

""Textbooks and tests create further constraints within which teachers operate. Even if the teachers do not openly subscribe to a method, the textbooks they use provide them with a working plan that defines how languages are taught and learned. In other words, many teachers have laid their religion of method to rest and have adopted the practical philosophy of coursebooks because the practical philosophy is more tangible and convenient for classroom applications. Textbooks now take care of all the details of classroom life.... Many teachers feel happy with such an arrangement because their workload does not leave them with any time for reflection and preparation..."" (pp 646-7)

In conditions like these, is rejecting the coursebook professional suicide, or is it the first step in a struggle for liberation? Are the proponents of a dogme approach a reactionary elite, or are they (forgive me) at the cutting edge? (...making headway through the free interchange of their revolutionary ideals, turning the establishment inside out, and confronting change face to face....) ;-)

## Post 236

*Coded as own out of school experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

Perhaps it really is just me then. If I look at a painting then, I can ""hear"" comments such as, ""That's beautiful."" or, ""I could stand here all day."" Now, whether or not I hear these words as sentences or hints of sentences, I couldn't say for sure. As I type. I can hear the words I want to write. Were I a musician, I am quietly confident that I would think, ""THAT'S the note I was looking for."" In an unpleasant incident, my brain might resort to the Anglo-Saxon vernacular.

In other words, our feelings may not need words, but once those feelings become thoughts, I am suggesting that they must be encoded into words --or whatever is the equivalent of words for people who don't have them. In the other article that \*\*\*I\*\*\* referred you to, \*\*\* ;), what I found fascinating were two things: that no research has been carried out into this area (if anyone nicks my idea, I'll be expecting a copy of the thesis); and secondly that (some) deaf people actually hear words in their thoughts and dreams. That seems to me to be amazing (and supportive of Vygotsky's thesis that thought is internalised speech).

I would argue that babies experience feelings, not thoughts. We also may be lost in feelings when we find ourselves ""unable to put it into words"", although reflecting upon our feelings has meant wordifying: ""It's indescribable.""

As for the esteemed demolition expert, Feynman, is that really what passes for scientific argument? Isn't he confusing understanding with thought. Can't a baffled reader think to themselves, ""I don't understand a word of this."" I have no idea what a crankshaft is, but the example had me thinking a number of things, all at once...and I HEARD my thoughts!

\*\*\*

## Post 237

\*\*\* and \*\*\*,

Can we hold the session here in beautiful Portland, Oregon? ...please?

\*\*\* ----- Original Message -----

From: \*\*\*  
To: <dogme@yahooogroups.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, May 06, 2003 2:11 PM  
Subject: Re: [dogme] Quintessential dogme practice

> \*\*\*,  
>  
> Yes. Count me in.  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>  
>  
>> Incidentally, Leni Damm is, and has been, one of the most  
>> influential voices in the learner autonomy movement, going back to  
>> the eighties and earlier (\*\*French, please come in). Her  
>> presence at the dogme session was significant and affirming, and,  
>> characteristically, memorable. We talked afterwards, and hatched  
>> the idea of a possible joint pre-conference session for next year -  
>> dogme meets learner autonomy, or some such. Any takers?  
>>  
>> \*\*\*  
>  
>

## Post 238

*Coded as questioning and answering.*  
*Coded as teaching text.*

Hi \*\*\*,

You might like to try the following websites.

<http://www.write-an-essay.com/>

<http://www.uefap.co.uk/writing/writfram.htm>

<http://www.mdx.ac.uk/www/study/Gloess.htm>

I use all of these with my university students.

Regards

\*\*\*

---- Original Message ----

From: \*\*\*  
To: Dogme

Subject: [dogme] A call of my own

The previous group of students I worked with are now having trouble with the writing they are required to do in their Natural Resource Technology classes. The teacher of the Ecology course tells me he finds the students communicate appropriately when he has conversations with them, but writing presents them with difficulties that adversely affect comprehensibility.

The students themselves have each cited different reasons for their low scores on a recent lab assignment. I find that each student's perception reflects his/her personality. For example, the most diligent among them blames the low scores on a lack of diligence; the guy who always spaced out instructions in class thinks nobody understood the instructions; and, the quick-tempered young woman who easily felt slighted believes she was cheated out of her rightfully earned points. The list goes on.

The Ecology professor has spent time showing students examples of what he considers well written papers and poorly written papers. He has incorporated mini-essay sessions into his lectures and seems to genuinely care about the success of my former students as writers.

I believe extensive reading and writing can help my current students. The students will eventually need to write scientific papers. Some of them can chat over tea and read newspapers. Others struggle to form a coherent sentence.

Please share your thoughts and impressions on this with me.

\*\*\*

## Post 239

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\*, I enjoyed reading your post. When I read this:

""As a teacher, my obligation is to make myself unnecessary. Perhaps this goes a little beyond what most of us think Dogme is, but for my part, dogme makes no sense at all until we get the teacher out of the room.""

I was reminded of this:

""Full Dogme

Dogme moments, Dogme lessons: the next stage is a Dogme classroom - an open one, to which the learners are bringing in their own material because they know they can, and one where nobody knows precisely what will happen when they walk through the door. This requires



considerable skill on your part, to manage the interaction but to keep one eye on the language. You are talking the talk and walking the walk, as it were."

I think you might be there, \*\*\*. That leaves room for this:

"Dream Dogme

Set up an open school. No levels. No coursebooks. No photocopier. No profits? ... Let learners organise themselves into classes based on their interests and sympathies, make sure the teachers are comfortable with talking with them, and with dealing with language that comes up - which is the language they need."

Both snippets comes from  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2003/apr/17/tefl.lukemeddings>

Or maybe you and the learners are somewhere in between?

A final note: It is interesting how analogies to medical practice often appear in posts about ELT: "They are all iatrogenic disorders." I suppose this means we often believe we are trying to fix something, to make things better. I like \*\*\*'s idea of letting go, to "stop teaching and start watching" in order to creatively construct a community of learning.

\*\*\*

## Post 240

*Coded as other's non-teaching experience.*

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

Isn't it really about the quality of language learning opportunities that children tend to be provided with rather than superior abilities.

When we arrived in Chile, 8 months ago, my 8 year old was a complete beginner in Spanish, and I was at roughly intermediate level.

Now he outperforms me in listening, speaking and vocabulary range.

However, he has been fed on a diet of listening to stories in Spanish, playing tag in Spanish, being teased and teasing in Spanish, even fighting in Spanish (He goes to a Steiner school here), whereas I, being married to an English woman, teaching and teacher training in English and not having the wildest of social lives( having a world year old son as well), am to all intents and purposes immersed in an English speaking world.

I wonder where my Spanish level would be if I could spend my days playing tag and painting with a bunch of Chilean kids.

\*\*\*

""\*\*\*"" wrote:

My two cents: \*\*\* said it was HARDER for adults; he didn't use the word 'better', and you seem to be comparing apples and oranges.

\*\*\* ----- Original Message -----

From: \*\*\*

To: <dogme@yahooogroups.com>

Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2003 3:54 AM

Subject: Re: [dogme] Ahem....

Dear \*\*\*,

I sort of have to disagree with you on the issue of language learning efficiency of adults vs. children, regardless of whether we're talking L1 or L2.

In my (very anecdotal) experience, adults are generally better at language learning than kids. Give an adult learner 200 hrs of EFL instruction, 3 hours a week over two years and they will generally be able to fend for themselves in English. Give a 5 year old the same amount of instruction and you should consider yourself lucky if he can put together a few sentences beyond formulaic language.

Let's take an L1 example.

My son \*\*\* is now 19 months old. He has had motherese-type input for hours and hours every day since he was born (except when he is sleeping) and all he can produce is 1 word: ""car"". Rather depressingly, no ""mum"", no ""pare"", no nothing else. Granted, he is having to deal with two languages at the same time (Catalan and English), but I'd have a hard time calling his progress spectacular. I'm in no real hurry, mind you, but clearly he isn't either.

Just my two cents.

\*\*\*

On Thursday, Sep 25, 2003, at 10:00 Europe/Madrid, \*\*\*wrote:

>

> btw - easily another thread here - why language learning is so much

> harder

> for adults than for (most) children.

> Isn't it something to do with the capacity to absorb + the fact that

> it's

> message NOT medium that kids are paying attention to?

## Post 241

*Coded as other's teaching experience.*

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Thanks--that was worth the wait! I too strongly believe that if language is socially motivated and socially constructed then it must be worthwhile speculating how it originated--we must be able to get some insights into how it can be taught that way.

I like the idea of babies and children inferring how sounds are made from visual information. It even suggests to me something my IH trainer used to bellow at us ""Show your LIPS and TONGUE!""--all we could think about was her highly visible tonsils.

I think it also offers a possible REASON (as well as a mechanism) for the exaptation to linguistic purposes of a cavity originally intended for eating (and, according to my mother, still primarily intended for that purpose).

And of course I agree that our models of articulatory gestures are too phoneticized. But that means (to me at least) to graphemized--because phonemes are really projections of graphology onto sound.

For that reason I'm not sure what you mean when you say that the model is over-elaborate. It seems to me, since literally ""millions of different colors"" are possible when you are speaking, the phoneme-model is dramatically under-elaborate. That's WHY we need gestures. Without an underlying gesture, the wealth of information is simply uninterpretable.

But you probably mean overelaborated for teaching purposes. Hear here! Yet even for teaching purposes--the syllable seems the obvious place to start, and there must be a couple thousand of those.

The other day one of my grad students offered a rather typical naturalistic explanation of why children learn to read and write only after they learn to speak and listen--it's easier. How wrong--how completely wrong--that is!

\*\*\*

PS: I liked what \*\*\* had to say about lesson plans, and I often feel frustrated that so little of other people's teaching situations seem relevant to mine (I teach kids who have known each other for at least

four years, and I am the only real stranger in the class). But I do think that activities that start out as one thing often turn into something quite different, and classes that start out as one thing (viz, stranger) often end up something quite different again (I remember a very memorable class in China where one half the class married the other half--I exaggerate, but only a little). And that's why lesson plans and getting-to-know-you and even (heaven forfend) materials are a starting point. The point is, how to keep going, and for that the learner is utterly indispensable.

\*\*\*

## Post 242

"Thanks, \*\*\*. \*\*\*'s phrase did inspire the imagination!

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:

>

>

> A lovely post, \*\*\* - it captures and suggests how to address so many of the key questions. I loved the bit \*\*\* wrote about making institutions disappear, too. As you say, shimmering away..

>

> \*\*\*

>

> On 21 Nov 2011, at 16:19, \*\*\* wrote:

>

>> See my notes below!

>>

>> --- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:

>>

>>> This resonated with me. Connections are what language teaching is

>>> about and I believe that most of my work as a teacher is about

>>> making connections: ...

>>

>> Yes, I totally agree. I would go so far as to say that connections are what language itself is all about. I see my role as helping students learn to use English to communicate successfully (make connections) rather than to ""teach English"".

>>

>>> ... Perhaps, a traditional

>>> view would be that learners should conform to learning as

>>> described in materials, so we are busy trying to fit learners

>>> into a mental model we have that is based on our materials,

>>> rather than trying to make sense of learners and what they

>>> actually need at any given point.

>>

>> This captures the disconnect I was talking about. if I hold up a picture and ask the class ""What is he doing?"" , I'm probably looking for answers that further my lesson plan (eliciting relevant lexis, examples of present continuous, etc.). If a student relates to the picture and

begins to tell a story from his or her life, what do I do? Break the connection and wrench everyone back to my agenda? Or hand the picture (and the floor) to the student, sit down and begin to scaffold the storytelling? Two years ago, I did the former. Today, I'm more likely to do the latter.

>>

>> What I'm wrestling with now is helping the students realize that these moments ARE learning. Right now, many see this as interruption and seem to be waiting for "the real lesson" to begin again. I think the presence of materials (especially the pile of handouts I haven't handed out yet) only reinforces this notion. Another motivation for coming in with fewer and fewer materials!

>>

>>> ... Institutions only exist for

>>> "accountability" and real learning is not accountable to anyone

>>> for anything.

>>

>> Another perpetual challenge: the need to produce the data which justifies the grants (in my case) is a force which seems to push in the direction of "lesson plans and materials". It's a balancing act, for sure.

>>

>>> Dogme offers me the opportunity of making institutions disappear

>>> - at least from students' perspective - so that everyone can

>>> learn what they need to learn (and that is usually not on the

>>> test).

>>>

>>

>> I like that phrase 'making institutions disappear'. I can imagine a school's walls shimmering away, making it easier for the students focus on communicating!

>>

## Post 243

Would be happy to contribute (along with \*\*\* who worked with me teaching unplugged for a while) on the student generated materials that were produced in our unplugged classes.

\*\*\*

On 19 October 2011 08:20, \*\*\* wrote:

> \*\*

>

> Inspired by the on-going discussion about (the probably misconceived) Dogme

> coursebook, along with the '\*\*\* thread' - culminating in this marvellous

> suggestion of \*\*\*'s: "it strikes me that you are in an ideal position

> to do some action research into dogme" I'd like to propose (to a publisher -

> and there are several I have in mind) the following:

>

> Book proposal - an edited collection of papers

>

> Working Title: Researching Dogme

>

> Description: Dogme ELT (aka Teaching Unplugged) has generated a great deal  
> of discussion and debate over the last ten or more years: online (by means  
> of a very active discussion list and a recent proliferation of blogs), at  
> conferences (including a monographic conference in Barcelona this year) and  
> in print, as well as having inspired a handful of MA dissertations and at  
> least one resource book. Yet little or no classroom research into how dogme  
> is implemented, and its impact on learners and other stakeholders, has  
> appeared in print in all this time. This collection aims to remedy this  
> situation. It will include at least a dozen reports of research, in a  
> variety of contexts and conducted with a range of age groups and class  
> types, that deal with such themes as: curriculum negotiation, course design,  
> reactive teaching, classroom interaction, learner and teacher autonomy,  
> teacher education, motivation and other affective factors, language  
> emergence, ESP, critical pedagogy, and situated learning. Research  
> methodologies will likely include action research, interaction analysis,  
> ethnographic and narrative inquiry, and curriculum evaluation, among others.  
>

> There will also be an introduction, outlining the origins and evolution of  
> Dogme ELT, situating it within a naturalistic and emergentist language  
> learning paradigm that shares space with task-based learning, content-based  
> learning, whole language learning, as well as aligning with a longer  
> tradition in education dating back to at least John Dewey (and the notion of  
> experiential learning) and including such progressive and critical  
> educationalists as Sylvia Ashton-Warner, Clestin Freinet, and Paulo Freire.  
>

> In addition, there will be an Afterword that will gather together key  
> issues raised in, and implications derived from, the studies themselves, as  
> well as suggesting pointers for future research and development. There will  
> be a bibliography and index.  
>

> Editors: 1. Scott Thornbury (The New School, NY) 2. [someone with a  
> background both in research and publishing - I have a possible candidate] 3.  
> ???

>

> Publication date: April 2014.

>

> Prospective contributors should submit an outline of their research  
> proposal (about 500 words), as well as brief bibliographical data, by  
> December 31st 2011.

>

> It is suggested that any earned royalties be donated to a charity jointly  
> agreed by the contributors.

>

> Contributors welcome! Don't dilly-dally!

>

## Post 244

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Hi,  
I'm new to the group. This is a really interesting group, interesting topics.

\*\*\*,

You say, ""Personally, I see very little reason to be cheerful about a rich, powerful and privileged man getting into power, regardless of the colour of their skin.""

Why wouldn't you be cheerful?  
If s/he's the right person for the job, who cares about their race/color and socio-economic background?  
If s/he's the right person for the job then there's a lot to be cheerful for, right?

\_\*\*\*

## Post 245

*Coded as own in class experience.*

During the last 20 minutes of today's class, we wrote summaries of the lesson. here are three of them, chosen at random:

Today in English class, we spoke about something at the beggining we gave the test to our partner and the teacher asked if we remember the last test that was about of some words that we unknow. Some people said tht yes remembered the words.

We also gave the new test to our partner also our teacher give us a good advice for the learn new words for eg. use the card and write the word in the from and the backward write the meaning in Spanish.

Also we were speak about the people can not sleep  
Is a big problem for my classmates because somebody only sleep for two hours or not sleep.  
But some classmates gave a some advice for the people can not sleep or not sleep very well.

\*\*\*\*\*

First we did a new test for us classmates, and everyone answered that.  
After, \*\*\* gives us a new idea, it was about a index card that will have Spanish and English unknown words. Also, \*\*\* wrote a paragraph on the blackboard, and put some words that we didn't know, and we filled the space with a new word, and everyone practiced with a classmate.

We talked a lot about how everyone sleep?  
Today was a wonderful time.

\*\*\*\*\*

To day in class very good to me because every class I to learn mor vocabulary and some thing above the text, colocation the words in the paragraph, also, I to learn talking in the

groups, por example when the we talk in the class is part of the learn more English. I like you class \*\*\* because I understand English when the you speak.  
Also, I want to corret my English every day.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Post 246

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Well said. You are echoing the point I think I was trying to get at when I described my background - that I am troubled by the dominance of fluent, articulate native-speakers (and also the more fluent and confident non-native but near-native speakers) in the EFL/ESL world. When I make comments about jargon and so on, I am perhaps being the devil's advocate, but I know from my present experience (the only native-speaker English speaking teacher out of 12 in my school) that many teachers are excluded by the whole TEFL disourse world. I'm not say ing this is intentional, but it happens. After nearly 6 years in my school, and after teaching other non-native teachers on a benchmarking course, I am painfully aware of the linguistic challenge met daily by many of my colleagues. Without the 'formalistic, fetishistic' elements of their lessons, their lives would be even more stressful than they already are! That is not to say that change doesn't or shouldn't happen, but it's a very gradual process, and it needs to be spoken of in accessible language...

I must confess I had to re-read the carved soap section a couple of times to get the drift - then I realised we were talking about 'show-and-tell lite'!

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*\*" wrote:

>

> The problem with prescriptivism (or ""proscriptivism"") is not so much  
> that it's prescriptivist, but that it's exclusionist. I don't mean  
> that it excludes this or that friendly poster on this list (we are  
> all capable of looking after ourselves).

>

> I mean that it excludes the vast majority of the world's teachers  
> who are not on this list and who teach wonderful, but highly  
> situated, classes, where they DO use quite formalistic, even



- > fetishistic, techniques (PPP, IRE, lesson plans, even materials).
- > And they work, at least in the sense that they get the learner and
- > the teacher through the day and they gradually develop into less
- > formalistic and less fetishistic techniques.
- .....
- > Interestingly, the ""show and tell"" session in early childhood
- > education has recently been replaced with a kind of ""morning
- > newsgiving"" session, to encourage precisely this kind of non-
- > mediated discourse, where children can invent unencumbered by the
- > necessity of referring to physical objects.
- >
- > According to Christie (""Classroom Discourse Analysis"", 2002, London:
- > Continuum) this sort of thing tends to side-show the less voluble
- > and the children whose tales of home are dark and bloody, and
- > privilege children who have happy, mildly titillating family
- > anecdotes to tell. Compare, compare with what Sylvia Ashton-Warner
- > got from her learners!
- >
- > I guess I think that what's sauce for the learner is sauce for the
- > teacher. There is a time for classroom fetiches, and a time for
- > putting them away. But for some of us, definitely including me, that
- > the time for putting them away comes after the time for putting them
- > in their place. In the meantime, let us beware the tendency to turn
- > anti-fetishism into a fetich.
- >
- > \*\*\* "

## Post 247

Strange comment. In my experience, I am in the majority.  
 However, let's not get angry about this, we clearly have different views, and that's ok.

---

From: \*\*\*  
 To: ""dogme@yahoogroups.com"" <dogme@yahoogroups.com>  
 Sent: Monday, 2 September 2013, 2:13  
 Subject: Re: [dogme] Teaching a la Dogme in Second Life

\*\*\*,

No, I don't write course books... You're in a dying dogme minority. Enjoy it while you can.

\*\*\*

On 1 Sep 2013, at 21:32, \*\*\* wrote:

>  
> Yes. Well, as one of the 'hardcore', may I point out that you are just advocating all the stupid, useless techniques which have been advocated by book-producers for donkeys' years? I don't know if you're involved with producing 'CourseBooks', but you sound like you are. I do not need you, nor does any respectable English teacher.

>  
>  
> \_\_\_\_\_  
> From: \*\*\*  
> Subject: Re: [dogme] Teaching a la Dogme in Second Life

>  
>  
> There's the trouble with dogme in a nutshell - full of the strident hardcore who haven't moved on in 13 years.

>  
> \*\*\*, Gordon and many others (including the 'founding fathers') have moved considerably to a centre ground that allows for technology, coursebooks and much more.

>  
> That was really the only sensible way to go....

>  
> \*\*\*

>  
> On 1 Sep 2013, at 20:33, \*\*\* wrote:

>  
>>  
>> as I understand it, 'Dogme' is about non-technical ways of working with and off students; \*\*\*'s comment - 'It's about people in a room using English'. All this dross is just technobabble nonsense and has nothing to do with Dogme.

>>  
>> Subject: [dogme] Teaching a la Dogme in Second Life

>>  
>>  
>> Shared with the following lists, groups, with apologies for cross-posting:

>>  
>> Facebook Machinema , Dogme, IATEFL Facebook, Webheads,  
>> learningwithcomputers, GISIG, YLTSIG, Learning Technology, TTEdSIG, ELTA-OWL

>>  
>> \*\*\*

>>  
>> -----

>>  
>> I have just re-discovered and uploaded to YouTube for the first time a 35  
>> minute-long video, divided into 10 short uneven clips of between one and  
>> eight minutes:

>>  
>> \*Dogme in Second Life\*: \*A conversation between Carol Rainbow and \*\*\*  
>> Newson (Osna) Teaching a la Dogme in Second Life \*

>>  
>> \*Camera and sound: Carol\*

>>  
>> \*-----\*

>>  
>> \*I suppose these video clips can be classified as machinema, though at the  
>> time they were made I, at least, had never heard of machinema! Im sure  
>> Carol had and, I believe, had already made one or two.\*  
>>  
>> \*Enjoy. Comments more than welcome.\*  
>>  
>> \*-----\*  
>>  
>> \*Like all basically lazy people, I try to avoid what I consider to be  
>> unnecessary tasks. These videos/machinema are raw not edited. It is what  
>> we say, that, just possibly is of passing interest to some. Technical  
>> imperfections are, in my opinion, far lower than secondary. Life is too  
>> short to edit such videos except under special circumstances.\*  
>>  
>> \* \*  
>>  
>> \*\*\*\* aka \*\*\*  
>>  
>> Video 1: <http://youtu.be/FTYENQEGppM>  
>>  
>> Video 2: <http://youtu.be/EF-DGFDeVpM>  
>>  
>> Video 3: [http://youtu.be/cMR5FdIp\\_ho](http://youtu.be/cMR5FdIp_ho)  
>>  
>> Video 4: <http://youtu.be/D8Cgz3bQ5X8>  
>>  
>> Video 5: <http://youtu.be/U9s6ELnZiMk>  
>>  
>> Video 6: <http://youtu.be/bO1q17im7b0>  
>>  
>> Video 7: [http://youtu.be/a\\_1gXzw434A](http://youtu.be/a_1gXzw434A)  
>>  
>> Video 8: <http://youtu.be/tVTnQGTDTIU>  
>>  
>> Video 9: <http://youtu.be/-rz6aZ7bqvY>  
>>  
>> Video 10: <http://youtu.be/Z4UJ2MMPUmM>

## Post 248

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\*,

I have read all your remarks about whether or not it should be ""English

only"" in the classroom with great interest.

I have always been an advocate of ""English only"", and, in principle, ideally, I still am.

BUT

Context is all. ""Never say never.""

1. BANNING the use of the mother tongue has implications that are totally unacceptable., NEGOTIATING an agreement with the learners that ""English only"" makes sense in terms of efficient learning and subsequent acquisition is a different matter.

2. The argument that some use of the mother tongue is necessary for developing a feeling of community in a group and creating a supportive learning environment is very powerful. At the same time. if mastery of the language is the serious aim of the learners I remain convinced that ""English only"" is the most effective strategy. At the very least it is a condition to aim for even if compromises are made at the beginning.

I have just been reading that the brain stores different languages in different parts of the brain.

(Proust and the Squid The Story and Science of the Reading Brain Maryann Wolf Icon Books UK ISBN 978 184831030 8) This has been not infrequently demonstrated by bilingual people who have had serious accidents and lost one language, but not the another. And I met a young man who stutters badly in German but not at all in English. These facts seem to me support the intuition that for learning/acquisition purposes is better to stay in one language and not move between two.

I have written embarrassingly often over the years on lists like this that from personal experience and observation I would state that if in an EFL lesson words from the mother tongue are used the effect is spoilt, the illusion is broken, it jars, the spell of a productive tension is shattered, the struggle to understand is slackened and the learner must surely think: "" I don't really need to put all this effort into learning this foreign language. The teacher speaks my language and can always say what he is going on about in my mother tongue.""

For many years at the university where I taught I followed through a policy of never ever speaking German to my students. If they spoke in German I answered in English. Within a week or so this situation was accepted and the students all spoke English to me. Years later, if I meet any of them by chance, they still speak English to me. They associate me with speaking English. And that is good. It is not linguistic imperialism. I came to Germany, I was paid to teach them English, not to learn German. But I noticed with English colleagues who had studied German and who spoke it far more fluently and accurately that I did/do invariably spent a lot of time in their English lessons speaking German and their students tended to speak German with them, too.

Never say never. But I think one needs to be awfully wary about the use of the mother tongue in EFL classes.

\*\*\*

## Post 249

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

A second take on this is that it raises, for me at least, the old basic question: HOW do people learn languages - from what gamut of ways? H\*ow do learners remember and more or less accurately use what they have learned? Will the Google Wave provide some answers?  
Frankly, I'm more than a little on guard about my writing being cooperative. The thought of \*\*\* and \*\*\*, treasure them as I do, modifying my messages before the list and the world see them is not appealing. Or am I misunderstanding?

\*\*\*\*

## Post 250

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\* wrote (quoting \*\*\*): >" It seems that we can help people learn a language if we draw their  
>attention to salient features of it."  
>I agree. What harm can come from helping students draw parallels?

I'm a great believer in the value of salient language focus; but what makes it salient??

\*\*\* wrote: >This is the point that I was endorsing - a reactive, vs, proactive approach to the teaching of grammar - that is, teaching TO the learner's (developing) grammar, not teaching the coursebook grammar AT the learner

Just thinking I've often found myself 'distinguishing' between two different ways of being reactive as far as language itself goes. One is to 'objectively' respond to what a learner is clearly not coping well with; another is to respond only to a learner's express curiosities and immediate questions and doubts.

Often, this latter can include learners asking about things they seem to have no difficulty with, or stopping mid flow cos they've got an 'itch' about a seemingly minor language point,

or saying something in a simple way but feeling they 'have to' use a 'particular structure', or being 'like a sponge' for a new phrase or expression because it just fits right in at the time; or earnestly asking about something seemingly off the wall you'd never ever have thought of; or just wanting some sort of corroboration; or being reminded about/asking about something they've read or heard in a song; etc!!; anyway, I no longer say, 'don't worry, carry on; it's not important'; or the famous 'later'; I give an immediate response (which might well have 'not sure though' as a coda!!) and make (mental and now or later scribbled) note of it (which also gives an example in live context should it be needed).

This contrasts with the type of language response which originates from me as teacher, and which may not fit in with a learner's current processing; indeed, if they've never queried it, it's gonna come in like a cold shower on a wintry morning; sometimes it does seem opportune to 'alert' learners to a particular 'blindspot' - as a sort of attempt at priming them to perhaps start to notice too; and if there's a particularly 'dense' spot, I can try to jog it into more conscious focus, but certainly wouldn't want to spend time which could be more profitably spent elsewhere ...

anyway, I've honestly found that the 'objective' type of reaction - teacher, rather than learner, drawing attention to salient language features - seems far less effective.....(which doesn't mean it has no place, or that I don't ever react or teach that way - especially in those cases where it might be embarrassing or dangerous not to intervene!); but it can in effect sometimes be more akin to the 'ram it down their throats' type of thing \*\*\* has talked about; it's more personalised than a course book/standard syllabus, but it's still measuring by some 'out there' language rod, rather than the learner's own readiness .....by learner product rather than learner process?, so it can in effect sometimes be more of an 'at' rather than a 'to' .....?

one of the differences, perhaps, is that the learner's readiness is rarely about just language per se, but very much part of how to create and share and understand meaning; as \*\*\* wrote, ""You need the context, the ambience, the feelings, associations - the communication that makes it real""; but as \*\*\* perhaps implied (or, it was my inference?), the tendency to see education and research in banking terms can become an insidious and underlying, unwitting 'trap'...or a completely open and deliberate one, such as the situation Margot is up against.

I also find it's vital that there's a shared and explicit understanding that language learning is a process of familiarization and experience; 'getting to know', rather than 'get(ting) it right'; this seems to de-stress, create an atmosphere of 'freedom' (that's quoting students btw), and also, incidentally, open things up to great passing thoughts and observations on why certain things are difficult to make friends with whereas others are embraced like bosom pals from the outset; and it revolves on 'learning by meaning' - and in very simplistic terms, it can come down to that old chestnut of whether you're teaching people or you're teaching language .....which reminds me of what \*\*\* wrote:

""For the subjunctive, I asked a friend how I could tell when to use it (the friend wasn't a teacher). The answer was that if I could be hit by a bus before the event happened, then I should talk about it in the subjunctive form. PING. Instant assimilation. Alas, for the pronouns in Catalan, I asked a teacher. I was loaded down with grammar ""explanation"", gapfills, ""look at this"" grammar boxes, sentences conversions..... I still have very little idea and use them according to instinct and quite unsuccessfully.""

\*\*\*

## Post 251

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

I would say, emphatically, 'yes' \*\*\*. If your friend had been on an extended stay, perhaps you could have taken a more 'dogme' approach, but in the context of three days, it seems to me that you did exactly the right thing. I'd hate 'Dogme' ever to become a dogma!

\*\*\*

At 01:12 PM 1/5/04, you wrote:

>My dogme conscience was troubled as I recently showed a close friend  
>around London  
>for three days. I know London pretty well, she doesn't know it at all. I  
>did take into  
>account what I thought she would enjoy, but it was my curriculum, not  
>hers.I was  
>bothered that I should be allowing her to uncover her own London, but with  
>only three  
>days and taking into account London prices I thought it more efficient to  
>make use of  
>my knowledge and experience.  
>  
>Are there occasions when, in the interests of efficiency, a good dogmeist  
>can allow  
>himself/herself to front his/her knowledge and experience?  
>  
>\*\*\*

## Post 252

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Thanks for sharing that, \*\*\*. I would encourage list members to read the article you've posted, which is short and cites the actual study, essentially a comprehensive scientific literature review, upon which the article bases its claim. Next, we would have to read the study although the gist (as interpreted by the author of this summary) is:

""Nearly all of the studies that purport to provide evidence for learning styles fail to satisfy key criteria for scientific validity. Any experiment designed to test the learning-styles hypothesis would need to classify learners into categories and then randomly assign the learners to use one of several different learning methods, and the

participants would need to take the same test at the end of the experiment. If there is truth to the idea that learning styles and teaching styles should mesh, then learners with a given style, say visual-spatial, should learn better with instruction that meshes with that style. The authors found that of the very large number of studies claiming to support the learning-styles hypothesis, very few used this type of research design. Of those that did, some provided evidence flatly contradictory to this meshing hypothesis, and the few findings in line with the meshing idea did not assess popular learning-style schemes.""

Ironically, the same critique could be (and has been?) applied to Dogme.

\*\*\*

## Post 253

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Yes, there are many humanistic resources out there. The web site of Pilgrims, run by Mario Rinvoluceri is a good place to start [www.hlomag.co.uk](http://www.hlomag.co.uk) (I think). Also Mario and others have different kinds of resource books which can be used (on the website there is a humanistic bibliography - needs to be updated now - in one of the early issues. If you can't find it, write me off line and I'll send it on.)

Another suggestion might be to try the cooperative learning structures, which can be used in any curricular context (big book by Spencer Kagan on this) and can fit quite well, I believe, into the humanistic educational paradigm.

Also, not for many actually classroom ideas but just for pleasure and a better understanding of what is involved in a humanistic view of the classroom you might look into anything by Earl Stevick.

One of the real advantages to delving into this reading - both the somewhat theoretical and the very practical - is that after a while you may find you don't need any of it, that you have the resources you need.

Good luck.

\*\*\*

## Post 254

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

You could let your students choose the movie. I've used a variety of films with my students and they've always found it quite a motivating way of learning. Even simple exercises based on noting interesting vocabulary can lead to some great language analysis classes.



I have found that 10-15 minutes is about as much as the students can focus on in one session, so we often watch a whole film over several weeks.

I've also used shorter, TV programmes and news bulletins to good effect. I often take IELTS prep classes to the BBC website and get them to choose a video story that interests them and get them to take notes for presentation and discussion back in the classroom."

## Post 255

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Dear \*\*\*,

Hi, I am \*\*\* from Morocco, an English teacher for young learners. I have been teaching now for nearly 7 months and it is interesting. Happy to hear u r on your way to start this precious sacred not job but mission, infact. Children are the favour of everything, and language teaching is another story. Be sure that they are all the time fascinated by motivating and funny activities that raise their curiosity to go ahead on the language learning path. I can advise you to adopt the communicative way from the very start because it is more promising for their future concerning language learning. Therefore, u can use project work, audio visual aids to make the message conveyed and grasped in a minimum of time, songs and games from an early age is of a paramount help, because they are not ""filling time activities"" as many consider them, instead they are useful and make the learner learn how to work and desolve within a community ( group work), how to use mental abilities to solve and answer questions... Moreover, problem solving activities are one among a huge bunch of activities... To sum it up, young learners are becoming a moving power that shouldn't be let without making it contribute in the success of the language learning process.

Friendly yours,

\*\*\*

\*\*\* wrote:

Hello everyone!

It's \*\*\*, from Chile again!

I am currently working on my final research paper to become an ESL teacher, and I have decided to work with children and Dogme teaching.

I have recieved wonderful inspiration from this dogme group, so I thought you might help me decide what type of activities would be appropriate for young learners(apart from portfolios...)in order to use these activites as part of the field work(proving my theory true) in a Chilean school.

I have about 2 months to prove that using a Dogmatic teaching approach with Chilean kids REALLY helps them developing their speaking skills....something the National Curriculum has not yet accomplished,sadly.

Once again...thanks for the inspiration and any future help!

Cheers

\*\*\*

## Post 256

And you can tell how late it was when I got the post below finished...of course it should read ""Willis and Willis - TBT and Michael Lewis - The Lexical Approach"". Hoping the gods of ELT will forgive me for my sins :)

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*\*" wrote:

>

> Last month the postman delivered my new and shiny copy of teaching unplugged. I did promise \*\*\* via twitter that I would respond with my thoughts but wanted to wait a few weeks until I'd had the opportunity to try it out for a number of lessons.

>

> A little background to put my Dogme interest into context. I am self-employed and work predominantly with students on a one to one basis. I am based in the UK for family/personal reasons (oh how I would love to be teaching in an exotic location but it's not feasible) and as such, I tend to work mainly with ESL students wishing to improve their English for work, advancement and integration in the UK. Sometimes this means Business English with a set agenda and sometimes a General English course with some grammar but no particular topics in mind (luxury maybe but very hard work).

>

> I did my teaching qualification at IH London where rather than the PPP method I had heard so much about prior to the course, we worked with a Task-Based approach (looking at Lewis & Lewis' work) and a mainly lexical focus (Michael Lewis). I must add here that no one method was dismissed. Rather pros and cons of various methods were looked at, a wonderful approach in my opinion as it kept my mind open to possibilities and has a lot to do with how I came to this Dogme group as a relatively new teacher. Course books were used during the course, but only in the planning stage and the students didn't have them. We were only told which language or lexical area we would be focussing on in the teaching practice and worked on making the material in the coursebook our own. I cannot thank IH enough for this as I'm aware that not every course goes this way. As such I like to get away from using coursebooks as much as possible unless a school asks me to specifically do so. I am very aware too that having a three-year old who is putting together brilliant sentences like ""hey Mummy, here me am!"" and ""where is my slippers I can't find them all over the place"" has made me think a little more about the ways in which we might acquire language and ask myself whether the predominant focus on grammar in many coursebooks is the only or the best way to learn. I am sure that it isn't and this is where my quest begins and this is why I'm here.

>

> So, to my short experience with Dogme. I considered that for a first run, I would incorporate some of the activities into lessons with a regular student of mine, Kamila, from Poland. Kamila works in the UK, is married to an English guy and is at upper-intermediate

level. One of her language goals is to become an advanced speaker so many of her lessons have been focused on incorporating more advanced vocabulary, encouraging independent reading, consolidating and revising some grammar points, common to Polish speakers and helping her use some language tools which can facilitate her self-study outside the classroom. Basically anything to shift her from the dreaded intermediate plateau.

>

> Following the previous week's activity concerning 'small talk', we wanted to look a little further at lexis to do with the weather. The first activity I chose was 'Up and Down' (page 40) as it seemed easy to incorporate at the start of a lesson, regardless of any topic. I had then chosen to use my own slightly amended version of the activity on page 58, 'Predicting the original text'. Finally 'Six of one' was not a million miles away from the error correction activities I tend to do towards the end of my lessons anyway so this looked good. We were ready to go!

>

> I must just point out my feelings as I walked up the path a couple of minutes before the lesson. I had that panicky feeling that comes when you think you may have left the house in your slippers, or worse, minus an essential item of clothing. Shoes check. Trousers check. Something didn't feel quite right. I felt sort of naked! Surely a real teacher can barely walk under the weight of course books, laptop, handbag, large bag of pens, handouts, and other paraphernalia 'essential' to the learning cycle. But here was I with nothing more than a notepad, some post it notes and a copy of Teaching Unplugged (in case I forgot totally what I was supposed to be doing) to hide my modesty. I will be honest, I felt a little uneasy at the lack of 'preparation' (I hadn't cut up any bits of paper a la CELTA, I didn't have a rigid lesson plan, and most worrying, I didn't have a set of aims which I was hoping to achieve by the end of the lesson. Surely IH would revoke my certificate if they ever found out). I wondered if I was going to be able to pull this off.

>

> However, we drew our graphs and we discussed how we had had a crappy day here, a great day there and why. This was a just a normal 'office water-cooler moment' happening in offices all over the world on a Monday morning. For Kamila, that is why it was relevant. We were connecting on a personal level (which although we had done before, it was nearly always in passing and not to do with the 'content' of the lesson per se' and at the same time, Kamila was searching for her language in a (very successful) attempt to convey her emotions that past week. I scribbled like a demon, yet ever eager to convey my genuine interest in what she had to say. I chose this particular exercise because the content of the conversation is tangible and likely to throw up all sorts of language necessary on a day-to-day basis. Perhaps predictable of the intermediate plateau was her ability to talk in relatively simple terms about her mood. ""My week was ok. Although work was hard. I am never feeling good on Tuesday but Friday I'm always happy because I'm ready for the weekend"". To me, this was worth its weight in gold! Just this short conversation indicated a whole area of language I was aware of before that we had to concentrate on, but now, through this simple activity, it had been given a context, and a context which we could revisit each week at the start of the lesson. I had taken with me also, my Collins Cobuild Learner's Dictionary (I am in agreement \*\*\* and \*\*\*, that this is the one item as teachers that we shouldn't be without).

>

> Following our discussion about our week, I asked Kamila to create a vocabulary scale based on emotion using some of the words she had heard me use and that had come up during discussion. I'm a huge fan of lexical scales and for her, they work particularly well. She can add to them as she finds new word and she's not left flicking through pages and pages of notes to find the words we looked at last week. So her scale incorporated some brilliant words, words that not only better described her mood over the week but also ones that

better befit an advanced student of English. Secondly, with regards to focus on form, we needed to work again on progressive forms and this is was an ideal time to check and look at `tend to' i.e. ""I tend to feel quite negative on Tuesdays"" rather than ""I am feeling..."" and ""I tend to feel great on Fridays because it's nearly the weekend!"". This I did in another lesson and used concordance data to look at the use of the phrase. `Look left, look right' and she worked it out herself. She is becoming more of an independent learner which is wonderful to see and now I need just say to her, ""what do you notice"" and away she goes.

>

> The text we looked at in the first lesson to do with `weather' was one taken from The Guardian about Britain's Indian Summer (looking out the window it seems a long time ago now). The link to the article can be found here:

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2009/oct/26/indian-summer-forecast>.

> I entered the text into Wordle ([www.wordle.com](http://www.wordle.com)) so we had a word cloud with the main words from the article. Kamila tried to guess the content of the article (which incidentally she didn't guess correctly) and we were able to consolidate a number of expressions such as ""it could be about"", ""it might be to do with"" etc. I then used one of my favourite Michael Lewis activities. Highlight all the nouns in the text and then see what collocations you can find by underlining their verbs. Finally we looks at another vocabulary scale to do with weather/temperature. I rounded the lesson off with ""Six of one"". I really like your tweak on this \*\*\* and \*\*\*. I have always focused on the errors but having some good examples of language production and some errors was brilliant (although I used four of each in this one to one situation).

>

> The lesson was only an hour and I'm aware I would like more time to look at language practice in the Dogme setting. I have been further experimenting with the activities as I go and tweaking them to suit my small classes. I find they work very nicely with lexical approach tasks and this has definitely produced some positive and fast results in my students.

>

> In my short experience I wonder whether the `post-lesson plan' could be one of the most important aspects of the Dogme-focussed lessons. It seems to me to perform two functions. Firstly for me as the coordinator of the lesson, I have an overview of where we need to focus our time and efforts. Is the student encountering the same errors again and again? Are there consistent themes which she likes to discuss? Perhaps we don't need Dogme to make us aware of these points, but the intense focus on the student throughout the lesson during Dogme causes the teacher to perhaps be more acutely aware of the student's production, habits and realistic needs that can be addressed in subsequent lessons. The second function I have identified concerns the student. When a student is used to language learning which follows a coursebook structure or perhaps a rigid grammar based syllabus, it is easy for them to see what has been covered at the end of the lesson. I won't have been the only one to hear in the staffroom ""today we did a present vs. present continuous lesson"". The student leaves the lesson happy that they have another piece of grammar under their belt and the teacher perhaps satisfied that they have imparted some important grammar knowledge on to a appreciative student everyone is happy, aren't they? However I wonder if the danger of Dogme activities might be a far less identifiable focus. A couple of minutes at the start of the lesson going over the post-lesson plan from last week, certainly shows the student that their lessons do have structure and they are being looked after and taken seriously.

>

> So am I a convert? YES absolutely. Contrary to some opinion, I do believe that Dogme and technology can work brilliantly well together when the situation requires it, but it is not

essential. What has won me over is the Dogme approach's consistent and genuine focus on the student and their needs. That is the key uncomfortable factor for me with the grammar syllabus regardless of your needs, we shall shoe-horn you into this lesson, and you will enjoy it! As a teacher, if I continue to keep my student's at the centre of every lesson and nurture the Unplugged approach of mutual dialogue, I cannot go far wrong, can I? Maybe like the road on the front cover, there is no definitive path and not right or wrong way to go. We can only move forward and see where the road takes us. It's not life or death and nobody has (as yet) found me out for not having a rigid lesson plan and a immovable set of aims.

>

> I would be very interested in hearing about how you (very much more experienced teachers) would recommend incorporating Dogme when there is indeed a particular topic that the student would like covered. For example, I have lessons with a brand manager for a large pharmaceutical company who would like me to do a lesson on fabrics and textures to help her with an up-coming marketing campaign. Here the outcome is quite focussed (she needs introduction to and revision of lexis to do with materials and textures) and I wonder how I can best use what might on the surface appear to be a quite non-directional technique. Anyway, I hope very much to be able to share some more (somewhat shorter) experiences with you in the near future and look forward more than anything to learning from many of you Dogme gurus \*I am not worthy\* :)

## Post 257

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\*,

I often ask students to write questions, as you have done, then, to their surprise and/or chagrin, have them answer the questions themselves. This usually produces interesting results, as they've intended the questions to reveal something about their classmates or put them on the spot. Your questions seem somewhat rhetorical. What would your answers be, I wonder.

Putting you on the spot? Hope not. And I understand you might not have time to answer.

\*\*\*

On Oct 29, 2010, at 2:14 AM, \*\*\* wrote:

> \*\*\* and others on this thread,

>

> I have read this thread too quickly to be sure that I am not about to

> state the obvious or miss the point, but there are some really

> fundamental issues here, aren't there - like:

>

> 1. To what extent do you agree with the theoretical, conceptual

> statements, assumptions of any course you teach or facilitate? Were

> you involved in its formulation? Were the students?

>

- > 2. To what extent do you personally believe in academic research in
  - > your own field?
  - >
- > 3. How free, unfree are you in the system in which you work and your
  - > students learn to work from their genuine needs, aspirations,
  - > interests as opposed to do your best by them in their attempts to
  - > accept the rules, play the games and do what their future assessors
  - > require of them?
  - >
- > 4. Notwithstanding a liberal does of political correctness - latest
  - > update automatically downloaded - do you also believe that a trained,
  - > professional, responsible facilitator/lecturer/teacher/trainer is
  - > morally bound to present his/her informed, considered convictions
  - > based on experience and study on matters like: most effective ways
  - > know to acquire new vocabulary, do research, read books etc.etc.
  - >
- > 5. How would you apportion lack of motivation amongst your amongst
  - > the following categories:
  - >
  - >> Deficient student learning/studying techniques?
  - >> Students clearly studying wrong subject for wrong reasons?
  - >> Your own lack of enthusiasm for the subject being thought?
  - >> A whole contributing raft of reasons, social, economic, political
  - > that neither you nor your studentss can directly influence or
  - > rapidly change?
  - >> The (generational?) clash between the legitimacy of a course of
  - > study you see in academic and educational terms and the students
  - > view of it as: ""Great because it does not start until 11 in the
  - > morning, ""Dead boring but it is worth 8 points, just what I need"",
  - > ""Takes place on Thursday, which is great because it means I can go
  - > away for the weekend.""
  - >
  - > \*\*\*
  - >
  - >

Post 258

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Dear \*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\*,

- and anybody else who's anguished or enthused about collocations and creativity and the constraints on both, if there are any, in the context of EFL/ELF.

- I agree with whoever said there is a crucial difference between EFL and ESL and no more so than in the case of collocation and more broadly formulaic language, of which

collocation is the most pervasive and, perhaps, least problematic part. The most problematic is undoubtedly the opaque idiom - and that happens to be the kind with which NSs are most creative and playful. This is, at bottom, the apple of contention or the bone of discord in this debate, because the evidence seems to suggest that though collocation is difficult (and why is an interesting question in terms of acquisition) many kinds of collocation are acquirable and are deployed appropriately, though they are still the Achilles' heel of even proficient learners.

- Then there are so many collocations which mysteriously seem resistant to acquisition and even when 'acquired' sound odd and attract attention to themselves rather than fading into the rich dialogic background. And as for the 'colourful' idiom variety - kicking buckets and spilling cats and dogs - they seem to be irredeemably unacquirable and pragmatically shot through with risk of failure or hilarity.

- The question is not really whether a large chunk of English is chunky - I'm convinced it is, as all contributors to this thread so far seem to be - for its NSs - though cognitive psychologists working in the Chomskyan tradition, such as Pinker, think the chunky component of language tells us little about language worth knowing - we may disagree with that, but it is a view we can respect and try and reconcile with more holistic, performance-based views of language acquisition.

- I think the question is what holistic chunkiness means for teaching EFL/ELF. I can understand why \*\*\* wonders about the limits of correctness and appropriateness in the case of collocation, though he excludes 'creativity' from the process of offering constraining guidelines in the classroom; \*\*\*, on the other hand, goes further and questions whether it is realistic (and fair?) on the students to allow them the illusion that unusual collocations (we can either call them un-native-like, but who cares whether they are or not or - better-pragmatically unsuccessful - there's the rub ) resulting from lack of competence, are actually attempts at creativity. Of course, it is different when the student or NNS interlocutor is deliberately playing with the language in a creative way: this is something a teacher and any normal human being should welcome and revel in, in, as somebody else said, a liberating carnivalesque way. (But see my 'bump into' survey for a more complex picture of attitudes towards NS / NNS linguistic creativity).

- In both cases, however, we have to confront, as professional teachers, offering a kind of service or training people to use a tool, the world outside the classroom walls and beyond the 'here and now'. What happens in the 'there and then' of people using English for social or business purposes, as a lingua franca, with or without the involvement of NSs? Will we have enabled our students to use this tool effectively if they talk about 'bumping into wet bread', let's say, to their Chinese or Australian interlocutor?

- Of course, it is politically most incorrect to impose limits on creativity, just as it is going against the grain to doubt that 'real' 'authentic' language is always a good thing. Who in their right mind would teach students 'unreal' language or prefer 'inauthentic' structures to slices of life, which is what formulaic language in natural discourse is. But dogme is all about questioning and inquiry, so we'll venture on to the obscure underground where mainstream approaches (including the nearly-can-do-no-wrong lexical approach) fear to tread

- The question is how far do you go? We can take a post-modern, free-for-all, let-it-all-hang-out-and-just-cool-it approach to teaching, which I think is easier for some teachers to



do than others - and at this point I would add non-native v native speaker to my EFL/ESL dichotomy (has anyone noticed the % participation of NS / NNS in dogme discussions and wondered why this should be so? Has anybody noticed just how collocational and idiomatically creative the debate sometimes gets? It's a delight to read, but what are the implications for the socio-cultural speech community which largely makes up dogme?). We can also try and understand the puzzle of idiomaticity: why it works differently for NSs than for NNS and arrive at informed decisions about how this fascinating aspect of language fits into a socio-culturally, sensitive dogmetic approach to foreign language education (or teaching people to use a tool) in a limited space and time.

- Perhaps the 'socio-cultural' context is the key concept here, and its place in First Language Acquisition and SLA. If collocation/idiomaticity is par excellence contextually-embedded and if routinized language is tied to pragmatic use, then it is, as \*\*\* argued, rooted in history and reinforced by repeated encounters in particular situations from childhood onwards, during which formulae are acquired as unanalyzed wholes. These formulae belong to the realm of linguistic probability rather than grammatical certainty (in the Chomskyan model). They are also, paradoxically, both fixed and flexible - they are open to variation both regular and creative (in the non-Chomskyan sense). NSs seem to have an unflinching and effortless intuition for understanding and producing canonical and non-canonical forms of formulaic sequences. Where do they get this conflicting competence from, which many argue is the key to native-like fluency? Well, they seem to get it from exposure to holistic chunks from an early age in socio-cultural pragmatic contexts. They pick it up in an endless chain of here and now encounters, by getting things done through language, by infusing phrases with feeling, all of which cumulatively, add up to intuition. And all members of their speech community seem to share this intuition. And it is inseparable from their sense of self. And when they play with these expressions and co-construct new variations on them, they affirm, modify and reinvent their sense of self or how they present it to the outside world. All this is done by drawing on the linguistic and socio-cultural resource that they share with their interlocutor.

- This is worlds and aeons away from the EFL classroom and, later, from ELF, with its rather superficial and occasional encounters or transactions between people who share much less background than members of a first language speech community. Most people learn a foreign language after childhood and they learn it analytically and in limited time and space. This is indeed an argument for more dogme not less. But is it a question of quantity or are we talking about two different kinds of linguistic codes? As \*\*\* once said in another context and with a wholly different pragmatic intent, ELF is like being on a long haul flight with someone you hardly know and don't really want to spend twelve hours talking to. But collocation and idioms are so tied to things we are close to and feel strongly about and which also make up who we are.

- Take my family - Greek speakers - they have a whale of a time listening to me use or abuse Greek idioms and collocations, both deliberately and accidentally - and their laughing at me and with me is neither here nor there. Indeed, the clash and mingling of languages and styles is great fun, sometimes. But outside the safety of those living room walls and the cosy here-and-now of family solidarity I don't play around with Greek idioms. They are as much a minefield as English idioms.

- In my Spanish classes, I've asked the teacher to skip the bits which teach us to use all those incredibly difficult idioms with parts of the body or whatever because I just feel it's a waste of time. Even though I am in theory no longer an elementary learner of Spanish, like



\*\*\* with Polish, I still 'just want to know how to say stuff the correct way'. Even when I use a slightly off collocation (wittily or unwittily or even unwittingly) my very undogmatic Spanish teacher jumps in to correct me (great shades of \*\*\*'s Catalan classes). As for my post-proficiency level Greek and with a cultural background like mine, idioms - and to a lesser extent non-opaque collocations - are still the chink in my Achilles heel.

- I think we do have to take the world outside the classroom into account and 'out there' in the 'there and then' there are not only \*\*\*s and \*\*\*s, \*\*\*s and DKs - all good liberal (in the best sense) dogmatists - but 'dogmatists' like some of the 400 respondents to my collocational creativity questionnaire, who not only rejected NNs creativity with collocation but were also quite explicit about discriminating between the legitimate power of the NS to bend and break the rules and the NO-go for the NNS.

- But to end on a more optimistic note, for I have I am sure overstayed my welcome, many of my respondents had a healthily dialogic, carnivalesque attitude to bumping into creative collocation and this may suggest that ELF can be as diverse, hedonistic and hybrid as ENL or indeed all native languages are.

- In conclusion, as students but NSs would probably not say, it is amazing how many experts in linguistics ignore the 'F' in EFL/ELF or think it's an 'N'" or an 'S'.

- That's all for now, but thanks to all for a very stimulating debate - dogme does it once again

----- Original Message -----

From: \*\*\*

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Subject: Re: [dogme] Re: collocations and such

... One of the great

>joys of conversation is taking the fixed and semi-fixed expressions  
>and unfixing and mixing them, cutting and pasting registers and  
>styles within single utterances, speaking in inverted commas for the  
>sake of parodic/ironic distance, and all the rest of the  
>carnavalesque procedures...

...

ns grant themselves the right to play with language, but tend to  
>police nns who try to do the same. This is a power thing, I feel: it  
>goes with the norms of the ruling dialect; you're marked out as  
>different (inferior) if you don't speak proper; and the further you  
>get from that golden norm of standard middle-class middle-english  
>(suitably estuarised for demotic effect) the more marginal you are.  
>In a word, ns \*discriminate\* against nns, and language is the vehicle  
>they use ....

Maybe there is truth here, on a larger societal scale. But in the classroom, I don't think it is a power issue at all. Yes, NS play with the

language. But you break rules intentionally, part of the fun is the shared joke at the breaking of the rules. For NNS, at least the kind I usually teach, they don't know the rules, so there is no shared joke: when they ask the waiter for wet toast the joke is on them.

I think most teachers with a bit of sensitivity can tell when to say ""well, that isn't really how we say it"" and when to realize a bit of intentional creative play is underway.

After seven years of learning / speaking Polish, I was quite proud when I could make a witty twist on an idiom, or disrupt a standard collocation - and my level of fluency made it clear that I was making a joke, not a mistake. When I was an elementary level speaker I just wanted to know how to say stuff the correct way - I was tired of speaking ""wrong"", with people needing to strain to understand me.

I am trying to imagine this from a student's point of view:

S: I like wet toast. (thinks: hmm, is the direct translation from L1 correct?)

T: Wow, cool, so do I. Who usually makes it, you or your wife? (thinks: how liberating for us to be creating this new, real language together)

S: She usually does the dinner, she is very sympathetic.

T: Great! (thinks: that's a really interesting, creative way \*\*\* has with words! But no need to comment on that, stay with the real communication here and now) ...I cook for myself, mostly. How about you, \*\*\*?

(sorry, I am taking the piss, I know)

## Post 259

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Hi \*\*\*

An exemplary reply - it served to clarify and to get me thinking just that little bit deeper! The comment about Pythagoras was one based on my own experience. God alone knows when I learnt about Pythagoras. I'm fairly sure that it was back when short trousers were the order of the day. And years later I know that we can use his theorem to calculate the length of the hypotenuse. Thanks to Pythagoras (or Pitagoras), I will for ever be imbued with the knowledge that  $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$ . Should I ever find myself in a situation when I need to know the length of the longest side of a right-angled triangle and I only have time to measure the two shorter sides, I will be able to call upon this knowledge. That day, I regret, has yet to come.

What I draw from the miniscule amount that I know of Mitra's work is that if people are left to their own devices and have an interest in finding something out, the natural skills that

they possess will be improved from working with other like-minded souls. That is, they don't necessarily need the training to be supplied - they are quite capable of training themselves and each other. It is this skill that I am referring to: the skill to educate oneself independently. This is not to say that I see no role for the teacher - the teacher can help oversee the process, but in a minimally invasive role. This is not how I view the educational system in its current format. However, this role that I see teachers as having is probably the same as your "focus on training learners to ask themselves questions which they want to find answers to."

I think I probably chose my words badly by saying that the comparison with Wolf's ideas was "unfair." This comes across as judgemental, and that is not my intention. Perhaps I meant something like "skewed" - although that doesn't quite sound right either! Maybe "tangential" would have been closer. What I was trying to say was that I couldn't see the direct relevance of Wolf's work in weakening Mitra's premise. I agree with the view that we need to go beyond the writer's words, but I think we do that whenever we take up the theory and try to put it into practice in the classroom. And I think that when we do this, we embark upon a voyage in which it CANNOT be the teacher who is solely responsible for asking the questions. Again, Mitra indicated this when he referred to the learners going beyond the original question. And I think that this is fairly commonplace (and facilitated by the hyperlinked nature of the internet -or the WWW as some would prefer me to say ;-)). The teacher is not really "teaching" the skill, just facilitating its self-development. And, in so doing, giving it value - showing the children, if you like, that learning is a self-directed activity, not an other-directed activity, and -more importantly- that it is worthwhile. Sure, we need to consider attrition - but I would dispute that it is a feature of \*self-organised\* learning: it is a feature of ANY type of learning. It seems to me that the attrition is slowed down when it is self-taught/learned. Attrition is more likely to take place earlier if the subject matter is imposed.

You write that you feel that Mitra's work is not showing children/people how to find out information for yourself. I agree, but I don't think that this is what this kind of education is about. If we show how to find out information for oneself, we risk setting down an alien process for learners to try and assimilate. Mitra's work seems to be about letting the learners discover THEIR way of finding out information by themselves. This is done in a social context. It is this feature that I find exciting.

I am less cautious about Mitra's showmanship, seeing it as no more than evidence that he is able to modify the message to reach the audience. I haven't read any of his published academic work, but I would be surprised if he had reached the lofty heights of academia (albeit Geordie academia) without paying due regard to the rules and regulations. I am impressed with your commitment to advance ideas as well as admire them. This gave me plenty of food for thought. I tend to admire and then try to assimilate. The advancement of the ideas had never really occurred to me. Then I thought that the assimilation of the ideas is in itself an advancement. For example, I can't say that I feel that I have advanced Vygotsky's theory of mind in any way, but I have deepened my own understanding of it. But I don't think that this is as noble an intent as yours. For now, and at almost 40, I suspect for the foreseeable future, I think I will have to content myself with standing on the shoulders of giants!

Which brings me onto \*\*\*'s question: why does the presence of the teacher or the educational environment make a difference? Does it indeed make a difference or did Lantolf, Vygotsky et al merely find what they were looking for? I'm afraid I don't know

enough about their methodology to comment - was there a control group? But if we assume that the methodology was (as) flawless (as possible), might it not be the very simple act of setting time aside for the express purpose of learning?

\*\*\* mentions John Holt - and there's something in this. Mitra's work, as I have said earlier, does not seem to be particularly original; after all, I think that Vygotsky was saying pretty much the same thing (plus teachers, admittedly) some 90 years earlier. But Mitra's approach - coming at the phenomenon from a more empirical pathway- IS more original. Holt never seemed to go beyond opinionating (much like myself). When my son, Eamonn, was around 4, I remember thinking back to reading a paragraph in Holt's books where he was mildly critical of a mother admonishing her son for running off in an airport. Holt was sure that if the son had been left to his own devices, he would have turned around before he found himself in real danger...as if the boy was in a vacuum and in control of all other variables.

Incidentally, I decided to show the Mitra video to my EAP students in their speaking and listening class. I began the lesson by sending them off for 45 minutes to find out as much about Mitra as they could. Despite one of them actually telephoning Mitra's secretary and grilling him/her, some of the stuff that they came back with was pretty poor: he likes pop music; he has a friend called Eli. They also seemed to have missed entirely what I considered to be the central points about the HITW experiment. I haven't got the time (you'll be glad to hear) to offer my thoughts on why they went for such bland information, but in brief I wondered whether or not it was because they were not yet part of a real academic discourse community and felt no real need to suspend their disbelief and imagine. You might think that I should have scaffolded their independent learning in some way - and you may well be right. This may be my eventual conclusion too. But for now, I am going to content myself by asking them to grade the information that they returned with and ask them to reflect on why they bothered to note this down. Perhaps this is scaffolding - in fact, I know it is! But it aims to provoke them to self-regulate for future tasks. That is, it is not scaffolding that aims to provide them with the tools that they need to research more efficiently, but scaffolding that aims to help them develop their own mechanisms to achieve this goal.

\*\*\* Thwaite -when are you going to join the blogging community again? Your style or writing and your choice of topics are too good to be kept for others! You're missed!"

## Post 260

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

Dear all,

Just a few points from my corner:

1. Yes, I read every single post, some by way of skimming (as an English student in the 80's I was lucky enough to be taught the subskills of skimming and scanning ;-)
2. Yes, I would welcome the chance to redefine (?) some of the vows. I don't necessarily mean watering them down (although some of the wording would scare the vast majority of the TEFL profession to death), just taking

away some of the more provocative notes. Cough mixture tastes better when flavoured.

3. I don't mind sharing some personal data. My name's \*\*\*, I am 34 and work as DoS at SALT, a course book captive private language school in Terrassa (Barcelona). \*\*\* was one of my DELTA tutors back in '97. I have a pregnant wife, two dogs and precious little free time.

All the best,

\*\*\*

## Post 261

*Coded as own out of school experience.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

A long time ago we were talking about the order of language acquisition and \*\*\* asked me:

> PS \*\*\*, does your dog have an acquisition order?

The answer is clearly yes!

Over the past ix months I've tried to note how much the dog 'Molly' understands and I have to say that a) it's increased, b) there appears to be an order of acquisition.

I wonder what it all means?

I'll have to try idiomatic expressions (obviously including the words cat &/or dog)

\*\*\*

## Post 262

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*,

Of course you are right. Shared interest is key. What I reacted to in the quotation was the emphasis on mere information - closing the information gap. Dealing with curiosity could be a different matter.

\*\*\*

## Post 263

Dear \*\*\*,

I think you must have missed the fact that I mentioned that I know \*\*\*, the Polish lecturer who sent the original request.

\*\*\*

## Post 264

Coded as classroom adjacent.

Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.

\*\*\*,

I'm thinking hard about your question. I am an IELTS oral examiner, amongst other roles I play - the person sitting on the other side of the table.

1. I know nothing about teaching for IELTS, but I do know the format of the exam.
2. I'd say a dogme-like approach, i.e. working from and on from where the learner is must, ultimately, be the most productive kind of preparation for this examination. (It is amazing what acceptance it has earned amongst official bodies in many countries.)
3. For the listening part of the examination just give her practice listening to tapes of innane conversatio9ns - like booking a holiday, finding a holiday job and giving details by 'phone.
4. I must pass on the reading section, because I've never seen a paper.
5. As far as the oral part is concerned she needs to be able to chat about a range of day-to-day topics, not very intellectually demanding. She must be as clear and accurate and fluent as possible.

Hope tthere is something of minimum help in my points above.

\*\*\*

## Post 265

Coded as Dogme ideology.

Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.

My goal is ""dogme moments"", as many as possible. It is not some slavish adherence to the dogme philosophy being the only way to teach.

\*\*\*

## Post 266

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Following the URL to the BBC site that \*\*\* provided, I must say I found it a hard report to follow. As \*\*\*. pointed out - it appears to contradict itself in more than one place.

The BBC report is an interesting exercise in summary. I've not trusted myself to add my own words. This is just a copy, cut and paste job.

-----

1. Students who use computers a lot at school have WORSE maths and reading performance, research suggests.

1.1 Those using computers several times a week performed ""sizeably and statistically significantly WORSE"" than those who used them less often.

2. .... study ... done by Thomas Fuchs and Ludger Woessmann of the CESifo economic research organisation in Munich.

2.1 Fuchs and Woessmann found that the MORE computers there were in students' homes, the BETTER their test performance.

2.2 But more computers went with more affluent, better-educated families. So they took this into account in the statistical analysis.

2.3 'The result: the MORE computers in a student's home, the WORSE the student's maths performance.

3. Schools with BETTER computer availability also feature other POSITIVE school characteristics

3.1 In schools, they found students performed WORSE in those which reported a significant LACK of computers.

3.2 But again, once they took into account the schools' general resources the same pattern emerged.

3.3 ""That is, the initial positive pattern on computer availability at school simply reflects that schools with better computer availability also feature other positive school characteristics.""

3.4 Once these were taken into account, COMPUTER AVAILABILITY NOT RELATED TO student PERFORMANCE.

4. They then considered computer use, particularly internet access, e-mail and educational software.

4.1 At home, GREATER USE went with BETTER test performance. And those who used these the LEAST did significantly WORSE.

4.2 But in schools the effect was different.

4.3 Students who HARDLY EVER used computers did A LITTLE WORSE than those who used them between a few times a year and several times a month.

4.4 But those who used computers at school SEVERAL TIMES A WEEK performed ""sizeably and statistically significantly WORSE"" in both maths and reading.

5. The researchers say their analysis just describes what the statistics show without explaining the findings. But they suggest two theories.

5.1 One is ""ability bias"" - it might be that teachers do not want low-ability students to use computers.

5.2 But this is less likely to account for the impact of high usage - which might instead be ""a true negative effect of excessive computer use"".

5.3 And it might be that some computerised learning is beneficial but at higher intensities it crowds out more effective teaching methods and hinders students' creativity.

-----

Computers and Student Learning: bivariate and multivariate evidence on the availability and use of computers at home and at school, by Thomas Fuchs and Ludger Woessmann, CESifo working paper no. 1321.

-----

BBC report at: (to repeat the information \*\*\* gave)

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/education/4032737.stm>

-----

Imagine you are a DOS, or school owner or a teacher about to run a parents' evening.

Based on your understanding of the report above and concerned about literacy and numeracy would you recommend:

More/less use of computers a) a school b) at home?

\*\*\*

Post 267

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*



*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*, I'm interested by 'What I try to do is to make them aware of other ways of thinking and accept that these other ways also have a degree of legitimacy.'

While it is possible to make people aware of other ways of thinking (and this can happen by default and sometimes unexpectedly through the use of coursebooks etc), there is surely a huge leap between this and [making them?] accept that these other ways also have even a degree of legitimacy.

A willingness or ability to accept the legitimacy of other ways of thinking is often culturally - or temperamentally - specific. And I think part of the job is also being sensitive to this, however alien it can feel.

\*\*\*

## Post 268

*Coded as teaching text.*

Here is a recent talk by the inimical Stephen Krashen. I'll declare a private prejudice: I am charmed and totally convinced by his arguments and what he has to say.[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a3pipsG\\_dQk&feature=youtu.be](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a3pipsG_dQk&feature=youtu.be)--\*

\*\*\*

## Post 269

*Coded as own out of school experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

I think it also depends on where you want to live and what you want out of life, and how demanding and materialistic you and your family are. My wife and son have full bellies and although we are not rich, we aren't wanting. Here in Kyrgyzstan we are able to live quite comfortably on \$300 per month.

If you can delay marriage until you are ready for a tt or dos position, it might be a little less tight.

If you want to live in US/Canada/UK/etc then ESL tends to be a somewhat ghettoized and poorly paid job, in this situation I'd agree with Mr \*\*\*.

In the rest of the world it is also poorly paid, but cost of living, free apartment, other perks can make it more possible to do. Also depends what wife will be up to - if she is willing /

able to fill a domestic support role, at home and cooking - then savings on food you'd be eating in restaurants and all that beer you would otherwise be drinking in the pubs will be a big plus.

Depending on who you meet and how pleasant you are in a one - to -one setting, you can usually get a pretty good (in local terms) price for private lessons to top up school work/contract.

Sorry for lack of cohesion in paragraph structure.

Grumpy \*\*\*

----- Original Message -----

From: \*\*\*

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2002 3:17 PM

Subject: Re: [dogme] Supporting a family through TEFL

Forget it!

TEFL is definitely a one-man/woman business. Once you get hitched and kids come along, you need to start looking for a real or proper job - unless you want to raise a family in poverty!

## Post 270

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Hi \*\*\*

While I am of the opinion that there is no such thing as the ""typical"" dogme lesson (each dogme class depending on the teacher and the students), I might be able to help you. I did a workshop for my colleagues as part of our in-house teacher development sessions about a year ago. I based it around ideas put on the list by \*\*\* (I think) and it worked quite well. On this computer I have only got my notes and the OHT with the aims and objectives (yes, I know...how dogmetic!!!) which I'll send to you off-list. If I can find the handouts (ahem) and the activities on the computer at work I'll also send them to you, but we are currently in the process of moving workplace so I can't promise anything yet.

Let us know how it went.

\*\*\* ----- Original Message -----

From: \*\*\*

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Subject: [dogme] Hi, can you help me??

Hello,

My name is \*\*\* and i am student at the university of muenster.  
I am supposed to give a speech about the ""Dogme-Approach"" to esl.  
What i would like to know is how such a lesson looks like.  
What i want to do is simulate a typical dogme lesson and therefor i  
need to know how exactly such a lesson looks like.  
Can you help me??

Sencereley  
\*\*\*

## Post 271

*Coded as teaching text.*

Just because I'm reading this book now, \*\*\*:

from Holt, J (1989) Learning All The Time, Perseus Books: Cambridge, Massachusetts

The best way to spell better is to read a lot and write a lot. This will fill your eye with the \*look\* of words and your fingers with the \*feel\* of them. Good spellers do not look many words up in dictionaries, or memorize spelling rules. When they are not sure how to spell a word, they spell it several ways and pick the one that looks best...People who spell badly - I have taught many of them - are not much helped by rules and drills. In all my work as a teacher, nothing I ever did to help bad spellers was as effective as not doing \*anything\*, except telling them to stop worrying about it, and to get on with their reading and writing.

pp.35 - 36

----- Original Message -----

From: \*\*\*

To: Dogme

Subject: [dogme] Spelling and sound

I'm looking for a link to the most common ways to spell sounds of English and the frequency of each spelling if possible, e.g. /ei/ 'ay' as in pay day (5.8%).

Thanks,  
\*\*\*

## Post 272

*Coded as own out of school experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

\*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\* and everyone who is following this thread,

The reasons why I (or anyone) belongs to a list, writes to it - and when and

how - are, indeed, complex and I am sure metaterminology exists to make the complication apparent, but I do not know it and probably would not be able to use it if I did - or be much interested in doing so.

Downstairs are 10 colleagues of my wife's, all women, a Woman's Reading Group, who only read books written by women. I totally disagree with their ideology and find it daft I know them all personally and quite like them - but I still find them wrong. Nevertheless, I had nothing against cooking a curry for them. I ate and then retreated upstairs to my study.

Now here is an example which I see as impinging on our present discussion about power, somehow.

When I am having 10 people to eat I go for a buffet, so that people take the food from a central table and then split off in twos and threes and sit elsewhere. I find that more communicative. These female Germans, though - and I knew they would - insisted in all crushing round one table, although it is not big enough - thereby blocking access to some of the sidedishes. And, of course, 10 people cannot talk to each other across a table, so the decibels mounted.

Now if our dining room had been a classroom and I had been the teacher in power I would have ordered them to sit in small groups and I would have moved around between them. (As it was, I sat off-centre and spoke to just two ladies, the ones sitting at the end of the table.)

What is a teacher? Yeah, yeah - a facilitator and all that stuff - but also someone in the privileged position of knowing the target language better than the learners, and, unless it is a really crap school, someone with experience of teaching.

I do not believe in repression, illiberalism or torture, but I do believe a teacher must have the power to do what (s)he believes in. (Buffet-style - no conglomeration around one table).

Can someone remind me what the subject of this thread is? I am sure I have wandered.

\*\*\*

## Post 273

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Hi \*\*\*,

Did your wife gravitate naturally towards her methodology (I use this term as I cannot think of a better one) or did you coach her in any way.

Obviously what she did was successful as she has a happy student, willing to take more lessons.

This interests me as I wonder how much innate ability there is in the human conscience to pass on knowledge. Are good teachers born with an ability which will always give them an edge over those who attend courses on how to teach. Can an innate ability be enhanced by attending such courses. Or do these courses blind teachers to thinking on their feet, adapting to the situation as they find it.

Cheers,

\*\*\*

From: dogme@yahoogroups.com [mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of \*\*\*

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Subject: Re: [dogme] Spanish as a second language

Yes, \*\*\*. My wife has done this, but in a 1-1 class with a 13 year old girl. \*\*\*, my wife, doesn't have any teaching qualification and no training, but we live in the UK and she was asked if she'd be interested in teaching a young girl. They met once a week for one hour in our home. They worked on writing a poem; playing games with word cards that they made up using the words in the poem; they made tortilla together and then wrote out the recipe; they watched the title sequence of Los Serrano and worked together on the song. The young girl obviously enjoyed it because she kept coming back for more! They stopped towards the end of my wife's pregnancy - last May, but the little girl's father has just asked Rosa if she would like to start again.

\*\*\*

\*\*\* escribi:

> Hello everybody!

>

> Just a quick message to ask you if any of you has applied dogma

> principles to the teaching of Spanish as a second language? Do you

> know anyone who has done it?

> Thanks a lot!!

> Best wishes from Madrid,

>

> \*\*\*

Post 274

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Hi \*\*\*,

I'm not sure I like the tone of your reply \*\*\*.

Confrontational

and just a little defensive -rather like those Southern Christian virgins!

I don't assume that everyone does dogme the same way. I made clear reference to a distinction between weak and strong dogme, and I put down what he did so that you can have an idea about what I'm talking about, with the understanding that everyone does it differently.

Thanks for the tip about looking back through the archives. Obviously, not being a zealot, I hadn't. I'm glad others have had the same thoughts about the need for good study skills as I.

Your last point is the one that warrants a reply. Weaker students nearly always do want to speak and they often feel resentful of the teacher-hogger mentioned in my first posting. One of the responsibilities of the teacher is to ensure, as much as possible, equal opportunity to practise. Now, merely saying that everyone can speak if they want to doesn't do this, especially when you take on board affective factors like being shy and their preferences for, say, pair or group work, mingling activities, or one-on-one time with the teacher away from the class. So varying the interaction patterns is very important. I'm sure it can and has been incorporated into Dogme-style teaching without losing the essence of being unplugged, though materials may make it easier to ensure a balance in the long run. Finally, and I know this will wind you Dogmedytes up no end, but yes, if it comes to it, the teacher can and should be prepared to tell a chatterbox to pipe down a little and let others have a chance. Of course, other, less abrasive classroom management tricks will usually suffice, such as selective hearing, positive reinforcement for weaker students etc. You will always get some students talking more than others; you cannot change people's personalities. What you can do is create the environment where everyone (not just the confident ones) feels comfortable talking, and hopefully, therefore, one student won't dominate.

--- In dogme@yahogroups.com, ""\*\*\*"" wrote:

> Hi dogmeskeptic

>

> Just a number of questions/points.

>

> Why do assume that everyone who says they teach in a 'Dogme style' teaches > in the same way the person you watched taught?

> Secondly, if you look back through the archives you will find

plenty of > examples of how well organised review notes can be and plenty of techniques > used to help study skills etc.  
> As for how much each student speaks, short of stopping those who want to > speak and forcing those who don't, how would you ensure a balance?  
>  
> \*\*\*

## Post 275

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

More to say - I'm not saying that being 'nice' means one thing to all people, or that it is enough in itself, far from it. Or that it was what you meant by things that happen in the margins. It just occurred to me as one of the marginalised issues - not niceness, but appropriacy and generosity of being with the students, part of which is learned, and part of which is, well, part of us.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\* REPLY SEPARATOR \*\*\*\*\*

On 6/28/2001 at 5:07 PM \*\*\* wrote:

>Hi \*\*\*  
>  
>You wrote:  
>  
>... perhaps it's the things the teacher does that the ""methodology  
>inspector"" considers  
>marginal that are the most important. As you can tell, I'm flailing  
>about a bit here, but ...  
>  
>but not flailing. One of the things that astonished me on the DELTA course  
>I did was the complete absence of any input on - for want of a better  
>phrase - how the teachers ARE with the students. And it's immediately  
>apparent as a DoS that this is a defining factor in classes. We collected  
>feedback yesterday on what our students liked about the school, and the  
>number of mentions for kind and friendly teachers greatly outnumbered the  
>citations for good or effective teachers/teaching/lessons. One of the  
>lessons I've learned the hard way is that difficult people in the  
>staffroom are difficult people in the classroom, and that difficult people  
>are in the wrong job.  
>  
>\*\*\* (more to say on this but no time now)  
>

## Post 276

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

thanks for your meaty response..admittedly i was confused by some of what you had to say...but whilst i can see that some may claim to define awareness as this or that, i am referring to something quite different...awareness is not an entity, it is not something which can ever be conceptualised or understood, and it is certainly not my attempt at even vaguely referring to it..we can only talk about it in negation....

is there any relevance to this and learning..yes there is..but i will write in detail when i have found a way to communicate the message..

I do not disagree with you - if we ""consider"" anything about ourselves then yes this is in time, sure, but when only watching is taking place - watching of thoughts whether they be memories or words - then this is not in time - this is futile to understand as its beyond conceptualisation - since all of this in time....

but it is possible to do what is our natural inclination to do..and apply ourselves with innate awareness to language learning and memorising...and to see that while language may become relatively structured or even fixed eventually; ""we"" are that which is not ""fixed"" and so we can allow it to unfold - and not get in its way..

quite simply ..this may sound like a load of esoteric waffle..i can see that!!..and it may be futile for me to continue this track - as it is not going to progress through analysis...rather it was a sharing of that which is happening whether we want to become aware or not....

fear not..i am not on any kind of crusade!

\*\*\*

## Post 277

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

I see that truculence is catching. My argument most certainly does not fall down, although it may be seen staggering, tired and confused back to its lodgings. First of all, ""around 30%"" of the largest number of delegates is pretty impressive. Secondly, how many more teachers were keeping abreast of events on the web? You claim, it would seem, that teachers non-presence represents a lack of interest. More probable is a lack of resources...especially the folding stuff. Thirdly, for every teacher who attended, I imagine that there are a number of others who will show some interest in what they saw. That is certainly the case where I work. As for the feedback, it is hardly



representative, is it? How many people fill them in? And what kind of people fill them in? I suspect that it tends to be those people who have something to moan about.

So, might your argument care to accompany my argument to the nearest bar? I owe you a pint. Then the real fighting can begin!

\*\*\*

On 06-may-08, at 06:35, \*\*\*wrote:

> Hi \*\*\*,

>

> Interesting when you write ...

>

> More school teachers than you would think are interested in  
> research. And if you think of the people who shared talks and  
> workshops with you at IATEFL, this is something you already know.  
> The place was packed with school teachers, either listening to  
> people present their research or presenting their own research for  
> the benefit of others.

>

> Unfortunately your argument here falls down on at least two points.  
> Firstly, and very unfortunately, the majority of participants at  
> the IAEFL Conference who are actually practising teachers is quite  
> low - somewhere around 30%. Secondly, on feedback forms there were  
> lots of complaints that too many papers were either commercial or  
> were people presenting their PhDs - ""not enough practical  
> sessions."" as one respondent wrote.

>

> So, not packed with teachers & not interested in research!!!

>

> \*\*\*

## Post 278

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

Hi all,

I have always hate dictation and reading aloud sessions as a student and now as a teacher, but, little by little I realize that could be the only way for adult beginners for improving pronunciation and breaking the ice for speaking activities, since they are not able to produce by themselves all the words they would like to use.

As a consequence of this, if they don't say before that word, and they do not feel corrected, it will be

much more difficult for them to produce and get the correct pronunciation at the same time.

Kind regards, and sorry for lurking such a long time, but I am completely busy these days....

\*\*\*

## Post 279

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

From:<http://www.celt.lsu.edu/CFD/E-Proceedings/A%20Technology%20Based%20Instructional%20Module%20in%20Deaf%20Education.htm>

Upon the death of his benefactor, Alexander the Great, Aristotle was accused of treason by the new political regime. He accepted exile from Athens and died shortly thereafter in 322 BC. He was 62 years old. His views on deafness were greatly influenced by his mentor, Plato. Plato reportedly agreed with Socrates that speech was audible thought and that thought was what made humans human. Aristotle, believing that speech was the distinctive characteristic of humans, and that because the speech of deaf persons was clearly not intelligible, thought that deaf people lacked the all important attributes (speech and hearing) that could impart intelligence upon humans. Aristotle has been accused of propagating the untruth that deaf persons were not capable of abstract thought and were somehow a bit less human than hearing persons.

## Post 280

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

With regards to Neil's points about his CELTA trainees I see my reasons for deciding against taking either a CELTA or a DELTA as confirmed - even if it means an end to me as a teacher.

I am against almost all the principals of current EFL pre-structured, teacher-centred, grammar/coursebook-led teaching. The one piece of grammar I had previously thought interesting, 'clause elements in declarative sentences', as students often have a problem with word order, I have spent 2 days trying to revise/simplify to the point where it helps more than it confuses - and failed. I find it much more productive if I get my students to focus on what they are actually trying to say, in real world terms, to the reader or listener; pointing out 'errors' as and when they occur in real world terms - this way they

gain a feel for the language and can `see` that something looks right or sounds right, even if they can't explain why. They don't need to explain why unless they intend to become teachers and those that do pay enough attention to enable themselves to do so.

I know my students make good progress and have fun doing so because they are learning to use the language not studying linguistics. Of those who can drive a car how many can describe the mechanical components and actions of even something as basic as pressing the accelerator yet in traditional EFL teaching that is exactly what the focus is on - and from that they are supposed to learn how to drive. Can anyone see a logic in that?

For me this is one of the key issues of dogme - breaking away from traditional parts-based teaching and returning to the real world where the students' ability to use English language and not its mathematical components are the focus.

Comments?

\*\*\*

## Post 281

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

The demise of the group. Is it necessary?

Perhaps take some time to ponder, then redefine/reaffirm/re-collect.

I have not enjoyed the list recently, but ""recently"" boils down to about a week's worth of postings. Apart from that, I have taken inspiration from many areas, I have found a sense of direction, motivation, a feeling of belonging to something bigger, as I sit here on my island where nothing ever happens apart from visits from The Burlington Boys. Where being an English teacher - or TEFLer - is often synonymous with being a wind-surfer who needs a few euros to pay for his beers and coke. I only joined about 7 months ago, in the middle of a huge battle between I don't remember who, but I got an off list message from \*\*\*Hill saying ""Don't worry, it's not normally like this; stick it out"" and I did. Because there are people like \*\*\*on the list.

Fewer and fewer dogme-relevant postings.....uhu, perhaps, but don't forget what time of year it is. End of term/semester exams, moving around the globe, preparing for family Christmasses - how many of us have split family situations which bring added tension at this time? - money worries, end of year deadlines.....it shows. Many of the 'regulars' have been quiet recently, possibly shying away from the duelling. But the best way to calm the mood might have been for one of us to come along with a dogme thread. No-one did. But is it so strange? After witnessing a 'tiff' or two, there's bound to be an awkward silence, that 'well what am I going to say now' feeling. On a couple of occasions \*\*\* has mentioned that he was ABOUT to post something; I have had the same urge, then quelled by what I read.

I WAS going to post something that \*\*\*'s post to the TEAvirtual list prompted. Something about techniques for helping the language to emerge, for giving teachers a hand when

classes are 'sticky'. I will if I feel the group is going to survive, but otherwise I'll take my dogme elsewhere.

Call me naive, but I think we should go on. \*\*\*, are you tired? Or do you just need more energy in here? Teaching gets tiring sometimes, and it's easy to lose your way - I did, stuck down here! But it was ultimately more positive to take up your suggestion to join this group, than to stop teaching.

I think maybe a compilation of what we DO all believe might be useful, to find the direction again. Help dogme to grow, rather than nip it in the late Spring bud. Something positive. I also reckon people should be strongly recommended to zip through the archives more, before repeating old threads - we did the anti list earlier this year.

Anyway, I'll hold my 'helping it emerge' post until I read other reactions. So far there are only two votes on the poll; the other person agrees with me, vote-wise.

Eyes on the monitor.

\*\*\*

x

Post 282

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*,

It depends how 'Brum' your Brummie is, I s'pose. Is it intelligible to the rest of us, or can you only communicate with the people in your street, or living room? If that is the case, then by all means teach it to your students, but as long as they only want to remain in the West Midlands (which I somehow doubt).

Most students realise that they will need to use English for speaking with non-natives, from Chinese to Chileans, as well as a wide range of native speakers (from Los Angeles to Leeds, etc.). In this case they need some form of standard that they feel will serve them adequately, in all situations.

That's why Standard English (or Standard American) is superior to any regional or class dialect - it can empower!

As for dismissing Standard English as a mere 'accident of history', well, that's a bit like saying the Soviets' persecution of the Kulaks was one too, or the Iraq war. It's a meaningless phrase.

And anyway, Caxton worked pretty hard at getting his brand of English to the top of the tree - certainly no accident! And the Americans took it from there...

\*\*\*

## Post 283

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\* writes as his answer to a list of alternatives offered in how to react to an unshared perception of learning and teaching (my formulation, not \*\*\*'s):

""Personally, conform a wee bit and then try to subvert/convert.""

I'd change that slightly to describe my own position:

""Conform at first and then try to convince/convert/subvert.""

\*\*\*

## Post 284

I am \*\*\* and iam teaching english to students of the engineering programme.i wish to start a GRAMMAR CLINIC in the department .can anyone help me with the materials for use in the clinic

## Post 285

*Coded as teacher training.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

\*\*\*, If the past tense can be accepted ('What I uased to do....)

1. I was not bad with the simpler system, where there were long and short forms of vowel sounds - /i/ as in slit and /i:/ as in seat, but when phoneticians told us /ɪ/ (roughly) as in sit wasn't just a short form of /i: (as in seat) and so provided a new symbol - which made changes in how your represent diphthongs, too, I found it harder to have some of the new symbols ready to hand. (Quickly - write in phonetic script now and new).

2. For a practising teacher, as opposed to teacher trainer, there is an initiakl disappoinment, too. What interests the ""language-is-communication"" teacher is speech on the move - full of short forms, and elisions and instances of intonation and prosody being of critical importance, not the citation forms, words as pronounced clearly and in isolation : /ei/ /buk/ /ei/ /red/ /buk/

as opposed to what people say, at normal speaking rates:

/u!/ /buk/ /a!/ /re/ /buk/

My (university teacher training) students were very good at learning the symbols, but not really good at reading phonetic script. They let the script prompt them as to what the text might be, but did not read what the script "said". Most of the would ahve read /re/ /buk/ as red book.

My students used phonetic script only in the context of a phonetics course.

Very occasionally they and I, in other courses, used our shared knowledge of IPA to make a particular point.

What was much more useful were intensive exercises on vowel sounds , including being able to say English words with German vowel sounds. A useful party trick.

\*\*\*

## Post 286

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

Maybe Im doing him a disservice (I dont have the book to hand), but I think it all comes down to your interpretation of artificial. Cook says that people have frowned on the artificial for too long a period in the world of EFL and that they do so for no good reason. He claims that most of the language use we engage in as language users is in fact artificial and that justifies the use of artificial language in the classroom for him. By "artificial", I understand him to mean, "language which has no other purpose than itself", or something similar. Play is considered to be artificial because it isn't intended to have any sort of changing effect on the world; it is done to amuse and is its own reward.

\*\*\*\*

## Post 287

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Hi,

I'm an EFL teacher of 3 years and am about to run an internal short (hour and a half) workshop on 'teaching unplugged' at my school in New Zealand. If anyone has some handy hints, ideas (how I can run the workshop without heaps of handouts!), etc, I'd be really grateful. Obviously, I'm not asking for any revelations that would infringe anyone's copyright, and I'm conducting my own research, but any pointers warmly welcomed.

Feel free to contact me at

\*\*\*

I look forward to joining in this group and the ESOL revolution.

Cheers,

\*\*\*

## Post 288

*Coded as other's teaching experience.*

*Coded as own in class experience.*

We have a collection box in our classroom. If any of my rich students use L1, they have to put 1 Euro into it for every foreign word that they utter. I video record all my lessons, so nobody can cheat.

One of my colleagues from another school teaches poor students. Her method differs to mine. She simply headbutts the student for using L1.

## Post 289

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

I am presently using a grammar text that my students and I can "do". It is Grammar in Context" by Heinle and Heinle. It gives many many examples of correct grammar use in interesting, current readings, conversations, etc. I never teach "tags" as I consider them to be unteachable. My students will have to pick them up in context. Basic grammar conventions, however, I think need to be taught. I have had students who, after several years, go to classes and the poor grammar that they picked up is so ingrained it is hard, if not impossible, for them to change.

\*\*\*

"

## Post 290

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

Hello,

having taught, consulted, and designed products to help shed statistical and mathematical insight on problems, I've managed to form a "theory of education" fairly close to dogma, but "validated" using a wholly different "postulated" mechanism; risk-reward.

Consider human motivation re;social acceptance. then consider formal education as a social setting wherein learning is ostensibly optimized.

it is my belief that ""we"" take ownership of our thoughts by giving voice to them, literally saying them out loud. this assignation process as the initial ""neural trigger"" might well explain allowing students to participate, insisting that they do so, exploits the natural process of risk-reward at work to allow students to ""reward"" themselves as a function of taking ownership of their thoughts.

Connectionist/Hebbian models of learning are purely dictated by ""proximity of the 'connection' of any 2 things"". and this glimpse of a dogme-like reinforcement mechanism is fascinating to me.

in a nutshell, I've found that forcing students to talk, not keep quiet, touches their learning experience positively, hence affects its own downstream success!

thoughts? out-loud ""summarization"" (not regurgitation) forces students into risk-reward cycles that fuel their own cognitive process?

\*\*\*

## Post 291

Coded as other's teaching experience.

Coded as own in class experience.

Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.

Coded as other forum post.

Hi \*\*\*,

You said, ""They were then banned form using mobiles and laptops/mobile tech. This straight away set up a bad atmosphere.""

This is the opposite of education. It's entirely motivated by control issues. The teacher is supposed to be in absolute control. The teacher dicatates who will say what, to whom they will say in, when they will say it and why they will say it. No wonder it's so difficult for people to learn in an ""educational environment.""

I have colleagues who also ban cell phones and mobile devices. I do the opposite, I insist that students bring these things, that they know how to use them. While my colleagues complain of students not being prepared, I never have any problems. Everything is always ready and available, and I have very high attendance and participation rates.

Obviously, we don't have proggam wide policies about technology use. The Luddites only end up tormenting themselves.

\*\*\*



""\*\*\*""wrote:

Hi \*\*\*,

I tried that a bit and you're right it does seem natural for them. At our place many of the students were computer students so used laptops all the time so when they arrived for 'English class', sat down in a desk filled room with dictionaries are were forced to buy a paper book it seemed a bit odd. They were then banned form using mobiles and laptops/mobile tech. This straight away set up a bad atmosphere. When I said ""sod the rules, I trust you to use them educationally"" they did.

I tried some chats and online discussions which also seem more natural for some than talking F2F. Perhaps text Dogme is the next big thing then.

If Dogme is still based on what is in the room and what students bring with them then when students turn up with ipads, laptops etc shouldn't we use them?

\*\*\* mentioned students showing photos on their mobiles in one interview. This seems very easy and useful and wouldn't halt the class. It's also what they do outside.

\*\*\*

## Post 292

*Coded as other forum post.*

Wow! \*\*\*, this sounds fascinating. I am very envious, it was something I thought about doing as a life-project, voluntarily teaching the blind English as a way to understand more about how languages are learned - through actual experience rather than someone's theories.

Will you be using L1 in your approach? Have you any experience with Braille?

Will you be blogging about the experience, the lessons you learn along the way?

If you do, I'll volunteer to write a guest-piece with some LP ideas if you want (in the new year, snowed under at the moment - just popped in because your post was so fascinating) - if not (blogging), contact me directly -am happy to be a bouncing board, I do a lot of dogme work.

Keep us all posted - and mega good luck!

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*"" wrote:

>

> Hello group,

>

> I am a new member! I have been Webheading since 2003 and I live in Florence, Italy where I teach English.

>

> \*\*\* from the Webheads mentioned this group. ELT Dogme sounds fascinating and I would like to learn more about it. It could be very valuable for me as I will be teaching English to a blind person starting next week. Can anyone give me some leads on this? I won't be using a book and so Dogme might be the answer.

>

> Looking forward to participating!

>

> \*\*\*

## Post 293

Coded as non-teaching text.

Coded as teaching text.

\*\*\*,

What a lovely find. Have printed it out to enjoy and mull over with a cup of tea - I loved the Soul's Code: have you read it? It's almost as bookmarked and highlighted as ST's How to Teach Speaking.

Yummy!

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:

>

> Everyone,

>

> I find this interview with James Hillman to be incredibly insightful.

> I welcome your thoughts about how Hillman's ideas relate to our work

> as language teachers.

>

> <http://www.scottlondon.com/interviews/hillman.html>

>

> \*\*\*

## Post 294

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

On 31 May 01, at 18:05, \*\*\* wrote:

> I still have some reservations. One of my advanced students

> recently wrote:-

>

> I've enjoyed the lessons more this term, the teacher(s) seem to be far

> more interested in the students but I'm not really sure what I've

> learnt. It's been less substantial.

- >
- > Maybe the lack of coursebook and photocopies has meant less for them to
- > reflect on?
- >

Well, the good news, \*\*\*, is a) you passed the inspection, b) at least one of your students is not bored. The challenge now, is how to address the ""face validity"" issue - ie, the learner's perception of spin-off? This is where \*\*\*'s idea of a kind of retrospective syllabus as class record, perhaps divided into ""Map of the Book"" - type categories such as Grammar, Vocab, Pron, Functions, Skills work... Learners fill this in individually, at the end of every lesson, or sequence of lessons, and then compare, before agreeing on a class ""syllabus"", to be displayed prominently on wall (and proudly pointed out to inspectors). Has anyone else done anything like this - and, if so, did it help reduce learner anxiety at perceived lack of course content?

\*\*\*.

## Post 295

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

he certainly feels very unsure of his own ability in general (which is not a surprise considering his circumstances) and language competence in particular. I differ from my learned colleagues inasmuch as I would not condone his habit of using a translator software to learn language communication. and the reason is quite simple: the d... translators murder English speech, turning the final product into something at best laughable, at worst completely incomprehensible. If he persists in using it for simpler texts/chunks/utterances where it might work (at a pinch), he will then be unable to recognize where it distorts his original ideas because with more complex texts he will not have the ability to understand what the English ""translation"" actually means! I saw (still see) it happening with my students who, being just kids, think they have found a paradisaical way to skip working but still getting credits for doing their homework. Believe me, it has been going on for at least five years now and none of the kids who cling to this invidious ""lifebelt"" have really developed any language competence and self-reliance.

But instead of peremptorily weaning him off I think I would start with asking why he insists on using this prompt. It coul really be a beginning of a nice dogme exchange!

\*\*\*

dogme@yahooroups.com \*\*\*:

\*\*\*,

Nice story about your student. Personally, I think I'd want to diversify what you're doing with him, but I think there's enough value in what he's doing to make it worth continuing. I'd want to make sure, though, that he was using the method to become gradually more autonomous. If we think of an L2 as initially ""parasitic"" and dependent on L1, as e.g. MacWhinney does, one important process in language learning is learning those areas which can be transferred helpfully from L1 to L2, and those which cannot - e.g. false friends, some syntax, morphological differences etc., and developing the habit of using an English (language) way of expressing them rather than falling back on the Romanian. Thus I'd want your student to gradually be able to automatically correct a lot of the oddness of the Google translation by referring to his developing knowledge of the L2 system. In doing so, he becomes more autonomous in his learning style, and his L2 system becomes more autonomous from his L1, cognitively speaking. But as I said, I'd want to diversify too - e.g. to break away from the prepared topic and discuss things more spontaneously. I'd also want to be sure that he was putting more time into his study of the English version of his text than he was in writing it in Romanian - e.g. by studying grammatical areas you've flagged for him and, just as importantly, by checking up on vocabulary the translator has produced so that he can decide if he has the exact word for what he wants to say, what sort of distinctions exist in English, and to develop a network of useful vocabulary centred around the given topic.

\*\*\*

---

From: \*\*\* \*\*\*

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Subject: [dogme] Re: How far would you go in accepting an individual approach to learning a language?

\*\*\*,

Great story. Sounds like he's got himself into a very nice language learning situation.

Actually, I'm not sure I would want to wean him off this habit at all.

Firstly he believes it works for him, and if he believes it works for him then it probably does. After all he's not a complete beginner is he, so he must have developed some useful personal strategies for learning.

Secondly, this approach involves a nice mixture of planning and performance. He goes away and researches the language he needs, and then performs it in interaction with a more advanced speaker.

Thirdly, incorporating translation is a useful way of giving his level

of English a bit of a push. If he operates only in English, he's limited by what he can already say.

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups. com, \*\*\* <\*\*\*...> wrote:

>

> A young Romanian flew into the garden of my house in the sky in Second Life

> two days ago and asked if I could help him with his English. He has two

> bathrooms he made a point of mentioning. He is in his mid-thirties, an

> accountant by training, is married, with a 9-year old daughter and he and

> his wife have both recently become unemployed. . His wife receives nothing,

> he will get unemployment benefit for 5 months. One thing he does have is a

> good internet connection and a PC in good shape. He discovered Second Life

> and is convinced it offers just what he needs urgently - the possibility of

> speaking English daily to a range of people. (He is convinced that improving

> his English is a priority if he is going to be able to provide for his

> family in the future).

>

> He has a quaint way of studying. He insists I tell him the day before what

> we are going to discuss the next day. He prepares it in Romanian and then

> uses Google translator to produce an English text. This he reads out to me.

>

> Question How would you break him of this habit? (Would you break him of

> his routine?) We are always saying we must honour each learner's individual

> learning style. Should I honour this method, or try to outlaw it?

>

> What do you advise?

>

> \*\*\*

>

> --

> \*\*\*,

## Post 296

Coded as logic and hypotheticals.

Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.

Coded as other forum post.

\*\*\*, thinking aloud about the persistent belief that a learner's written language should be corrected, writes:

""Does it have something to do with the concept that the written form is more permanent and therefore it is easier to spot errors and correct them? ""

I'm quite certain that is one reason. Speech leaves no permanent trace, unless you make a recording. \*\*\*s on a page or bits and bytes on a screen can be read over and over again.

\*\*\* also asks:

""Or is it that we feel that the written form is purer and less tolerant of errors?""

It could be that, but isn't it also because the written form is so tangible - you can isolate elements easily - wrong preposition, missing article, inappropriate register etc. and offer the ""correct"" forms. Speech could be dealt with similarly - /i:/ articulated too high, final /d/ wrongly de-voiced, sentence intonation incorrect, incorrect stress on ""incorrect."" Speech could be dealt with like that, but I bet there aren't too many classrooms where it happens.

Finally, \*\*\* writes:

""Why can somebody get a good mark in a spoken English exam, but fare so badly in writing? Is there no room for communicative competence in writing exams?""

Well, once we start talking about examinations many things are possible. It's quite possible for a person to get a good mark in a spoken English exam because he/she communicates well, despite inaccuracies. Almost by definition, though, examinations go in for the measurable - right:wrong - and although there could be an examination in written communicative competence I bet most people would want an accuracy element amongst the factors to be considered in awarding a grade..

\*\*\*

## Post 297

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

I have a class that is nominally ""Pre Advanced"". but is closer to an upper intermediate level.

It has one very quiet and detached Chinese girl, 4 Saudis, 1 Bahraini and 1 Omani. It is a class of students who are studying English to raise their level to the point where they can get a required IELTS score in order to progress to university for undergrad/postgrad study. I teach them once a week on Wednesday mornings from 0900-1300.

Yesterday, we started by my chatting to the first student to arrive (the Omani). He was a new student and I have taught in Oman so there was a lot to be talked about. Then a Saudi arrived and joined the conversation. Then another Saudi arrived and joined in, less enthusiastically - the conversation had come around to Obama's inauguration and the feelings caused by it. She wasn't particularly interested in politics and the men were dominating the class at this point. As the conversation came to a close, I put forward a plan for the class and ran through it. During this time, more students arrived.

I gave them back a piece of diagnostic writing that I had asked them to do and asked them to read through it. Then I gave them a model answer to the question that I had written. I asked them to work in pairs to identify topic sentences, these statements, internal structure of paragraphs and the overall structure of the essay. They did this. I then ran through what they thought and added my tuppenceworth. I pushed the lesson towards devising a simple framework for an IELTS essay. MY framework...but offered as a suggestion.

Then I asked them to re-read the essay again and see if there were any things they wanted to ask about. There wasn't. I drew their attention to things that I had thought they might want to ask about and argued that they might need to develop their critical skills. I explained the difference between understanding the message and understanding how the message was achieved. I urged them to look at English texts as vehicles of information but also as vehicles of information about the language.

Then I told them that I would like to play them a poem that I had heard this morning ("You're beautiful" by Simon Armitage). I explained that I had chosen this because it was read by a northerner (they have said that they find the northern accent difficult to fathom); it was five minutes long (let the cynics make of that what they will!); it gave them the opportunity to practise and develop note-taking skills (they took none...); it was easy to understand on a surface level.

They listened to the poem and singularly failed to take any notes. I asked why - the answers ranged from lack of understanding to the feeling that it would be wrong to take notes when listening to a poem. I asked them if they could face listening to the poem for a second time. They said yes and I gave them a copy of the poem. I asked them to read and listen and to put a ? next to anything that they would like to discuss or clarify.

They worked in pairs to discuss any areas that they wanted to clarify and also to share with their partners any language, images etc that they had liked particularly. There was a (rather) unsuccessful feedback slot at the end of this.

Some of the ideas shared in the pairwork were very perceptive and showed students engaged in the co-construction of meaning with the poet. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the line, "I am ugly because I have proven that God is a mathematical impossibility" was a challenge to the Muslims in the class. Unbeknownst to me, the new Omani student was also a poet and president of the Omani Poetry Society. He offered a gloss on the poem that was convincing and insightful.

I concluded the class by setting the homework of going away and researching the poem. I set the parameters wide by pointing out that there were two ways of doing this: cursorily or in-depth. I pointed out that the task was to last a week. I pointed out that they would

need to demonstrate good research skills, good reading skills, good selection skills. Or not.

The class ended (a four hour class).

++++++

I felt disappointed and confused for large parts of the class. The students are very different. The Chinese girl is a withdrawn undergraduate; the Arab students are garrulous postgraduates. The men are keen to talk about politics and offer opinionated statements about nearly everything. The women are less openly opinionated and not that interested in political debate.

In pairwork, there were long periods of silence before anyone spoke. In feedback sessions, there were few contributions and even fewer contributors (another mathematical impossibility?). In feedback sessions, questions and comments were directed through the teacher. Nobody interrupted their classmates or asked for clarification or responded by agreeing or disagreeing or expanding upon what their classmates had said. Very often, contributions had to be solicited.

The text analysis of my essay had clearly inspired them...much less than I had hoped. I suspect that I spent too long on this as well. I noticed eyes floating up towards the clock on a number of occasions.

I had the feeling that the Chinese student perceived little or no worth to the lesson. She seemed utterly removed from it. Unfortunately, she was also sat right next to me and I am a naturally paranoid individual. When I was critical of her opening paragraph in the diagnostic writing - she had re-written the whole question and then written ""I disagree."" - her response was a whispered, ""OK. I won't do it again."" I took this as signifying a complete lack of involvement in the critical appraisal of what I was saying. I replied by saying that it was up to her how she wrote the introduction and that she could do it again if she felt that it was a valid style. But it would possibly create a misleading impression of her capabilities for an examiner. I think she is still struggling with the idea that there might not be a definite answer to everything and that the teacher can offload responsibility for learning onto the students. I may be wrong and I may be stereotyping...but I was there, and don't think so.

+++

And there were good things to the lesson too. Some students...on reflection, the majority of students...were fired up for a lot of the class. They took notes, asked questions openly disagreed with me, debated various points, shared ideas, furthered their and my understanding, demonstrated a willingness to tolerate ambiguity, looked for ways to hone their hypotheses about new language.

But I left the classroom unsure of the success or direction of the lesson and feeling that had I had time to prepare it (I am the DoS where I work and we operate a system of roll-on-roll-off plus I had been interviewing people for the part-time pool of staff plus I had had to deal with constant interruptions of students who wanted to move up a level or to a different class etc), I could have got a lot more out of it."



## Post 298

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\* wrote: >

>

> \*\*\* wrote:

>

> >

> > I'm not really that interested in discovering new activities for

> > students to do because I'm starting to feel that most of the

> > learning happens around the activities rather than actually in

> > them.

N S Prabhu mentions his book ""Second Language Pedagogy"" that ""there is, intimately, no way of attributing, with any certainty, any specific piece of learning to any specific teaching: language learning can take place independently of teaching intentions and it is impossible to tell what has been learnt because of some teaching, and what in spite of it"" (Oxford, 1987: p. 9).

This very interesting book is available for free download at the OUP website. The title may threaten to send you into a coma, but the book is fascinating.

Another of Prabhu's gems is the history of anti-grammar:

Joseph Webbe (1622) criticising Latin teaching says, ""no man can run speedily to the mark of language that is shackled and ingiv'd with grammar precepts. ... By exercise of reading, writing, and speaking after ancient Custom... all things belonging to Grammar will without labour, and whether we will or no, thrust themselves upon us.""

Palmer (1921) says ""the utilization of [the adult learner's] conscious and focused attention [on language] militates against the proper function of the natural capacities of assimilation... [in teaching a second language] we must design forms of work in which the student's attention shall be directed towards the subject matter and away from the form in which it is expressed"".

Bloomfield (1914), ""our fundamental mistake has been to regard language teaching as the imparting of a set of facts... ""

> > Isn't there a substantial amount of research that points to language

> > learners acquiring a lot of the language that teachers use around the

> > activity? I mean the language used to set up and explain the

> > activity rather than the target language required.

I don't know about research proving it, but for quite a long time language teachers have suspected this. If anything, it is the traditional grammar-rooted methodologies that rest upon theory divorced from actual practice, and indeed, severed from the very observation of

practice.

\*\*\*

## Post 299

*Coded as teaching text.*

Hi \*\*\*,

Have a look here:

<http://www.cambridge-eef.org.uk/teaching/index.cfm>

Kind regards,

\*\*\*

## Post 300

*Coded as teaching text.*

Dear All

I've written a series of stories for pre-school/infacnts/lower primary, all downloadable free from:

<http://regandlellow.webs.com/>

There are 7 stories there at the moment, with more to follow and additional teaching ideas.

Would be delighted if anyone wants to visit the site and use the stories in class.

\*\*\*

## Post 301

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Thanks \*\*\*. He's a genius. His framework for a Dogme lesson really works.

I like his boardwork and 'blank paper' work too. It turns everything on its head. Instead of having loads of stuff to give out and hope students will engage with, this asks students to create everything from writing, to speaking activities or just notes.

I must get some Dogme T-shirts printed.

Many thanks again everybody for your tips and advice.

\*\*\*

Posted by: \*\*\*

Absolutely, couldn't agree more! Sounds like just the kind of classroom I'd want to be in.

\*\*\*

On Apr 1, 2011, at 3:32 AM, \*\*\* wrote:

> Bravo, Phil! I look forward to reading more.

>

> \*\*\*

> On Mar 31, 2011, at 2:24 PM, \*\*\* wrote:

>

>> Thanks to all your comments and tips I've managed to survive and  
>> quite enjoy a Dogmeticish (??) week. It is the first time I've seen  
>> students actually interested and giving their own true opinions. And  
>> what was fantastic was that it worked best with my rowdy advanced  
>> class. From this week on students chose their own topics for  
>> discussion and source their own texts for background reading and  
>> noticing/uncovering grammar/vocab/ language which we can then build  
>> on and exploit.

>>

>> In one lesson I asked students to make notes after a discussion  
>> about what language they had been corrected on, anything they had  
>> problems with or wanted help with. This led to several great  
>> 'language discussions' and personalised practice. All of which they  
>> noted down and probably understood and will remember better than 2  
>> hours of grammar gapfills. The students also naturally scaffold and  
>> support each other and ask me to help too without being afraid of  
>> losing face.

>>

>> Am I right in encouraging 'mini linguist' style sections? Maybe a  
>> thesaurus would be useful?

>>

>> The best feedback I've had is that one student comes early for class  
>> and now says it is the first time he has ever been allowed to speak  
>> properly. In his country the teachers sent him out as he spoke too  
>> much apparently.

>>

>> On another note, I've read Thornbury's book so much that my 1 yr old  
>> daughter now taps on his face and gives him a kiss from time to  
>> time. You don't get better reviews than that.

>>

>> Thanks again.

>>

>> \*\*\*

>>

>>

Posted by: ""\*\*\*\*\*"

Happy talking students who accept and work on corrections. It is a real change.

Someone mentioned the term 'pocket linguist' which seem quite good for the language sections. I tried a website called WORDNIK which I used to show example sentences of the word BAN in a conversation about CENSORSHIP. This led to lots of noticing of structures and collocations and then a discussion about their parents banning certain things in their childhood.

Of course, we do have a book, a rather dull one which I do have to use but creating a platform for a discussion or conversation which then naturally leads into an opportunity, a real one to use something from the book is better than P12, P13 etc. I think this is what I really like about dogme work. As opposed to reading 2 dull texts and doing gist exercises and vocab about alternative energy we had a conversation about the general topic where students asked questions and I helped with language. We then dipped into these readings but not just to read but to find information to help their discussion. Students then highlighted words and asked ""what does..mean"" or ""why...? and we discussed the ideas.

I don't think the phrase 'a breathe of fresh air' goes far enough. Things just naturally develop and language and speaking opportunities pop up rather than being ripped out of the ground.

Does anyone know any sites where I can watch DOGME lesson videos?

Re: Cheers!

Posted by: ""\*\*\*\*\*"

I'm assuming \*\*\* won't mind my sharing this since it's on his blog (and twitter). So, here's a place to start, Phil:

[http://jasonrenshaw.typepad.com/jason\\_renhaws\\_web\\_log/2010/11/flipcammed-an-unplugged-lesson-with-beginner-level-students.html](http://jasonrenshaw.typepad.com/jason_renhaws_web_log/2010/11/flipcammed-an-unplugged-lesson-with-beginner-level-students.html)

\*\*\*

On Apr 2, 2011, at 1:46 PM, \*\*\* wrote:

> Happy talking students who accept and work on corrections. It is a  
> real change.

>

> Someone mentioned the term 'pocket linguist' which seem quite good  
> for the language sections. I tried a website called WORDNIK which I  
> used to show example sentences of the word BAN in a conversation  
> about CENSORSHIP. This led to lots of noticing of structures and  
> collocations and then a discussion about their parents banning

- > certain things in their childhood.
- >
- > Of course, we do have a book, a rather dull one which I do have to use but creating a platform for a discussion or conversation which
- > then naturally leads into an opportunity, a real one to use
- > something from the book is better than P12, P13 etc. I think this is
- > what I really like about dogme work. As opposed to reading 2 dull
- > texts and doing gist exercises and vocab about alternative energy we
- > had a conversation about the general topic where students asked
- > questions and I helped with language. We then dipped into these
- > readings but not just to read but to find information to help their
- > discussion. Students then highlighted words and asked ""what
- > does..mean"" or ""why...? and we discussed the ideas.
- >
- > I don't think the phrase 'a breathe of fresh air' goes far enough.
- > Things just naturally develop and language and speaking
- > opportunities pop up rather than being ripped out of the ground.
- >
- > Does anyone know any sites where I can watch DOGME lesson videos?

\* 4

## Post 302

*Coded as teaching text.*

>But did it produce learning? Did it produce acquisition?

(\*\*\*)

just to go back to this, should we add,  
""Did it help the learner to NOTICE?""

I've only just managed to get hold of a copy of Scott's 'Uncovering Grammar', and hope it breaches no copyright to just quote a few lines about NOTICING (which certainly bear out my own experience of learning language):

p.35:

""Have you ever had the experience, for example, of being taught a new word in a second language, and subsequently seeing it everywhere? It must have been there before, but you simply didn't NOTICE it.""

""Reflect on your own experiences of noticing when learning a second language. For example, while writing this chapter, I happened to notice the expression 'Ni se te occura!' in a comic strip ...The context suggested that this might mean 'Don't even think of it!' I checked this with a friend who confirmed my hypothesis, but who was surprised that I hadn't heard this expression before. Sure enough, the very next day I came across the expression in an interview in a magazine. Now I am waiting for an opportunity to try it out!""

(what do we really mean when we use words like 'awareness' or 'consciousness raising' and such like? Perhaps 'noticing' is a clearer, more accessible term for all this?)

\*\*\*

## Post 303

A stirring posting, but I can't (because of what my mail program does with headers?) be quite certain who wrote it. Author, kindly put up your hand.

\*\*\*

=====

\*\*\*

## Post 304

*Coded as teaching text.*  
Seasons greetings!

List members might like to know that there is an article by Susi Trler-Karlen on dogme and learning technologies in the latest issue of CALL Review.

<http://ltsig.org.uk>

\*\*\*

## Post 305

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*  
*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*  
*Coded as teaching text.*

Anyone minimizing the importance of fun in learning is forgetting Horace's famous maxim about edifying and delighting being joined in the best learning.

No one - I don't think even the new teachers referred to in the article - would (should) confuse just playing games and having a good time with all that we need to do in the classroom but the idea, as usual, is balance, and as has been said before, it is FUNdaMENTAL to remember that the FUN comes before the MENTAL.

In a class of extremely motivated, highly disciplined, academically

focused, very intelligent, totally committed students, anything we do they will learn from. In fact, they will even learn in spite of us. But how many of us have classes like that today? So somehow we have to touch their motivational fibers and one way is to incorporate some activities that are intrinsically enjoyable. Jill Hadfield says in her very useful book on classroom dynamics (and many others echo this, of course) that the atmosphere we create to a large extent determines how much learning will be taking place, and she points out that some activities may be justified just because they create this favorable climate but the best ones also carry important language learning work piggyback on the fun. I think this is something that could have been stressed more in the article to give a less finger-wagging impression.

\*\*\*

\*\*\* escribi:

> A one-sentence comment. I can't prove it, but I'm personally convinced that

> there is far more likely to be learning if there is enjoyment than if

> it is

> absent.

>

> \*\*\*

>

<[http://us.lrd.yahoo.com/\\_ylc=X3oDMTJIMmltcWZzBF9TAzk3MzU5NzE0BGdycElkAzE2NTM2NzIEZ3Jwc3BJZAMxNjAwMDQzMzM2BHNIYwN2dGwEc2xrA3ZnaHAec3RpbWUDMTE0OTkyOTI5Ng--;\\_ylg=1/SIG=118gugdcj/\\*\\*http%3a//groups.yahoo.com/group/dogme](http://us.lrd.yahoo.com/_ylc=X3oDMTJIMmltcWZzBF9TAzk3MzU5NzE0BGdycElkAzE2NTM2NzIEZ3Jwc3BJZAMxNjAwMDQzMzM2BHNIYwN2dGwEc2xrA3ZnaHAec3RpbWUDMTE0OTkyOTI5Ng--;_ylg=1/SIG=118gugdcj/**http%3a//groups.yahoo.com/group/dogme)>

>

## Post 306

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Thank you \*\*\*. What I had in mind was the original dogme idea about listening, which I appreciate may have been re-examined since then.

""No recorded listening material should be introduced into the classroom: the source of all ""listening"" activities should be the students and teacher themselves. The only recorded material that is used should be that made in the classroom itself, e.g. recording students in pair or group work for later re-play and analysis.""

It is partly because I am not a 'native speaker' myself that my students ask me to bring the recorded examples into class. Although I do also record speaking activities that happen in the class, these are used to back up the speaking (with further language analysis and feedback) rather than to offer challenging listening opportunities. The students recognize that distinction.

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:

> Listening is an area that has indeed been discussed relatively  
> recently. As usual, the ""dogme take"" was actually ""dogme takes"". My  
> personal view is that learning how to listen is a fairly natural  
> skill which will develop by itself if students are motivated enough  
> to want to understand what is being said. I would say that a wide  
> range of accents is not a prerequisite for making sure that people  
> can ""listen better"". It just makes it more challenging. There are so  
> many varieties of accents that it would be impossible to cover all of  
> them and, the chances are that were they to meet any strange  
> accents , the listening strategies that they would need (asking for  
> repetition, guessing from context, asking for clarification etc) are  
> the same as the ones that students need in class anyway.  
>  
> That said, if your reason for taking in lots of tapes of different  
> accents is to keep your students happy and motivated, that seems like  
> a perfectly good rationale. "

## Post 307

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\*, when I read:

""Hi \*\*\*

Why did you translate in and out of Ancient Greek?

I think it has changed the meaning quite substantially.

Best wishes

\*\*\*

I am reminded of William Carlos Williams.

## Post 308

\*\*\*,

Glad to hear youll be going ahead with Sergei and Im hoping youll keep us informed.

All the best,

\*\*\*"



## Post 309

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

\*\*\*,

My tongue, at that moment, could not have been further in my cheek... Anyone who knows me will know that I campaign for mobiles to be left on in class, and for teachers to be either more interesting than what's available on the mobiles, or to find such a good use for the mobiles that Facebook would be nigh on impossible.

\*\*\*

Sent from my iPad (you must buy one, or you're a failure. I am an evil technophile...)

\*\*\* wrote:

, ""\*\*\*""

> wrote:

>

> But of course, it's much better if we, as teachers, ensure that

> they're

> turned off in our classes. They'd only be on Facebook all day,

> otherwise ;-)

> \*\*\*

>

> Oh my!

## Post 310

*Coded as teacher training.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\*, I'm doing DELTA myself and was tempted to do a dogme class for the same assignment, but in the end decided to cop out and play safe (and did process writing - which surely anyway is a bit dogme-like).

What does your tutor say? Also, surely given that it is supposed to be ""experimental"" you can try out any crack-pot method you like (I'm not suggesting, of course, that... , -).

Someone in my class did go in with only a tape-recorded and no written lesson plan... and passed. Their tutor had okayed it first, however.

\*\*\* (the other one, but also Grumpy when the subject of DELTA comes up)

## Post 311

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Thanks \*\*\*! Yes - replace RADIAL for RADICAL:

""I affirm that I enter this classroom of my own free will and for my own personal development. I duly authorize the teacher (see fine print below for definition and caveats) to expose me to his or her own brand of radical pedagogy. In declaring this affirmation I also abandon all allegiance to and personal expectations of conventional pedagogy. I further consent to the ""blowing of my mind"".

Now 'radial pedagogy' must have some significance! I'll mull it over and 'get back to you tomorrow'.... (oops! sorry for the 'Keynesian slip', \*\*\*!).

\_ \*\*\*

----- Original Message -----

From: ""\*\*\*""

To: <dogme@yahoogroups.com>

Subject: Re: [dogme] classroom contracts

> Many schools in Germany have started drawing up contracts with  
> their pupils in an attempt to have a basis for dealing with  
> disruptive behaviour on a shared-responsibility as opposed to  
> authoritarian top-down model.

>

> I love \*\*\* draft.

>

> ""I affirm that I enter this classroom of my own free will and  
> for my own personal development. I duly authorize the teacher  
> (see fine print below for definition and caveats) to expose me  
> to his or her own brand of radial (radical?) pedagogy. In  
> declaring this affirmation I also abandon all allegiance to and  
> personal expectations of conventional pedagogy. I further  
> consent to the ""blowing of my mind"".

>

>

> Clearly a fair contract will be drawn up by teacher and pupils  
> together.

>

> Any examples, suggestions?

>

> \*\*\*

## Post 312

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Thanks, \*\*\*. I'm not sure what we can do either. A student has to be very motivated to stop the fossilization process once it has begun. I once made a poster for high school kids, ""A wise ESL tries Not to fossilize.""

\*\*\*

## Post 313

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

One thought/comment on what \*\*\* says:

> won't it be somewhat boring to reuse these texts.

Well, don't you reread things in 'real life'? Don't you retell stories and jokes, refining them and improving/embelishing them?

> and isn't it a problem if it is hard to find texts at the right level where these common grammar words are repeatedly occurring > in their patterns?

No - because they are common!!!

\*\*\*

## Post 314

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

Just wanted to reiterate my original point. I have nothing against giving marks for planning. The issue of test validity arises, however, when you assess writing and planning as one skill, which they are not.

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:

> \*\*\* has rejected this posting once ffor 'personal' reasons. Let's see if he allows it through now that I've made it more acceptable to him...

>

> Yes, I agree (I think). For formative assessments, it's always a good idea to give extra marks for a plan, as it encourages the students to give some thought to what they are going to write about before starting out on the intro.

>

> Otherwise, far too many of my students would just launch into the first sentence without a single thought to the direction of the paragraph, let alone the essay. They moan that they don't see the

point of doing the plan, as it means extra work - poor things!!

>

> Fact is, a lot of them are just 'cruisers' who prefer to do the minimum - they have no real desire to improve their writing or organisational skills, but we have to bring them up to something approaching a 5.5 IELTS band. So giving marks for planning is definitely a positive move, I think.

>

> And yes again, it is definitely a thinking skill, one that can help students to create better essays. For one, it gives them some time to think about what they are going to write about, and I usually tell mine to produce a basic framework. 'The Rule of Three' is one of my favourites, in which you get them to write down three main topics (or headings), each with three sub topics. It works well with some genres, but not all. However, it is simple, and even the worst of my wonderful students can remember it.

>

> As for teachers writing lesson plans, though, it's a bit like a taxi driver preparing a route for every fare he catches. There's no need - it's just 'second nature' after a while. Provided you know how to drive in the first place, of course!

>

> \*\*\*

> --- On Fri, 11/7/08, \*\*\* <moyadaly@...> wrote:

> Subject: [dogme] Re: planning is a thinking skill

> To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

>

> Bravo \*\*\*!

> Wonderful analogy and so very relevant to dogme. Whilst I do not

> condemn planning at all, and concede that, for some, it is a very

> valid if not vital part of writing, I fail to see the point of

> marking a student's planning-in a summative assessment anyway.

> With reference to the dogmatic (ha ha) insistence on detailed lesson

> plans I agree wholeheartedly that a lesson plan does not in any way

> reflect a teacher's ability to teach; it just demonstrates his/her

> ability to CONFORM and jump through the hoops of the dictatorial

> powers that be. How many of us have spent hours preparing such a plan

> for an observed lesson only to receive comments such as, ""WEll, you

> could have done X, Y or Z here"" when X Y or Z is EXACTLY what you

> would have done if you had been given the freedom to deviate from the

> damned lesson plan?? !! Grrr!!!

> In a staff meeting about lesson plans and schemes of work recently I

> was regarded with horror when I dared to say that I used lesson plans

> and schemes of work ONLY because they were required. When I

> mentioned that I thought Schemes of Work were a waste of time one

> colleague asked, ""How would you know what you were going to teach

> then?"" Hmmmmmmmmmmm! !!! Experience?? A degree of thought? Of course a

> certain amount of planning is essential. You need to think about what

> you would like students to achieve (sorry Im using the dogmatic-not

> dogmetic jargon)However when I can get away with it, I always write

> lesson 'plans' after the lesson, with the evaluation being the most  
> important part of the 'plan' since it is the evaluation that will  
> dictate (oops, not a nice word) where the teaching and learning goes  
> from there.  
> PS Dont tell my programme managers!!!! !  
> PPS Your book was very helpful for the Discourse Analysis assignment  
> on the Subject Specialist part of my teaching course.  
>  
> --- In dogme@yahoogroups. com, ""\*\*\*"" <\*\*\*@ ...>  
> wrote:  
>>  
>> Dear all,  
>>  
>> Just written a long message but lost the whole thing - here goes  
>> again.  
>>  
>> I think that all this is very central to dogme \*\*\*.  
>>  
>> Assessing students writing through the plan that they write  
>> beforehand is as ludicrous as assessing teachers through their  
>> ability to write a lesson plan.  
>>  
>> I honestly think that getting experienced teachers to write  
> detailed  
>> lesson plans in the way that is often demanded is rarely useful,  
> and  
>> cannot be used as a way of assessing their teaching. In fact it may  
>> actually make them worse teachers since it may lead to less  
>> spontaneous teaching.  
>>  
>> Similarly, forcing learners to write plans of their writing does  
> not  
>> suit everyone and may turn some people off writing.  
>>  
>> I certainly feel far less motivated having to write this email a  
>> second time!  
>>  
>> Actually isn't this all very belittling for the learners, taking as  
>> it does an approach that ESOL learners are unable to string a  
>> coherent text together without going through the process of  
> writing  
>> a plan.  
>>  
>> Jim Scrivener led a brilliant session at IATEFL a few years back  
>> called 'Planning is a thinking skill - not a writing skill' or  
>> something like that.  
>>  
>> Jim, if you're out there, would it be OK to add your handout from  
>> that session to the files section here? I think it may be of  
> interest  
>> to many.

>>  
>> \*\*\*  
>> --- In dogme@yahoogroups. com, \*\*\*wrote:  
>>>  
>>> I suppose, \*\*\*, you could say the same about art. The point  
> is,  
>> is that  
>>> planning allows a certain amount of reflection to take place from  
>> which a  
>>> coherent and cohesive text will flow. I agree, there are many  
>> types of writing  
>>> but these assignments are set so that the candidate can prove  
> that  
>> he can  
>>> communicate effectively.  
>>>  
>>> If anyone saw in the news last week an examinee was awarded 2  
>> points in an  
>>> exam for writing F.O (the full version but I am being polite). I  
>> guess he was  
>>> communicating.  
>>>  
>>> \*\*\*.

## Post 315

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Hi \*\*\*

Thank you for your long message. An interesting read. But how does your Korean teacher fit with your theory about the social attractiveness etc of `teachers with ""jizz"" ' ?

Dr \*\*\*

## Post 316

\*\*\*,

You say 'Why are you teaching this?' but if you look again at \*\*\*'s post you will see that this is a conversation between the learners. I don't see that there is any overt teaching from \*\*\* going on in this extract.

I'd say that conversations like this are pretty much what we're after. We want students to simply talk but we also want them to talk

about language because these are the moments when they stop and think about their own language use.

Continuing our long process of diasagreeing,

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*\*" <\*\*\*...> wrote:

>

> Dear friend \*\*\*,

>

> You wouldn't expect me not to comment, would you? Top marks to your bright,

> funny student and his imaginary dog Fast, but why are you teaching your

> captive youngsters this stuff? unless they need it for an exam, what is the

> point? It's just unhelpful knowledge, isn't it? If you insist, teach them

> that ""Today"", ""Yesterday"", ""Tomorrow"" are adverbs and see where that gets

> you all.

>

> \*\*\*

>

## Post 317

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

Many thanks for your reply, \*\*\*. It's interesting to hear this. I did like the idea that the conversation had taken place in Second Life. It added relevance to what was being discussed and it was a good way to get some insight into SL events, from the comfort of my kitchen! I'm not sure my intrinsic motivation is sufficiently high yet to venture in, but the idea that I'm missing out on interesting and useful experiences might change that eventually!

\*\*\*

----- Original Message -----

From: \*\*\*

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Subject: Re: [dogme] Re: Audio script of \*\*\* Interview in Second Life

Hi \*\*\*,

You wrote:

""In the meantime, and perhaps even to encourage me to take the plunge, I would be interested to hear how my experience of listening to the conversation

would have been enhanced by being present in avatar form. How is it different from listening to, and perhaps participating in, a radio talk/phone-in programme, albeit broadcast on the internet? Am I missing out? Or should I simply see SL as an alternative way of achieving the same thing and to be considered if I fancy trying something new?""

As with language learning, intrinsic motivation is key to how much you enjoy SL, I'd say. As for the difference between being present as an avatar vs. listening to the conversation, the best way to know is to give it a go. I can tell you I created an avatar a while back and then never returned to SL until the interview with \*\*\*. \*\*\* showed me a few tricks, which was kind of him, but I've also not returned since. To me, listening in would be just as good as watching two-dimensional figures bump into things and meander. But you might experience it all much differently.

\*\*\*

## Post 318

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Hi...

As someone who sits in an Internet Room used by students for many hours a week, can I suggest we ""forget"" to buy a printer...?

The easier it is to print, the less they ... and I'm not sure how to finish the phrase. It's a bit like the photocopier: the more photocopies you provide, the less effort the learners have to make.

Personally, I'd go for one PC per classroom, not one classroom for the PCs.

Agree with the cork and white boards all round the room. But haven't we forgotten windows...? We want as much natural light as possible.

Also, if it were possible to have a coffee machine (one that didn't make a ghastly coffee substitute), would that make any difference to what happened in the classroom? Like, if instead of, first, pulling out your homework, you helped make everyone coffee...?

\*\*\*

\*\*\* wrote:

Hallo,

I agree with all that has been suggested, but if there are going to be 8 or 9 classrooms, I would make one of them a self accessed IT/Internet centre. After all, students with this average age are generally all extremely



computer literate and use the internet a lot in their everyday lives.

6 modern multimedia computers with internet access placed around the edge of the room, with some tables in the middle which they can gather round to discuss anything they want. The material they can get from the internet, which they decide themselves, would prove extremely fruitful for discussion purposes.

Cheers

\*\*\*

---

From: dogme@yahoogroups.com [mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of \*\*\*

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Subject: [dogme] Design a classroom...

Hi all,

After 17 years in the same building, my school is moving to a new location in a couple of months.

Language school classrooms tend to be quite similar (whiteboard, noticeboard, phonemic chart, map of somewhere or other), so this is our chance to do something different.

And that's why I want to pick the brains of all the teachers who subscribe to this site.

What do you think a modern language classroom should be like?

Some points to consider:

There will be 8 or 9 classrooms.

The minimum age of the students is 18 and the average is 23.

Class size: 12 students.

The school will be close to the British Museum.

We also run a course where all the General English lessons take place in museums and galleries.

I'm open to all ideas!

Regards,

\*\*\*

Post 319

(With apologies to all who are not interested in dogme on line).

\*\*\*.

Your alternative dates are fine by me.

""Can it be possible to schedule it for Monday July 21 or Wednesday July 23 at 20:00 GMT?""

I'd just be grateful for a clear decision if tonight is off because I'm planning to leave a dinner party early to attend.

\*\*\*

On 7/15/08, \*\*\* wrote:

>  
> \*\*\*, \*\*\* and all,  
>  
> I don't know who would like to join this virtual meeting.  
>  
> I can usually make it on Wednesdays at 20:00 GMT, but I won't be able to  
> make it tomorrow since I have a meeting and I couldn't re-schedule it.  
>  
> Can it be possible to schedule it for Monday July 21 or Wednesday July 23  
> at  
> 20:00 GMT?  
>  
> All the best,  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>  
> De: dogme@yahoogroups.com [mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com] En nombre de  
> \*\*\*  
> Thwaites  
> Para: dogme@yahoogroups.com  
> Asunto: Re: [dogme] Dimdim Web Meeting  
>  
>  
> \*\*\*, \*\*\*, all,  
>  
> Wednesday 20.00 GMT is fine with me.  
>  
> \*\*\* ..,\_\_\_  
>

## Post 320

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.  
Coded as teaching text.*

Just a quick note to say thank you so much to all those who took part in our survey.

Your help with this was invaluable and we were able to put together an infographic combining academic research, opinion and a lesson plan for those doing learning-to-learn activities with your students!

As \*\*\* says... let's make our students ethnographers of their own language!

You can find it here

<http://voxy.com/blog/2011/05/are-flashcards-an-effective-learning-tool-infographic/>

Again, many thanks!

\*\*\*

p.s. for anyone doing like research we've also made the poll summary available as a downloadable pdf.

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*"" wrote:

>

> Hey ya,

>

> Am trying to get some data on the use of flashcards in the language learning classroom, could you please...please....please answer a very quick-2mins-poll:

>

>

<https://spreadsheets.google.com/a/voxy.com/spreadsheet/viewform?formkey=dGVGeDFfalVxYU9SNTZLa19iOF80YIE6MQ>

>

> Thank you x 1million+1

>

> \*\*\*

## Post 321

*Coded as teaching text.*

I would like to thank members of the list who have given feedback to the Kindersite project ([www.kindersite.org](http://www.kindersite.org)) regarding the use of the Kindersite with their children.

Of course, all are welcome to use the Kindersite, there is no charge. We do ask for your feedback if possible.

\*\*\*

## Post 322

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

Thanks for that link, \*\*\*. People might like to check the links to praxis and Freire, as well. Very dogme-relevant.

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*\*" wrote:  
> Which part of the cycle was missing?  
>  
> <http://www.infed.org/biblio/b-explrn.htm>  
>  
>

## Post 323

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

\*\*\* asked: >

> Also, what is your favorite activity?

>

I think I dreamt it, last night. It was the beginning of the school term, and the dream starts in a staff room (not one I recognised) with teachers scurrying around loading up with books, etc to go to class. I couldn't find mine, but someone said, well, you're the dogme teacher, after all... so I went into the class with nothing, except what looked like a large bar of blu-tak. I found the classroom (room 4) and burst in, but the previous class was still in progress - teacher very apologetic. I waited with the students outside - some of them I recognised from previous courses - Spanish young adults, advanced level. I was already thinking, damn I won't be able to recycle any old lessons. The lesson started - I knew I wanted to do something on the topic of education, so I said (and this is the ""favourite activity"" ""I want you all to write a sentence beginning ""Learning is...."" What I vaguely planned is that they would then share their sentences, work them into a sort of poem or rap, perform them, and then discuss the content. They busied away. I went over to check one student, and he had written sentences which were completely off-task, connected I think to a text that was still on the board, and nothing to do with learning at all. At that point I woke up.

## Post 324

Definitely spam or worse - please avoid! (""Member"" has been deleted)

\*\*\*

-----Mensaje original-----

De: dogme@yahoogroups.com [mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com] En nombre de Elizabeth

Enviado el: 02 May 2010 10:05 AM

Para: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Asunto: [dogme] Spam ? - or not ?

a recent message from \*\*\* ... (no subject line - no comment - just a link) looked a lot like spam (I searched the list of members and couldn't find the person) am I being paranoid ?

## Post 325

*Coded as teaching text.*

A little more information about Grammar Dictation by \*\*\*...  
As far as I can remember, it basically includes a lot of material related to the dictagloss method. Some basic information about this method is available on the internet, just in case anyone is interested but doesn't have access to the book.

\*\*\*"

## Post 326

Sorry, I meant to delete three lines, having deleted a comment - so my post should've read as below, skipping out the bit with a '2' in front.  
Sorry about that - tis the flu!

\*\*\*

> Thoughts on \*\*\*' thoughts:

>

>

>

> 1 ""the kids as their lab rats exclusively for their own material benefit.>

> > As long as the institution gets some cash, I see no problem if certain teachers need money on the side as a motivation to produce better lesson plans, good for them.""

>

> But the kids don't belong to the institution, they belong to the kids, so maybe the teachers should credit their students in their materials (books published acknowledge the schools and individuals involved in piloting) and, if any money is to be shared out, share it with the kids. The school's already hanging onto a fair cut of what the students have paid..

>

> Who decides if what these teachers publish online is any good? Effective? Accurate? The net is full of tosh in all fields - who oversees the stuff some TEFL teachers upload? We know there're plenty of - erm - tosh-mongers in our profession, but how do teachers buying online materials know if it's any good? I know there are webs that do all the necessary checking, but what about the indies??

>

> Hilary Mantel once wrote ""how do you know your thoughts have never been thought by anyone else before?""

> Who checks that what people upload and sell as their stuff really is? They could so easily be selling other people's ideas? Have you ever toothcombed the web to see if YOUR ideas are there, uncredited and for sale?

>

> I have no worries about people selling their own class plans(though you'd be hard pushed to sell a dogme class plan, given that they don't exist and retro-plans are so individual it'd be more like selling a blog post), though I would rather post ideas on a list like this one, to be shared. However, as these class plans will generally be used with kids, I hope there's some sort of filter, otherwise it's like selling toys with large pins holding the eyes in place or toxic lead paint. Who's to know? The people on this list are ethical, almost by definition, but there're plenty out there who aren't.

>  
> It all boils down to what your driving force in life is...

## Post 327

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.  
Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

\*\*\*,

thx for the support. It is an interesting notion, contrasting;

learning vs. cognition (semiotics)  
information vs. wisdom (semiotics)  
teaching vs. socially-connecting (semiotics)

As I stated from the outset, learning hardly requires speech. How could any human ever learn to speak if they weren't endowed with that skill from a nearly-tabula-rasa standpoint?

No, I never claimed that learning MUST follow from speech. Only that the social reinforcement we see at work in classrooms with students speaking their own take on ""the topic"" out loud seems to act in a similar way that early reinforcement from a neural standpoint when as infants we watch, listen, and observe for connected events from which our very first and mos important learning-exercise ensues! ;D

My take on the difference? early hebbian learning takes place in a discrete reinforcement world; yes/no, on/off, is/isn't, hurts/feels good...whereas what we call learning is actually a higher level process with multiple inputs with multiple modes (scalding/hot/warm/cold/freezing,

It could well be that we start out learning with discrete hebbian inputs simply because that's all we can take in at that point. Once language kicks in we move to the cognitive level. recognize the word dog as a child hardly belies the ability to discern a dog from a coyote, but certainly that skill seems to come with its won ""automated user manual"" as well.

Learning or cognitive process/ I can't claim to know the difference, but will continue to seek to connect what I see as synergy at one level repeated at a higher level with the same process at work but appearing to be different because of the level of the cognitive exercise.

In Physics these days they've realize that it's wholly possible that the laws of physics were different an instant after the big bang than 3 instants after the big bang, yet the base forces at work all seemed to have ""universal"" connectivity somehow. perhaps learning is like that. How we learn ""tabula rasa"" uses the same machinery as how we learn ""tabula partis"" so to speak. The inputs become multi-modal not binomial, and the connections become more complex simply because there is more information with many more levels of context to connect.

I know this sounds like I'm making it up as I go along, terminally mixing pseudo-scientific metaphors as I go.

But I'm going to continue to argue my point, if only because I've seen it at work over and over again. ;D

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*\*" wrote:

>

> \*\*\*:

> All he's saying is that you can't

> take possession of/ appropriate/ OWN a language until you give it voice. That is to say, an extended silent period is not in your best interests. My experience (not) learning Spanish in Spain would seem to bear this out.

>

>

> \*\*\* banging on about the same thing again: But does that voice HAVE to be out loud?

Can't it also be in written form or in your own mind? What was Einstein doing for the first seven years of his life before expressing stuff out loud? Not learning efficiently any kind of way to express his ideas? He must have been thinking in / learning some kind of language...and pretty efficiently, I suspect. Particularly given the school of thought that says we think all our thoughts in words (a school I don't subscribe to, but I do remember an interesting thread on the subject, oo, about six years ago? Seven?)

> I don't know, but I just think it's too limiting to say that we all need to speak out loud to learn a language efficiently.

> I don't 'disagree' with \*\*\*, as such, I just don't think EVERYONE has to express their thoughts/language out loud to be an efficient language learner.

>

> And I wasn't suggesting reading poetry out loud, by the way, only saying that one can appreciate certain aspects of semiotics without actually understanding the content of the text (I'll add that I studied semiotics in France, with the focus on poetry and cinema, not linguistics or language acqn). Probably mixing two lines of thought though - the other day I had a heated debate with the teacher of my younger son; she thoroughly believes that 'everyone knows you have to read out loud to improve your intonation, and you have to have good intonation to understand what you're reading'....

>

> Anyway. Have a good Wednesday.

>

>

>

>

> --- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*\*" wrote:

>>

>>

>> \*\*\* wrote:

>>

>>> Well-meaning friends are always asking me what subjects we discuss. And I

>>> want to scream. We don't ""discuss"". We talk about ourselves and share

>>> enthusiasms, dislikes and opinions.

>>>

>>>

>>>

> > Nice, \*\*\*. When I see the D-word ("Discuss among yourselves...") I come out in a rash. But I don't think \*\*\*'s notion of "forced production" implies artificiality, or even force, for that matter. All he's saying is that you can't take possession of/ appropriate/ OWN a language until you give it voice. That is to say, an extended silent period is not in your best interests. My experience (not) learning Spanish in Spain would seem to bear this out.

> >

> > On another subject, your description of your class chimes nicely with the analogy of "language class as ecosystem" that I referred to in my last blog post ([www.scottthornbury.wordpress.com](http://www.scottthornbury.wordpress.com)) where I used van Lier's analogy of the class as football game. \*\*\* might want to extend this metaphor: you're not playing football if you don't make contact with the ball.

> >

## Post 328

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*, do you have a dictionary in class? I always check, or ask learners to check, if I'm not sure about a spelling. I think this is good practice, not poor teaching; it also seems to help us all remember tougher spellings than if I just gave them off pat. And one of my best misspelling moments was with 'embarrassing' - good for remembering 'an embarrassing mistake' .... but it's not only spelling - I've had cats splayed (rather than spayed), and squatted (rather than swatted) mosquitoes recently - and no one seems perturbed when I own up and confess; words are like that, and it's no shame to misspell or whatever - unless you torkin ebout kumpleet ill lit rasee.

on language awareness, I have a sort of 'golden rule' about using the context (adding in shared group knowledge and past situations if necessary) and avoid automatically launching into standard PPP type examples/nuggets which may have little or nothing to do with the angle on the thing the student's taking, how they're seeing it, and which will probably have little to do with the context either. It's one thing to blind students with your wisdom (so-called; I mean knowing all the technical stuff), another to go with them and try and see how they're seeing the language and help them get a more user-friendly, clearer picture. And I honestly find that a lot of the things students ask about and want to know about aren't in any of the grammar or course books!!!

And a good dictionary can be just as much of a help as a grammar book sometimes.

And of course, sometimes there is no answer; or at least, not a useful one; just a 'keep them quiet and bluff your way through one' ; or, (better I think), a 'keep the pot boiling' one - we'll look out for that and see if we can find out more as we go along.

Part of what I'm trying to say is that sometimes a teacher can be TOO helpful/clever - I know I've done this in the past, by trying to give a question the whole caboodle and probably missing the one little point that the student was concerned about and needed reassurance or guidance on; or, knowing all the standard syllabus stuff, I've launched into something assuming that what was the student was asking about, but it wasn't .....



I don't think it needs PPP for a teacher - or anyone - to be aware of language and feel confident with grammar. And often the PPP 'answers' answer questions in the first P or second P, but not the student's question .....

What is perhaps more important, though less easy to schematize and predict, is understanding what the student wants to know and is asking - really listening to what they're saying, and being as aware as poss of where they're coming from and what their view of language is; maybe this seems blindingly obvious to most teachers, but I've had to learn to learn about how a student sees the language, rather than just 'throw' the language at them. (And must admit I find it much more exciting and interesting and useful all round than just rolling out the present perfect, 'rules' and all ....)

As to \*\*\*'s closing comments: >My fear is that underlying all of this I may not become a ""good""

>(whatever that is!!) EFL teacher although I love being with students,  
>I take great interest in the lessons, I try to choose relevant  
>interesting material, I am a good motivator and facilitator but I may  
>be lacking in grammar awareness (and occasionally in my spelling  
>ability!!)..how can I (or can I!!) get better at this?

the best way to improving teacher language awareness is via students I think, not text books; and I'm pretty sure we're all having to at least try to do that all of the time, whether we've been teaching for 2 years or 20 years. Anyway, \*\*\*'s 'self-portrait' sounds like a pretty cool number to me!

\*\*\*

## Post 329

For those who haven't read the article I sent, this excerpted paragraph might be of interest:

""It was while studying with the radical educational theorist Ivan Illich in Mexico that he learned to throw clay pots. Illich said that human beings were disconnected from the earth, and Ron realized that he did not really know how to do anything with his hands, Ms. McBride said. 'So he moved in with a Mexican potter and learned.'

\*\*\*

## Post 330

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

In Connecticut, USA we are required to earn a certain number of CEUs each five year period. So we have to go to conferences or training sessions.

\*\*\*

## Post 331

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Remember I'm taking Postman's words out of context. Also, great minds can be wrong about things, can't they? I do think Postman had a lot to say that is still relevant. I do appreciate your respect for teachers and the work we do. I believe, based on what I know of Postman (possibly not much) that he treasured human beings and education.

What are the ramifications for dogme?

\*\*\*

On Feb 17, 2010, at 2:47 PM, \*\*\*wrote:

> \*\*\*,  
>  
> My problem with Postman is that there is a seething agenda in there,  
> and  
> anyone who can say something as spectacularly obtuse and  
> wholeheartedly  
> wrong as "" School teachers, for example, will, in the long run,  
> probably be  
> made obsolete by television"" really should be taken with a pinch of  
> salt...  
> If he really believed that, then I find his credibility shaky...  
>  
> Similarly, the quote you have below: ""When we begin relying on the  
> Internet  
> for all of our news and information we will turn into a nation of  
> zombies.""  
> strikes me less as a criticism of technology and more as a comment  
> from  
> someone who really has no faith in human beings at all, or their  
> capacity to  
> discern (rather like when a posting on this list said that  
> technology was  
> alright for the person posting, but not for the poor average teacher  
> who  
> would find it all so terribly confusing - if we truly believe these  
> points  
> of view we are not uncovering flaws or dangers with technologies, but  
> intrinsic problems with human beings. Totally different thing.  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>

## Post 332

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Oh, dear, oh dear, oh dear!

A while ago I was asked for examples of ""cockamamie NLP techniques"". I did actually supply some: Jane Revell's breathing exercises, the so-called ""Precision"" model, all sorts of ""guided visualizations"" (most people prefer their own fantasies), and the absolutely inexplicable ban that NLPists have on asking the perfectly good question ""why"" (supposedly it makes people defensive, and as we can see on this list the NLPers have much more effective ways of making people defensive). But that was one of the mails that I put together that didn't post for some reason, and I couldn't be bothered to write it again.

But good examples come to those who wait, and here is an excellent one. For those of you who don't understand NLP, I should explain that one of the NLP techniques is to try to get the person you are mindfucking to acknowledge supposed ambiguities in what they are saying by asking ""challenges"" (but not the question ""why"" because that is too open ended and besides, as they acknowledge, it tends to give the game away).

Instead of intersubjectivity, instead of trying to understand the whole picture (including the deliberate, indeed artistic, ambiguities of what people say), the NLPist will focus on some apparent ambiguity of which the speaker is apparently unaware. This has two advantages; first of all, it puts you firmly in control of the conversational agenda and second it puts the gist of what the other said on the backburner.

There is a really hilarious chapter in Harold Garfinkel's ""Studies in Ethnomethodology"" (Prentice-Hall 1967) where he tries to get his graduates to do this with their families at home, e.g.

GRAD: When you say fine, do you mean your health, or your mental state?

GRAD'S MOTHER: What's wrong with you? You know what I mean!

Several of the grads had to discontinue the experiment to avoid incidents of domestic violence, and at least one did permanent damage to her relationship with her boyfriend!

The problem, \*\*\*, is that you have a firm grasp of the utterly obvious. Both \*\*\*vil and were perfectly aware of the ""ambiguity"" you spotted, but neither of us is responsible for it or even particularly interested in it. ""English Teacher"" is, actually, what people say, even outside England, and they do manage to live with the

ambiguity, including all of the hypothetical nefarious logical corollaries (strength in numbers, dominant culture, etc, etc) which you manage to attach.

The same thing, by the way, holds true of your unpleasant comment on my alleged sexism, and your impertinent insinuation that I am an ""academic"" who only sees people and conversations as objects of inquiry and will not recognize them in the round. Yes, I am aware of all these potential meanings, and no, I am not responsible for them and I will not be bullocked into taking responsibility for them.

And now a question for you. When I was in my twenties I was briefly the object of a political misunderstanding which led to my being locked up in a Baath'ist prison (Syria, not Iraq) for about two months and subject to daily interrogations, threats, and even a mock execution. During the whole two months, I was asked many many questions, but I do not ever remember being asked one which began with ""why""? Why not?

\*\*\*\*

## Post 333

Dear \*\*\*,

You are welcome to dogme ELT - though I suspect that the word ""pedagogy"" might not be the word chosen by the majority of the list - we definitely do a lot of thinking about it - most often at a real classroom level.

In friendship,

\*\*\*

On Mon, 2008-08-11 at 08:51 +0000, \*\*\*. wrote:

> Hi everyone,

>

> I've just joined the ELT Dogme group with the objective to contribute  
> on the subject of pedagogy.

>

> If you are interested in issues related to pedagogy, I kindly invite  
> you to discover my open source, non commercial and independent portal  
> (founded on July 2005) entitled:

>

> learning environment, learning performance & lifelong learning

>

> <http://www.pedagogy.ir/>

>

> I've no doubt that your comments and feedbacks will guide me on how to  
> improve what I do.

>  
> Your kind consideration is highly appreciated in advance.  
>  
> All the best,  
>  
> \*\*\*

## Post 334

*Coded as questioning and answering.*  
*Coded as teaching text.*

Hallo Everyone,

Just what is SIT?

As for Applied Linguistics and cognitive neuroscience take a look at Skehan', A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning, a book in the OUP Applied Linguistics series.

Cheers.

\*\*\*

---

From: dogme@yahoogroups.com [mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of \*\*\*

Sent: 21 February 2007 11:46

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Subject: [dogme] Re: Do interesting things & teaching unplugged site

--- In dogme@yahoogroups. <mailto:dogme%40yahoogroups.com> com, ""\*\*\* "" wrote:

> \*\*\*, what do you say to people who suggest that SIT spends too much time reading soft and fuzzy books without delving into applied linguistics? >

> \*\*\*, what do you say to people who claim that unless your teenage students are beyond an ""intermediate"" level, they are probably not ready to acquire 's' for third-person singular? >

Hi \*\*\*

Although the questions weren't addressed to me, I thought:

1. to the critics of SIT, I'd ask whether there was any reason to

suppose that the reading of soft and fuzzy books was any less worthy than the study of hard, poky applied linguistics. Has Applied Linguistics been able to answer definitively ANY of the major questions it has spent the last fifty years looking at? I might also ask them why they were reading applied linguistics books and not looking at the field of cognitive neuroscience.

2. to \*\*\*'s questioners, I'd ask whether or not that 'fact' should mean that there was no point in highlighting it. After all, there is no set timeframe in which people get to intermediate level. I'd also point out the idea, voiced by \*\*\*, I believe, that maybe people don't get third person -s until quite late on because it's usually allowed to slide: meaning is clear without it, so there's no need to bang on too much. I think \*\*\* uses this as an example of how we can pretend to not understand when Ss make this error in the hope that it might speed acquisition up.

3. to the devil's advocate, I'd ask how much the retainer is (and whether or not there's a well-paid vacancy for a legal assistant).

\*\*\*

## Post 335

*Coded as teaching text.*

Here are a couple of quotes from an article on the A'level disaster ('fiasco'). The address of the article is below. Maybe there's hope.....

""It can't be beyond us to devise an approach that recognises talents, diagnoses weaknesses, directs pupils into appropriate careers and yet teaches children that learning can be pleasurable""

""Let's settle for good and imaginative teaching, with very few examinations, and time in the curriculum for teachers and students to pursue interesting ideas."" (haven't they heard of dogme?)

<http://education.guardian.co.uk/alevels2002/story/0,12321,797097,00.html>

\*\*\*

## Post 336

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

All:

You know those moments when the teacher says something like:

Right! Now....

OK! Let's...

And now for something completely different....

My hypothesis, which I am going to have the kids test on our next classroom observation project, is that these moments occur much less frequently (if at all) in "dogme" classes (and by extension in classes where the stress is on TEACHER-SOMEBODY and SOMEBODY-SOMEBODY interaction rather than TEACHER-EVERYBODY interaction).

In the past year on this list, we have given a rather disproportionate amount of energy to the criticism of materials and pedagogical materialism. Well, not disproportionate, considering what we are up against, but disproportionate considering all the other ideas that are implicit in \*\*\*'s initial article.

One I would like to develop is his criticism of "grammar McNuggets". I think implicit in this is the idea that the smallest teachable unit of language is NOT a sample sentence, but a unit of discourse, that is, an exchange between two human beings. This is the elusive "teach-eme" that Fanselow was looking for; it's in this that you find all the properties of language that we obfuscate with terms like "natural", "real", and "authentic communication".

But does discourse come in McNuggets? Or are the units simply artefacts of description? Or are they something in between, like "species"? I mean, species do exist, but only after the fact of evolution. Nature does not ever say "And now for something completely different....!"

\*\*\*"

## Post 337

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Hi \*\*\* and everyone else.

I can corroborate \*\*\*'s "three paragraphs only" suggestion. Three is the magic number of paragraphs that I swear by with texts, too. The rest is there for optional homework, if the studes want it (which some of them do, but many don't, so everyone ends up happy).

I also go along with \*\*\*vil's comment. Here it is again, to save you getting RSI:

-- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, "\*\*\*\*" <wrote:

Personally, with my class I'd take the text in (unless they brought it), give it to them in groups and ask them to use it and create tasks for each other. Then I'd go off and have a coffee and come back later (Oh no! I wouldn't do the last part - getting carried away again - I'd skulk in a corner). >

> \*\*\*

But I more often do this with fake listening material than with

reading material. I find that adult learners really engage much more tightly with the task of \*listening in order to create a task for their peer teams\* than they ever have done with the task of \*complete this task which some stranger devised and thought might be interesting for you, even though that stranger has never met you\*.

The other obvious advantage of having students create tasks for each other is that more time is spent using the text (ie, using the text to create a task, then using it again to complete the task set by the folks over at the other side of the room).

I don't know how ""dogmatic"" any of this is, nor whether that matters to anyone. Does it really matter to \*you\*, \*\*\*? You seemed, earlier on, to hold dogmaticness as a fairly sacred principle that you wanted to adhere to (""...Im wondering how to exploit this whilst keeping things healthily dogmatic..." was what you actually said in 7406).

I can't help but wonder why ""keeping things healthily dogmatic"" is an objective for you or for anyone else, when responding, tightly, to the needs and concerns of the people in the room might be a more worthwhile guiding principle.

What do you reckon, \*\*\*?

La'ers,  
\*\*\*.

## Post 338

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Hello all,

I am torn between two equally negative options: should I post my boring, mind-numbingly predicatble response, which anyone in the group could also post (not because they agree with it, but because it's so predictable) -- or should I not say anything, leaving the impression that I shoot my mouth off at random, without provocation, and without even the slightest basis for what I say? :-) In short, it's pride versus monotony!

Pride wins!! I dunno if that's good or bad.

For example, I would wanna know:

- 1) Pre-test results. Did one class know more than the other before treatment?
- 2) Test done by disinterested party: did teacher (unconsciously of course; no charges of dishonesty here) somehow bias the results? Or did the students, out of love and respect for the teacher (no sarcasm at all intended) somehow bias their own results?



- 3) Questions covered: remember how..uh what's his name, Asher.. biased the TPR tests that Krashen then trumpeted? [By the way, for the record, I love TPR for absolute beginners].
- 4) Yeah, I would want a sample size big enough for some statistical analysis. Forex, what does ""scored better than"" mean, statistically speaking. Predictable. Boring. Mea culpa.
- 5) Post-test interviews: did the ""uncorrected"" students run home and drag out their grammar books?
- 6) ""...class which weren't corrected were far more willing to open their mouths and speak."" Could teacher have improved this disparity this via behavioral engineering? Smiling? Encouragement? ""Mistakes are OK because they help you learn"" speeches? Fostering a risk-taking attitude? Etc.
- 7) And so on and so forth, boring, etc. And etc.

Cheers,

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*\*"" wrote:  
 > been away, still catching up! meanwhile, think this may be the post \*\*\*  
 > refers to:  
 > ----- Original Message -----  
 > From: ""\*\*\*\*\*""  
 > To: <dogme@yahoogroups.com>  
 > Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2002 3:46 PM  
 > Subject: Re: [dogme] error correction  
 >  
 >  
 >> About 8 years ago I did a small scale piece of research  
 (unfortunately too  
 >> small to really be publishable).  
 >>  
 >> I had 2 classes of monolingual beginners - 15 students in each. I  
 taught  
 >> both classes 2x3 hours per week. Both had similar demographics - 18-23  
 > year  
 >> olds with minimal English language learning experience.  
 >>  
 >> I decided (with their approval) to try out something in the 6 months I  
 >> taught them. With one class we were quite strict on error correction,  
 > noting  
 >> mistakes and trying to systematically deal with them. In the other  
 class  
 > we  
 >> didn't care less as long as we could understand the message - in fact  
 > there  
 >> was absolutely no overt error corection of either spoken or  
 written forms.  
 >>  
 >> Not surprisingly the class which weren't corrected were far more  
 willing  
 > to

> > open their mouths and speak. However, the surprise came at the end when we  
> > did a fairly traditional 'grammar' test based on what had been covered  
> > during the course. The class which hadn't been corrected scored better  
> than  
> > the class that had been corrected in 13 out of 15 cases!!!!  
> >  
> > \*\*\*

## Post 339

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

*Coded as teacher training.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

I too am a dos (and feel much the same about admin as \*\*\* does ...).

\*\*\* asks >If I'm developmentally observing a teacher, I always get a lesson plan, but would >be happy if they diverged from it in a valuable, real way.

I don't ask for lesson plans when I go into class with another teacher! If they want to bring me in on one beforehand, or talk about what they plan to do before the lesson, I go along with that; what is most useful is always the chat after the lesson.

>""Why did you continue as per the plan? Why didn't you follow that lead?"" Similar problems

> anyone ( teachers or DOSES )? Any answers, other than patient explanation and reiteration >that the plan can be to get away from the plan?

I had somewhat similar thoughts about a colleague's lessons recently; when I was thinking, wow, this could really take off, the teacher was impatient to get things back onto 'lesson plan track'; of course, it's important to respect this - and not think that what I would have done would have been better just because it would have been the way I teach, or believe. Several things that have come out of our post-lesson chats are interesting; for example, the teacher was worried about timing - if she let the conversation go on too long, there wouldn't be time to 'wind things up'; she also wanted to 'experiment' with activities she hadn't tried before, so was especially concerned about 'getting through things'; or, to use a recently recurred metaphor, she didn't want the foreplay to go on for too long (but whose foreplay is it anyway?!). She's not a course-book-addict teacher, and one of her primary aims is to develop learners confidence and ability in conversation. Overall, she is working nicely towards her aims, and feeling satisfied with the learners' response. And her plans increasingly allow for more flexibility. Part of it was that she needed to be reassured that no teacher can ever be expected to be an egg-timer.

I said she is ""feeling satisfied with the learners' response"", and I find that learners themselves are often very satisfied with the lesson plan track approach - and its spontaneous diversions that \*\*\* wants to encourage in some of his peers - when they don't have the subtle if to my mind vitally important experience of a more dogmatic approach; so why rock the boat when you can gently row it ashore, sort of thing; that has been my thinking in recent situations which seem similar to those \*\*\* talks about. By which I mean, I

don't feel right or comfortable explaining to a teacher why s/he should have deviated from the plan - unless of course that teacher half wanted to but was unsure about whether to do it - but I can put a few alternative ideas forward, and make it clear that it's okay to go in without a full lesson plan. Colleagues come into my classes too - so we can benefit from working with each other and with learners who are not our 'sole responsibility' - they can see me practising what I may - albeit subtly - preach, and if they feel it's appropriate for them, they can take cues from that.

>Another confession, while I'm here: As a DOS, I confess to not drawing newly-qualified or >less-experienced teachers' attention to this site. Most of our teachers are shown it, or at least

>given the address. In a sense, those who've proven that they can walk the line,

I feel the same, in that I don't want to 'preach dogme' - just try to practice it and learn and understand it better - but I do find a lot of teachers discover it for themselves - and a lot of learners seem to have 'invented' it!

\*\*\*

## Post 340

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

1. The teacher is the most important person in the classroom.

Hopefully the content is the most important thing in the classroom and the teacher and students equal participants.

I quite like it when my students take over and take control of the learning, I sort of nod off in the corner until required to answer a question they feel I should know the answer to! Maybe I should remove the phrase ""nod off"" but .... when you're teaching 26 x 60 minutes a week ..!

I do wonder though whether Dogme has more credence outside the UK - I'll explain what I mean.

I was recently discussing the style(s) of teaching with an Advanced evening group. All the group work during the day and come for 1 2 and a half hour lesson per week. One comment that struck me was ""It's nice to 'chat' and talk about language but we could do this down the pub, I've come here to have more structured input and I want you [the teacher] to tell me what I need. If I was in my own country this would be great [Dogme] but here I can get most of this outside the classroom.""

Now, maybe it's what I'm doing [my dogme teaching] that's wrong! But I'd be interested in what other people (particularly those working in the UK) have to say.

I do like the comment from \*\*\* about beasts of burden - strikes a chord - Oh! yes, that's what my institute currently think I am!

It also raises the question of 'fraternizing' with students!

Another point to be made about beasts of burden is that they may actually have a place in the language classroom. I'm just off to Uzbekistan at the end of the week to work on a project, 65% of the student population are rural ..... maybe relevance of materials will be a key issue?!

\*\*\* (aka \*\*\*!)

## Post 341

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Dear \*\*\*,

Why is Dogme Teacher-fronted? you said:-

On the one hand, there's this ethnographic study of Vietnamese classrooms by Sullivan that argues against pairwork and for a very Teacher-fronted, dogme style.

In my experience the teacher becomes even more of a facilitator taking student input and turning it round to get students to explore further.

\*\*\* (still around!)

## Post 342

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\* wrote: 'Adults 'think' too much about their learning.'

...and their teaching?

## Post 343

*Coded as teaching text.*

Finally, a personal account from a linguist and language learner, Elizabeth J Barber, at <http://www.mla.org/adfl/bulletin/v12n1/121026.htm>

""The sounds in my head became so intense after five days that I found myself mindlessly chewing on them, like so much linguistic cud, to the rhythm of my own footsteps as I walked the streets and museums. Whenever I noticed this din, the linguist in me would demand to know what I was saying. Half the time I had to look what I was saying up, or somehow

reconstruct what it meant from the context in which I had heard it hours or days earlier. The constant rehearsal of these phrases of course was making it easier and easier to speak quickly and fluently; things popped out as prefabricated chunks. But I had no control over what my subconscious fed into my ""chewer"" each day. It fed me what it considered memorable -usually from a surprising or stressful or isolated incident-not what I considered maximally useful. Nonetheless, my overall command of Russian improved more in a single week than it would have in a month or two of intensive reading.""

The rest looks interesting, too!

And, the forgotten link to \*\*\*'s short article: <http://www.hltmag.co.uk/jan04/sart1.htm>

\*\*\*

## Post 344

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

Dear \*\*\*,

When I read:

""I cannot change the university system that means she is expected to study English, I cannot change the fact that we live in a world where presently English is the language of power and status""

I was reminded of a quote I read today:

To be truly radical is to make hope possible rather than despair  
convincing  
- Raymond Williams

\*\*\*

## Post 345

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\* - did you (or did someone else) recently quote some research that's been done (or is being done) on the tendency for teacher-fronting in classes with interactive whiteboards?

I need some ammunition, as my name is mud in Brazil at the moment, since I delicately suggested, in a talk, that IWBs might become ""interactive white elephants"". Especially when they seem to be used primarily to deliver grammar mc nuggets. (The Cultura Inglesa has just invested millions in

fitting out its schools with them, and there were at least half a dozen talks on the subject at the conference I was at). The argument that even the sceptics all use is that at least their use encourages a "heads up" approach. "Heads up and answer the teacher's display questions" it seems to me. I did point out that open pair work is also "heads up". Am I tilting at windmills? (Again?)

Aux armes, dogmatists!  
\*\*\*

## Post 346

"We talked afterwards, and hatched the idea of a possible joint pre-conference session for next year - dogme meets learner autonomy, or some such. Any takers? \*\*\* "

I'll be sitting in the front row.

\*\*\*

## Post 347

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*  
*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

again I think the words just didn't quite do what they were intended to here!

Actually I was not referring to discipline per se here. I was using the term firm in terms of the role the teacher plays in introducing language, words, ideas at the right stage of child development.

But I am not sure that it's true that schools ruin children. This could be a gross generalisation. Children are not autonomous - this is too simplistic - we need to go further and look at stages of human psycho/social/spiritual development if we want to see to what degree a child is truly autonomous.

If you go back to your psychology (whether it be Eastern or Western based) there is firm (oh, not that word again!) evidence that until about 6 or 7 children have not yet learned conventional rules and roles, ie. they have not been socialized. They cannot take the role of the others and thus have not developed genuine care and compassion. So compared with subsequent development children (up to 6 or 7) have their feelings and morals still heavily centred on their own impulses, physiological needs, instinctual discharges.

At around 6 or 7 children begin to take on the role of the other

(countless simple experiments show this). This stage is a change from selfish to care and lasts to adolescence. The sharing of views and perspectives with others develops to the point that a child can be trapped in the views of others ie. conformist...this stage is accompanied by intense peer pressure, group dominance

Then after adolescence another change takes place. One's own peer group is subjected to scrutiny.

The changes going on in general are decreasing narcissism and increasing consciousness.

So, I am not saying that we can't say children are autonomous, but the truth is that children are reliant on the guidance of adults to nurture their unfolding development. We do not live in isolation, but in communities where this unfolding takes place.

If we get specific about learning English or a foreign language then at certain points teachers will need to introduce ""firm guidance"" to nurture the linguistic and social development of the child.

?"

## Post 348

Dear \*\*\*,

Apologies for not knowing if you are  
\*\*\*/\*\*\*/\*\*\*/\*\*.

Thank you for your prompt and kind reply.

I am currently so busy that when I turn one of the four corners of my house, I catch a fleeting glimpse of my own disappearing buns ...

when I ""get round 2 it"" I shall peruse with interest and perhaps chuck in me tuppence h'apenny's worth.

I should, in all fairness, warn you though, that I am a ""non-professional/un-qualified professional EFL teacher "".

I came into the profession by chance/luck back in March of '93. By trial-and-error and ""flying by the seat of my pants, a.k.a. bush-piloting"", and the inexorable passage of time, I have ""drug meself up to teachin' at a local uni.

Dog gone!

Hairy Hound

p.s. Dinner is in the dog!"

## Post 349

Dear Dogme List, My name is \*\*\* and I've been hanging around this group for a while. While I've been pretty quiet for the last few years, I am dying to meet any of you who will be coming to TESOL 2014!! I live in Portland and know some awesome spots to sit down and drink...Portland doesn't only have awesome beer, it has the best coffee and an amazing food scene. Our food carts will knock you out! Come hang out with me and let's talk! I would be so happy to organize/facilitate some Dogme gatherings for whenever a majority of people can meet and be a resource to anyone who is looking for all the best Portland has to offer. What do you say?

---In dogme@yahoogroups.com, <\*\*\*> wrote: Fellow list members,

Diane Larsen-Freeman is slated to talk about Complexity Theory as it relates to language, learning, and teaching.

Care to chat about the talk over a pint at one of Portland's many microbreweries? That is, will you attend the convention here in March?

\*\*\*

## Post 350

Coded as own in class experience.

Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.

Handouts also give students a chance to hear and see words at the same time.

That is why my students really enjoy it when I copy lyrics to popular songs.

They listen to and look at the song at the same time.

I once had two elementary school students who always went from my room back to their classroom for ""three choice"" That is what they called it, because they had never seen the words which were, in fact ""free choice"".

\*\*\*

## Post 351

Coded as own in class experience.

Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.

Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.

Yeah, ""eidetic"" memory is used in lots of ways by lots of people. I'm trying to use it the way it's used by Vygotsky, and also by Craik and Lockhart (and Stevick).

But Vygotsky on the one hand and C & L on the other have very



different agendas. Vygotsky, as usual, is in pursuit of a GRAND UNIFYING THEORY, and in particular he wants to use eidetic memory to unify FOUR wildly disparate things: a) the evolution of the hominid ""physical system"" which is the precondition for language like behavior, b) the prehistoric evolution of language-like behavior into language, c) the ""ontogenesis"" of language (that is, L1 acquisition) and what he calls d) ""microgenesis""--learning on a moment by moment basis, in schools.

The c-d link has been extensively discussed on this list (that is, L1 acquisition = or does not equal L2 learning). Only Marxists or other social-constructivists would really see a-b, or b-c as linked in any meaningful way; other people talk of genes, which is not very helpful for understanding d, or even c-d links. Yet surely the things should be linked--after all, the subject is the same (humans), the object is the same (language) and even the verb phrase is the same (learning) whether we are talking a, b, c, or d.

Eidetic memory, or ""literal"" memory, is probably the same thing, whether we are talking a, b, c, or d (or for that matter if we are talking about dogs or humans), but the significance of it must diminish as we develop our higher cognitive functions. Enter Craik and Lockhart (and Stevick and dogme) who recognize that memory is not simply a matter of brute repetition, but exists to different depths, according to how the material is analyzed and stored. The most ""context embedded"", literal form is on the surface--a great deal of material is stored for a very short time, as when we reconstruct the furnishings of the room we are in with our eyes closed, or repeat exactly what we just heard. The less ""context embedded"" forms, analyzed and stored for their meaning, last longest, but contain more of what we call ""language"" (semantics, pragmatics, grammar).

A final note on ""Fox in Sox"". We did a short experiment in my graduate class where we read ""Fox in Sox"" and a much more difficult but much more plot-driven story called ""Imogen's antlers"" in class, and then tried to see how much of each story (phonology, vocabulary, grammar, plot) we could remember the next week. I thought ""Fox in Sox"" would score high in phonology but low in plot while ""Imogen's Antlers"" would be the opposite. Not so. ""Imogen's Antlers"" outperformed ""Fox in Sox"" in every category.

\*\*\*

PS: A note on political petitions. There's a precedent on this list--in the early days of the list, Neil Forrest posted something on Brazilian rainforests, which was allowed to stand. On the other hand, very strong controversies (such as those triggered by various postings I've made on the role of US imperialism in the middle and far east) generally get deleted. I think the criterion is really the amount of ""classroom disruption"" engendered.

\*\*\*

## Post 352

You know, the guy who types quickly at all hours, at various monitors.... which inevitably leads to (surprisingly few) typos.

No, it's actually the residual effects of Scotch Ale (so it's \*\*\*'s fault?) and lack of sleep that's caused me to type 'body imagine devices' instead of body \*imaging\* devices. But I like the implications of the former. And 'interested' term in stead of interesting? Must be the all the Spanglish rubbing off on me. :-)

\*\*\*

## Post 353

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

Interesting \*\*\* as the test only has 9 questions and the highest it goes is Upper Intermediate anyway!

\*\*\*

On 25 Sep 2009, at 08:33, \*\*\* wrote:

> I just took the BC test out of curiosity and scored ""intermediate""  
> on the grammar (just 10 questions?!) WTF, I am a native speaker with  
> a 5-year degree in Linguistics! I took the test a second time and  
> got ""Upper intermediate"".

>

> British Council Placement Test: FAIL

>

> \*\*\*

>

>

>

> \_\_\_\_\_  
> From: \*\*\*

> To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

> Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2009 11:11:59 AM

> Subject: [dogme] level / placement tests

>

> Hi,

> Can anyone point me in the right direction of any posts on this  
> subject in the archives? I'd be very interested to hear about any  
> alternatives to traditional multi-choice placement testing,  
> especially ones that don't involve an oral test - unfortunately in  
> my case, not possible before the courses start.

>

> Also having attained a pretty poor score myself on the British

> council's example reading level test - oops! (see here...  
<http://www.britishcouncil.org/learnenglish-central-test-test-your-level.htm>  
> (reading test)) I'd be interested in hearing how people 'level test'.  
>  
> Many thanks in advance  
>  
> \*\*\*

## Post 354

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

> \*\*\* (3/24 'Variety not linguistic-driven') asked for our comments on  
> this thought: ""Though our main professional aim is to enable our learners  
> to progress in their understanding and use of English, when we are not  
> preparing directly for tests and examinations, most of us in fact think of  
> lessons not in linguistic terms but in terms of variety, enjoyment,  
> absorption. . .""  
>  
> I guess I'd just change the first 'Though' to a 'Because.'  
> \*\*\*  
>

Nice point. No, perhaps KEY point, if the following example serves.

Here's one of the activities that was presented at our teachers mtg this morning.

Everyone has a blank sheet of A4 paper; following the teacher's instructions/example, we fold it into 3 along the long side, and then in half along the short side, so that when we unfold it we have 6 squares.

The teacher then dictates what we must write at the top of each of the 6 squares; in this example it was: early life; family; work; something I like and something I don't like; something interesting that has happened to me; a time when English will be useful to me.

Then we are asked to draw something in each square to represent each 'title'.

So far, I'm thinking, this is a nice activity; it's intriguing, it's involving, it's personalised; it has potential for exploitation and adaptation; it's nice cos it involves all sorts of things like using your hands, listening, writing, drawing: so far, so good.

Of course, not all of us manage to conjure up images/easily fix on so many different aspects/draw pictures at equal rates, but that's not really a problem.

And I can see some interesting, even intriguing, things appearing on the sheets of those around me - \*\*\* to my left has drawn a sperm caricature in the 'early life' square, whereas Kev on my right has drawn a big question mark in that square; and the same picture twice for 'like/don't like'; and so on - already, my natural inclination is to start nosing and sharing and finding out and comparing. (And, perhaps by doing this, I might find it easier to come up with ideas for the squares that are so far pathetically blank on my own sheet??)

Anyway, time's up, and we're in pairs, swapping sheets and told to ask each other about the pictures we've drawn.

Now comes the 'KEY'; today, we're all teachers pretending to be students, so the teacher isn't really able to 'control' what we say or do; but all the same we are categorically told that we mustn't ask yes/no questions, and that we must find out as much info about each pic as possible; that the objective is, 'TO ASK LOTS OF QUESTIONS'; (with 'questions' emphasised many times); 'TO USE THE PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE', (whatever they are..), 'AND, AFTERWARDS, TO REPORT ON WHAT YOUR PARTNER SAID USING THE THIRD PERSON'.

We were even told that with some pairs it's necessary to badger them and 'force' them to ask MORE questions if they've stopped (in that 'been there, done that' style some students have!); and that the icing on the cake is making them report in the third person.

so, an activity that starts out with a fair amount of real potential in the variety/enjoyment/absorption stakes is turned into a grammar circus; a personalised grammar circus, perhaps; an ambitious grammar circus, certainly; but a grammar circus all the same? (someone on list recently asked if we found course book content coercive .....

and those 'been there, done that' students - if they don't see the point, there is no point; the point is to let \*them\* create/find one .....? (or just let them stay happy with a little distraction time ....)

And, as a coda, we teachers found ourselves using lots of yes/no questions (a sort of automatic curiosity/guessing thing - is that because ....? do you mean .....? is that your...?); but at least they were questions .....! - the alternative might be, 'tell me about this', which is not a question; and the most obvious question would sometimes be our famous 'why?' - though in many cases, as in the sperm and the question mark, no questions are really needed at all; no doubt, the whole thing maybe works 'better' with people who don't know each other very well, so there's no automatic temptation to guess; but it's a bit personal as an 'imposed' activity for people who aren't at all familiar; but now I'm meandering out loud.

The key point, as I'm seeing it, is that you CAN'T impose 'grammar' on what is supposedly a personal or communicative or discovery or whatever activity; grammar comes out of it, yes, but neither we nor our learners really do these activities in order to write neatly on the register: 'practised questions and answers using present, past and future, and reported information about someone in the third person.'

Perhaps ironically, this is also partly why so many language students are satisfied and successful despite the purported, well meaning grammatical aims of their teachers. Because regardless of whatever we (meaning teachers in general, not specifically me, or you, or you etc) say or write in our registers or syllabuses, most learners go there, do their own thing, and ignore the rest .....for example, no one suggested we compare, but we all did - 'oh, I've put an alarm clock there too!', and we were far more interactive on our own (anarchic.... - well, teachers can tend to be that way ....) terms than within the neat and efficient prescribed parameters of the intended 'outcome'.

All this is partly why the 'communicative approach' has opened doors for many learners, because it does give scope for going out of bounds and letting learners get on with it regardless of the teacher/syllabus aims. I was joking about teachers being anarchic - students are too; and often the plus side of pair and group activities is precisely that the teacher canNOT control the language the students are using all the time, or the aims they are personally developing, or the relationships they are building, etc; yet students have the security of a structure, and at least a 'somewhat' freedom to do things their own way; a bit along the lines of a poor man's, unauthorised version of \*\*\*'s great definition; (like it so much I've got to repeat it: >"...teaching in the dogme classroom is not >about anarchy, >it's about holding the space responsibly, ie making sure that everyone feels >relaxed enough to wallow, paddle about, wade or swim like mad in the >language."")

(and perhaps even more learners could get through those doors more easily if syllabuses/teachers etc realised that \*imposing\* language - whether overtly, hidden or semi-hidden- was a waste of time???)

And in my own teaching situation I've been noticing something too common to be ignored over the last two years: even with the most dedicated and willing of learners, any language which comes up from them is remembered/reused almost sponge like, rarely needs a second chance; while anything I add in or think I should give them unasked is much denser, even after a number of 'exposures' - and maybe it might subsequently come up from them, in which case it's as if they're really 'seeing' it for the first time....

\*\*\*

PS: don't want to be accused of just being negative or slagging off and all that; to use a similar type of activity more constructively is just a matter of changing the focus somewhat; for example, putting all the sheets on the walls or boards and talking freely to each other about what arouses curiosity/interest; this in itself would yield loads of threads to follow and develop - more than one single lesson could cater for; I've had similar 'repercussions' in one of my classes recently - those pebbles that start avalanches - just from a little story one student told about something that happened to him, which caught everyone's experience and imagination, we've so far had three sessions which have included substantial ongoing 'show and tell' development from all the students - personal photos, stories, even short video clips they've brought in; (and yes, they sometimes ask questions, but no one needs to tell them to) .....

And btw I also like what \*\*\* (sorry, I'm probably the only one who doesn't have a clue who Grendel is ....) said so much I've got to repeat that too:

- >... the absence of powerful individuals who dictate to the masses how
- >things must be. In a dogme classroom, the class acts as a community. It
- >doesn't blindly follow imposed rules and guidelines, it negotiates the way
- >forward, building on what people want or decide they need. People respond as
- >they see fit.....

and >dogme is better suited to those teachers who are not frightened to share control with their learners."

## Post 355

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Hey everybody,

I just joined today, after reading several scintillating articles on the dogme approach online. After teaching basic ESL for 1.5 years, I'm now teaching a pre-Business English (bridge) course and am really enjoying my students. It's our 2nd week of the 4 week course. We're using a textbook, which as per usual sucks, for the morning segment each day, and my own hopefully more creative and communicative activities in the afternoon. The class energy is extremely low in the morning, and markedly more upbeat and dynamic in the afternoons. I'm not merely blowing my own horn here, because even in the afternoons I detect a ""going through the motions"" vibe from several of the students.

So, from what little of the dogme approach I've been exposed to from recent readings, I feel a strong urge to, as early as tomorrow (after correcting the homework that was assigned today, of course) make the dramatic gesture of literally throwing the loathed textbook against the wall and putting them in S-S dyads to discuss these questions:

""What would we do in this class if we didn't use the textbook? More importantly, what would you really like to learn about in this class?""

I'm a bit nervous about doing this, but mostly excited, impelled even. Again, what little I've read about dogme really resonates with an inchoate impulse in me about what the next phase of becoming the best teacher I can be is gonna look like. I know I need to read tons more about the methodology (or lack thereof) of this approach, but at this early stage I'd appreciate any feedback on my idea of throwing-the-book-against-the-wall-and-resultant-discussion for (as soon as) tomorrow.

Plus, I'd really like any comments on these factors, should we as a class decide to adopt this unstructured approach:

(1) what about quizzes? (There are preformulated quizzes that go with the hated textbook, which I've been adapting as required.)

(2) what about office politics? I'm teaching this course alongside a fellow teacher who's been teaching it a bit longer than me (i.e., we each teach our own classes in the same ""bridge"" program), and he strongly feels that we should each be covering the same material (and he's been great about borrowing my own, ideas for the afternoon communicative activities -- but I don't think he'd necessarily ""go"" for such a radical pedagogy. Never mind what the conservative administration of my school might think -- which could actually become a huge issue. Do you just do your own thing and throw caution to the wind, or....?

(3) what about student consensus (more specifically, the lack thereof) on topics and themes? How do you deal with this from the dogme perspective?

I'm totally stoked to walk into the classroom without a net as early as tomorrow, but any feedback in the interim (or after) would be greatly appreciated! If there's some essential reading I need to do to get up to speed, I'd be grateful for any references too.

\*\*\*

## Post 356

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

Hi

This little interactive webtext tool for the projector or white board may be of interest.

The featured simple text is marked in word groups according to function and meaning.

e.g. Things, people or ideas = red

Places, Manner or Time = blue

Doing or being (i.e.verbs) = green

The text can be hovered on with the mouse and word groups light up in the appropriate colours. By double clicking on a group it can be edited and improved.

e.g. (a new camera) = ( a new expensive digital double reflex camera)

or ( On Monday ) = (On Easter Monday last year)

I've been trying this out with an EFL class in a relaxed brainstorming manner before they attempt to write their own versions based on the text. They are always motivated and often laugh at the hilarious suggestions of others. No mention of grammar, vocabulary or conjugation at all.

Is this dogme by stealth? The tool is only experimental as of yet but I'd appreciate any suggestions or feedback. For details of marking up other original texts please contact me via the webpage.

(PS: doesn't work properly on tablets yet, use a proper PC if interested)

BTW: Has anyone heard of the late Michael Thomas? He made a fortune teaching English to rich clients using a relaxed non-formal teaching method from what I can see.  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P8jhy7ZQC38>

Worth a look.

\*\*\*\*"

## Post 357

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

Hi \*\*\* & everyone,

Firstly, good luck to you \*\*\*! As I'm sure you will hear many say you are in for both a challenging but potentially rewarding experience.

I first started teaching English to small groups of mixed-ability and multi-cultural Students in Miami. They were all immigrants and primarily adults 18+ years of age. Thankfully, I didn't have a 'dry government syllabus' to contend with, but I did have a 'suggested' grammar syllabus to 'tick off' (you may interpret 'tick off' both ways!). We did a lot of work with newspapers as well took field trips. Yes, the order of the day was teaching 'getting along in life' skills. I've also worked with a lot of



16-18 year olds here in Greece.

I think you're on the right track with personalized tasks... but they are still tasks. Somehow the tasks need to become more than just tasks. They have to develop a life of their own. Same thing with project work. It has to be meaningful and perhaps even student inspired and created. Ask them! They might suggest something like creating the story line for a video game, music video, etc.

The days I 'mislaid' the grammar syllabus were usually spent discussing grammar or expression related 'life skill' items. At one point, when the students were comfortable enough with me, they began bringing in vignettes of the frustrating situations they encountered outside of the class in which they couldn't express themselves or were confused. When the classes finally took on that 'we are all in this together' feeling, there was much discussion not only on what to say and how to say it, but also the underlying social issues. The classes ran the gamut from ESL to group therapy.

I'd also venture to say that if you really want to succeed with this class, you'll have to do your homework (probably more than they will), be a good listener and become (if you aren't already) a reflective teacher. Play the psychologist. Go home at the end of the class and keep a journal of who said 'what' and 'why' (and if you're into NLP don't forget 'how' :). Keep notes of student interests as well as turn-ons & turn-offs and so forth. Simply put: it's not enough to who they are and where they are coming from, you need to know what's in their head.

Here are a few quick thoughts/suggestions/ideas:

Music: Why do boring canned listening exercises if they would prefer to listen to Eminem, Panjabi MC, Dr. Dre and Snoop 'DOGME' Dawg? Here's one idea if they are into rap (especially Gangsta Rap): Play some rap music they bring in. Tell them you have a real hard time following what the lyrics are or are about. Can they please write them down for you? Have the students compare their lyrics. Even if they have most of the lyrics correct, with rap music there is always room for interpretation. Ask them to read the lyrics to you. Feign confusion about understanding them. Ask them what that means in PLAIN English. Have them explain or translate it for you. Discuss the story line, etc. Can they improve on the story line? Can they translate that back into rap? Can they perform it to the music? I assume you can do the same with Heavy Metal. If you are doing rap.. whatever you, don't mention ""Vanilla Ice"".

Interviews: What kind of interviews do you want to do. Job interviews? They probably won't be that motivated to do an interview for an imaginary job they could care less about in the real or worse would not be qualified for. Do you know what kind of jobs they would like to have? Find out. Go with what ever they suggest and modify the task accordingly. Would you go to an interview for a job you wouldn't want?

Use an alternative interview format. Let them be someone famous (or perhaps as you seem to imply infamous) like celebrities or sports figures or themselves (because of something special they did) being interviewed by a magazine reporter. First the students discuss and decide who they want to be. They must then justify their choice. Besides the oral work, it also helps the 'interviewers' to form questions. Let them be who they want to be. no censoring! In groups, have the students develop interview questions and compare. Have them justify their questions to the class. they should make amendments as appropriate. Alternatively, have the interviewees develop questions they would like to answer themselves. Finally conduct the interviews and then discuss the answers to the questions. Ask the interviewers what the interviewees had to say. Ask for class comment.

For extra-motivation, tape their interviews - this gives it a semi-real feeling. I've had better luck with hand with student motivation using hand microphones rather than the built-in types. It gives you the real interview experience. Using your thumbs might give some students mixed signals! Of course the tapes can come in handy later for other exercises.

Just a note on having students be someone else: As communicative teachers, I know that we are forever trying to put our students into a 'real world' context. But, perhaps kids of this age and disposition have enough of the real world already. They might not be happy with who they are or where they are in life at present, and your class can be a real escape for them.

For writing tasks: Contests. Keep and keep them on the lookout for contests in magazines (Guitar world, Rolling-Stone, Sports Illustrated, Guns & Ammo, etc..). There are a lot of magazines offering prizes for short essays on ""why I want to win"" or ""who is my hero.."" etc. There is motivation, there is context, etc. Don't forget to send the essays in. Make sure the students understand that YOU WILL send the essays in.

Lastly, but most importantly I think in terms of fostering a safe and positive environment for them is: Listen and Don't Judge!

\_ \*\*\*

PS. \*\*\*, good luck to you to with your new job!

## Post 358

Hi \*\*\*!

Thanks for the advice, it sure was helpful and I will make sure I go back to it during the course, as I'm certain by then I will be able to make even more sense out of it. And I will do as you say and have a look at previous posts.

Thanks again!

\*\*\*

---

De: \*\*\*

Para: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Asunto: Re: [dogme] CELTA course trainee

Hi \*\*\*,

Welcome! And Happy Halloween if relevant.

There are sure to be queries similar to yours, and the attendant advice, in the archives. I suggest a search under ""CELTA"" if you have time for it.

Although my CELTA experience happened back when owning a new tablet meant having found a flat piece of stone with no glyphs on it, some elements of the course seem to stand the test of time. For example, a lot depends on how well you and your tutors get along. I'm sure you know that, and you've asked for advice, not the obvious, so here goes:

\*Teaching Practice is at the heart of it:

Get as much out of the Teaching Practice (TP) as you can by using this time with language learners to better understand and appreciate the significance of the interaction between the people in the room, how this interaction can create a language rich environment that affords plenty of opportunities for learning. Let the TP inform your practice: Keep a journal of it to return to once you've been teaching a while; be sure to have questions ready for your peers and the tutors when you reflect on TP; experiment (eg, with Dogme) as much as you can within the constraints of the CELTA coursework. Observe your peers and study how their style and way of doing things in the classroom influences the flow and dynamic of events.

\*Don't swallow a bitter pill unless it helps you:

Question rules, formulae, patterns, etc. and think about them critically; some are helpful while others may just be hand-me-downs that don't fit but must be worn if you're to ""look presentable"" (ie, pass the course).

\*The show must go on:

Figure out the correlation between what your tutors expect of you and how that translates into their formal assessments. Plainly stated, what must you do to get the tutor to tick the box labeled ""Establishes rapport"", and all the others on the checklist? This doesn't have to be as conniving as it might sound if you simply feel your tutors out for what they're looking for. Hopefully, they'll provide you with plenty of feedback and freedom to explore and experiment; however, there do seem to be hoops to jump through on most courses. Once you've demonstrated that you are adept at concept checking, drilling, and so on, it might be easier for your tutors to accept teaching practice outside the domain of the expected, which leaves room for authentic interaction with learners.

I'm sure I've made some assumptions and omitted things here that you, your tutors and peers will discover during the course. So please share your experience with us when you can.

And let's hope other list members chime in soon!

Best of luck to you, \*\*\*!

\*\*\*

On Oct 31, 2012, at 7:42 AM, \*\*\* wrote:

- > Hey all!
- > I'm \*\*\*, I just joined the group and I'm about to begin with my CELTA challenge, the course starting next Monday. I'm really looking forward to it and I really believe I'm ready, although it does seem a little intimidating!
- > Any advice from anyone who has already taken the course will be much appreciated!
- > Thanks everyone!
- >
- > \*\*\*
- >
- >

## Post 359

*Coded as other forum post.*

- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote: >
- > \*\*\*, thanks for recasting my error. :-) I seem to have this
  - > problem with L1 and L2, thinking L1 represents the target language. I
  - > meant, of course, L2 (target language) should be used as often as
  - > possible.

Actually I didn't even notice because I'm always getting confused too--English is my L1, their L2; Japanese is my L2, their L1 (although more and more I get Chinese/Mandarin for whom Japanese is their primary L2 and English is something they have to take to keep their student visa).

\*\*\*

## Post 360

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Hello everyone.

I've been a member of the list for ages but only took an interest during the recent 'Coursebook discussion'. Since then I've been to a seminar on Dogme and have been looking at old posts here and on the British Council website. \*\*\*'s post below has inspired me to share/ admit what I've done as soon as I've started.

So, I based a lesson for a class at A2 on an idea from the Teaching Unplugged book that I bought a few days ago, always/ sometimes/ never enjoy, as a way of recycling the adverbs, and likes and dislikes from an early part of the coursebook we are using.

I put the headings horizontally on the board with ""shopping for food"", ""shopping for clothes"" and ""shopping for gadgets"" underneath. I then told them a short anecdote about

an afternoon at the shopping centre and asked them to match the activities with my feelings about them. Once done I then asked them to do the same in turn (there were three in the class including me), which left us with three different activities after each of the headings on the board.

We then looked at enjoy+---ing for the verbs they wanted to use and some other language that had come up, such as 'taking my dogs for a walk', 'shouting and screaming', to describe kids in a doctor's surgery. I then asked them to write extra questions about any of the anecdotes that had come up. I checked the questions and we carried on.

For today I asked one to prepare a short report about the class above for us to agree/ add to before we tried a quiz (which included the new vocab) about what we had learned about each other.

As I say I'm new to this and would appreciate any advice, but it feels like progress.

\*\*\*

---

De: \*\*\*

Para: dogme <dogme@yahoogroups.com>

Asunto: [dogme] A sweet taste of Full Dogme?

The leaves are turning ever so slowly here in the Pacific Northwest. Crossing the campus, I stop to watch the creek below the walkway: clear, crisp water passes under leafy archways of brilliant reds, yellows, greens, and golden orange. It's important to take time to pause, to slow down and listen to something other than the ho hum. On to the classroom, in a wing of the building I affectionately refer to as Cell Block H. :-)

Class is scheduled to start at 2:30, but the students begin to filter in just after the hour so that all nine students are in the room by a quarter past. I manage to transform the room into a space where we strive to use English as much as possible, so nearly all the interaction I'm about to describe happens in English.

Two girls are having an animated conversation about the latest gossip within the SEED group (SEED is the scholarship program that sponsors the students). A boy is reading his English Conversation book, leaning over now and again to ask the girl next to him a question about something he's just read. Meanwhile, that girl is reading a book of her own, a picture dictionary, and recording vocabulary from it into a notebook. Next to her, a student is reading through her journal entries, making minor changes here and there and occasionally reaching over to slug the boy next to her in the arm as the two of them tease each other with huge grins on their faces. A boy listens to their conversation and chimes in from time to time. There is another conversation, this one about a recent quiz, as two students look over the work they have done, comparing answers and ideas.

As I watch, I think to myself, This is it: Dogme is happening before my eyes, and wouldn't it be foolish of me to interrupt. It's taken a while to get to this place with these learners, considered the 'weaker' group I work with, some of whom were speaking exclusively Spanish and relying on classmates for translation a few months ago when they arrived. So, after fifteen minutes of observation and listening, when the clock strikes 2:30, I do nothing but continue to be a fly on the wall. Only one or two students notice the time, but they assume we'll start soon.

After five minutes, a couple of students are sitting silently, waiting to start. When I don't make eye contact with them and pretend to be engrossed in a conversation happening on the other side of the room, they go back to what they were doing. This goes on, with students sort of checking in and me pretending not to notice, for about twenty minutes. Occasionally, somebody asks me for clarification on a word or phrase they've just read or heard. We're in the zone, if you will, I'm transfixed on this buzz of interaction, the hum of conversation and the intensity of the concentration I see in front of me, my heart warms with each burst of laughter. God, you guys, you're doing it. Your using English like never before. Don't stop - Go! Go! Go!

Then, a student asks me directly if we can start. The others look to me for an answer. I want to make an excuse, I have to use the restroom, or I'll be back in five minutes, but I don't say anything. The spell is broken, but of course it's nobody's fault.

Instead of leaving the room or coming up with a clever way to keep the 'Dogme party' going, I explain that, to me, we have already started. I point out how some students have spoken more English in the past 45 minutes than they might during an hour of 'official' class time. They smile in acknowledgment, but they are now fixed on Teacher, on me, waiting. I feel obligated, responsible, and, it is my job after all.

I ask, What is the purpose of English class, and they respond:

- to learn English;
- to practice;
- to listen;
- to read;
- to write;
- to speak English;
- to study.

I agree then ask what they've been doing since they came into the classroom just past two o'clock. Their list is the same as that above.

See? You've been in English class, haven't you? Again, they see my point. But, quite understandably, it's 'really-really' English class now.

If only I could have held on, kept it going, day after day, we would have been in what \*\*\* dubbed Full Dogme in a Guardian article <http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2003/apr/17/tefl.lukemeddings> back in spring of 2003:

""Dogme moments, Dogme lessons: the next stage is a Dogme classroom - an open one, to which the learners are bringing in their own material because they know they can, and one where nobody knows precisely what will happen when they walk through the door. This requires considerable skill on your part, to manage the interaction but to keep one eye on the language. You are talking the talk and walking the walk, as it were.""

I haven't given up on this aspiration. Watch this space.

## Post 361

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

>>> \*\*\*... 09/12/04 7:39 AM >>>

I know 'noticing language' is part of dogme, but I've often wondered if this registering how language is used doesn't represent the teacher's interest rather than the learner's. Do learners learn this way?

I would have thought that it's more than the teacher's interest, but I certainly would agree that although it might be \*in\* the learners' interest it rarely stirs the pools of enthusiasm.

I can say that when I learnt/picked up Spanish, during the grammar stages I found myself comparing it frequently to English to get a better idea. Even these days, I look some words up in the Sp-Sp dictionary, but I always go to the Sp-Eng dictionary afterwards.

\*\*\*

## Post 362

*Coded as own in class experience.*

\*\*\*,

I'm a great user of YouTube. With a private one-to-one learner we recently worked for a bit - using a cassette - on ""When I'm 64"". When he got home \*\*\*, the learner, found ""When..."" on YouTube and listened to the whole thing on his own. What you are doing and what \*\*\* did using YouTube seem to me legitimate, yet use of resources like cassettes and YouTube are surely anathema to the true Dogmeist.

What is the present party line on such matters?

\*\*\*

## Post 363

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\*,

It is a mistake to think that research I refer - about the foreign language learning abilities of kids up to 8 - is somehow suspect because language schools might make use of it.

What surprises me in this discussion is that certain ""facts"", long known are regarded in this discussion as suspicious.

\*\*\*

## Post 364

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

Hello,

This is the most interesting list I have ever encountered.. even if I am an infidel, or at best a mongrel. :-) There are so many ideas popping around, I wanna press the ""pause"" button to have time to process them... I am interested in some old threads about ""process"" and ""what's countable and what counts"".. but... time...

> ... if the non-teachers/non-EFL

> bods thought he was successful, who were the EFLERs to contradict? A

> language is for communication, not for conforming to some Miss World

> type concept of 'perfection'.

But Wes was aware of his level of (in)accuracy, and of its



ramifications in his daily life. That is a key ethical point. Since he was aware, but was (at least apparently) content, there is no reason to worry about greater accuracy. If there is any ethical problem with the "no error correction" stance, it occurs when the teacher does not even make the learner aware that he/she is making any mistakes. Leaving the learner vulnerable.. because of blindspots about his/her proficiency.. is hardly compassionate.

ehh... about "learning from the butcher, the baker...". Is dogme purely incidental learning, then?

For \*\*\*, who seems to like the topic of motivation, and mentions zen: I found this article on my hard-drive... in light of recent discussions about motivation from an educational perspective: "Adding Legs to a Snake": A Reanalysis of Motivation and the Pursuit of Happiness From a Zen Buddhist Perspective. Gaskins, Robert W. Journal of Educational Psychology, Volume 91(2).June 1999 p 204-215]

I have more questions. But that's enough for now.

\*\*\*

## Post 365

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, "\*\*\*\*\*" wrote:

> 1. Is there any 'concrete evidence' (I know it's hard to come by that SLA stuff) that learning styles or multiple intelligences are valid learning constructs?

What makes a learning construct valid? If we rely on concrete evidence, we're screwed! I suspect that there are as many learning styles as learners. Similarly, I suspect that there are as many teaching styles as teachers. As for multiple intelligences, it's all a load of tosh. Intelligence is a construct in itself, so multiple intelligences are just another made up explanation. To his credit, Gardener didn't really claim to be saying much more than this! His acolytes, on the other hand... >

> 2. Is there any such thing as 'learnt' learning styles? I mean, for example, do you think it's possible for a person to develop a preference for aural learning because that's all they've been exposed to in their education culture?

Assuming that learning styles are unique to the individual, ALL learning styles are learnt. They are developed as one gets more exposure to the world in which one lives and they are used to mediate one's view of the world. >

> 3. Is it possible for a person to change their learning style or intelligence mode?

>

I would say that it is inevitable as a person lives longer and has more experiences.

> 4. Do you think it's more important for teachers to be aware of their students learning preferences than for students to be aware of their own learning styles? (Certainly teachers

receive a lot of training on the topic, but in a survey of resources in the teacher's room I found that there were no 'learner training' materials that specifically help learners.) I think any teacher who claims to be aware of their students' learning styles is kidding themselves. The most we can hope for is a broadly generalised idea of what students like to do (perhaps this was what you meant anyway?). I don't see much point in trying to tell students how they learn - it sells them the myth that they learn in a particular way when they probably learn in a myriad of ways. I wince when I hear a student tell me that they are a ""kinesthetic learner"" or an ""aural learner"". > "

## Post 366

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Hi, \*\*\*, and Happy New Year!

Were the students in SL all from the same country? If so, which one? If not, do you know where they were from?

And just to clarify, does your friend take in newspaper articles, etc. to a SL environment, or is this in a brick and mortar space when your friend is not in SL teaching?

\*\*\*

\*\*\* wrote:

> Greetings, list.

>

> I had an interesting conversation tonight with a friend who does

> many hours

> a week teaching EFL in Second Life. My friend - an excellent teacher

> and

> highly competent technically in SL - said that Dogme simply did not

> work

> for them. Learners simply are not able or willing to talk - the

> teacher has

> to work very hard to get responses out of them. What my friend does

> is take

> in newspaper articles, extracts etc. to get them going. And the

> friend also

> tried storytelling: ""Tell us a story you love."" The attempt was a

> failure.

>

> I have often read reports on this list of people who could not get

> learners

> to talk.

>

> Comments fellow Dogmeists?.

> --

>

> --

## Post 367

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as teacher training.*

"On one of his in service training sessions, Mario Rinvoluceri once did an activity in Greek. This would also work in German.

He confronted us (=the audience of teachers) with a few (I think about eight) basic Greek words (e.g. neh) and asked the public to guess their meaning. People in the audience were looking for transparency but were often fooled (e.g. neh) by the false friends.

The next activity, though, was the more interesting one. People had to draw a basic ground plan of their houses and put the different words in rooms they could be linked to.

Afterwards - first in pairs, and in the mother tongue - people had to explain why they put certain words in certain rooms. It was a way to make words function in the world people live in and a step towards transfer.

I have always liked the idea and I can still remember (many years after) a few of those Greek words (though I have never been to Greece since then - maybe now's the time, they could do with a bit of tourist investment I suppose).

\*\*\*

Quoting \*\*\*:

> \*\*\*, if I might add an anecdote, as I think \*\*\* has offered plenty  
> of helpful suggestions: On the DELTA I did years ago, our tutor, in  
> order to demonstrate one way to teach lower level learners, came to  
> class with a tablecloth and some menus she'd made up. The menus were  
> in simple Portuguese, a language virtually unfamiliar to all of us  
> trainees. It was clear from the start that we were in a Portuguese  
> restaurant, our tutor was the server, and we were expected to order.  
> It was a perfect setting. She asked (in Portuguese of course) what I  
> wanted - notice I don't remember her phrase, but I certainly  
> understood it in the context! I do remember exactly what I ordered, it  
> was a sanduche de queijo (cheese sandwich). I tried to say it, she  
> repeated it in much better Portuguese, and I repeated. People who  
> didn't want to try simply pointed and our tutor spoke the words.  
>  
> Anyway, I don't want to belabor the point. Just an example of how one  
> might approach things in a semi-dogmatic fashion. I say 'semi-  
> dogmatic' because we trainees hadn't indicated an interest in ordering  
> food in Portuguese, but we were certainly interested in learning about  
> teaching people who were relatively new to a language.

>  
> Hope that helps. Please keep us informed and don't hesitate to post  
> further questions, challenges, aspirations, successes...  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>  
> On Sep 22, 2011, at 12:06 PM, \*\*\* wrote:  
>  
>> Hi \*\*\* - ok, I didn't need to mention the book! I'm glad you're  
>> finding it interesting. I think the social opportunities (nice  
>> phrase) and resulting real conversation can work with lower levels  
>> too - the same principle applies, which is starting with what the  
>> learner already has and building from there.  
>>  
>> There may need to be a little more focus on providing language than  
>> 'adjusting' it (because the outputs are more limited and  
>> conversation turns perhaps shorter), but in essence the notion of  
>> guiding the learners as they reach for ways to express themselves -  
>> and to express concepts they already have in L1 - applies at lower  
>> levels too.  
>>  
>> I have to say I'm very excited that you're exploring the book in the  
>> context of teaching German and I hope you'll let us know how things  
>> develop. Good luck, and as we say on this list - hope there isn't  
>> too much pffaffing around!  
>>  
>> \*\*\*  
>>  
>> On 22 Sep 2011, at 19:10, \*\*\* wrote:  
>>  
>>> Hi \*\*\*,  
>>>  
>>> Thanks for your quick reply. I bought ""Teaching unplugged"" last  
>>> week and have started reading through Part A and Part B 1. The book  
>>> gives me lots of interesting food for thought.  
>>>  
>>> I have already found suggestions I could easily transform to  
>>> German. The only problem to me seems that teaching lower level  
>>> classes might cause difficulties in producing language that is  
>>> ""acceptable"". I have the experience that my students talk ""Jean  
>>> Marie Pfaff Deutsch"" (Pfaff was a Belgian goalkeeper for Bayern  
>>> Munchen during the eighties and when he talked so called German in  
>>> his interviews, this provoked some laughter in Germany as well as in  
>>> Belgium) because of the lack of sufficient (acceptable) vocabulary.  
>>>  
>>> Anyway, I really believe that teaching unplugged brings more  
>>> social opportunities in language teaching and more time for ""real  
>>> conversations"" which on itself will be more productive. Any ideas  
>>> how I could overcome the above problem with low level students?  
>>>  
>>> Kind regards from Belgium

>>>  
>>> \*\*\*  
>>>  
>>> \_\_\_\_\_  
>>> From: \*\*\*  
>>> To: ""dogme@yahoogroups.com"" <dogme@yahoogroups.com>  
>>> Subject: Re: [dogme] DOGME in GERMAN lessons  
>>>  
>>> Hi \*\*\*, modern language teachers (MFL) teachers in the UK have  
>> always responded positively to unplugged ideas in workshops I've  
>> run. This inevitably sounds like a plug, but most of the activities  
>> in the book written by \*\*\* and myself, Teaching  
>> Unplugged, are transferable because they do not include language  
>> exponents - rather they are frameworks for interaction, and ideas on  
>> how to use the kind of stimulus \*\*\* has mentioned. Best wishes, \*\*\*  
>>>  
>>> On 22 Sep 2011, at 13:14, \*\*\* wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Dear everybody,  
>>>>  
>>>> I am thrilled by the idea of unplugged teaching.  
>>>>  
>>>> I teach German as a foreign language in Belgium and wonder  
>> whether there are already (German) resources/lesson plans/  
>> activities) for teaching ""unplugged"" German as a foreign language. I  
>> wonder whether the principles of unplugged teaching have found  
>> common ground in German publications/resource books etc.  
>>>>  
>>>> Look forward to your reply.  
>>>>  
>>>> With many thanks.  
>>>>  
>>>> Regards  
>>>>  
>>>> \*\*\*

## Post 368

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*  
*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*  
*Coded as other forum post.*  
*Coded as teaching text.*

Here's a good quote:

""But how does analysis begin? I believe it begins with attempts to answer perhaps the most foundational of 'analytical' questions we can pose of any object: 'What do you notice about this object?' This is the first and most basic analytical question that you are likely to be asked, or will ask yourself, when you really look at a

particular Rembrandt painting for the first time, or hear a musical composition for the first time. Not 'What is it?' or 'Do you like it?': these are not truly analytical questions. But 'What do you notice in this (from among, by implication, all the innumerable things you could notice here?'. "" (M. Toolan, ""Language and Literature: an introduction to stylistics"", 1996 Arnold, p. 3)

Yes, that's what makes ""Tell me what you see"" a non-display question. That doesn't mean it's always good; a question like ""What's this?"" or ""Do you like it?"" are obviously more holistic in some sense. But it does mean that it has a different focus and it's more likely to establish that key starting point which forms the pedagogical point of this picture exercise, what the learner can do without help, and by implication what the learner needs help to notice.

It's interesting that what \*\*\* notices in my posting (from all the things in it) is the agonistic, performative aspect (and what \*\*\* notices is the punchline).

What I notice in it, rereading it, is quite different. It's a focus on something that doesn't seem to get much attention on this list: What does the teacher actually say in a dogme lesson?

On the face of it, this line of dogme inquiry is absolutely illegitimate, because it would involve predicting and setting in stone certain classroom utterances that are not predictable or fixable ahead of time.

Some on this list might even bristle that the teacher's freedom of speech is being fenced in. After all, if we can't really, a priori, prescribe or even proscribe particular activities (hence the inability of dogme to give birth to a method), how would it be possible to prescribe or proscribe actual classroom language?

That's just it! We can and do talk about things we do. What I notice in \*\*\*'s classroom diary (and also \*\*\*'s postings) is the extent to which he (and she) focusses on doing things rather than saying things. As native speakers, the language seems ineluctable, almost obvious.

It's really not ineluctable. First of all, the non-native teacher needs this language, far more than the non-native teacher needs reams of activities. Secondly, the interactive, non-predictable nature of dogmetic teacher talk means that it has to be acquired from large and various samples and cannot be copied from teacher's books. Thirdly, and perhaps more importantly, the underlying principles are really not obvious at all.

\*\*\* points out insightfully that there is more to seeing people copy their addresses down than meets the eye. Let me offer another

example. On this revolting NLP poster downstairs (it's still there; and the flyer folder still empty) the teacher is faced with the problem of eliciting shifty eye movements from a poor child who has played hooky from private lessons in order to play video games. So when the child says Yes, I did go to my private lessons yesterday, the teacher says ""What clothes did the teacher wear?"" The child cannot meet the teacher's eye, and the next poster celebrates the perspicacity of the NLP teacher in being able to ferret the truth from the video-game playing miscreant and uphold NLP justice.

But of course the suspicion implicit in a question like ""What clothes did the teacher wear?"" is transparent; no competent schoolboy would fail to pick it up whether he was telling the truth or not. Is, then, the shifty eyed reaction of the child a reaction to guilt, or to unjust and presumptuous suspicion.

For the NLPist, the question does not arise; the NLP practitioner has an unlimited right to put other people on the spot, and the NLPist believes, or pretends to believe, that in so doing he/she is not powertripping but rather expressing intense interest in the learner. Permit me to avert my shifty gaze.

\*\*\*

## Post 369

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Didn't the original 'interactive' in IWB come from the fact that the projection/screen can interact with the computer that runs it .....? ie, nothing to do with interaction with or between the 'viewers' themselves?

Which doesn't mean it can't be used in a socially interactive way - for instance, \*\*\*'s examples (msg 11182) were almost obscenely learning-centred and learner controlled, and far from teacher-fronted; and \*\*\* alone convinced me that IWBs can be used to enhance some of the existing ways of a group of learners as well as explore new ones,

On the other hand, my experience with publishers' representatives is similar to \*\*\*'s - IWBs have been presented mainly as an 'eyes up' version of the course book which in addition can save the teacher loads of prep time .... a sort of just press the 'repeat' button and no more photocopying. (But what if the students don't like the coursebook?!)

Never had the opportunity to use an IWB myself, but when/if, hope I'll be like you guys and girls here and explore the possibilities with the

learners, not merely follow the user's manual .... meanwhile, what you don't know you don't fret about, but this discussion has certainly aroused my curiosity!

\*\*\*

PS: with sincere apologies to anyone who is adverse to rat experiments, \*\*\*'s mention of a new gadget to play with reminded me of the following (fm Learning and Memory, Marilee Sprenger, p11/12)

""As an educator, I have a favorite rat story. In a 1985 study, Diamond placed baby rats and mature rats in the same enriched cage. She wanted to know if both the young rats and the older rats would grow more dendrites. The surprise came when the older rats refused to let the young rats play with the toys. The mature rats took over the cage and did not allow the baby rats to play. The result was that only the mature rats grew dendrites.

Why do I like this story? When I walk past classrooms with high-tech equipment such as computers, I like to watch what is happening. Often I see the teacher (the old rat) sitting at the computer showing the students how to do something. The students are sitting and watching. Who's growing dendrites here - the old rat or the babies?

We can conclude from Diamond's study that it isn't enough for students to be in an enriched environment. They need to help create that environment and be active in it.""

(NB the final conclusion is based on other experiments which showed that rats learned better when living together, and even better when living together in an enriched environment; not being allowed to play sort of counts as not being together, as well as not really having access to the enrichment in the environment!)"

## Post 370

Dear colleagues

Just a quick note to draw your attention to a fielded discussion scheduled to take place on the GISIG discussion list from 13th-17th June.

Prof. Patrick from Essex University has agreed to field a discussion on Linguistic Human Rights. He is a professor of Sociolinguistics in the Department of Language and Linguistics at Essex and is a member of the Forensic Linguists, The Linguistics Society of America and the Linguistic Association of Great Britain, among others.

By way of introduction to the topic and to Professor Patrick's work, feel free to check out his website ""Linguistic Human Rights: A Sociolinguistic Introduction "" at  
<<http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~patrickp/lhr/linguistichumanrights.htm>>



<http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~patrickp/lhr/linguistichumanrights.htm>

If you are not a member of the GISIG discussion list and would like to join, go to <<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/gisig/>> <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/gisig/> and follow the 'join this group' instructions. We'd welcome your thoughts.  
<<http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~patrickp/lhr/linguistichumanrights.htm>>  
Thanks

\*\*\*

## Post 371

*Coded as other's non-teaching experience.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Many many thanks to all for such an interesting discussion - which really struck a chord practically all the way through :-)

When \*\*\* said about his French classes,  
""the few pupils who spoke French at home performed terribly at the grammar tests, whereas the others could master the grammar, but were very limited in speaking activities. So much for memorising grammatical forms...""

This in fact corresponds to what the Freinet-evangelist nursery school teacher of my French children actually said of the 100% French children in the system here... that in the nursery school they use subjunctives correctly, and then in the primary school, when forced to learn their conjugations, start getting it all wrong !  
But I can't take on the whole pays de Voltaire ;-)

And as for quotes \*\*\* - this one is up in 72pt font on our staffroom wall.

""We have been reminded recently of Von Humbol's statement that we cannot really teach a language, we can only create the conditions in which it will develop spontaneously in the mind in its own way""

S Pit Corder

The significance of Learnerr's Errors

IRAL Vol 4 1967 ...

But when I just tried to check out the full IRAL ref, I was offered a plethora of volumes, dates and page numbers !!!

And finally - just to answer the original question - as a complete beginner, I know I would need a fully bilingual approach ...

\*\*\*

## Post 372

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

\*\*\*'s post is another useful reminder that making a connection with what goes on outside the classroom (whether it's trends in the use of English as a global language, or users' immediate experience of speaking English in their everyday life) is just as important as trying to understand how people do or don't learn languages inside it. Prioritising conversation, allowing things to develop at their own pace and avoiding scripted presentation all help.

I haven't entered the Second Life debate as my avatar is in rehab, but there is a heart-warming story in today's Sun newspaper about a woman and a man, both trapped in unhappy relationships, who fell in love on Second Life. Their relationship evidently survived the comparison between their real selves and their super-sexy avatars, all of whom are pictured in the paper, and they are now a couple. This contrasts with the equally unhappy Bosnian man and woman who fell in love with one another's online identities; it transpired that they were in the same unhappy relationship, and have now divorced.

I like \*\*\*'s idea of the Third Life where we replicate Second Life in First Life. Confused? You won't be...

\*\*\*

All the thoughtful remarks from \*\*\*, \*\*\*, and \*\*\* have been interesting to read and ponder. And thank you for that YouTube video!

A classroom 'lesson' can be divided up traditionally into activities, stages, steps... however we want to slice and dice the interaction. An important question is the extent to which we must, or desire, to plan our interaction with, as well as the interaction between, the peeps in the room. As you've pointed out, this question is often answered by forces beyond our control. I like to imagine a classroom as only one time-space possibility for learning. Others are probably obvious, but the activity / -ies might be more productive and memorable the less they \*feel\* like a classroom. But try telling that to your students. :-) No really, do try.

So perhaps our work can include an effort to connect how learners use English (or whatever language we claim to teach) outside class with what happens inside the room. Already doing that? Most textbooks, IMHO, do not contribute to this effort in a meaningful way per se. I did manage to score a cache of books sent to the school here as samples. They sit in a library, which students can access. So the students decide which books they want to use and how. There have been some interesting alterations to the activities in the books. Who knows? Maybe soon these kids will be writing their own books and planning their own activities. :-)

\*\*\*

Post 373

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\*,

Getting six uniformed soldiers in a circle instead of line formation might be a feat in itself ;-)

I have some questions about the lesson, which I enjoyed reading about:

You wrote: ""1) Once established that they all had vestigial notions of English, I interviewed one of them with basic personal info questions.""

How did you determine these traces of English among each student? Did you choose a student at random to interview?

""They formed two groups to remember and write down my questions. These were then boarded and we compared the two sets of questions. They then interviewed each other each other and wrote about their partner.""

Why did you choose written reports over verbal ones?

\*\*\*\*\*

By the way, I don't mean to cross examine you, \*\*\*. I'm genuinely curious about the choices we make while teaching and the extent to which we can claim them to be conscious decisions, based on pedagogy.

Finally, I think this first lesson might have gone off better than you seem to feel it did. Do keep sharing when you can. I like the idea you've put forward of having the soliders share stories.

\*\*\*

## Post 374

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\*,

I had come across your blog before you wrote to dogme and enjoyed it greatly. Clearing paper away from my desk in the hunt for my keyboard I have just found some notes I scribbled during a recent online event in which \*\*\* and \*\*\*, amongst others, took part.

I think it was \*\*\* who coined the acronym SMALL - social media assisted learning and certainly he and \*\*\* emphasised that it is what we do with the tools that is important, not the tools themselves. Context, it was pointed out, is hugely important i.e. local circumstances are always going to profoundly influence what use of technology is appropriate.

I also jotted down two quotations which encapsulate arguments against not

using appropriate tools:

""We don't ban swimming pools, we teach people to swim.""

""You can kill someone with a pencil.""

What is special about your suggestion of course, is the attempt to draw up a list of one's own indispensable, transportable teaching aids kit.

I must say that a good mobile phone is an obvious candidate since with it a teacher can access the internet, take photos - which can include photos of board work to be noted, or pages of writing by students in the classroom (electronic note taking) - make short videos or make voice recordings. But those should all remain teacher aids, if we can draw a distinction between that and teaching aids, and good dogme teachers, I guess, will have their attention firmly focussed on the students' language needs and try not to be seriously diverted by the electronic toys. The substantial point, surely, is not to be automatically, as a matter of principle, against them.

\*\*\*

## Post 375

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

how about,,,,?

start out with dogme, go back to conformity, and then bring them little by little back into dogme,,,you wont have to convince them,,,they will convince themselves,,,

\*\*\*

\*\*\* ... wrote:

\*\*\* writes as his answer to a list of alternatives offered in how to react to an unshared perception of learning and teaching (my formulation, not \*\*\*'s):

""Personally, conform a wee bit and then try to subvert/convert.""

I'd change that slightly to describe my own position:

""Conform at first and then try to convince/convert/subvert.""

\*\*\*

## Post 376

...and now I've read the FOURTH copy.....

\*\*\*

## Post 377

*Coded as own in class experience.*

I am just conscious that when I teach I am drawing on:

my teaching experience  
listening and responding rapidly to the students - that is hard work  
making work for myself (writing up things - distributing texts links to  
videos on youtube.com that illustrate things)  
and a whole host more.

If I was new to teaching - I don't think I could do it - so is dogme a  
style that can only develop after you have tried with other things?

\*\*\*"

## Post 378

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

\*\*\*,

Thanks for your very interesting post. By a strange coincidence I  
have also just seen 'the boss of it all'

What struck me about it, and where I see the parallels with dogme  
ELT, was that although the boss was working with a predefined role  
and objectives (the coursebook -in language teaching terms) he ended  
up breaking away from the script because he was influenced by the  
feelings of the people in the room. Interesting that he argued  
against improvisation at one point, when this in effect was what he  
was doing.

Isn't this what inevitably happens anyway? We may start with a  
coursebook, but by unit 3 we're thinking why am I doing this, and by  
unit 7 something completely different is happening.

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*\*" wrote:

>

> I've been hiring all the D95 (or related) films that I can find in

> our local video store. For those that haven't seen L.V. Triers

above

- > titled film, there's an IT company, the owner of which has pretended,
- > since the establishment of the firm, that he was just the manager,
- > and that any unpleasant decisions actually came from a mysterious
- > Director somewhere overseas (el jefe de todo esto). Finally, when he
- > wants to sell the company, he has to get an actor in to play the part
- > of the Director, and that's how the comedy begins.
- >
- > It got me thinking on several lines. Who's the boss in a Dogme ELT
- > class? Does there have to be one, and will there always be one even
- > if we don't assign the position?
- >
- > In the film, the real director imports an imitation director, who
- > then goes a bit too far with his own interpretation of the role.
- >
- > What's imported into the class if we apply Dogme style vows there,
- > and where does the direction reside?
- >
- > Jumping between analogies, in an awkward and confused manner, I
- > reflected the following:
- >
- > THE BIGGEST IMPORTED RESOURCE...
- >
- > In a Dogme style classroom, the biggest importation is THE
- > IMAGINATION. The imagination is filling any void left by the
- absence
- > of traditional 'crutches' and materials. REFERENCE TO OTHER THINGS,
- > outside of the classroom, such as the students' own STORIES,
- > EXPERIENCES, HISTORIES, etc these rush in to act as the raw
- material
- > on which to work language. These indeed are powerful resources -
- much
- > better than any IWB and comparable in power to the internet. But is
- > it really concentrating on the 'here and now'?
- >
- > ZEN ELT DOGME
- >
- > Zen Dogme really does adhere to the 'Here and Now' principle. In
- Zen
- > Dogme:
- >
- > 1. No reference to the outside world - neither past, present nor
- > future may be made.
- >
- > 2. Thoughts, too are confined to the same criterion. Which requires
- > practice and training.
- >
- > 3. Students may discuss their relationships to each other, within

the

- > paradigm of their relationships to each other only. They may also
- > discuss features of the room, such as the paint on the walls, the
- > fabric of the carpet...
- >
- > ""What is Christopher Wave on with?"" I hear you say. Trying to
- > demonstrate my point that the imagination, too, or at least that
- over
- > which the imagination presides, is an imported resource.
- >
- > DOGME ELT V's DOGME 95
- >
- > We do have one thing that the film directors don't. Our VIEWERS are
- > actually inside the frame with us. A Dogme 95 vow that stated:
- >
- > Only people who are in the room, by coincidence,
- > at the time of filming, may authentically view the
- > work...
- >
- > would lead to rather exclusive and high paying audiences (as we
- often
- > have in TEFL).
- >
- > Perhaps in Dogme 95 we have a reasonably authentic product,
- consumed
- > quite artificially, whereas EFL we have a reasonably artificial
- > product consumed as authentically (as in Dogme EFL) as possible.
- >
- > EFL IS BY ITS VERY NATURE ARTIFICIAL
- >
- > Rolling on. In fact, I'd say that the modern EFL classroom is an
- > authentic, artificial construction. There's varying layers of
- > simulation (to use French philosopher Baudrillard's language).
- >
- > 1. The class as event is artificial - the people in it would not
- > normally come together by accident on the street.
- >
- > 2. The classroom itself is artificial - it's purpose built for the
- > quite orchestrated meeting of the people in it.
- >
- > 3. The teacher themselves is an artificial body - it would be
- highly
- > unlikely that a student would normally have someone at hand who
- just
- > happened to have trained in TEFL/TESOL and was ready to answer all
- > their questions, by accident. (We could solve this by saying that
- > only teachers who accidentally walked into a classroom full of
- > students on a random basis could teach a class - but then under
- what
- > pre-text would we get them there?)
- >
- >

- > 4 Constructing artificial scenarios is in itself a completely
- > authentic activity and that therefore - areas 1, 2 and 3, all being
- > artificial, may be all nonetheless still authentic.
- >
- > THE SCRIPT
- >
- > These Dogme films have scripts (I daresay there are some that don't).
- > Scripts are pre-meditated, by definition pre-script-ive. What equates
- > to the script in the average EFL class? The handout? THE BOOK?
- > Perhaps. What equates to the director's vision would then be
- > methodology, and to the directors' directions, classroom management.
- > But who's the real boss of it all? Where does the Dogme EFL class
- > come from?
- >
- > OK. As I see it, reading the articles, postings and enjoying putting
- > that into practice myself, it comes from the people in the room.
- I'm
- > sold on that. We've gone one further than the films, and the actors
- > are improvising - sometimes. But where, precisely, does it all come
- > from? I suggest it comes from the people in the room's imaginations.
- > From their interactions with the big wide random old world outside -
  
- > their pasts and their projected futures as they tangle with the
- > arbitrary montage 'out there'.
- >
- > When we get students to talk about themselves, to tell an anecdote,
- > or give an opinion based on private, shared knowledge (or fiction)
- > we're importing into the classroom. It IS imported. What we've done
- > is change the medium by which we allow the existential mosaic out
- > there, in here. Perhaps it doesn't matter either if that randomness
- > is provided by the teacher, in the form of a prescribed handout,
- as
- > much as it matters that the focal point is quite clearly the student
- > (actors) (unprescribed) interaction with that material once they get
- get
- > it.
- >
- >
- > With all the best will in the world - \*\*\*

## Post 379

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*



Honestly, I think you're being ""French"" again ;-) Seriously though, you've said emotion lies in words and words are within emotions --- a contradiction in words or emotion?

I disagree that meaning lies at the heart of words. I believe words are empty without our attached meanings. They can have a life of their own as symbols and sounds, but the meanings come from us and are not inherent in the words.

Finally, your comment on mute people changes the definition of words, which might mean you've got a different idea of what words are than I have. As with dictation, we might have to define our terms.

\*\*\*

----- Original Message -----

From: """""" \*\*\*

To: <dogme@yahoogroups.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2004 10:45 AM

Subject: Re: [dogme] Internalized speech

"""""" wrote:

\*\*\* has mentioned thought as internalized speech (hypothetically). I know I can sit here and talk to myself without moving a muscle, but that seems to be only one form of thinking, one which says nothing about emotions or social interaction, which are probably just as important in learning.

\*\*\* : What do you mean ""it says nothing about emotions or social interaction"" ? Emotion lies within words, imho. Words are everywhere, even and especially within emotions. When you experience an emotion you experience meaning, and meaning lies within the heart of words. You don't always pronounce them or actually utter them, but they are there, at the back of your brain, ready to leap forward and say hello. OH but now you think : what about mute people ? Well they have their words and language too, they just express themselves differently.

## Post 380

Bearing in mind the development of recent debate on these here pages, I thought that this quotation from Rost, M. (2002) ""Teaching and Researching Listening"". Essex: Pearson Education Ltd might be of interest:

""While researchers in applied linguistics may view themselves as 'knowledge-generators' for teachers, the teachers may not view themselves in turn as 'knowledge-appliers', waiting to apply the latest knowledge in the field. Rather, they may see themselves as

'managers of learning', responsible for the practical issues of organising learners and delivering a multifaceted service to them. The main types of knowledge that teachers will then be interested in are those that most directly assist them with /managing learning/, not those that may promise to /advance their understanding/ of the teaching or learning process. This need to bridge the professional priorities and concerns of researchers and teachers leads to the notion that 'practical problems' in teaching concern not just the application of or experimentation with new knowledge, but applications and experiments in the area of 'learning management'.'" (203-4)"

## Post 381

- > Following Hollywood tradition, the awards ceremony - held in the fashionable Borough district of London - featured figurines for the winner, emotional acceptance speeches and a gala dinner attended by a galaxy of ELT star names.
- > Presenting the winners with their Elton figurines was \*\*\*
- >
- >
- > What the article doesn't explain, is why the figurines are called Eltons.....

Or why \*\*\* was presenting them?!

\*\*\*

## Post 382

I say go for it, \*\*\*r. You don't have to ask for \*\*\*'s approval, or anybody else's, as ideas belong to us all.

As long as there's some sort of 'critical mass' willing to push the stone up the hill again, we can keep Sisyphus occupied for another ten years or so!

\*\*\*

\*\*\* wrote:

From: \*\*\*

Subject: [dogme] Re: 10th anniversary - and close down!

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Date: Sunday, 28 February, 2010, 22:05

Cheesecake apart, I'm having an idea. You can probably hear the cogs from wherever you are.

I can understand \*\*\*'s decision/wish perfectly. Like it or not, the dogme group is as closely associated with his name, as is the whole approach. For better and for worse. If he feels it is time to move on, I, for one, second that.

However, reading Sara, \*\*\* and others, I'm wondering if this is also the time to bring dogme 2.0 into official being? I'm willing to set up a separate group and moderate it ie kill spam, post interesting (?) links etc. and slightly off-the-wall comments, and call it the dogme 2.0 group (or similar) - maybe \*\*\* could co-moderate from his lodge or villa in Second Life ;- ) and perhaps it could be the place to migrate to, if you wish. And keep the original dogme group as an archive, in line with \*\*\*'s wishes.

So... well, if you think it's worth it, let me know off-list, please. If I get around 25 messages (or more, obviously), I'll do it. If \*\*\* agrees. You have until next Friday 5th March 9pm GMT to let me know (email with dogme 2.0 on the subject line, please). Ready, get set..... GO!

Cheesecake for the first twenty-five email senders....

;-)

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups. com, \*\*\* wrote:

>

> mixed feelings- or, perhaps, no feelings as yet, but shock - definitely.  
> amazing, that - for quite a few years I didn't really contribute all that  
> much, but now with \*\*\*'s announcement came the sense of loss. so perhaps  
> what I feel is not different from grief when someone well known has passed  
> away. bizarre? I don't know... dogme has become part of my life, even when  
> some threads infuriated me or left me cold - others profited and it was like  
> a real community .

>

> \*\*\*, I guess you are the owner of the list so you can euthanize it, but  
> are you sure that killing a community that's alive and kicking is humane?

>

> whatever happens... oh, one more thing: \*\*\* speculated (or have you  
> some ironclad facts?) that some older members could have left as their needs  
> were unmet - sounds rather unlikely - I remember several postings when  
> people felt that the list strayed off-track . Guess that perhaps sometimes  
> there is less need to be active on the list, that's all.

>

>

> \*\*\*, I do hope that your words come true and I fear a little losing touch

> with you guys. I have become so attached to the mere fact of dogme list

> ""being there"" - even if the threads were un-dogme!

>

> BTW I love lemon cheesecake, \*\*\*. must visit Spain...

>

> Bye all

>

> \*\*\*

> dogme@yahoogroups. com \*\*\*:

> Sob. Hope the cyber ""ink"" doesn't run with my tears. Just found out  
> about the close down, appropriately from one of the dogme old-timers  
> having lunch at my place (even though the news was bad, your lemon  
> cheesecake was great, \*\*\*). Have now reading \*\*\*'s message. I'm  
> sure he knows what is best and this may even push dogme into new areas.  
> Our dogme writing and lurking urges now need to find new outlets.  
> But it has been good and will certainly be something we can fondly look  
> back on.  
> Thanks to \*\*\* and to everyone who has made the site so interesting.  
> \*\*\*

## Post 383

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\*, the abstract alone puts one off reading altogether, no?

""Abstract:

This study employed (and reports in detail) systematic procedures for research synthesis and meta-analysis to summarize findings from experimental and quasi-experimental investigations into the effectiveness of L2 instruction published between 1980 and 1998. Comparisons of average effect sizes from 49 unique sample studies reporting sufficient data indicated that focused L2 instruction results in large target-oriented gains, that explicit types of instruction are more effective than implicit types, and that Focus on Form and Focus on Forms interventions result in equivalent and large

effects. Further findings suggest that the effectiveness of L2 instruction is durable and that the type of outcome measures used in individual studies likely affects the magnitude of observed instructional effectiveness. Generalizability of findings is limited because the L2 type-of-instruction domain has yet to engage in rigorous empirical operationalization and replication of its central research constructs. Changes in research practices are recommended to enhance the future accumulation of knowledge about the effectiveness of L2 instruction."''

Note the hedge sentence at the end!

\*\*\*

On Apr 28, 2007, at 3:22 AM, \*\*\* wrote:

> \*\*\*,  
>  
> I have to agree that it would be difficult to have much of a  
> relationship in  
> bed with anyone who insists on remaining in the armchair.  
>  
> Now let me do what I can to raise the discussion back from the  
> muddy depths  
> to which I have just thrust it.  
>  
> First, thanks greatly for using 'search' to find my old posting from  
> Istanbul, complete with spelling mistakes.  
>  
> It could be that someone has demonstrated (I would not unreasonably  
> call for  
> proof) that CR concentrating on grammatical issues improves learners'  
> language performance. (Again - demonstration, even anecdotal ,  
> would be  
> taken seriously.) My anxiety remains, though, that such  
> demonstration is  
> hard to find. I would be openly-mindedly delighted to be shown  
> wrong here.  
>  
> I am still trying to read that formidable article recommended by  
> Rod Ellis:  
>  
> Effectiveness of L2 Instruction: A research Synthesis and Quantative  
> Meta-analysis, John M. Norris and Lourdes Ortega Language Learning  
> 50.3September 2000, pp 417-528  
>  
> Has anyone on the list read it?  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>

## Post 384

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

Agreed \*\*\*, all societies may be power-bound. The question is where that power canme from and whether or not it is legitimate. I don't agree that we are freer than ever before, so I can't subscribe to the paradox. There are many things that I do that are not based on subjugation. I'm sure the same is true for you and everyone else!

(Apologies for the apparent terseness. Once again, I am writing subjugated to the contraits of time!)

\*\*\*

El 19-dic-06, a las 14:16, \*\*\* escribi:

- > I too , understand what you're saying but I also think that whether
- > we like
- > it or not we live on earth and everything we do is based on
- > subjugation.
- > Even the most powerful amongst us have rules and laws they must
- > abide by.
- > That's just reality, hateful though it might be to some of us.
- >
- > In fact, one of today's paradoxes is that we have never been so
- > free yet so
- > bound.
- >
- > Really, I am hard pushed to think of any culture, anywhere that
- > isn't, to
- > some degree, power-bound. Even when we are alone on a desert island
- > we are
- > bound by our own thoughts, some more powerful than others.
- >
- > \*\*\*.

## Post 385

*Coded as other's teaching experience.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

just a postcript (a very short one I promise!);  
as (very late) last night I took off from some of \*\*\*'s points but didn't really relate them to Mr \*\*\*'s (and other's) realities...

""Just because a grammar point that the students are tested on is boring & irrelevant, doesn't necessarily mean that we should shrug our shoulders and do a classic PPP style for that quickly then return to the dogme segment of the lesson.""

Perhaps, when you are under very rigid grammatical terminology type testing constraints, this ain't such a bad idea after all?

A colleague commented in his end of year report on one group this year that with them he found that what worked best was 'focused conversation, followed or preceeded by a grammar exercise'.

It's a very general statement, but it seems to be saying a similar kind of thing (though neither my colleague nor his students are under any rigid testing constraints .....

\*\*\*

## Post 386

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

A variation on the 3-2-1- activity that \*\*\* recently wrote about:

Yesterday the students talked about potential problems they might have when they move into apartments together in about three weeks. After writing the problems on the board, I asked them to choose a problem and its solution(s) to act out for the group. I like to advise students to ask not just what their lines are in a role play but also what feeling they associate with each line. It seems to help the drama become more believable. It might even help the language ""stick"" since it's associated with a feeling and not just something to say. Some groups like to make up a story line and improvise around it.

After all the performances, it can be interesting to ask students to act out another group's story. I was amazed how eager the students were to do this. I see value in this because the context and plot are set, so there's room to play with different language within that context and plot.

So, that's the 3-2. The final stage can be either talking about differences in the performances or letting the initial performers act out their story again for everyone to compare to the other interpretation.

\*\*\*

## Post 387

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

I didn't see the game between Saudi Arabia and Germany and in fact don't know one end of a football from the other, but, as a ""cheeky"" theorist-in-cloud-cuckooland, I am nevertheless ready to offer a theory about the sad ""crapness"" of the Saudi defense.

As I write, I can see, out of the corner of my eye, the elementary school students outside my window playing football (the World Cup is being played in Seoul right now). Van Lier points out that sometime between fourth and sixth grade, the kids get a ""feel for the game"". (van Lier, *Interaction in the Language Classroom*, Longman 1996, p. 55)

This happens when they stop running after the ball like a swarm of bees and realize that efficient use of the football space means passing rather than running, and cooperation rather than competition. I'm afraid there's not much evidence of that outside my window right now.

Or on the dogme list these last few weeks. We had a number of serious teachers introducing themselves--with little or no response beyond go back and read the archives. Then some boring bigot rolled in, promising (and never delivering) a serious critique.

We had James Farmer's very interesting websites on TEFL and a key question about computer based learning (something \*\*\* has expertise in)--alongside the moronic heterosexist We-hate-English site. Guess which attracted the most hits.

Yes, there were some ""spirited"" defenses of the dogme creed. But there was never anything like a spirited attack, so what was the point?

In the meantime, real threads get lost. For example, if anonymity encourages pragmatic irresponsibility, what about ""MOOs""? What is the difference between name-to-name interaction, and using the ""MOO"" mask on the net? What about name-to-name and offline face-to-face?

Of course, the impulse to rise to provocations is strong, human, and hard to resist, especially when the provocations are laced with white racism and heterosexist harrassment.

But it is resistable. We need a closed site so that contributions to remain relevant and we stay on task and on topic. We need a closed site so that there is time and space to respond to Romiha, James Farmer, \*\*\*, \*\*\*, and others.

Above all, we need the closed site so that we can ensure conformity to the tenth commandment. Racist, macho abuse of Asian learners is not ""cheeky"", it's just white trash. It's neither a ""poke in the ribs"" or a kick in the groin; it's the flipside of mainstream and therefore utterly boring.



I am with \*\*\* on this one, although I have come close to being banned myself a few times. It's not a matter of ""political correctness"", or even pragmatic competence. It's not even a matter basic hygiene. It's a matter of staying on task and on topic.

Vote for a closed site! And BOYCOTT bigotry, starting NOW!

\*\*\*"

## Post 388

Dear Colleagues,

I am pleased to inform you that we have completed the legal formalities to publish an international journal in the field of foreign language teaching and learning. The title of the journal is ""The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning"" with the web address of [www.jltl.org](http://www.jltl.org) .

JLTL is a biannual scientific journal dedicated to the exploration of original and high-quality research and critical scholarship that helps define and advance inquiry concerned with issues related to language and education. JLTL aims to provide a medium for communication among researchers as well as a channel linking researchers and practitioners. JLTL includes research articles, book reviews, critical literature reviews. JLTL publishes original refereed contributions including but not limited to the following aspects of foreign language teaching and learning:

- Second/Foreign language acquisition
- Second/Foreign language pedagogy
- Teacher education and development
- Language and Technology
- Language assessment and evaluation
- Culture and language teaching
- Language, cognition and brain
- Language and learner characteristics
- Language planning and policy
- Applied linguistics research methodology
- Reading, writing, literacy

Authors are particularly encouraged to offer innovatory and challenging perspectives as regards the teaching of foreign languages. We would be very grateful if you could kindly inform the colleagues in your department and circulate the email to inform the possible contributors.

JLTL is also looking for editors who can review the manuscripts received. We are looking forward to your contributions. You may visit the site to learn more about JLTL and to register to the site. If you would like to become an editor, please do not forget to paste your bio-statement so that we can send you manuscripts that are relevant to your studies.

Kind regards,

\*\*\*

## Post 389

*Coded as own in class experience.*

An edited summary of comments made by the students I work with, who've used coursebooks most of their lives and have been learning 'unplugged' for the past four months:

The book doesn't know what topics I like, but you (people in the room) can ask me.

Every day is different; following a coursebook is too rigid.

The coursebook isn't as good as your (people in the room) immediate feedback.

The grammar exercises are usually easy to 'figure out', which is not like actually using English.

\*\*\*

## Post 390

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Hi \*\*\*,

I am also new to this list.

Thanks for the mention of winkball.

I added some comments in your e-mail below (in green to separate my comments out).

\*\*\* wrote:

>

>

> A quick search of Google threw up a bibliography for teaching EFL to the  
> blind ([http://www.ecml.at/mtp2/LangSEN/pdf/biblio\\_langsen2.pdf](http://www.ecml.at/mtp2/LangSEN/pdf/biblio_langsen2.pdf)) and a  
> British Council bulletin board thread (  
> <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/talk/questions/teaching-blind-students>)  
> and a range of other sites of relevance (search term: efl teaching blind).

>

> Dogme is, I would suggest, more than just going into class without a book.  
> It's about rejecting all materials that are artificial and solely-focused  
> upon a rather outdated (ioho) view of language learning. It's about going  
> into the class without ANY preconceived ideas about how things should

> develop and working with whatever the student(s) throw to you. The basic  
> idea is that by relying upon the students to come up with the areas for  
> study, the whole experience will be more meaningful and more memorable (and  
> therefore more purposeful) for them (and you!).

>  
> Giovanni is obviously going to be more dependent upon his hearing than his  
> sight and so I would recommend (let it be whispered) sites like Winkball.com  
> which allow you (and us, for that matter) to post video (and therefore  
> audio) messages to a wall. Dare I say it, but I am sure a lot of us would be  
> more than happy to participate in any vox pop that you wanted to initiate  
> there. I know that winkball is a video-based site, but I don't know of any  
> that just require audio. I imagine that most of the challenges that you are  
> going to face will be concerned with finding innovative ways of  
> reconfiguring the visual into audio.

>  
There are various podcast sites that do not rely on the video aspect.

<http://www.repeatafterus.com/> has audio files of varying lengths and difficulty levels.

\*Poetry\*

<<http://www.repeatafterus.com/genre.php?g=poetry&s=a>>\*Drama\* <<http://www.repeatafterus.com/genre.php?g=drama&s=a>>

\*Prose Fiction\*

<<http://www.repeatafterus.com/genre.php?g=prosefiction&s=a>>\*Prose  
Non-Fiction\* <<http://www.repeatafterus.com/genre.php?g=prosenonfiction&s=a>>  
Children's

Stories\* <<http://www.repeatafterus.com/genre.php?g=childrensstories&s=a>>\*Nursery  
Rhymes and Tongue Twisters

\* <<http://www.repeatafterus.com/genre.php?g=nurseryrhymes&s=a>>\*Memorable  
Quotes\* <<http://www.repeatafterus.com/genre.php?g=memorablequotes&s=a>>\*In  
Your

Own Words\* <<http://www.repeatafterus.com/genre.php?g=worldstories&s=a>>

> [http://www.eslpod.com/website/index\\_new.html](http://www.eslpod.com/website/index_new.html) has transcripts and good  
> practical topics written in idiomatic, correct English

>  
<http://www.podomatic.com/> lets you \*record\* your own podcasts with an easy  
user-friendly interface.

For low bandwidth connections the sound is not optimal, but still usable.

Here is an example I recorded as a demo this morning.

[http://redcamarocruiser.podomatic.com/entry/2009-12-11T04\\_52\\_11-08\\_00](http://redcamarocruiser.podomatic.com/entry/2009-12-11T04_52_11-08_00)

Podomatic allows one to post directly to a blog, which could be a nice way  
to organize all the audio responses your student creates for your lessons.

<http://redcamarocruiser.blogspot.com/> has the podcast posted. One thing that  
confused me when making the recording was that it gave me no confirmation  
that it had recorded anything. It said 0:00 length of the recording.

However, when it posted to the blog, the whole 3 minute file was there.

Another point I would like to make is that my Portuguese classes followed

the format that the learner directs the content by bringing questions that are relevant to him. The class is composed of visiting scholars and their wives in Brazil. So, we are living in an immersion environment and have the opportunity to learn in a natural setting (we are forced to learn in order to cope with shopping and other communicative situations).

I took another language course that followed a program set by the teacher, and it was not as helpful because the things that interested the teacher (cute idioms of phrases using animals) had no bearing on what I needed to know how to express at a practical survival level.

I also took another university course that followed a prescribed syllabus based on a text which the professor liberally supplemented with eclectic selections from other texts. It was better than the course which offered animal idioms instead of useful examples of how people really speak with grammatical constructions to make my Portuguese sound fluent and elegant and comprehensible. However, I feel it was too generalized to be as effective on a pragmatic level as the course offered in Brazil to the visiting scholars, where the professor offered the participants the opportunity to generate the content based on their own immediate needs for coping in real life language situations.

The only drawback was that some weeks no students had written down their questions to bring to class. The teacher remedied that by offering us access to his expertise through on demand e-mail contact. This proved very effective for learning sentences that one could not readily look up in a grammar or textbook. For example, how do you tell reception that you are locked out of the apartment, or how do you tell reception that you suspect a gas leak from the stove?

Sincerely,  
\*\*\*

## Post 391

\*\*\*,

You are a master-storytelling... you brought a tear to my eyes.

Now - I need to go watch a stupid movie and get off the machine.

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* <\*\*\* ...> wrote:

>

> My third and last message for today, I promise.

>

> For a few months I taught a young student here a la classic dogme. What do I

> mean? He (23) came to me (old enough to be his grandfather) a student of

> law, born in Germany but his parents are from Kosovo and he is bilingual,  
> German Albanian. 8 years or so English at school but claimed that he could  
> speak no English. It seemed to be true. But sitting once a week in my study,  
> packed full of books and posters and a spinet and lamps and framed photos on  
> the wall with a mug of Typhoo and a piece of cake to juggle with, and a  
> strict policy of English only except in real linguistic emergencies, we  
> talked about what took our fancy. I made a recording of our conversations  
> and sent them to him over the Internet by 'Yousendit' He used to listen to  
> those recordings attentively, I thought of exploiting the - ""Language and  
> mistakes arising from...."" but never did.

>

> Gradually the miracle began to happen. English became his language of  
> communication with me. He no longer dropped into German. Last week he told  
> me: ""I felt I was really into the language.""

>

> And then he flattered me by saying I was the first English man he'd ever met  
> and everything I'd told him about England made him want to go to England,  
> he'd never been there.

>

> He found us RyanAir tickets, return, full costs for two about 23 pounds, and  
> off we flew together for a few days staying at St. John's, Cambridge, where  
> I studied and then one night London where we stayed with the middle son of a  
> former English student and friend of mine.

>

> The visit magical. The sun shone all the time, he fell in love with  
> Cambridge and wants to do an MA there, and he did all the arrangements for a  
> trip down the Thames and visits to Buckingham Palace (!).

>

> He bought tickets on the Underground and on busses and travelled alone by  
> bus to find the Germany Embassy - and still talks today of how friendly and  
> helpful the driver and passengers on the bus were in helping him to find his  
> way.

>

> ""That's the Ritz"" I said., ""reputedly one of the most expensive hotels in  
> London."" And before I could stop him, in he went to ask at the desk if they  
> could tell him where the Kosovo embassy was.

>

> But the ending of this anecdote is sad. - and really the point of telling  
> it.

>

> The timetable of his law studies was changed and extended. It is impossible  
> for him to come for lessons any more. We are still in contact, but not in a  
> learner/tutor relationship. We just met for a meal, and we spoke German.

>

> Moral? Even if a learner feels he/she is ""into the language"" only constant  
> use will keep the language being learned of ""language of automatic use""  
> status.

>

>

>

> \*\*\*

>  
> --  
> \*\*\*

## Post 392

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*  
*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

Well, friend Two-cents,

I think what worried me about Fish's argument was that:

- He began by saying that students can't write well because they don't know what a sentence is, they don't know the form of a sentence. This was his basic premise.
- This implies that you can only convey meaning if you get the form right.
- That's the equivalent for me of saying: ""Your thoughts must be conveyed in correctly formed i.e. conventionally correct grammatical sentences otherwise they won't be accepted. Dreadful. Sack the man. Make him take early retirement.
- If his article had been about how to teach structural linguistics it would have been much more acceptable. ""Get into groups a create a new language"" is quite a ploy.

\*\*\*

## Post 393

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

I was thinking about this recently. I think the very pro-coursebook types have to be conscious of the following.

What's the difference between a dogme/ dialogic / participatory etc.EFL teachers and traditionally schooled ones, or at least those of them who haven't looked beyond that mode of working?

You can ask dogme-thinking teachers to start teaching a new group by saying to them, 'OK, here's your course-book or course materials. Go and teach the group for the rest of the week.'

But you can't ask traditionally trained EFL teachers to start teaching a new group by saying, 'OK, here's your group. Teach them for the rest of the week without any resources from our resources centre.'

If you did that to a teacher who has relied on being very well prepared materially but doesn't know how to BE with a group and build something up,

the chances are they will panic. Maybe even the thought of it will make them feel a warm flush under the collar."

## Post 394

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

\*\*\*, I've a hunch you could teach a whole course with young people - from teens onwards - I don't know how far onwards - using songs, especially if the class can bring in songs for you and their mates to listen to - though some lyrics are likely to be more exploitable for language purposes than others.

\*\*\*"

## Post 395

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\*,

At the risk of appearing stupid, how does one teach reading?

Cheers

\*\*\*

I'm not sure that's true! I think the problem is that most EFL teachers haven't been taught how to teach reading. What passes as teaching reading (certainly on CELTA style courses) is actually nothing more than 'practising

reading' rather than 'teaching' it.

\*\*\*

## Post 396

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Dear \*\*\*,

\*\*\* wrote:

> I don't know how an approach can be mature unless we mean it has  
> been around a long time and has had a lot of people contributing  
> ideas to it.

>

I see now what you mean by that - thanks for clarifying!

> However, my point was that the sort of things AT described are  
> typically what are ascribed to experienced teachers.

>  
I also think they are ascribed typically ascribed to experienced teachers - which is what prompted me to see whether that meant they were beyond the reach of non-experienced teachers.

> My own take on teacher training, teacher education is that most of  
> what sustains teachers in their careers can not be taught in formal  
> courses.

>  
I think I agree with you on this. But just because something can't be taught, that doesn't mean that it can't be learnt on a training course ;-)

> What counts the most is the period of induction, the first one or  
> two years, and then each teacher's path in their own development.

>  
I don't (yet) know if I agree with you here, but I'll think about it!

> Experienced teachers have complex 'theories-in-action' that embed so  
> many schema that is often very difficult to work out what they are  
> thinking when they are teaching.

>  
Absolutely true, and there's a lot of interesting work on this right now.

> And many teachers do not do justice to what they actually do in the  
> classroom if asked about it in meetings for teacher development or  
> teaching conferences.

>  
I think you are right here but I don't know the real point you want to make by saying it - sorry if I am being dense!

Best wishes,

\*\*\*

>  
> \*\*\*

## Post 397

*Coded as teaching text.*

I was just thinking, there are probably quite a few members of this list who rarely, if ever, go to the dogme website.

Could it be that there are people who have never visited the related site?

<http://www.teaching-unplugged.com>



\*\*\*

## Post 398

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*,

First, your student who was unable to make love reminds me of one of my students who handed in his piece of work saying: "" Here is the report on 'Mother F\*cker"" - he actually used the German version of the Anglo-Saxon, /fi...../. When I pointed out the error - he meant ""Mother Figure"", he was mortified. Moral: Sometimes pronunciation REALLY matters.

Can you give the URL of your blog again, please, I cannot trace it?

\*\*\*

## Post 399

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

I find the accounts of TESOL teaching, Alistair, CH, fascinating, but I have absolutely no firsthand experience of such teaching and cannot therefore comment, One obvious difference from TEFL teaching is that TESOL learners are people from all over the world learning the language of their new or not so new home. Have I got that right?

\*\*\*

## Post 400

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

so you were the lucky one (unfortunately only one of a very few ""ones""...). I am happy for you. But please take a good look around and see what is happening. Why do you think the aggression in schools is growing? as the alternative to a passive teenagers we get the violent ones. they at least haven't given up, not that I condone any act of violence

\*\*\*

## Post 401

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

I'm still digesting a lot of recent postings, sometimes with considerable effort from those poor little grey cells, but always gratefully, and thanks to all concerned (whose valuable time and trouble - and patience! - is much appreciated, believe me).

Meanwhile, I've been having an interesting experience thanks to the kids recently, and it could tie in to some extent with \*\*\*'s comment: >How can we wean them from materials-given content to learner-given content?

Here's a rundown which I'll keep as brief as possible:

The kids all love Harry Potter (and though I baulk considerably at such mass marketing and merchandising, that is beside the point; the fact is that in these kids' lives and imaginations Harry Potter characters and stories currently play a large part).

The kids suddenly came up with the idea of doing a Harry Potter play. To cut it short: Parts were allotted, plots discussed. A fair amount of L1 was involved, but as they had to tell/show their ignorant teacher everything about the characters etc, a lot of L2 was involved too (at least on my part; but understanding L1 was essential).

At home, they each enthusiastically wrote their own ideas for a story - mostly dialogue, with short bits for a narrator - using English words and phrases they knew, L1 when they didn't know the English. They shared the stories, and more ideas came forth. Next, I put their dialogues totally into English - this was quite simple and not at all time-consuming. None of the stories is very long. ((personally prefer 'are' there myself!))

We are now doing the stories one by one. So far it works like this:

The title: for example, 'Harry Potter and the Well of Truth'

Visuals: they design and draw (for example, a beautiful big well on a small portable whiteboard)

Orientation: for example, the 'Well of Truth' story contains the following:

""looks into the well"", ""throws a stone into the well"", ""goes away from the well""  
""pushes --- into the well"" ""inside the well"" and ""comes out of the well""; (they haven't seen the script yet). Around the well prop (and initially at the teacher's prompting) we all do these things, and imagine/describe what we can see, sounds, how we feel, and so on. Then we simply 'look!', 'push!', 'throw!' and other verbs (which will appear in the story) like scream, fall, fight; we also 'go and get ..', 'go and tell...' and 'go away', repeating and elaborating these actions in a largely deictic way but with the addition of personalised codas, reactions and associations.

Reading/Modelling the script: I give a photocopy (!) of the script to each child, and we read it through aloud together, while they generally 'negotiate' understanding (based on their knowledge of the original mainly-L1 version, what's likely, and to some extent their experience and personal recall of the previous orientation phase!).

Amendment phase: any changes to the script, additions, etc, often come up here; for example, one boy realised that Voldemort couldn't do what he was supposed to be doing, because he was still inside the well, so we decided on a bit where he comes out of the well; I then wrote it on the board, and they copied it onto their scripts as an amendment. (Of course, sometimes, these type of amendments only become apparent later, during rehearsal phase!)

Rehearsals: minimal make up (eg, drawing a scar on Harry's forehead) ; positioning of the well, designation of the stage area, getting into position; prompting, and help with pronunciation, generally comes from peers, and I rarely have to intervene; sometimes I suggest more emphasis on body language, or model a phrase to give clearer intonation, but overall they fall into the swing of it and after two or three shots (the stories last 2-3 minutes each, with 8-12 characters per story), they're ready for a 'performance'. (I am either one of the characters, or the narrator).

Performance: this varies. Sometimes it's done for another teacher to come in and watch, sometimes for 'freezing' into photos for a photo story which they then mount and add dialogue bubbles to, perhaps next week for filming, as one kid says he'll bring in a webcam. Some of them have also asked if they can do a performance of the stories for their parents. (Our existing classroom is about the size of two or three small broom cupboards, but strangely enough despite its limitations of size and shape I've often found it exceptionally successful for drama activities; perhaps two factors involved here are (a) you HAVE to use your imagination! and (b) there's a certain sense of intimacy and collaboration created; but I wouldn't say no to a larger room!)

What I'm finding exciting about all this - apart from the obvious and all-important thing of the kids' enthusiasm - is that basically the kids themselves are taking over the lessons; there is a fair bit of negotiation all round, and I have to actively keep up the role of 'senior play mate'; and I am inevitably the major resource for L2; and I know a lot of people would harshly criticise the initial L1 element of the process; but the driving force of content - linguistic and non-linguistic - comes from the kids, and comes spontaneously. They ask a lot about the English, notice things in the scripts (like the 's in ""Voldemort's head"" vs the 's in ""she's my sister""), and I take the opportunity of the orientation phase to focus them in a more specific way on one or two language points that are 'patterned' in the story we're dealing with (eg, the well of truth examples above, 'has/have got' from another).

We're also doing other things, not only their Harry Potter stories, but I must say that the 'vehicle' of Harry Potter is proving most vivid to them at the moment, and of course we're all having a lot of fun and laughter too.

I don't think they'd learn or retain any more by having an input/materials driven based course, and I don't think they'd have such a personal - or pro-active - investment in the proceedings either.

Of course, there is a strong element - at least superficially - of repetition and rote memory (once they've learned, rather than are reading, their lines!) going on here, particularly in the performance phase; but that is only part of it, and also the meanings they personally create under that superficial repetition count as much or more. There's no GUARANTEE that every child will remember, for example, 'fall' when they want it in another context, or associate/elaborate something like 'falls into the well' to 'falls on the floor'; the important thing is that every child IS creating their own meanings and contexts for the language they

take on board; it may be that certain things are more commonly taken on board than others, other things tend to be far more subjective. Perhaps one factor in current standard testing and assessment - for whatever age or stage of learner - is that it focuses almost exclusively on the most common things - most commonly known but also most commonly tricky (and, in turn, conventionally, most commonly 'taught'), in hackneyed, well-rehearsed format. All of which often has only a minimal relationship to what is going on in a learner's head, what they know and can do, and, perhaps more to the point, what will stimulate them to use their language knowledge and capabilities in a genuine way.

>What's the assessment connection? Well, it seems to me that if the learner is giving us copies of

>what we put in his head, no communication (because no elaboration) is taking place. The most

>such tests can tell us is what the learner has learned (and that is a rather uninteresting definition of

>learning, based on memory. What we really want to know is how much more the learner can take

>and what he/she can do with it.

(\*\*\*)

I don't think we can put things in learners' heads; only they can; this is why learners (perhaps especially good learners?) can often fail tests; when, that is, those tests are aimed at testing what the teacher has supposedly put in the learners' heads, rather than what IS in the learners' heads and what the learners can do. I agree wholeheartedly with what \*\*\* says about new elaboration of new stimuli.

And the Kiraly stuff from \*\*\* is great.

""and that is a rather uninteresting definition of learning, based on memory.""

I don't think learning based on memory is uninteresting, though. Because, of course (stating the obvious), memory is not limited to the type of token/iconic, one-to-one matching involved in 'exact repetition' or old reactions to old stimuli. (This was only to say, let's not give memory a bad name! It is, in its multi-complex and still most mysterious way, the 'rosetta-stone' of all we strive for ....and I realise that this comment is probably a bit 'eyore-ish', a bit bottom-up, non-empathetic!)

Good evening ....

\*\*\*

## Post 402

Hi \*\*\*,

Thank you so much for the file,I'm sure it will help me a lot

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:

>

> Hi \*\*\*,

>  
> Sorry about the inconvenience to you and anyone else that didn't work for. Did you also try the Files section on this listserv?  
>  
> Here's the shortest of the long URLs I found:  
<http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ass/article/view/2993/2761>  
>  
> \*\*\*  
> On Jan 5, 2013, at 7:06 PM, \*\*\* wrote:  
>  
>> Hi \*\*\*,  
>>  
>> Can you post the full URL to this article. Tiny is blocked in Saudi  
>> Arabia (and possibly in many other block prone places).  
>>  
>> \*\*\*  
>>  
>> On Sun, Jan 6, 2013, at 04:12 AM, \*\*\* wrote:  
>>> Hi \*\*\*,  
>>>  
>>> In the hope that it's not too late to reply, I've uploaded a paper from  
>>> The Asian Social Science Journal to the Files section. You should be able  
>>> to access the file here: <http://tinyurl.com/a3kht9r>  
>>>  
>>> The article, despite it's misspelled title (guess the peer-review missed  
>>> that?), provides a basic theoretical overview with some practical tips  
>>> for the classroom. If nothing else, it's a start.  
>>>  
>>> Best,  
>>> \*\*\*  
>>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> "

## Post 403

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

To George W. Bush, so-called ""President"":

As a teacher of English, I am growing increasingly concerned by the possibility of a gratuitous war of aggression against Iraq. As the sad history of Hitler's attack on the USSR shows, such attacks have a tendency to backfire. In the event of an Iraqi victory, therefore, I would like to offer my services as an English teacher to the Iraqi occupiers. I believe that in this way, otherwise unavoidable misunderstandings and even atrocities against the innocent civilian

population might be avoided.

Of course, the fortunes of war may well dictate a contrary outcome. In that event, the ignorance of the local language by the American victors does not augur well for the local population, as the experiences of No-gun Ri in Korea and My Lai in Vietnam have shown. I would like, therefore, to insist, in my capacity as a language teacher and in particular a teacher who believes in the interchangeability of conversational roles, that no American soldier who is not completely fluent in Iraqi Arabic should be allowed to set foot on Iraqi soil. In fact, it would be preferable to send only servicemen who are willing to adopt the culture and indeed nationality of the local population as well as the language. The experience of English teachers shows that this type of intervention is the only one that lasts.

I recognize, of course, that this war is being organized at extremely short notice, and as an emergency measure--election deadlines are, alas, quite inflexible. I therefore propose more immediate measures to deal with the situation at hand. As part of war preparations, the unelected Bush-Cheney military junta has made it clear that immigrants in the United States of America are subject to unconstitutional surveillance, including arbitrary detentions and even deportations, along the lines of the concentration camps visited on the Japanese during the Second World War. As part of these measures, language teachers such as myself are occasionally called upon to report the activities of their students to the Immigration and Nationalization Services.

This kind of activity on the part of the INS is not only a far more serious threat to our work than the existence or otherwise of Iraqi "weapons of mass destruction". It also is a serious threat to the crucial future supply of teachers of Arabic so desperately needed in the USA. I should therefore like your government to inform the INS that I and teachers of my persuasion will not cooperate with any such measures against our classrooms and against our students.

\*\*\*

## Post 404

About ten years ago (ie. pre-dogme)I collected lesson accounts from teachers working in two different language schools around Barcelona, as well as going on line (via the TESL-L listserv) to solicit a few more (our \*\*\* was in fact one of my informants - I don't know whether he remembers that!).

I'd like to update the data base (for reasons which I won't disclose right now, for fear of skewing the data - but I WILL keep you informed once I have some data).

If you're interested in contributing (and you need to be a practising teacher) this is all you have to do:

1. Provide an account of the last lesson you taught (not important what, who to, or how long the account is - can be twenty words or two hundred - just has to be your last lesson prior to reading this)
2. Tell me how long you have been teaching, and where you are teaching presently.

You can either post this directly on to the dogme site, or send it to me off-list: \*\*\*

All contributions will be acknowledged and may be cited, anonymously, in a talk I'm preparing for mid-July, a summary of which I'll post as a file on this list.

Thanks in advance. (No prizes on offer I'm afraid!)  
\*\*\*

## Post 405

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\* asks:

""Does anyone have any ideas to share about teaching collocations?""

\*\*\*' example: ""I can't be happy until I've made a boyfriend.""  
reminds me of when I first became aware of the problem of teaching the limits of expressions - that's how I thought of it at the time, I think linguists referred to 'distribution'.

In 1961 I taught the expression: to look forward to and asked for examples. A young Ghanaian in Form 1 said:

"" I am looking forward to my girlfriend.""

You can't say that that doesn't mean anything. Everyone laughed because it was a rather colourful and memorable way of expressing what he meant.

I suppose my rather predictable, hobby-horse-riding post-dogme answer to \*\*\*' question is that I wouldn't teach collocations.

Of \*\*\*'s post mentioning wet toast - another example of collocation or distribution - I thought: Yes. Interesting, but interesting under the heading ""language"" rather than under the heading: ""teaching and learning"" (There's nothing wrong with that, of course. How can language teachers not be interested in language?) And I feel \*\*\*' post mentioning the making of boyfriends is interesting under the same 'language' heading.

It could well be that I am being simplistic and reductionist - and \*\*\* will surely tell me if I am - but although you can most certainly sensitize learners to collocational facts, I reckon as you do that they studying how a language is used, like linguists, rather than being involved in putting a language to use. \*\*\*'s deceased grandfather probably wouldn't have, but he could have described such activity as playing linguistics in the woods instead of doing something useful with the language.

\*\*\*"

Post 406

Hi \*\*\*

You wrote:

> Oh, RP - was that what you were on about? Don't hear too much of it these days.

Strange. Did we read the same email from \*\*\* when she wrote:

> I teach RP with a bit of American thrown in.

?

I must say the whole idea of RP with a dash of American ...!!!

\*\*\*

## Post 407

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\*,

I admit I'd be fascinated to read how you use KISS in your profession. Is that part of behaviourism - a KISS for an appropriate response?

""It is possible to be serious but still have fun.""

\*\*\* in a posting to dogme



## Post 408

*Coded as teacher training.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

\*\*\*,

I have to come out in support of \*\*\* here. a) the context he is in - I spent years retraining ex-Russian teachers and there is, in many cases, a 'conditioning'. + my current project in Uzbekistan has opened my eyes even wider. b) there is a difference between a teacher and a teacher trainer (at least god ones) - you have heard of the Peter principle, haven't you?

One last line - care of my mother! She always reminded me of the adage: Those who can do, those who can't teach. When I started TT she said ""Those who can't teach, teach teachers"", when I then started training trainers she asked me how low on the evolutionary ladder I wanted to go!!!!

\*\*\*

## Post 409

*Coded as other's non-teaching experience.*

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Very good point, \*\*\*!

I don't think homework (or any other form of knowledge enhancement) is a valid form of punishment; surely discovery and self-improvement are pretty big rewards (aren't they?). Certainly, I don't think it'd be appropriate for me as a teacher to encourage students to conceive of study in this way.

I've spent the last several weeks supporting my six-year-old son on his journey through his summer homework tome. He often argued to me that he'd ""prefer to have fun than do homework"", but I tried to help him notice just how much fun there is to be had in sitting with me, looking through his book revisiting the activities that he'd already completed to his own satisfaction and seeking out the activities that he thinks would be most fun to do next.

I keep telling him that the kind of things he's doing in his book are exactly what Mummy and Daddy do every day, and that we get a big kick out of reading and writing and arithmetic and a bit of doodling. He still claims to be not entirely persuaded that it's fun, but he knows I'm telling him the truth about the fun Mummy and Daddy have, and he

certainly \*seems\* to be enjoying himself when he's on task (humouring me? Maybe.).

I think your students are adults, though, aren't they, \*\*\*?

I can't remember the last time I considered trying to punish a grown-up student, with homework or with anything else. Equally bad, I reckon, is encouraging other grown adult students to devise punishments for each other - if you can't persuade the ""sinning"" adult to stick to whatever rule it is (s)he's decided not to stick to, then (s)he's even less likely to accept whatever punishment is in store. In terms of homework, I always tell adult students that all homework is optional and that there's no upper limit on the amount they're allowed to do - and that an important part of my commitment is to give feedback on all homework they choose to do.

Drawing up lists of ""what we all agree to do"" is fine, isn't it? And if we all agree, freely and communally, to do these things, then there is no expectation that anyone will ever need to be punished for straying from that agreement, surely. And if anyone does stray from the agreed path, then it seems to me there are two options for the other mature people around:-

1. Remind \*\*\*, respectfully, that we all agreed to ""x"", which is up there on the wall (in the case that we think Jaime just slipped up, and that he'd appreciate being reminded of what we're all committed to);
2. Ask \*\*\*if he disagrees with item ""x"", and is so renegotiate it to Jaime's and everyone else's satisfaction (in the case that it seems that Jaime has grown/shifted/moved on from what he and the rest of us had agreed).

Similar stuff happens around here on the dogme list periodically, doesn't it? People get a chance to be reminded of where they might be straying from principles that they had seemed, previously, to hold dear; and people also get a chance to decide that they've moved on, or gone ""back to the fold"", or whatever.

But nobody gets their wrists slapped; nobody gets fined; nobody gets given extra, obligatory, educational advancement; nobody gets detention; nobody gets electric shocks. Perish the thought!!

We're all grown-ups, after all.

La'ers,  
\*\*\*.

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*\*"" wrote:  
> I suggested a set of guidelines for our class. It was agreed that we needed some. Groups of four gathered to brainstorm ideas for 20

minutes, after which we compared our ideas as a class. The final list of guidelines, signed by each of us, hangs on the wall above the chalkboard. It reads:

>

> ""We agree to these guidelines: September 8, 2004

>

> Do our homework and bring it to class.

> Make sure that everyone participates in class.

> Respect our classmates and their opinions.

> Listen carefully and pay attention.

> Keep our classroom clean.

> Be on time.

> Try to speak English.

> Help each other.""

>

> I felt the urge to ask what happens if we don't follow the guidelines. Students came up with all kinds of punishments --- some struck me as torturous and I said so --- until everyone could agree on extra homework for someone who didn't follow the guidelines.

>

> But what about me? These guidelines are for me too; that's what we said. A couple of students said they would design Spanish homework for me if I did not follow the guidelines. I asked why homework, which I used to help them practice and learn English should be considered punishment. Mmm... good point.

>

> Beyond punishment, no one had any suggestions. I suggested self-evaluation, which we eventually adopted.

>

> My question to all of you? In your experience, is it inevitable that people focus on punishment and reward systems (punishment only in this case) when the question is framed as 'What happens if we don't follow the guidelines'? Is it more effective to just trust in everyone and take any problems as they come?

>

> I know there can be no recipe, but what have you experienced?

>

> Turning to you and Doernyei,

> \*\*\*

## Post 410

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\*wrote:

<<That said, a great deal of listening is of course transfer - we don't have to teach learners to use context clues to make

intelligent guesses, or to distinguish when it is appropriate to listen for gist as opposed to listening intensively for specific information. >>

Although such listening strategies seem universal to all language speakers, it still never ceases to amaze me that their transferred application when using a second incipient language is by no means guaranteed. Granted I find that, pedagogically, improving transfer starts merely by bringing it to the students' attention. For some students, that's enough. But for others (especially people with less of a "knack" for language) it's easier said than done: my students often comment that they're so busy doing the bottom-up processing, and the speech stream is so fast, that they don't have time to get from the bottom to the top before the next significant bit of speech is already whizzing by.

Many of you will also recall times when learners did manage to process the sounds into words correctly but completely failed to understand the message. The "You know what I said, but not what I meant" sort of situation. An example: this morning upon greeting the class with the "how was your weekend?" pleasantries, when one said "Fine, and yours?" I replied "All I can say is that I'm glad to be back at work." The general response: "You're lucky!" (meaning, I later found out by asking them, that they thought I was saying I loved my job so much that I couldn't wait to be in class again!). This kind of implicature crops up all the time in interactional speech (less frequently in purely informational speech perhaps) and is often as not the listener's bane as much as parsing the speech stream.

\*\*\*

(new to the group, and thrilled to find so many like minds out there! Y'all wanna come round for supper some day?) "

## Post 411

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

""Who knows better than the learners what they want to learn?""

This reminds me of the advice to students that I quoted, mockingly, from a 60s Brazilian coursebook during my talk at Poznan, Poland last month: "Remember, you [i.e. the student] may know what you WANT, but your teacher knows what you NEED!" (This is in the context of students feeling frustrated by not being allowed to talk until they have achieved mastery of the grammatical system).

In her closing plenary Catherine Walter took issue with me. She

argued that it IS in fact the teacher who knows that the students need, by dint of being an informed, trained, experienced and reflective practitioner. Why else have teachers after all? The analogy is often made with the medical profession: you may know what you want, but your doctor (dentist, herbalist, shrink etc) knows what you need.

Hmmm.

Why do I accept the logic, but question the motives, of argumentation like this? Is it because Catherine is/was a coursebook writer? No. It's the dependence metaphor that bothers me - patients dependent on doctors, good or bad; students in the thrall of teachers, coursebook writers, applied linguists...

\*\*\*"

## Post 412

Not \*\*\* \*\*\*. It was Vic who asked this!

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* <\*\*\*@...> wrote:

>

> \*\*\* asks how you would design a course to instil true freedom.

> Leaving aside the fact that 'true freedom' is a slippery concept that

> cannot be said to exist, difficulties are compounded further by the

> fact that most people are compelled (either directly or indirectly)

> to learn English. Surely, we can only hope to increase the amount of

> personal freedom in the classroom?

>

> \*\*\*

> "

## Post 413

*Coded as teaching text.*

Dear members,

Watch this space.....

There will be a meeting in Second Life this Sunday - late evening for Western and Central Europeans - when those gathered will discuss \*\*\* and \*\*\*'s new book.

\*\*\* and \*\*\* will be present.

Further details later today, but the basics are:.

Day: Sunday 10 May

Time: 21:15 GMT

Click here for a chart of 21:15 GMT converted to local time:

\*<http://tinyurl.com/cxn26k>

Venue: \*\*\* place<<http://slurl.com/secondlife/EduNation%20III/171/232/22>>

( My name in SL is \*\*\* - hence '\*\*\*'s place')

\*\*\*

--

\*\*\*

## Post 414

Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.

Coded as teaching text.

As another nay-sayer to academic speak, I feel I should say that it's not a question of understanding it or not (I have written my fair share of 'nonce-y' papers to satisfy the requirements of various institutions). I don't presume to be able to or even to want to dictate the tone or language of this forum, but I respond fairly negatively because I feel that there is a tendency to use multi-syllabic words (as \*\*\* puts it!) where there are better and clearer ways to convey the same ideas. Is it shorthand? To me it seems not. I can happily bandy words, but I know that I become a bit lazy when I speak jargon, because it often obviates the need for thought.

However, I have also just proofread 60 or so excruciatingly long, verbose and unclear testimonials to universities written by 2 of my colleagues, so perhaps I'm not the person to comment. (mind you, I did get a good chuckle out of the notion that some of our students will benefit from the 'stimulants' - sic - provided by tertiary education).

\*\*\*

--- In [dogme@yahoogroups.com](mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com), ""\*\*\* "" \*\*\*

wrote: > Personally, I've grown quite fond of academic speak. It's the joy of learning a new language that, like Latin, is pretty much dead when talking about my real job. I like colligation, contronymy, intuitive linguistics and such terms. I've even built an understanding of what is meant by Cognitive (and, like \*\*\*, that was one which had me puzzled for years...all it basically refers to \*\*\* is Brain over

Heart...so, cognitive explanations of language learning look at what is happening in the head instead of in the heart). But I sympathise with people who rail against them because they do feel exclusionistic (to be all noncey) and thus not at all welcoming. Perhaps we should put some kind of explanation in parentheses the first time we use them. The scaffolding part of the construction. >

## Post 415

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*,

That was too exciting to stay in lurkdom. Congrats.

The founders, the producers, actually don't ""own"" this story, this story is time-old: it belongs to life and language learning itself, generation upon generation upon generation before the psychologists and linguists realized there was something special about learning languages worth watching and reporting on.

This story was there before we had companies with agendas, before writers needed incomes... This story belongs to all of us, to its teachers and to its learners.

My truppence would be to add then, that I think dogme is an adjective, describing a philosophy in the way one teaches and that any dogme teacher can actually teach ""dogmeically"" - with a coursebook, or without - with a computer, without, with photocopies etc, as long as it's minimal, as long as this is not the plot's focus.

That the teacher can practice whatever methodology - he or she can perform drills, translate, teach grammar alongside conversations - that all of these are just external ""things"" and thus, actually, irrelevant... that they are just like the special effects, location, lighting, music score - i.e. change one and you might have a different movie but probably, at the core, the exact same one.

I think these ""external things"" should not be so heavily dwelled upon, so focused on, so placed in the centre of what we think is dogme or what we think is not dogme.

The point, in my opinion, of dogme, is the question

""is what we are doing in the classroom about my learners and if it is not, how can I make it so?""

Because at the end of the day, the elegance of dogme is that materials are not the journey, methods aren't the plot, passing exams is not ""the end.""

As with all the best films, what dogme really boils down to is this:

the characters,  
the roles they play  
and the richness of their dialogue.

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:

>

> \*\*\*,

>

> Historically speaking, a key message to the Dogme list, I would say.

> Congratulations. Congratulations.

>

> Like all members of this list, I suspect, I shall need to read and re-read

> but , if I understand you correctly, you are suggesting we jointly attempt

> to write, reformulate, a dogme statement of principles and mission.

>

> Excellent idea.

>

> Thanks, \*\*\*.

>

> \*\*\*

>

> On Mon, Oct 24, 2011 at 6:02 AM, \*\*\* wrote:

>

>> Times have changed since \*\*\* wrote the original ELT Dogme

>> 'manifesto' <http://www.thornburyscott.com/tu/Dogma%20article.htm> It

>> seems ELT Dogme has changed, too. Teachers have tried out 'teaching

>> unplugged' for themselves and, to a large extent, have shaped it by

>> feeding back to it's 'founders', largely through this forum.

>>

>> Through time, and, on occasion, 'tempest' (ie, 'stormy' debate), ELT

>> Dogme, inspired by the manifesto of the Dogme 95 filmmaking movement,

>> has, in my opinion, become something much more representative of this

>> filmmakers' manifesto:

>> <http://jesse-richards.blogspot.com/2008/08/remodernist-film-manifesto.html>

>>

>> In the spirit of the times, and in the spirit of Dogme, I therefore

>> feel compelled to reify (or (Occupy?) Dogme by drawing an analogy

>> between ELT Dogme today and this new manifesto, suggesting it might be

>> more befitting our 'movement'. I'll also include notes\* and excerpts

>> from \*\*\*'s 'Vow of Chastity' (aka 'Dogme manifesto'), published over

>> a decade ago.

>> Remodernist Film Manifesto (accessed at

>>

<http://rogerebert.suntimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20100608/LETTERS/100609980>

>> on 10/23/2011)

>>

>> 1. Art manifestos, despite the good intentions of the writer should

>> always ""be taken with a grain of salt"" as the cliché goes, because



>> they are subject to the ego, pretensions, and plain old ignorance and  
>> stupidity of their authors. This goes all the way back to the Die  
>> Brcke manifesto of 1906, and continues through time to this one that  
>> you're reading now. A healthy wariness of manifestos is understood and  
>> encouraged. However, the ideas put forth here are meant sincerely and  
>> with the hope of bringing inspiration and change to others, as well as  
>> to myself.

>>

>> \*This first 'tenet', however ironically, instructs us to consider even  
>> it's source and progenitor with a 'healthy wariness'. Proponents of  
>> Dogme have suggested 'The Vow' not be taken too seriously and always  
>> read in the context of the state-of-the-art pedagogy at the time  
>> during which it was written. In that sense, this new manifesto adopts  
>> a more critical perspective on itself than does 'The Vow'. This first  
>> principle also applies to coursebooks, I believe, although I don't  
>> like the harshness of the word 'stupidity'. Perhaps \*\*\* should have  
>> included a similar disclaimer back then. Please understand I do not  
>> mean to imply \*\*\*, or coursebooks writers for that matter, are  
>> driven by ego, pretense or stupidity!

>> 2. Remodernism seeks a new spirituality in art. Therefore, remodernist  
>> film seeks a new spirituality in cinema. Spiritual film does not mean  
>> films about Jesus or the Buddha. Spiritual film is not about religion.  
>> It is cinema concerned with humanity and an understanding of the  
>> simple truths and moments of humanity. Spiritual film is really ALL  
>> about these moments.

>>

>> \*Detractors have compared the enthusiasm for ELT Dogme to religious  
>> fervor, while others have patently denied any evangelizing. In the  
>> classroom, dogmetic teachers continue to explore humanist principles  
>> and perspectives on education and language learning by giving  
>> prominence to the lives of students, creating a space for 'moments of  
>> humanity' among the people in the room, rather than by serving up  
>> Grammar McNuggets. Understood in this way, there is no 'state of  
>> grace' to be attained, and Dogme seeks a sort of 'humanist  
>> spirituality' in the art of pedagogy.

>>

>> 3. Cinema could be one of the perfect methods of creative expression,  
>> due to the ability of the filmmaker to sculpt with image, sound and  
>> the feeling of time. For the most part, the creative possibilities of  
>> cinema have been squandered. Cinema is not a painting, a novel, a  
>> play, or a still photograph. The rules and methods used to create  
>> cinema should not be tied to these other creative endeavors. Cinema  
>> should NOT be thought of as being ""all about telling a story"". Story  
>> is a convention of writing, and should not necessarily be considered a  
>> convention of filmmaking.

>>

>> \*\*\*\* asked in his manifesto, ""But where is the story? Where is the  
>> inner life of the student in all this? Where is real communication?"" ,  
>> which suggested that time in natural setting of the classroom was  
>> being misspent. I think it has been realized that the emergent  
>> language arising from communicative and meaning-oriented interaction

>> or tasks must be supplemented by some sort of attention to form, in  
>> order for the story, and the students, to find new meaning and carry on.  
>>

>> As for the 'rules and methods used to create' ELT Dogme, \*\*\*  
>> initially wrote ""A Dogme school of teaching would take a dim view of  
>> imported methods, whether the Silent Way, the Natural Approach, the  
>> Direct Method, or hard line CLT. No methodological structures should  
>> interfere with, nor inhibit, the free flow of participant-driven  
>> input, output and feedback."" But it seems clear that the unplugged  
>> teacher takes less than 'a dim view' towards these and other methods  
>> (eg, CLL and TBL). It is quite possible that the original manifesto  
>> (ie, 'Vow'), based on a rather strict code established by a group of  
>> Danish filmmakers, would squander possibilities afforded by the more  
>> tolerant and inclusive Dogme we see today.

>>  
>> 4. The Japanese ideas of wabi-sabi (the beauty of imperfection) and  
>> mono no aware (the awareness of the transience of things and the  
>> bittersweet feelings that accompany their passing), have the ability  
>> to show the truth of existence, and should always be considered when  
>> making the remodernist film.

>>  
>> ""The point is to restore teaching to its pre-method 'state of grace' -  
>> when all there was was a room with a few chairs, a blackboard, a  
>> teacher and some students, and where learning was jointly constructed  
>> out of the talk that evolved in that simplest, and most prototypical  
>> of situations.""

>>  
>> \* As mentioned above, there really is no 'state of grace' as far as  
>> Dogme is concerned, and a time without technology is also unimaginable  
>> to tool-using creatures like us. Unplugged learning can be co-  
>> constructed out of the talk that emerges from extraordinary situations  
>> just as well as it can out of simple and prototypical ones. Thus, this  
>> Remodernist Manifesto propels Dogme toward a post-method 'state of  
>> grace'.

>>  
>> 5. An artificial sense of ""perfection"" should never be imposed on a  
>> remodernist film. Flaws should be accepted and even encouraged. To  
>> that end, a remodernist filmmaker should consider the use of film, and  
>> particularly film like Super-8mm and 16mm because these mediums entail  
>> more of a risk and a requirement to leave things up to chance, as  
>> opposed to digital video. Digital video is for people who are afraid  
>> of, and unwilling to make mistakes.\*\* Video leads to a boring and  
>> sterile cinema. Mistakes and failures make your work honest and  
>> human.\*\*\*

>>  
>> \*As with the author's reconsideration of the merits of video (cf, 6.),  
>> Dogme has, I think it's fair to say, assumed a less hostile stance on  
>> the use of digital technology in the classroom. Nonetheless, the  
>> smaller formats (Super-8 and 16mm) of a 'stripped down, technology-  
>> free kind of film making' are still best suited to a 'poor pedagogy'.  
>> Moreover, flaws are commonly seen as opportunities rather than

>> imperfections by dogme enthusiasts.  
>>  
>> 6. Film, particularly Super-8mm film, has a rawness, and an ability to  
>> capture the poetic essence of life, that video has never been able to  
>> accomplish.\*\*\*  
>>  
>> \*Just as Dogme, in my view, prefers, indeed thrives on, raw  
>> communication, there can be exceptions \*\*\*, so that whereas Dogma 95  
>> dictated that ""Temporal and geographical alienation are forbidden.  
>> (That is to say that the film takes place here and now)"" , this new  
>> manifesto mandates that, as long as ""Learning ... takes place in the  
>> here-and-now"" , the means of interaction might be asynchronous and  
>> create geographical distance among the learners.  
>>  
>> 7. Intuition is a powerful tool for honest communication. Your  
>> intuition will always tell you if you are making something honest, so  
>> use of intuition is key in all stages of remodernist filmmaking.  
>>  
>> \*This seems wholly in line with Csikszentmihalyi's concept of flow,  
>> cited by \*\*\* here:  
>> <http://scottthornbury.wordpress.com/2010/05/30/f-is-for-flow/>  
>> Perhaps by no coincidence, Dogme has often been associated with flow  
>> by, among others, \*\*\*  
>>  
>> <http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/mortarboard/2006/jul/28/letitflow1?INTCMP=ILCNETTXT3487>  
>>  
>> 8. Any product or result of human creativity is inherently subjective,  
>> due to the beliefs, biases and knowledge of the person creating the  
>> work. Work that attempts to be objective will always be subjective,  
>> only instead it will be subjective in a dishonest way. Objective films  
>> are inherently dishonest. Stanley Kubrick, who desperately and  
>> pathetically tried to make objective films, instead made dishonest and  
>> boring films.  
>>  
>> \*I'll admit to liking some of Kubrick's films and apply this point to  
>> attempts to situate Dogme within a standard framework of qualitative  
>> scientific research.  
>>  
>> 9. The remodernist film is always subjective and never aspires to be  
>> objective.  
>>  
>> \*Likewise, I think Dogme, as \*\*\* has suggested in his most recent  
>> posts to the discussion forum, will benefit most when ""Research  
>> methodologies ... include action research, interaction analysis,  
>> ethnographic and narrative inquiry, and curriculum evaluation"".  
>>  
>> 10. Remodernist film is not Dogme '95. We do not have a pretentious  
>> checklist that must be followed precisely. This manifesto should be  
>> viewed only as a collection of ideas and hints whose author may be  
>> mocked and insulted at will.

>>  
>> \*Not sure \*\*\* has been mocked and insulted because of his 'Vow' -  
>> only he can tell us how he feels - but the fact remains that, just as  
>> ELT Dogme has been criticized, the original manifesto (link to article  
>> above) has been drawn into question and more or less diminished, at  
>> times by Dogme enthusiasts themselves. This post is no exception  
>> though it aspires to offer a more rigorous analogy.  
>>  
>> 11. The remodernist filmmaker must always have the courage to fail,  
>> even hoping to fail, and to find the honesty, beauty and humanity in  
>> failure.  
>>  
>> \*Read for yourself how the classroom accounts shared on this forum  
>> attest to this.  
>>  
>> 12. The remodernist filmmaker should never expect to be thanked or  
>> congratulated. Instead, insults and criticism should be welcomed. You  
>> must be willing to go ignored and overlooked.  
>>  
>> \*While certainly not 'ignored and overlooked' entirely (and never, I  
>> hope, on the discussion forum), the unplugged teachers I've  
>> encountered, as with the ELT community in general, typically invite  
>> criticism - 'insults', not so much. This new manifesto reflects this  
>> humility much more than do the 'Dogme-like' prescriptions of 'The  
>> Vow', however tongue-in-cheek.  
>>  
>> 13. The remodernist filmmaker should be accepting of their influences,  
>> and should have the bravery to copy from them in their quest for  
>> understanding of themselves.  
>>  
>> \*Need I say more than Sylvia Ashton-Warner, Paulo Freire and Leo van  
>> Lier? See \*\*\* Gaughan's Unplugged Public Library for more at  
>> <http://teachertrainingunplugged.wordpress.com/unplugged-public-library/>  
>> , all of whom have been mentioned time and again since \*\*\* drafted  
>> the original manifesto.  
>>  
>> 14. Remodernist film should be a stripped down, minimal, lyrical, punk  
>> kind of filmmaking, and is a close relative to the No-Wave Cinema that  
>> came out of New York's Lower East Side in the 1970's.  
>>  
>> \*Still materials-lite at heart, after all these years. This new  
>> manifesto retains the minimalist call to 'chastity' with less dogma  
>> attached.  
>>  
>> 15. Remodernist film is for the young, and for those who are older but  
>> still have the courage to look at the world through eyes as if they  
>> are children.  
>>  
>> \* I leave you alone to mingle with that last bit. For the record, I no  
>> longer consider myself young, but I'll be rubbing elbows right beside  
>> you just the same.

>>  
>> \*\*\* (The position on digital/video has changed since this manifesto was  
>> written in 2008- the group is inclusive toward use of any motion  
>> picture format. See recent essay here).  
>>

## Post 416

*Coded as own in class experience.*  
*Coded as teaching text.*

Hello all,

This is my first post though I have been an active reader and ponderer since 2004. This afternoon, I suddenly became excited about sharing what I have been working with the dogme group.

A bit of background: I just started a new job teaching English to Korean students in an intensive program. I am teaching a course called 'Learning to Speak' where the main purpose is fluency in spoken English. We meet for about 5 hours a week. The suggested textbooks were terrible so I decided to go without. I also decided to start a blog for the class. Both the class and the blog are just in the beginning stages but I wanted to share. The blog can be found at: <http://learningtospeak1b.wordpress.com/>

I am looking forward to any comments or suggestions.  
cheers,  
\*\*\*

## Post 417

Certainly you are NOT the average old-timer, \*\*\*.

From: \*\*\*  
Sent: Thursday, January 13, 2011 7:52 AM  
To: dogme@yahoogroups.com  
Subject: Re: [dogme] L1 in the Classroom: (was Re: Classroom Management and Dogme)

Age... Well, despite the chronology, my ego at 75 (that figure astonishes me when I write it) is robust. I cannot help sitting here and wondering which category \*\*\* would put me in. :-)

Greetings to all of you,

\*\*\*

## Post 418

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

it seems that again, we have several aspects on our plate when we consider learning by heart. getting to the core, the aspect of understanding the content is a serious issue - learning by heart meaning reciting things without understanding would be perceived as a horribly outdated and injurious pedagogical practice. that might be what the Chinese student had in mind, I personally didn't ever see an inside of a typical Chinese classroom so I cannot say.

secondly, the nature of the learning stuff bears some relevance as to the method of retaining it in memory,. sometimes rote learning seems to work, sometimes it is more practical to use mnemonics, sometimes understanding and elaborating seems the best way. that is where we enter the "learning to learn" skill, where it is important that the student (and the teacher, obviously) knows how to decide which method of learning works best.

still, there is a valid point made by \*\*\*, that the "modern classroom", while holding rote learning in disregard, is possibly not necessarily doing a service to its students?

\*\*\*

dogme@yahoogroups.com \*\*\*:

An interesting point - and one which might be borne out with reference to Shakespeare and the Bible - not just Shakespeare, either. The process would appear to be one in which memorable words, phrases, rhythms and meanings are stored and then reconstituted (this makes it sound like instant soup but I can't find a better word). Is this so different from the way one learns to speak or communicate in another language?

But the source material has to be sufficiently impressive. One may assume that had Shakespeare or the Arab writers referred to by \*\*\*'s colleague been raised on the Stratford phone directory (or equivalent) the results might have been less impressive.

I think learning by heart is an essential part of learning provided - in answer to \*\*\*'s point - one understands what one is learning. I would go so far as to say it is under-rated, and that it is an obvious contender for key dogme skill as it requires no additional technologies.

\*\*\*

From: dogme@yahoogroups.com on behalf of \*\*\*  
Sent: Sun 17/08/2008 23:30  
To: dogme@yahoogroups.com  
Subject: [dogme] Re: ps (rote kills creativity)

This is a very interesting area - even at bedtime with a big day tomorrow!

A teacher of Arabic as a second language who I used to work with tells me that the most creative writers in Arabic tend to be those that learnt huge parts of the Koran by heart as a child.

Rather than being a hindrance, I wonder whether rote learning has some kind of slow release effect on our creativity? Isn't there also research which suggests that learning by heart and creativity happen in the same part of our brains?

\*\*\*

I--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com <mailto:dogme%40yahoogroups.com> , ""\*\*\*\*\*  
wrote: >

> I meant to add that I DO think not encouraging students to think  
has a > detrimental effect on creativity and imagination, not taking them  
> inside their own minds, not leading them to question and/or  
analyse. > But that's different from 'learning by heart'.

## Post 419

*Coded as own in class experience.*  
*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*  
*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*,

Good to hear from you again.

You won't be in the least surprised to hear my eyes opened wider when I read this:

""when they all said ""we need grammar!"" , I  
tried to find out why - in order to understand, in order to not be  
seen as a poor English speaker, etc. They told me they wanted to be  
able to express their thoughts more clearly and appropriately.""

I used to hear the equivalent from university students in Germany. Notice, Dear Reader, that \*\*\*'s students real concerns are - comprehension, face, ability to express thoughts clearly and appropriately.

I'd still argue that there is no obvious logical connection between those

concerns and doing ""grammar"". ""Grammar"" won't help them much, other things could.

I'd continue to say that the task for the teacher, dogmatic or other, is to find out what the students think they need and want (most important) and skillfully and convincingly demonstrate to them that the need something else.

\*\*\*

Post 420

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\* wrote:

""please speak more slowly': a way of saying, speak more clearly, give me time to think, and don't use too many words??"

\*\*\*\*\*

Yes, and sometimes, I believe, it means ""I don't understand."" At the beginning of my class, a couple of the students inevitably ask me to speak more slowly. This leads to a discussion about what we've been turning over here on the list. In the end, I don't really slow down, I simply remember to be more economical when I can. Less is more.

Perhaps the real issue is how the students are speaking.

\*\*\*

## Post 421

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*, \*\*\*,

>

> I also teach in FE, although fortunately only part-time. Although there is  
> a lot of talk about schemes of work, pre-session lesson plans, ILPs etc.  
> In reality it is quite easy to work round these - if you want! In the past  
> 10 years I've been observed countless times and have never been graded  
> less than a 2 and this includes times when I have taught a really radical  
> version of Dogme (no plans, no books, student written ILPs and just me  
> with a pack of pens and a blank notebook to scribble things in as we go  
> along.

>

> \*\*\*

\*\*\*,

Did you say no plans, no books, no student written ILPs and no use of technology. You would fail you lesson observation before you had even



started your precious dogme lesson in my college.  
You are supposed to present all the paperwork at the time of the lesson observation, it is examined in great depth, lesson plans are supposed to tie in with schemes of work and ILPs negotiated with and signed by the students are also supposed to tie in and this is with each class  
You are also supposed to have full details of EXACTLY what you plan to do until the end of term with each class including resources, page numbers, technology and so on. This is day after day, hour by hour, minute by minute in advance. Full time!! Also \*\*\*, no chance of writing lesson plans after the lessons. That really is a hanging offence where I work!  
What about dogme in this situation?? And yes we DO want to do it. We are not layabouts....

\*\*\*

Your FE college must be very special!!!! >

>

## Post 422

Hello again \*\*\*,

Funny name, that! How did you get it?

Good luck for your course. It does sound interesting. Perhaps you could tell people about it on your return?

\*\*\*Hi \*\*\*, >

> I'd love to answer your email (and will try to remember to do so). But,  
> unfortunately I am just about to leave to run a 2-week training course for  
> Spanish Secondary teachers teaching in a CLiL context.

>

> More when I get back

>

> \*\*\*

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: \*\*\*

> To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

> Subject: Re: [dogme] ESOL vs EFL

>

> > Good morning \*\*\*.

> Our college does not have a Key Skills Unit whatever that might be and

> learning difficulties are definitely not assessed for ESOL learners. You

> already say that this is done for L1 learners and it would certainly be

> easier. It is more debatable when it comes to ESOL learners because of

> the

> apparent difficulty of distinguishing between the varying abilities of

> students to acquire the second language and any ""learning difficulties""

> there might be together with the associated stigma.

> Furthermore, I have faced tough resistance from My Asian Team Leaders

> when

> I have endeavoured to refer Asian students for the kind of assessment

> you

> have referred to. This was largely due probably to the quite

> understandable notion that in some way you are blaming the student for

> his  
 > or her own apparent ability to learn at an ""acceptable"" pace.  
 > Anyway what more could CH do? What would your solution to the ""problem""  
 > be? Perhaps CH could chip in here?  
 > Your point about differentiation being talked about but not being  
 > carried  
 > out is interesting but you have seen how hard CH is trying. She is  
 > certainly not unusual among ESOL teachers in her sense of vocation and  
 > commitment. How would you go about differentiating in the class she has  
 > described? what would your solution be?  
 > Sincerely,  
 > \*\*\*  
 > >  
 > > a) Yes, there are differences between ESOL classes and EFL classes,  
 > I'm  
 > > quite aware of that.  
 > >  
 > > b) All FE and community colleges have people (often based in their Key  
 > > Skills units) trained to assess students who might have learning  
 > problems  
 > > - it is as much a requirement as is differentiation in classes.  
 > However,  
 > > they are usually trained to look at these issues for people whose L1  
 > is  
 > > English and may have problems when the L1 is different. But that does  
 > not  
 > > mean it should be ignored (if you take on the students you should have  
 > the  
 > > ability to deal with them).  
 > >  
 > > c) Differentiation is often talked about and then not actually carried  
 > > out. I think CH's class is a great case in point. What's the point of  
 > > differentiated learning if the end tests are all the same?????? This  
 > needs  
 > > to be pointed out to the powers-that-be, in writing as well so that  
 > they  
 > > can't pass the buck when results come in and inspections are carried  
 > out.  
 > >  
 > > \*\*\*  
 > >  
 > >

## Post 423

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\*, so good to have you with us! I'm glad you've shared your concerns and doubts about Dogme here. Healthy skepticism and critical inquiry are important. Thank you!

There's not much I can add to the comments by \*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\*, and \*\*\*. I would suggest, however, that the notion of 'grammaring' is more significant than grammar when it comes to learning a language. Have you read Scott's book *Uncovering Grammar*? It's an excellent introduction to the idea that grammar is as grammar does, if you will. In this sense, teaching unplugged becomes a way to help language learners 'grammar', which is a dynamic, learner- and \*learning\*-centered, fluid exercise, rather than a teacher-centered transmission of static forms, ie ""grammar McNuggets"" that can deaden the classroom atmosphere. So it's obvious why TBL and Dogme complement one another. But to get to a task, we need a lead-in. Rather than initiate the lead-in, I find it more suitable to wait for it to emerge.

As coincidence would have it, your example (""I was never in USA"" ) applies to a class of nine language learners that I was with this week (With these students it was ""I have six months in USA""). In cases like this, I find students usually do one of the following:

Peer-correct, eg, ""I have \*been\*...""  
Ask if the form is correct, ""Can I say that?""  
Just keep talking.

Selinker's (or Weinrich's?) notion of interlanguage (1972) makes some sense to me, and I take it into consideration when deciding if, when, where, and how to provide feedback to learners. Peer correction often leads to conversation, or a peek at previous writing samples from students, a text, or opening the archives of memory.

A question about the accuracy of a piece of language can follow much the same path, or, I might turn the question to the group and then lead them down the trail to look at writing they've done, texts they've read, or ask them to do some online research, eg, type your piece of language in the search box, hit return, and see what comes back at you, a sort of very amateur corpus.

If they just keep talking, it might be best to keep listening and make a note of the slip, mistake, error, or what have you. This is where interlanguage comes in, for me. And, how well I know the people in the room and their English(es), helps me determine what to do next. Will I talk and chalk, elicit, plan to copy the awareness-raising task on past simple vs. present perfect at the back of *Uncovering Grammar*, or spontaneously create a relevant task?

So much depends.... and that's what keeps teaching unplugged fresh and exciting for me.

I'd enjoy reading about your classroom experiences, \*\*\*. Please don't hesitate to share more concerns, doubts, and aspirations here.

\*\*\*

On Jan 25, 2013, at 7:32 AM, \*\*\* wrote:

- > Dear all,
- >
- > I've been teaching English as a second language for more than 3 years now and the reason I joined this group was to try to get some answers and hear other teachers' thoughts on dogme as a teaching method.
- > The first time I became aware of it was half a year ago or so on a seminar here in Belgrade. I've done some research, watched \*\*\* in some of his dogme classes and read articles about it but I must say that , though it sounds intriguing and refreshing, this method doesn't seem to nourish and encourage actual learning and it also has some serious flaws.
- > Why am I saying this?
- > Firstly; having watched \*\*\*' videos on british council site, I've come to realize two things: a)the students liked it because 'it was interesting' b) there wasn't actual learning going on at all.
- > Yes, we all want to be immensely entertaining and interesting to our students but our primary goal as teachers is to actually teach students, not to chat with them casually for an hour or so and that's pretty much what happened in the video I'm talking about. So,my first concern is: can you, as a student, learning anything (and how much) if you're working under dogme methodology?
- > The other thing I noticed was the difficulty of teaching grammar with dogme. Namely, how can you just casually start explaining Present Perfect when it pops up during a conversation? Ok, you can revise things, that's perfectly fine, but I just don't think that this methodology is grammar-teaching-friendly so to speak.
- >
- > Imagine a class: you're chatting about travelling and a student keeps repeating 'I was never in USA'. you know it's incorrect but let's say you haven't taught PP yet, so what do you do? just correct him without givign further explanation or freeze the discussion in order to extrapolate the business of PP and then go back to talking and chatting?
- > I hope you see my point here; it seems impractical and I believe that dogme is maybe suitable for intermediate + students, and even in that case, I don't think I'd spend the whole course relying on it. Maybe in some conversational courses I would actually, but not in classical ones in which your students expect you to teach them something explicitly and not just beat around the bush and talk about things as they naturally come into conversation. That just seems too irresponsible.
- > In my opinion, textbooks, no matter how seriously flawed they sometimes might be, still give a wider range of different types of exercises which are more beneficial for students' language understanding in the long run.
- >
- > Ok, so I'd really like to hear from you, feel free to change my mind because maybe I'm missing the big picture here :)
- >
- >

## Post 424

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

"And then there's this thing called the heart, which might actually be just as important, if not more so, than 'the brain', which our age of cognitive science loves to focus on as if it were the very essence of human

existence --- I know some readers will think it is! Well, we are classified as homo \*sapiens\*, but how might note-taking relate to our emotional needs as learners? Silly question? Well, perhaps I deserve a silly answer.

Here's one silly answer: Teachers should let learners incorporate notes into their learning if learners feel it will be of value, even if teachers do not agree. This might enable learners to discover on their own the importance and worth of such note-taking according to their learning styles and needs.

If I remember correctly, the Japanese don't really distinguish between the mind and the heart.

\*\*\* ----- Original Message -----

From: \*\*\*

To: <dogme@yahoogroups.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 03, 2003 5:29 PM

Subject: [dogme] notes, communication, learning

> Thanks \*\*\* and \*\*\* (both 6/27 ""Presentness and Students"" ) for broadening  
> the notes discussion (and thanks to others for their note-related comments,  
> too).  
>  
> After writing ""Presentness and students"" on 6/26, I talked with the guy I  
> work with. Matt said that notes are useful as a means to remember things  
> you need ""as is"" a short or long time later (e.g., a shopping list; a  
> quote; a fact that may appear on a test; the note of something to come  
> back  
> to later that \*\*\* might have made in the training course he described  
> [6/26]).  
>  
> Notes made toward language competence are usually less effective, however,  
> as each note records a particular instance of language. But accumulating  
> specific items isn't central to learning a language. Rather, our brain  
> needs lots of examples of an item, allowing us to pass from vague to  
> clearer generalizations about that piece of language.  
>  
> This morning I read this: ""The child does not think of languages as things  
> in themselves--indeed, hardly thinks of them at all. They are just part  
> of  
> the activity of communicating with others."" (Marshall Childs, The Daily  
> Yomiuri, July 4, 2003, p. 14. [One of the perks of living in an EFL world  
> is the occasional pithy comment on language learning with your  
> breakfast.])  
>  
> This sums up for me the power of dogme with its lessons 'primarily based  
> on  
> the language that emerges out of the communicative needs, interests,  
> desires of the people in the room.' I believe from experience that the

> brain goes about learning languages basically the same way no matter the  
> age. Dogme puts the emphasis on communication, freeing the brain to do  
its  
> slow unobserved work of acquisition.  
>  
> So I've put away my pen and notebook and try to be present and engaged in  
> the communication of my Japanese classes. I trust my brain to note what  
it  
> will. It does a far better job than I ever could.  
> \*\*\*  
>

## Post 425

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Where are the dogme files ?

\*\*\* a crit :

At the IATEFL conferecne in Harrogate last week I took part in a debate whose title was, Sorry, but you've got to have a grammar syllabus... Arguing for the motion was Michael Swan. I was arguing against it. The whole thing was fairly lacklustre and unspontaneous, and left me feeling more than usually incoherent. Needless to say, no one ""won"".

As a follow-up, we've been asked to post a summary on the OUP Teachers Club site. I've also posted it in the dogme files, since it sits fairly comfortably with dogme principles. (You will have to go to the OUP site to see Swan's arguments, though).

\*\*\*

## Post 426

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

One thing I would say about the 'activities'/'ideas' in the back of Uncovering G is that they are almost all for higher level classes. Good as they are we need to start doing this stuff right from the start. I've started trying to put together suitable 'tasks' for my intermediate(ish) - but low - group.

\*\*\*

## Post 427

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Dear \*\*\*,\*\*\*and \*\*\*,

This is a lesson which i recently gave and i believe that it could be described as an organic lesson.

It involves use of prepared material but i feel that

is justified when the subject is generated by students and when it is used to change the pace of the lesson rather than as the lesson's focus. The focus of this lesson was clearly the chat between the students and myself and what is interesting for me is that the subject generated after the text was not one i had predicted at all.

Please give me any comments you have and also any comments you have about pacing organic lessons and the exercises you use to do so.

I look forward to further discussion,

\*\*\*

## Post 428

Well put, \*\*\*. you've really managed to say all of what needs saying in a concise manner. You should be a writer! :-)

Interesting comments so far.

Off to finish his gardening projects for the weekend.

\*\*\*

\*\*\* wrote:

> March 9th will mark the tenth anniversary of this site. None of us  
> who were in at the start could ever have imagined that this  
> conversation would carry on, more or less without stop, for ten  
> years, clocking up over 15,000 postings, and (at a guess) around 3m  
> words. It's impossible to know how many active subscribers there are  
> (the official number of members doesn't take into account those who  
> have subsequently left without intentionally unsubscribing), nor the  
> number of those who aren't subscribed but who simply lurk. But, over  
> the ten years that this site has been active, I imagine there may  
> have been hundreds - even thousands - of visitors.

>

> Certainly, dogme is now, if not a household name, at least a  
> staffroom one. I am constantly amazed by how the term 'dogme' is  
> taken for granted amongst teachers as if it were just another option  
> in their battery of available approaches. On Diploma courses it is  
> now fairly common practice to experiment with a ""dogme lesson"".  
> Articles have appeared in print and online that allude to it, and  
> MAs have been written about it. It is mentioned more than once in  
> the latest editions of both Harmer's Practice of ELT and Scrivener's  
> Learning Teaching. It figures in Wikipedia. A bootleg video of me  
> doing a dogme workshop is extensively traded.

>

> None of this could have been foreseen ten years ago. Initially, the  
> site was intended as an easier alternative to what until then had

> been a sporadic email exchange between just three people: me, \*\*\*  
 > \*\*\* (in London) and \*\*\*French (in Poland). (None of us, at  
 > this point, had met face to face.) It was \*\*\*who suggested  
 > setting up what at the time was called an e-group. You can still  
 > visit those first exchanges, and get - I hope - a flavour of the  
 > excitement that was generated as we struggled to rationalise, and  
 > implement, an approach to teaching EFL/ESOL that chimed with what  
 > (we soon discovered) many teachers had been feeling - and doing -  
 > for years, unaware that there were other teachers all round the  
 > world dedicated to a similar enterprise - but without, until then,  
 > being able to give it a name.  
 >  
 > After an initially quiet start, the discussion started to gather new  
 > members at an exponential rate (an interesting reflection of the  
 > emergentist theory that only later began to infuse discussions about  
 > dogme pedagogy itself). And, while at first dogme was mainly male  
 > and native-speaker dominated, the balance started to shift within  
 > the first year or so.  
 >  
 > By the second year the volume, not to mention the quality, of the  
 > postings suggested that there was more going on than could be  
 > characterised as simply a loony fringe of anti-Headway iconoclasts.  
 > Meanwhile a steady influx of new members was enriching the  
 > discussion, both in terms of its theoretical underpinnings and its  
 > practical applications. Within two or three years an archive of past  
 > postings was being assembled (you can find it on my website), and  
 > not long after that a dogme ""book"" had been mooted. Meanwhile, the  
 > discussion went from strength to strength. It is always ill-advised  
 > to mention names, but I have to acknowledge the always insightful,  
 > often brilliant, contributions of \*\*\*, \*\*\*,  
 > \*\*\*, \*\*\*, and \*\*\* Haines among many, many  
 > others.  
 >  
 > And now what? After ten years, is there any point in keeping the  
 > dogme list alive? I think not. It seems to me that it has outlived  
 > its usefulness. Dogme is already 'out there'. It no longer needs the  
 > security of a dedicated discussion list. Moreover, times have  
 > changed. When the dogme discussion first started, there were no  
 > blogs, no Second life, no Twitter. Now, all of these networking  
 > media, and more, serve to broadcast the dogme point of view on a  
 > regular basis. Dogme has both evolved and migrated. (There is even a  
 > book!) What survives at the Yahoo site is fast becoming the residue,  
 > the trace or echo of a discussion that is taking place somewhere  
 > else. This site - for better or for worse - is less and less  
 > important as the ""Grand Central Station"" of dogme theory and practice.  
 >  
 > So, having consulted with my colleagues, I have decided it's as good  
 > a time as any to draw a line in the sand and close the Dogme  
 > discussion group as an active forum - while leaving it available as  
 > an archive and a resource. As of March 9th 2010 (the tenth  
 > anniversary if its founding) it will no longer be possible to post



> on this site.  
>  
> Of course, this does NOT mean that ""dogme is dead"" (although there  
> are bound to be one or two who will claim as much). Nor does it mean  
> that no one else can start their own dogme site and carry on the  
> conversation in their own terms. Dogme was never meant to be a  
> franchise or a brand or a method. By closing this site, we hope  
> simply to untether dogme from its somewhat homespun origins, and  
> allow it to evolve in ways that best suit the needs of its many fans  
> and practitioners, and using media more fitting to the second decade  
> of the twenty-first century.  
>  
> You have precisely nine days to voice your approval, disapproval,  
> shock, horror, joy, sadness, anger, glee, resignation, boredom - or  
> whatever. Looking forward to hearing from you!  
>  
> \*\*\* (with a lot of help from \*\*\* and \*\*\*)  
>

## Post 429

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as own learning experience.*

I'm feeling rather cynical about teaching English these days or I'm just burnt-out trying to making a contribution in Korea and instead feel like I'm bashing my head against a brick wall of ""Oh, English is very difficult"" ""Oh, English is too difficult"", ""Young kids can't read and write in English, it's too difficult for them"" and so on and so on. My Korean co-teacher's response to trying and encourage the kids to take more risks in constructing sentences was that I should give them sentences to memorise and then use in conversation.

And now I have to write lesson plans in my holidays - a whole seven days of holidays. One lot of lesson plans is for 3-5 year olds.

Yours in exhaustion,

\*\*\*

--- On Mon, 1/26/09, \*\*\* wrote:

From: \*\*\*

Subject: [dogme] What about Krashen?

To: ""dogme"" <dogme@yahoogroups.com>

Date: Monday, January 26, 2009, 5:35 AM

Hi again \*\*\*,

Sorry, I forgot to comment on your question about Krashen and Comprehensible Input. Have a look at Swain's work with Comprehensible Output. Simply stated, instead of spoon-feeding learners the language we want them to eventually acquire, the learners themselves provide

each other with the language they need as they need it. If you search the Web under Swain and Comprehensible Output, you'll find more info. Leo van Lier is another source of information for a curriculum (his AAA curriculum) that heads in this direction.

I know this is a bit vague, but perhaps it'll crystallize when you read the relevant literature.

Hope that helps,

\*\*\*

## Post 430

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

As I read your message, \*\*\*, I could here the Guardian brigade turning over in their graves. ""Doing dogme without realising it?!?!?!" They won't have liked that!

Secondly, not only is it alright to be Impure of Dogme, it would appear that there are very few people who aren't. Too be honest, any dogme purist might come across as sanctimonious even to the most sanctimonious of us (and, if we're to believe what people say, we are, to paraphrase Mr Kipling's friend, exceedingly sanctimonious).

Thirdly, with that in mind, don't feel bad about bringing whatever you need into your classroom. Think of dogme more as a challenge whereby you would like to bring in less but have to think of ways of doing so that are as efficient as or more efficient than what you did before. Remember, even Our Kiwi-in-Chief tell us in one of the Early Dogme Scrolls how he brought a picture of an Arab statesman into a fairly low level class and let the lesson unfold.

Fourthly, and finally, try to get your hands on a copy of Sylvia Ashton Warner's ""Teacher"". It's short and easy to read and tells how she ""did"" English with her primary school children without materials or owt. Obviously, your students aren't primary school children, but you may find some practical ideas.

\*\*\*

## Post 431

Coded as teaching text.

Hallo \*\*\*,

It has just occurred to me. Have you got a copy of Peter Wilberg's One

to One. It has some great ideas that are not way off the dogme mark.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*... wrote:

- > It was easy at first to talk English with context making the meaning
- > pretty clear -
- >
- > 'Let's go upstairs. Here - left. Be careful, it's a bit narrow here.
- > Would you like to take a seat
- > here? No, here.' |
- >
- > | Some general business in German followed, including the statement
- > that I was going to
- > speak as much English as possible, but that he should feel quite free
- > to speak German if he
- > wanted to or needed to. (Various friends and colleagues had made me
- > feel a bit of a beast
- > for not planning to build in a fair amount of translation). |
- >
- > We were able to make spontaneous use of a bee (sent by the Spirit of
- > Dogme?)
- > that buzzed and flew from one window to another generating for us:
- > bee, honey, inside,
- > outside and ' I like bees if they don't sting me. They make honey.'"
- >
- > \*\*\* had told me he'd picked up a few English words from films and
- > video and music
- > channels.He added yesterday that one doesn't necessarily know what
- > they mean, one
- > cannot necessarily translate them properly, but one has heard them. I
- > asked him for 10. He
- > came up with, in the order I give them: LOVE, POLICE, ( a police
- > siren could be heard
- > outside) MAN. There may have been two more, but that was it. He
- > immediately apologised:
- > ""I should have prepared more carefully."" I tried to convince him he
- > couldn't have and I was
- > only asking out of interest. |
- >
- > Thinking that we'd need to be able to talk about when we were going to
- > meet, I arranged for
- > us to do the following: |
- >
- > the numbers from 1-12 (for the time), the hours (6 o'clock etc), half
- > past, quarter past,
- > quarter to. (This was all oral. The only thing I wrote down in 90
- > minutes was: ' o'clock' and all
- > S wrote down was his email address for me). |
- >
- > I said the word(s), S repeated a few times and then - with the numbers

> - he said them  
 > forwards and backwards and according to what I was indicating with my  
 > fingers. For the time  
 > I provided a clock, he moved the hands to the appropriate time and I  
 > asked: ""What's the time  
 > now?"" |  
 >  
 >  
 > | Towards the end I asked: ""When are we going to have our second  
 > meeting?"" He said to  
 > himself, in German: ""I understand that question and I know the answer,  
 > um..."" And he  
 > volunteered: 'Wednesday', which was correct. |  
 >  
 > | Finally, I spent some time explaining (German) and demonstrating  
 > (English) how to use  
 > the tapes to English 900. He was quite interested in the chance to be  
 > able to work outside  
 > the meetings and saw at once that he could listen to the tapes, for  
 > example, while driving his  
 > car.  
 >  
 > | We'd gone on 30 minutes longer than expected, and he absolutely  
 > insisted on paying me  
 > for an extra half an hour. He also asked if ""hour"" for the  
 > meetings/lessons meant 60 or 55  
 > minutes.  
 >  
 > As he left S said: ""Goodbye, \*\*\*."" He'd picked up 'Goodbye' doing  
 > one of the English  
 > 900 drills.  
 >  
 > |||| My comments.  
 >  
 > 1. It was most enjoyable and we achieved something. Could we perhaps  
 > have done more? |  
 > 2. Did I put on too much of an act? |  
 > 3 I definitely spoke too much copulating German, though not for the  
 > teaching. I can see,  
 > however, a first session is not typical and there are lots of  
 > arrangements to make. |  
 > 4.. He has said several times: 'This is very different.' Does that  
 > mean where is the  
 > textbook? He asked if he should have a vocabulary book. I said, if it  
 > helps, but only if the  
 > words end up in his head as well as in the book. |  
 > 5. I'm thinking I must provide him with a list of words - the 1000  
 > most commonly used  
 > words in English? - so that he can tick them off when he's 'done' them. |  
 > He can also tick off English 900's 800 base sentences- and I'm  
 > beginning to think I will (we

> will) produce dialogues that try capture what he needs and wants to  
> say. ||||| At a  
> conference: May I introduce myself? S from the Department of Heavy  
> Engineering...May I  
> ask where you come from? I was at your presentation yesterday  
> afternoon and found it most  
> stimulating..... |  
> 6. My worry is that \*I\* could end up having a great, humanistic,  
> dogme time and S could feel  
> he isn't getting much. As I write this point I'm having an awful bout  
> of: ""It's all very well for us,  
> but what do the Ss of this world want? ..... Do you think I qualify  
> for a free copy of  
> ""Throwaway"", just in case ?  
>  
> ||""These things which we with ourselves too much discuss."" ||  
>  
> ENOUGH!  
>  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>

## Post 432

*Coded as teaching text.*

Formal grammar is 'ineffective'

Formal grammar is not an effective way of teaching children to write, say researchers at the University of York.

The government-funded study claims this resolves the longstanding debate as to whether drilling pupils in grammar improves their writing skills.

""There are better ways of teaching writing,"" says Richard Andrews of the university's English Review Group.

The findings are based on what is claimed as the largest review there has been of research on the subject.

""This does not mean to say that the teaching of formal aspects of grammar is not interesting or useful in its own right,"" says Professor Andrews.

High priority

""However, in a pressured curriculum, where the development of literacy is a high priority, there will be better ways of teaching writing and our findings suggest that the teaching of 'sentence combining' may be one of the more effective approaches.""

The teaching technique of ""sentence combining"" is defined as ""combining short sentences into longer ones, and embedding elements into simple sentences to make them more complex"".

The study is based on an analysis of previous research produced since the beginning of the last century - and it concludes that teaching formal grammar is not the best way to develop children's writing.

The university says this review ""discovered no evidence that the teaching of traditional grammar, specifically word order or syntax, was effective in assisting writing quality or accuracy among five to 16 year olds"".

The study has been funded by the Department for Education and Skills, via a unit at the Institute of Education in London.

'Tried and trusted'

But it concludes that the national curriculum, which promotes the study of grammar, should be revised.

At present the literacy strategy in England teaches primary school pupils about nouns, verbs and pronouns and other parts of speech.

The report concludes that ""the teaching of formal grammar (and its derivatives) are [sic] ineffective"".

The Department for Education and Skills said: ""We dont expect teachers will use any single teaching method in isolation. The national strategies gives teachers the tools to personalise the teaching according to the purpose of the writing pupils are engaged in.""

The Shadow Education Secretary Tim Collins said it was surprising that this report should come to a different conclusion to the ""tried-and-trusted methods"" of helping children to improve their writing skills.

""At the very least parents should have the choice of sending their children to schools where traditional approaches to literacy have been adopted,"" he said.

## Post 433

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

""\*\*\* cautions, "" But how we actually DO go about it exactly is surely why so many people jabber on so much on this newsgroup - We aren't 100 per cent sure, and to think we hold the key (to ALL students in ALL situations) would be arrogant and dangerous, no?""

Quite. And I'm sorry if my post made it sound like I hold the key to anything. Rather than boast that I know how people learn a language, I think I'd prefer to say that I have strong feelings about how they don't.

\*\*\*

PS I also take your point about students who struggle with rudimentary English and yet perform reasonably well in an exam. As for Polonius, I think the lesson to be learnt from his untimely demise is that you can never trust the royals.

## Post 434

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Whilst we're on the subject of books (which of course we shouldn't be really, should we?) I have to admit very sheepishly that I have never seen *The Standby Book*, and would be grateful if someone could let me know author and/or publisher. Alternatively I guess I could be proactive and search amazon. Doh!

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:

>

> Hi \*\*\*

>

> A while ago I read an article of yours about noticing. Have you written more than one article about noticing? I was telling a Korean friend of mine who will become a middle school (intermediate) or high school English teacher next year about noticing and would like to pass on some articles to her.

>

> cheers,

>

> \*\*\*

> --- On Fri, 1/23/09, \*\*\* wrote:

> From: \*\*\*

> Subject: [dogme] Dogme book

> To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

> By the way, does anyone know anything about the book that \*\*\* and

>

>> \*\*\* were planning to write which i believe was going to be ready

>

>> last Autumn? I'm still waiting!!!!

>

>

>

> It'll be out this spring, hopefully in time to be launched at the

>

> IATEFL Conference in Cardiff in April. It's called Teaching Unplugged:

>

> Dogme in English Language Teaching, by \*\*\* and \*\*\*

>  
> published by Delta. Hurry while stocks last! ;-)  
>

## Post 435

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

Hi everyone:

Search for just about anything on Google-is-Evil, and you'll find a Wikipedia page within the first 4 or 5 results. Do you trust Wikipedia? Not entirely (or at least you shouldn't...)

But would you trust the other stuff in the top 5...? Not entirely, either.

I quote an article on TechLearning.com:

""History used to be written by the victors; now it is written by the people who can get their sites ranked highest in Google""

\*\*\*

\*\*\* <\*\*\*...> wrote:                               \*\*\*,

As I may have written before, many schools and universities in Germany are suspicious of Wikipedia because of its alleged unreliability. I have always been quite satisfied with what it has told me.

\*\*\*

## Post 436

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\* makes a lot of good points in his last message. Note: The practical/theoretical part of my message begins in paragraph 5. Rants and raves are in paragraphs 1-4.

This is after all nothing more than an unmoderated discussion list, I don't think the intent of most posters (as \*\*\* said less than 10% of the list members) is to proselytize anyone or change the world (not really at least!). I'm not teaching or preaching here, just engaging in discussion. And the discussion does provide nutritious food for thought, for those who enjoy this particular type of menu. The product of the discussion is another



matter and of course entirely personal relating to what you do or don't in your class. As \*\*\* said: ""Hey, if you don't like it, don't use it.... As far as I'm concerned, it's something that has improved my teaching and how I feel about it"". I couldn't agree more!

Proposed and concerted Dogme initiatives for 'public consumption', like a Dogme Compendium or coursebook, skills book, etc.. perhaps should have some editorial control and be tweaked for the masses. But this list, I think was at one time, referred to as 'the voices of the teachers' and in that sense, being the real voice of real people, should not be censored, edited or restricted in some way. At least that's how I feel. I am after all only a guest on this list and should the 'rules' change, I would comply, if I chose to continue to post here.

Imagine breaking up a class discussion to admonish some students for using big words or a tense which isn't the 'tense of the day'. ""\*\*\*o, please don't use present perfect. The 'tense of the day' is simple past. Also, please be considerate and limit your vocabulary to the 'official word list' of the week. We don't want to inconvenience anyone here by making them reach for their heavy dictionaries. I only want people to learn what I want them to learn today.."" (Is this thinly disguised sarcasm or what?) ;)

While some posters offer Gems (as \*\*\* has said in the past) others offer 'oos' and 'aahs' (as \*\*\* has said) and still others offer vomits of mental masturbation (perhaps like me!?). Nevertheless, I'm very happy to receive them all, peruse through most of them and make of them what I will. No one is forcing me to read through all this, so I'm not really going to complain.

In terms of practice (here comes the theory!), Dogme has given me a new handle on the types of things I've always done in my classes. But it has also helped me to go one step further by integrating a certain level of 'control' or 'nurturing' into the chaos. Whereas in the past teaching time was teaching time and discussion time was discussion time. Now it's more integrated. As a 'production' phase, I used to let the discussion run on and on. I would regroup after class, dissect it all and try to build on it the next day or just move onto the next item on my syllabus. Now I'm much more aware of what I can do with the discussion and the product of the discussions, during the 'while' and 'post' stages of a traditional lesson.

For example, I might tape a discussion, then on a following day have the same students work with it by having them change tenses, summarize their own speech, etc. Nothing radical in terms of teaching practices mind you. They then try to reinvent the conversation in different words. From student reflection, often the values or opinions of the new conversation change during this transformation and that stimulates further discussion, language and so forth. A very practical example would be replaying yesterday or last week's conversation and having student reflect back on what they said. This of course naturally forces them to use indirect speech. Of course during the new discussion, problem language does arise and I deal with it on the spot in traditional ways and with scaffolding. The difference is I'm 'playing'

with naturally produced and relevant language as opposed 'pre-planned' or 'canned' language. In lessons like this it's always great when students say something like ""I can't believe I said that yesterday"".

Someone made the comment about dogme moments not repeating themselves. In my case that's not true. Students in different classes have been able to regenerate similar discussions, albeit with variation. This is where the 'subversive' nature of Dogme comes in, at least for me. I can non-invasively tweak the conversation, by participating in it and suggesting ideas or topics, as a conversation participant, just as I might in a non-class conversation. When I throw something into the mix, it's an experiment, because I don't want to force students to stick to a pre-planned agenda. But there is usually a lead-in to the discussion - which does set the foundation for certain ideas to come up or language to be produced. At home, I usually keep notes of what topics were discussed and what language arose. In a different class of students, I'll throw in something from my notes and see which way the tide of conversation carries it. So for me, one part of Dogme isn't only about the conversation itself, it's also what else the students do with it.

The important thing though is that Dogme has helped me to reflect much more on my teaching practice and the dynamics of the classroom. In simple terms, I'm just trying to make the most of what I have in my classroom and bring a new sense of appreciation to the wonderful force of nature that it is.

- \*\*\* :) <<<<< Note the smiley! It's not sarcastic! :)

## Post 437

Loved the poem.

\*\*\*

## Post 438

*Coded as other forum post.*

This is \*\*\* to say that \*\*\*' idea is a wonderful one, and I hope we go with it. Also, \*\*\* is spot on with his observations about personality (dis)order. The next step in solving the mystery is to ask, 'Why are there personalities like that out there?'

\*\*\*

## Post 439

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as teacher training.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Hi again

\*\*\*, from my experience of teacher training courses I've undertaken in the past few years (and that's quite a few as I had to re-invent myself in my 30's living in Hong Kong) is that either they don't mention theories at all or if they do they make a passing reference to them eg. Vygotsky's ZPD but they don't give the teachers concrete examples of how to put that theory into practice. It's soooooo annoying. I don't think I would have noticed this but I did my degrees 'the wrong way around'. I did an MA in teaching English to young learners and then a PGCE (don't ask ... certifiable I know ...) and I had to constantly stop myself from berating the teacher trainers on the PGCE for not explaining what the theories were and what exactly they meant and what it looked like to put into practice - I think I was the trainee from hell.

But I was only the trainee from hell because having studied the learning theories in great detail for my MA from the very first module

'How do young learners learn and what are the links between this and their acquisition of a foreign language'

that I found it very condescending of my trainers on the PGCE to mention the theories in passing, almost like flagging them ie ' ... of course learning theories include Vygotsky's theory of ZPD, Bruner's theory of scaffolding and Piaget's development theory ...' to get Brownie points but absolutely no explanation of what they actually meant and how you could use them to improve your teaching.

I take your point re. Shaw and actually that reminded me of how I started teaching, by throwing myself in at the deep end without any teacher training at all (I had trained to be a Brownie and Girl Guide leader and I was a mother of 3 small girls at the time). I very soon found out (2 months to be precise) that I needed a lot more information on 'how to teach' and 'how to be more effective' as well as the myriad of other 'stuff' (classroom management, a must with, at that time 45 pupils in a class and only 35 minute periods). Going from getting on and 'doing', I learnt how to 'teach' and I must say I really like knowing that there are theories to support what I'd worked out on my own a long time ago ... so perhaps what I'm trying to say (and my goodness do I go around the houses or what????) is that you need a combination of all 3 ie do/teach/theory to be the most effective professional.

Blethering now ...

\*\*\* :)

----- Original Message -----

From: \*\*\*...

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Subject: Re: [dogme] Back to theory?

\*\*\*,

Great to meet you in the Dogme Club Room.

You write:

""I do think theories help to describe the processes which are believed to occur but what is fascinating is that many teachers function extremely well without knowing about the theories and seem to teach by instinct, extremely successfully.""

Well, precisely.

Could it be that there is a lost part to Shaw's statement:

""Those that can do. Those that can't teach.""

""Those that can't do that theorize?""

Sorry. I don't really mean that. But theorizing is a different activity from teaching, usually done in a different institution and usually carried out by other people i.e. not teachers, or by teachers when they take time off as teachers to study for higher degrees.

Many people on this list (and yours) are the sort of people who, apart from being teachers, are also interested in theory - they are the sort of people who, by nature, want to speculate and explore the nature and implications of what they do in their professional lives. What becomes difficult, I believe, is on courses of teacher training/education when certain practitioners are told they must study theories A,B,C. and they don't really see the point.

\*\*\*

## Post 440

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as own out of school experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

Here is an issue that I feel quite strongly about (and unfortunately haven't had time to catch up on all the messages yet).

I really think that as teachers, facilitators or whatever label is now 'pc' it is extremely important for us to represent a realistic model of English. I always point out differences if I'm aware of them

and I always stress to students that English in the classroom can be extremely different from that on the streets.

I live and work in New Zealand where there are many pronunciation differences and a few grammatical ones (tin for ten, one woman two woman) as well as a heavy influence from Maori. Originally, I'm from Essex in England (no jokes- we've had that discussion!) and frequently find myself saying 'me and me bruvver', 'I was sat in me car when...' when relaxing.

The students I teach are from Europe, Asia, South America and Saudi Arabia, and the common problem they all have is having a hard time understanding (or being understood) outside the classroom.

How many of us have snickered at a listening exercise they found from the 70s where the orator has the most delightful old BBC pronunciation?

I think students need to be taught, shown and exposed to English which is considered grammatically correct for tests, written essays, job applications etc, and what is used in the 'real' world.

Trust me, before long we'll all be having to present 'Jizzle ma dizzle wizzle yo fizzle' because it's what our paying customers (and life) want.

For any who haven't read it I highly recommend 'Mother Tongue' by Bill Bryson for an insight into our linguistic history and what is considered to be 'Standard' English.

Many thanks for all who've posted on this marvellous matter.

\*\*\*

## Post 441

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\* wrote:

> \*\*\*: that theory...I have tried it out...many times. It's never worked out that well...the practice that is, not the theory. That said, I once gave the most stifingly dull class which consisted of ""Now do exercise two...answers...now do exercise three...stop talking....answers...etc"". I made the decision to abandon that routine immediately. Things had been absolutely terrible. No fun, no structure, no nothing. So, imagine my surprise when one of my students commented in her diary or her tutorial...I can't remember which...that my lessons were soooooo much more interesting than before and that she was learning more.

After a long absence here after my initial introduction, I'd like to concur with almost everything says. Last week, one student reproached me for being lazy. Recovered from my initial shock, I asked him what on earth he meant. Turned out that he meant that in class /they/ had to do the working, and I did almost nothing (where, in my

view, I facilitated, acted as a coach, etc)... Then what did he expect from me? Fill in-exercises and correction in class. I had a similar experience when I did a dictogloss last year with immigrants learning Dutch: while reading the writing of others, they put MARKS on it, unasked. It's just the system they're in: they've had one bad teaching example too many.

and that exactly is the void I'm in after one month of EFL at secondary school. I've read similar experiences on the list before: I have to function in this school system as well! Last week, I had them make drawings on the difference between the present continuous and present simple (I know, I know...)... One of my colleagues stated this was way too modern for her and the students asked me why on earth I had copied their drawings during the break... Instead of small groups with highly motivated students (as some here teach to), I have about ten classes ranging from 20 to 30 students anything but bored by the idea of having to learn English. Can Dogme cope?

There's another thing: I just don't feel proficient enough to turn the class into an off leash area... I had four years of English at university, but compared to my mother tongue Dutch (first language at university) and the English of most of you on the list... well, it just doesn't cut it... that means: when I am met with unexpected questions and situations, I have a hard time solving them. Dogme: for proficient, experienced teachers only?

Best regards,

\*\*\*

## Post 442

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

How could I possibly resist as well ?

\*\*\* writes: ""Well, I'm not sure that this is a strict definition of the word. ""

For a professional of communication you seem to be awfully uninformed, and yet again misinterpreting what I wrote.

So, to illustrate you ( and others):

<http://www.answers.com/proselytize>

v.intr.

- 1.. To induce someone to convert to one's own religious faith.
- 2.. To induce someone to join one's own political party or to espouse one's doctrine.

See the words RELIGIOUS and POLITICAL?

THAT is what I mean. > I am NOT talking about pedagogical ideas ! <

Now, to proselytize, as above defined, THAT is, definitely, NOT a teacher/educator's job !

\*\*\* continues: ""But dogme is most certainly proselytising, if by such a word we mean the advocacy of an idea.""

Well, sorry, it does not mean that. It is not ANY idea. It is not even ""advocating"", but , rather, ""inducing""...

So, his next statement ""And teachers are always proselytising (at least the good ones are)."" is false as a 3 dollars bill.

Actually, teachers who do proselytize are doing their students a great disservice!

I love the idea that this is the equivalent of a staff room, though.

However, I think we are blessed for not having the back stabbers, gossipers and Bosses around...

\*\*\*

From: \*\*\*  
Sent: Friday, February 06, 2009 6:09 PM  
To: dogme@yahogroups.com  
Subject: [dogme] What is dogme if not chitter chatter?

...as if I was going to resist the poking...

If this is equivalent to a staffroom, perhaps we could just count our blessings that so much of the chitter chatter is connected to teaching, and perhaps we should be tolerant of the asides, the irrelevances and the irreverences. As \*\*\* said (I think), we are what we think and we are what we say. In that regard, gentle asides, explosions of fury and even chafing ribbing is what helps others understand who and what we are.

I know that not everything that I write will be of interest (or perhaps of disinterest) to all and I would apologise if I had not just read Stephen Fry's views on not apologising for things that are inherently natural. And, although it may rile \*\*\* a smidgin, it is no bad thing, say I, if Some People (whomever THEY might be) bring politics into each and every thing. \*\*\* says that bringing politics into everything is proselytising. Well, I'm not sure that this is a strict

definition of the word. But dogme is most certainly proselytising, if by such a word we mean the advocacy of an idea. And teachers are always proselytising (at least the good ones are).

What I do find unusual in an educational environment, at least in a dogmetic educational environment, is the apparent desire to rein in the ramblings and to prohibit the phatic.

## Post 443

*Coded as teaching text.*

This might interest those who blog and are interested in CALL (TELL):

<http://tesl-ej.org/ej34/m1.html>

\*\*\*

## Post 444

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\* asked,

How much are they paid to do the speaking tests in your neck of the woods?

It's been almost a year so I can't give you the exact rate, but it worked out at around 18 euros an hour.

## Post 445

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

Is dogme a method? No, not in the sense that it prescribes a closed set of procedures that derive from a specific theory of learning and/or of language, as in the audio-lingual method or the Silent Way or task-based language teaching, say.

Dogme may be part of what Kumaravadivelu (in the latest TESOL Quarterly, and mentioned in an earlier posting) calls the postmethod condition, of which he writes:

""One way of conceptualizing a postmethod pedagogy is to look at it three-dimensionally as a pedagogy of particularity, practicality, and possibility. As a pedagogy of particularity, postmethod pedagogy rejects the advocacy of a predetermined set of generic principles and



procedures aimed at realizing a predetermined set of generic aims and objectives. Instead it seeks to facilitate the advancement of a context-sensitive, location-specific pedagogy that is based on a true understanding of local linguistic, sociocultural, and political particularities. As a pedagogy of practicality, postmethod pedagogy rejects the artificial dichotomy between theorists who have been assigned the role of producers of knowledge and teachers who have been assigned the role of consumers of knowledge. Instead, it seeks to rupture such a reified role relationship by enabling and encouraging teachers to theorize from their practice and practice what they theorize. As a pedagogy of possibility, postmethod pedagogy rejects the narrow view of language education that confines itself to the linguistic functional elements that obtain inside the classroom. Instead, it seeks to branch out to tap the sociopolitical consciousness that participants bring with them to the classroom so that it can also function as a catalyst for a continual quest for identity formation and social transformation". (pp 544-555)

One way that teachers can operationalise these (fairly lofty) principles, including "theorizing from their practice", is by "exploring which of the resources learners bring with them can be profitably exploited for learning, teaching, and research purposes, including learners' sociocultural and linguistic knowledge". This strikes me as a fairly basic dogme tenet. As does the notion of social (as opposed to academic) autonomy, related to "learners' ability to function effectively as cooperative members of a classroom community". K. sees the development of academic, social, and what he calls "liberatory" autonomy as fundamental to his three-P platform.

Because coursebooks are laden with excess methodological baggage, including a narrow focus on linguistic competence, and because they are general rather than particular in terms of their reach, and because they foster dependence rather than autonomy, whether academic or social or "liberatory", they don't fit easily into a "postmethod pedagogy". But that does not mean that for some learners in some contexts they might not be suitable or, at least, the lesser of two evils. Dogme, after all, is not anti-coursebook, which would be tantamount to being anti-method. Dogme is simply, post-coursebook, post-method.

\*\*\*

## Post 446

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*  
*Coded as teaching text.*

In a message to me, someone who wants to observe a class wrote:

"I don't know a huge amount about Dogme but have been reading

'Teaching Unplugged', which [a friend] loaned to me. I'm interested in how Dogme appears to address the problems that can result from trying to bend a class in order to accommodate outside materials. I like the idea of low tech teaching that is better able to respond to cues provided by learners. I have observed, and regrettably even taught, lessons that get so caught up in materials, content, and activities that are brought in from outside, that the lessons fail to take advantage of, and respond well to what the students ask for and can contribute. I haven't yet finished 'Teaching Unplugged' and Dogme is new to me, but I'm interested in learning more and seeing how some of the principles might look in the classroom.'"

Wanted to share that with you all.

\*\*\*

## Post 447

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

I think \*\*\*'s aside about the medical students and stomachs relates to what I want to say about listening.

I've been watching a fair amount of German TV recently. I understand the Austrians, the Bavarians, the Swiss Germans, the ""high German"" of moderators and news people and even the Americans making no apparent effort to alter their accents when they speak German.

I learned to listen to German mainly through exposure to what some have called a totally different (non-German) dialect called Bavarian, which has dialects of it's own, e.g. Dachauer dialect.

\*\*\*

## Post 448

*Coded as other's teaching experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\* wrote: ""Well, this teacher of mine couldn't do the course; He was turned down because of language limitations, according to the institution that held the course...I felt really bad about this, and although I can perfectly understand their reasons, as well as Cambridge reasons, still it makes me wonder...What is EFFECTIVE teaching after all? What is qualification, if this guy who can't even START to try and take qualification because of his ""language limitations"" turns out to be one of the most effective teachers I've ever met? Something like this makes me think maybe the role of human interaction in effective

learning should be better considered when giving out certificates and diplomas...""

I do know of at least one institution that took an intermediate or upper-int. (by the institution's standards) student on their CELTA course. One of the tutors commented negatively on this, but I can't remember exactly why. In my experience, even when NNS are accepted onto a course, they seemed to be frowned upon unless they have near-native (I know it's a slippery slope that term) proficiency.

Another important matter, and perhaps this relates to the point above, is that Cambridge is in the business of grading people. Why couldn't Cambridge simply refer those who are still struggling with learner-centeredness ---the core of the CELTA in my view --- to further teaching practice and feedback? Why do they need to stamp fail on people's foreheads? I don't think they do really. Who am I as a tutor to say: ""You haven't met the grading criteria, so this learning opportunity has ended, i.e. you've failed the course... Game Over!

Each trainee brings gifts and talents to the course; however, not all of us learn or perform at the same pace and level each day of the week. If you're the square peg on the day when the square hole is open, you're in; round pegs just won't fit.

Sorry to hear that your friend, who seems to be a competent teacher, has been let down, \*\*\*. I wonder what it is you can understand about the institution's and Cambridge's position though.

\*\*\*

## Post 449

\*\*\* wrote:

- > See this declaration from the dogme Yahoo homepage:
- >
- > ""Note: This is an open source site. This means you can freely copy, adapt
- > and distribute material from this site so long as you explicitly
- > mention the
- > source of the material, attribute the original writer(s), and advise the
- > group moderator accordingly. People posting messages on this site should
- > bear in mind its open nature).""
- >
- > I'd interpret that as meaning, despite the reference to ""materials"", it's
- > quite OK to quote people as long as you acknowledge them as author of your
- > quote.
- >
- > \*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\* - you are the authorities in this case. What are the
- > list's
- > rules?

List rules and Yahoo aside, it is common courtesy to ask people before citing them in your publications. This should be a simple matter of sending an email to the person who posted the message one wants to cite. I have been approached by people off list for this reason on a couple of occasions. One of them told me that his publisher required a written release from me and sent me a letter asking me to sign it and return it to him.

\*\*\*

## Post 450

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

> I also see contradictions galore in \*\*\*'s postings.  
> Let me give you an example (and \*\*\* please don't get on your high horse, but > rather look back at what you wrote and see if there is some mileage in what I > say):

I think it's clever of you to say that--loads and loads of contradictions but let me just show you one and don't get on your high horse. Do you see how manipulative and misleading such rhetoric is? Where has it got you in life? Have you been rewarded for this sort of thing?

>  
> \*\*\* wrote in an earlier posting about the dangers and absurdities of dividing > language into .. ""... 15 skills .."" to be taught.  
> But all of your postings have had a narrow focus looking at spoken language > and almost completely ignoring written language.

I don't see the connection with criticizing a discrete, analytical approach to language teaching and learning. I even mentioned that there was phonological activation during reading. However, we largely are talking about spoken language here. OTOH, if you think I should address written language, I already have. This is what project LAC is all about. >  
> There is an awful lot of useful stuff in what you are saying \*\*\*, but there > also seems to be a lot of arrogance. In one posting you said: > > But my students win the speech contest.  
>  
> Something which none of us are able to judge and, in fact, neither are you.

I'm proud of them for winning, though it was they who won, I didn't.

Incidentally, some of this is detailed in the IATEFL's

Pronunciation SIG's newsletter and addresses using written text to help promote better pronunciation.

\*\*\*

## Post 451

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Do dogmatics have an opinion of this man? Have people heard of him? Following up a query in the staffroom today.

## Post 452

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Hi everyone:

\*\*\* says ""to create rather than consume"". Yes, that's exactly it, IMO. And that's why blogs could ""be dogme"".

Don't some of you say you write things up post-lesson (whatever has come up in class, I understood), photocopy them, and then hand them out? Or who was it that said they brought back in a paper chat several months later...?

A blog is absolutely ideal for that sort of thing, of course...

\*\*\*

\*\*\* wrote:

Very very briefly - and without I confess having read the whole thread - surely the key is to create rather than consume. Or as \*\*\* puts it, 'finding a purpose ... that will get students really involved'. The medium is less important than the way we use it. I'd say.

\*\*\*

PS I like the idea of a dogme radio station... not sure the schedulers would be so happy...

## Post 453

Coded as other forum post.

Coded as questioning and answering.

> \*\*\*,

Interesting first point. I am not so sure about the second. I assume the kids in the middle school were not from the local Bedouin encampment? I liked the Africa story.

\*\*\*

\*\*\* asks: >

> ""Have you ever been a teacher teaching a language that is not  
> your L1.""

>

> No. I haven't and don't see what that has to do with our thread.

>

> ---

>

> it sounds like they were already quite competent in English (Writes \*\*\*).

>

> Completely true. And their competence was maintained and improved by  
> sticking to English.

>

> ----

>

> Have you tried your English-only policy with beginners at 20 contact hours  
> a week?

>

> Yes, I have, for two years in a middle school in Doha, Qatar. It was hard  
> going, but it worked.

> (And the same approach was used by three other teachers working at the  
> same  
> time.)

>

> \*\*\*

>

## Post 454

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

--- In dogme@y..., \*\*\* wrote:

<snip>. ...It works. My students learn. They like me. I

> like them. Is that a problem?

>

No, it sounds great. Was someone complaining about this TE? "

## Post 455

*Coded as teaching text.*

" "Some words on motivation from Leo van Lier:

""Language educators agree with admirable unanimity on the supreme importance of motivation in language learning. However, rather than doing justice to the construct by critically and analytically examining it in thorough and honest ways, educators attempt to capture the students' attention by various gimmicks such as putting on a show (the Rassias method of teaching a foreign language is an extreme example, see Oller & Richard-Amato 1983), providing stickers and grades, and a multitude of other superficial devices that I have touched on in various places in this chapter. I cannot escape the thought that all such 'motivating' actions at best relate to learning in the way that the supermarket version of 'have a nice day' relates to wishing someone well, or a TV cooking show relates to a family dinner. Somehow, many of the things done in the name of 'motivating the students' do nothing but sidestep the issue of true motivation. Education, in other words, is heavily polluted with surrogate motivation.""

Interaction in the Language Classroom, Longman 1996, pp. 120 -121.

## Post 456

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

Now that I spend most of my free time in a village which is mainly Catalan speaking I've bitten the bullet and enrolled in a beginners Catalan class. This takes place in a community centre in Barcelona twice a week: the first lesson was last week, and the experience was uncannily reminiscent of the film ""Italian for Beginners"" i.e. dogme 95 meets dogme ELT. The classes are subsidised by the local government; there are about a dozen of us, crammed into a small room with a whiteboard, and all ""immigrants"" of one form or the other (so there were occasional side-conversations in Spanish and especially among the South Americans as to who had or had not got their ""papers"" yet). The teacher (21, Catalan) introduced herself by telling us, candidly, that the designated teacher was somehow not available, so she'd been asked, at the last minute, if she would take over, and though her only ""teaching"" experience was as a school camp monitor she was going to give it a go. My expectations already at low, having walked in to find her mucking around with cassette recorder (a listening on Day 1???) - sank further.

But then she told us that since there was no ""book"" she was prepared to adjust the content of the lessons to our own needs and interests (or words to that effect). We then embarked on the usual personal information stuff, where she showed she had some basic intuitions about the usefulness of repetition and pairs practice. We students, perhaps taking advantage of her youth, ingenuousness and relative lack of a clear plan, interrupted constantly to bombard her

with questions, often about what seemed to me to be fairly minor points of pronunciation and grammar. She managed fairly well at fielding these, although even she admitted disarmingly- that she was making things up from time to time. But we did have to wade through a sheaf of photocopies, which seemed to have been cobbled together at the last minute.

By the second half the group had clearly bonded, and there was a lot of laughter and a growing feeling of warmth towards her, as she was clearly prepared to bend to our own wishes (e.g. no writing, lots of speaking, please). And, very candidly again, she asked us at the end of the lesson, how it had been for us or words to that effect a question that very few "real" teachers would ever dare to put. Her lack of training and preconceptions, combined with her candour actually seemed to work in her favour. It made us feel that we could take more of the running in terms of the direction, pace and content of the lesson. All we asked of her was that she should provide accurate models, some (albeit dodgy) linguistic information, and lots of constructive feedback, especially on pron. When I left, my head was buzzing with lots of (admittedly fairly disconnected) fragments of Catalan.

Day Two began less promisingly, with two new students to integrate, and a ton of photocopies, uncollated, and even more questions flying at her, especially from the South Americans. A fractured, but self-initiated and highly engaging, account, by one of the students, of what he had done in the weekend, was cut short by the teacher as she tried to steer the lesson on to the p/copies. At the break she was looking quite depressed, and I dared suggest that we could perhaps do more dialogues. In the second half we listened to some short taped dialogues, and then practised them ourselves in pairs, and in front of the group. Morale picked up hugely, and there was a lot more laughter and the sense, again, that we were "learning" something useful.

Day Three (last night) the first absentees, always a bad sign and yet more photocopies. Also, she seemed to have made a conscious decision to control the flow, and was showing more resistance to student-initiated questions about grammar, avoiding eye contact when she sensed these were coming, The photocopies had become her first line of defense. It's true, that the students' questions were breaking the flow of the lesson, but she needn't have been worried about her ability to answer them, since the fact that she was native speaker (oh dear, politically awkward this) meant that even if she couldn't provide an explanation she could at least assure us that "That is what we say" with the added promise that she would check up on it and let us know. But clearly, she needs someone to tell her not to worry too much about it. Nor is it that she's impervious to on the spot suggestions: I even suggested at one point, when we were doing "the time", that we practise by doing a clock dictation, which once explained to her - she immediately did,



and with aplomb. She has also suggested that next lesson we adjourn to a bar for the break and ""talk Catalan amongst ourselves"", to which we reacted a little like the oysters when invited to go for a walk with the Walrus and the Carpenter . ""Only if you help us!"" we cried, (turning a little blue).

The point of all this is simply to underline yet again the point that learning is jointly constructed (she's helping us, we're helping her, we're helping each other) and that the materials far from supporting the learning process simply inhibit it. The fact that the materials are photocopies would seem to support \*\*\*'s radical stand, although I am very sympathetic to \*\*\* (and \*\*\*'s) line, especially with higher level learners.

More bulletins from the front to follow.

## Post 457

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\* writes:

""But I as a teacher also have to follow up input with ways for students to practice new or corrected items so the explicit knowledge becomes implicit and part of the students' automatic language ability.""

I'm playing Devil's Advocate, perhaps, or Doubting Thomas in danger of arguing that the teacher can't go beyond creating the environment for language learning, but, \*\*\* and others, can you really cite examples of where you have been able get your learners in some way to practice new and corrected items that resulted in automatic - i.e., presumably, permanent - automatic language ability?

\*\*\*

--

\*\*\*

## Post 458

And I had hoped to soothe the debate...

Kind regards

\*\*\*

Quoting \*\*\* <\*\*\*...>:

- > I don't recognise the virtual scenario \*\*\* describes. It is not 'my'
- > virtual world in Second Life, for example.
- >
- > Incidentally:
- >
- > 1. I hate the name Second Life because it drags in with it implications:
- > Second life is secondary to and inferior to First Life and it is ""life"" -
- > and so on.
- >
- > 2. Second Life is not REAL life - which is rubbish because it is in First
- > Life and the voices with which people speak to each other are their own
- > First Life voices etc.
- >
- > 3. I don't much like 'virtual' either- that, too, encourages one to start
- > thinking of fantasy and unreality. I prefer the word ""electronic"". SL is
- > electronic, an electronic space. The word ""world"" is too emotive for me.
- >
- > 4. I rent a space on the SL computer, computer network in San Francisco.
- > (Shorthand: I rent a villa from \*\*\*on one of his EduNation
- > islands). In my villa we have serious discussions with serious people. Some
- > of those who have been there that will be known on this list are:
- >
- > \*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\* \*\*\*, \*\*\*
- >
- > I find the tone of suspicion of technology, especially SL, reminiscent of
- > those who reject modern medicines in
- > favour of stinging nettles and get the carpenter to extract troublesome
- > teeth with plyers instead of going to a dentist equipped with an x-ray
- > machine and electrical scanning equipment.
- >
- > \*\*\*

## Post 459

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

\*\*\*,

I agree with \*\*\* - dogme is not a movement. At best it is a group of like-minded people, though there is a range of things they are like-minded about, and they are not like-minded right across the range.

I think it follows from this that dogme cannot be subversive, though individual members of this list may be so.

I'd go so far as to say there isn't really a ""dogme"" - though there is a dogme list. I can see it is hard for people to grasp, and we (the dogme list) are a curious phenomenon.

One thing is that although we have a founder (or founders) we haven't got a spokesperson. I guess that makes the list anarchic if not subversive!

Those of us that have been on this list for a long time have our own ideas about what ""dogme"" is and isn't, but I doubt if these ideas coincide, though there will be comment elements.

I suspect in those voluminous archives there are statements by various people along the lines: ""What dogme is - a personal view.""

\*\*\*

## Post 460

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

"I descend from Second Life, where, with 6 other colleagues I am moderating, tutoring a free, six-week intensive course in Second Life on ""Teaching languages in virtual worlds 2010"" under the aegis of EVO/TESOL.

The 300 participants from around the world and the 7 of us are all 100% human and very alive and well. In this hotbed of technology I've never heard anyone discuss whether human teachers are doomed to extinction. Who would write the scripts, service the servers, develop new programs?

\*\*\* - known in the other world as \*\*\*

## Post 461

*Coded as teaching text.*

Possibly - although less an activity, more a state of mind.

As an example of the ""dogme state of mind"" check out <http://education.guardian.co.uk/tefl/story/0,5500,1049784,00.html>

;) )

\*\*\*

## Post 462

*Coded as teaching text.*

For \*\*\* and others interested in the role of identity in SLA, two articles appear in the latest edition of TESOL Quarterly that indicate (by title) that they might touch on relevant subject matter:

Negotiating Participation and Identity in Second Language Academic Communities, Naoko Morita (p. 573)

and, Participation, (Dis-)Identification, and Japanese University Entrance Exams, Tim Murphey (p. 700).

I have not read any of the journal yet, so I can only reiterate that these titles might be an indication of relevant subject matter.

\*\*\*

## Post 463

Interesting question!

I think I say /dogmi/

Any advance on /dogmi/ ?

\*\*\*

## Post 464

Thank God not everyone will agree with each other...I'm glad it was your posting I had misunderstood, and not all of the others. Thank you, \*\*\*.

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*\*" wrote:

>

> Your questions are relevant, \*\*\*, but please remember that this is a discussion, as you've stated, so not everyone will agree with each other. It is, however, plausible that a discussion list asks

that its contributors post messages that are notionally related to the subject at hand. Fortunately, we've always managed to subvert any effort to determine the content of our messages, more or less.

>

> So we're on your side, \*\*\*.

>

> \*\*\*

## Post 465

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Hi \*\*\*,

First, thank you \*\*\* for your thorough comments on \*\*\*'s topics. Given that \*\*\* has said most of what I would have said, (although until I read what \*\*\* wrote, I didn't know that I would have said it), this is going to address your concerns from an oblique and personal angle.

You say you're chewing over theory and trying to implement it. In my experience, that may be creating a whole new problem: I mean, what do you do when the theory doesn't seem to fit what is going on in front of you. I know the answer--you do what you did--write to the dogme list for advice. But maybe you can erase the problem by ditching the theory, and just being with your students and the constraints (e.g., Korean advanced students who act like beginners), and applying your intuitions (that students need to listen to lots of voices, and that video seems a good idea) and your experiences (this grammar uncovering doesn't seem to be going anywhere with these guys).

For me, theory is something that comes after or alongside the practice. I began teaching by following rigid lesson plans (the teacher's book of the 80s ancestor of Headway). Good thing, too; I couldn't have taught otherwise. Then, over the years, I've gradually refined my practice, simply by doing more of what seems to work and less of what didn't work. This process has probably seen me move in the direction of healthy educational practice, but as much as that, it is getting to know who I am, my strengths and weaknesses as a human and a teacher, and getting to know what the students want and were willing to do (their motivation, and oriental occidental differences real or imagined).

Theory is useful to me, not as a template to lay over my teaching and try to achieve a match, but as a way of realizing what I'm doing. When I teach, I don't really know in a metacognitive way (e.g., as if I were out of body looking down at myself teaching) what I'm doing or why I'm doing it (beyond that what I do works most of the time). But when I read dogme or any other theory, it sometimes makes me realize, wow, so that's what I'm doing (e.g., paying attention to students and using their lives as material) and, wow, that's why I'm doing it. The value of theory is that

it lets me see myself and my work more clearly, and out of that clarity, I can sometimes get fresh ideas for improving what I do. It doesn't worry me that much of my practice doesn't match a particular theory (photocopy addict that I am; and as I sit writing this next to a bank of videoTV monitors). And it does excite and challenge me to read about others who want to smash photocopiers or regret having installed them in their school. I have no idea if anyone else on this list has the retroactive relationship to theory that I do. Theory tells me what I believe when I didn't know I believed it, just as \*\*\*'s reply told me what I would have said if I'd had the smarts to come up with it myself.) \*\*\*, good luck in facing the challenges and sheer impossibilities of what you are asked to do.

\*\*\*

## Post 466

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Absolutely

----- Original Message -----

From: <\*\*\*...>

To: <dogme@yahoogroups.com>

Sent: Friday, August 20, 2004 4:12 AM

Subject: Re: [dogme] left-brain/right-brain

> A question to you all:

>

> Wouldn't you agree that theories like left brain/right brain, ZPD, transformational-

> generative grammar etc. are, at best, simplifications and can quickly become simplisitic

> in the hands of the over-enthusiastic.

>

> I'm thinking of a 60s book I have that promises to teach users English and typing by

> getting them to type the kernel sentences of the language.

>

> All relevant theories are potentially interesting, but, I would suggest, they make their

> entry through the teacher's increased sensitivity to and knowledge of what might be

> going on in the interactions in the classroom.

>

> \*\*\*

## Post 467

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

*Coded as own in class experience.*

Oh how I agree!!!!!!

Every observation feedback I am subjected to usually ends with a target to use technology more -correction: use technology!! And I duly state that I really must get some decent training for using it.

Then I go back to my dogme style of teaching and dread the next observation. Which reminds me that I have one coming up in less than two weeks. Oh dear!!!

\*\*\* ----- Original Message -----

From: \*\*\*

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Sent: Friday, November 06, 2009 4:30 PM

Subject: [dogme] There's faffing and there's faffing

\*\*\*, with respect, comparing a computer breakdown or projector failure with the unanticipated drying up of a board pen is disingenuous and ignores their relative impact on the classroom ecology. Having witnessed both categories of classroom events - boardpen failure (and its equivalents) and total network collapse (and its equivalents)- I can tell you that the repercussions of the latter, on the teacher and the students, are massive by comparison. (I can tell you stories that will make your flesh creep!)

Technological failure is a different order of failure entirely, partly because so much of the lesson content is mediated by it (compared to, say, the board and its pen) but also because of the expectations it arouses in the students. Also the sense of helplessness, and the resultant frustration and humiliation, on the part of the teacher is much, much more acute, since it is often impossible to know what the problem is or how to correct it (with a projector failure, for example), whereas the dryness of a boardpen doesn't require a PhD in hydrology to understand and remedy.

Small wonder then that (some) teachers avoid introducing potentially unreliable technology into their classrooms, especially when the effects of said technology can be replicated just as well with, for example, pen and paper. As I have said repeatedly, the classroom is a complex ecology at the best of times, and to introduce into it yet more variability and unpredictability might just seem more trouble than it's worth. Sure, one should be prepared for any eventuality - but there are some eventualities that may not be worth the risk. A relatively inexperienced teacher, in the face of a computer crashing, will not take kindly to being told to simply ""roll with it"".

Why (some) advocates of technology persistently refuse to acknowledge its inherent instability, and why they so readily dismiss practising teachers' very real anxieties, does them no credit.

\*\*\*

## Post 468

*Coded as teaching text.*

The following comes from Amazon.de

Beyond Methods: Macrostrategies for Language Teaching (Yale Language Series) by B. Kumaravadivelu

Price: EUR 38,31  
Pb - 352 pages - Yale University Press  
ISBN: 0300095732

Price on Amazon.co.uk

25 pounds sterling

### Synopsis

In this work, B. Kumaravadivelu presents a macrostrategic framework designed to help both beginning and experienced language teachers develop a systematic, coherent and personal theory of practice. His book offers to provide the tools a teacher needs in order to self-observe, self-analyze, and self-evaluate his or her own teaching acts. The framework consists of ten macrostrategies based on current theoretical, empirical and experiential knowledge of second language and foreign language teaching. These strategies enable teachers to evaluate classroom practices and to generate techniques and activities for realizing teaching goals. With checklists, surveys, projects and reflective tasks to encourage critical thinking, the book is designed to be both practical and accessible.

\*\*\*

### Post 469

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*  
*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*  
*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\*,

You have the right to find my perception shallow, I don't find yours shallow. You say :""Other people's perceptions of how we are does not rest entirely (and in many cases AT ALL) on how we see ourselves"" It does not rest \*entirely\* on how we see ourselves, but perception of other people goes both ways. The way we see ourselves has an impact on how people see us, this is obvious to me. And, since, you write about interaction being situated in a context, I would say perception of ourselves is all the more important in a teaching situation : confidence, credibility, being at ease with oneself and with others, humour, enthusiasm, energy, all this is connected to the way you see yourself and all this flows over, goes through, impregnates the whole""context"" , and goes to the learner together with any language he is learning.



--- En date de: Jeu 4.12.08, \*\*\* a crit:

De: \*\*\* <zpd.english@...>

Objet: Re : [dogme] Re: On second thought...  
: dogme@yahooroups.com

Your view of interaction is correct, but too shallow. Interaction is also situated - that is, it has a context. In this context we were asked to consider whether or not a teacher should consider themselves credible based on whether or not they had learnt another language. My point, in context, was that I didn't think it a useful question to ask themselves. It was a question best left to the students. I suggested another question that teachers could ask themselves. This is the reflection that you seem to elude to.

You ask, ""how on earth can I be credible in the eyes of others if I am not credible to myself?""

Very easily. Other people's perceptions of how we are does not rest entirely (and in many cases AT ALL) on how we see ourselves. Which, in my case, is very fortunate!

\*\*\*

## Post 470

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

no 1-2-1 classes myself, but if I had one, this would be something I would want to try.

\*\*\*

El 31/03/2013 20:03, \*\*\* escribi: >

> I've just posted this on the eltpics ideas blog, but it's very much

> about Dogme, a Dogme lesson with a 1-2-1 adult student that worked

> very well, and I've added the student's written work (inc visuals) at

> the end. I'd be interested to know what you think.

> <http://takeaphotoand.wordpress.com/2013/03/31/burning-questionnaires/>

>

> \*\*\*

>

## Post 471

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

\*\*\* said ...

> Spend time on language, and less on skills.

My problem with skills is twofold.

Firstly, separating the skills into discrete items is rubbish - how many people speak without listening taking place (apart from politicians and dysfunctional families!)

Secondly, is something like reading a skill in the same sense as cooking or juggling or ....

\*\*\*

## Post 472

*Coded as classroom adjacent.*

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Hi. Just a few thoughts in regards to \*\*\*'s and \*\*\*'s comments on my post:

\*\*\*: It would be prohibitive in this market to suggest teaching without a course book. I've been trying to advocate finding new and different ways of using the coursebook in the classroom (examples: place mats, fans, fly swatters, etc..). Seriously in the states I conducted very effective classes with nothing more than the newspapers I asked students to bring and my wits. My idea in Greece, has always been to use the course book in the same way I may have used a newspaper or other authentic reading material. And.... there is always homework. Coursebooks are wonderful for homework. Unfortunately most coursebooks today also come with the 'workbook' and 'companion'.

The hard sell here is trying to convince students that we won't ""dogmatically"" follow the course book. I can't tell you how many times students have expressed immediate concern because I skipped exercise ""B"" or started the course with unit 3 rather than unit 1. I usually tell them there is a method to my madness. Sometimes there even is! :)

\*\*\*: I've found the best way of alleviating student fears about not swallowing the course book is to be honest with them from the very 1st day of class that this is how I teach and how they will benefit from it. I think this should be an issue especially when the teaching style may very well be radically different from the students' expectations. This kind of like a patient having the right to know in advance what type of therapy the psychotherapist practices.

As far as the Cambridge results in Greece goes, thank you for taking the burden off my shoulders of not belaboring the exact point you made. The only statistic you left out was that the average age of students taking these exams in Greece is younger than the rest of the world. How many 15 year olds do you think could handle the CPE?

An interesting comment on the Michigan exams (the results are usually slightly higher than Cambridge): Michigan has held the policy for many years of not helping publishers write exam prep books or suggesting ways for students to prepare for the exam other than taking general English courses. As a result, many private language schools favored Cambridge exams and tried to convince students against preparing for Michigan exams .... (drum roll please) because there were no coursebooks and they didn't know how to teach it! Some schools even went as far as suggesting that Michigan exams were not recognized by the government, which they certainly are.

\_\*\*\*

----- Original Message -----

From: ""\*\*\*""

To: ""Dogme"" <dogme@yahoogroups.com>

Subject: [dogme] how well does DOGME fly in an EFL dogpound?

> \*\*\*,

>

> a colleague of mine worked in Greece; he was severely - almost violently! - reprimanded by the school owner if he didn't do 3 pages from the book each lesson. He said this meant .... he HAD to 'do' pages from the book, but that this meant the teenagers were never getting any chance to do ..... ANYTHING, really; they were apparently fed up with the situation of having the coursebook/exam forced down their throats - it was CPE and far too difficult for a lot of them - and welcomed the opportunity to all meet together informally with the teacher on Sunday afternoons and chat in English.

>

> A lot of these students kept in touch with my colleague after he left; they had all taken Cambridge Proficiency, but very few of them got through it. I know the Michigan Proficiency is also a popular exam in Greece, and a lot of students take both exams.

>

> It has often surprised me to see how notably and incredibly low the figures for Greece are in Cambridge exam statistics by country; just checked the public site, where the statistics for 2001 exams are, and they bear me out; statistics for Greece are: CPE June 2001 - 32 percent pass; 56 percent grade E; Dec 2001 same figures; MUCH lower than ALL other countries listed. The CAE and FCE stats for Greece are considerably lower than MOST other countries: CAE June 2001 - 44 percent pass, 45 percent grade E; Dec 2001 - 34 percent pass, 52 percent grade E. FCE June 2001 - 50 percent pass, 39 percent grade E; Dec 2001 - 48 percent pass, 42 percent grade E.

>

> Such consistent, average 50 percent of candidates, grade Es for these exams surely means that at least half of those who take them are nowhere near ready for them - despite such assiduous use and study of exam coursebooks .....

>

> could these statistics - which also compare very badly to other

countries - be a possible way into cutting through the clever marketing and getting to some common sense? (Or would the reaction be that the figures would be even worse without the books???! Help!!)

>

> I don't think dogme is less suited to EFL - but the situation you describe is more like English for Exams, almost to the exclusion of EFL??

>

> We have exam classes where teachers use the book quite a bit, exam classes where teachers use the book some of the time, and even exam classes where teachers don't use a book at all; the overall exam results are always pretty similar across the groups; but exams apart, the overall satisfaction, motivation, competence and confidence is higher in the groups who have done it 'their way' ....

>

> \*\*\*

## Post 473

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as thinkers, theories and methodologies.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

While on the subject of grammar, it might be worth making a distinction between, on the one hand, doing grammar for grammar's sake, and, on the other hand (to borrow \*\*\*'s term) ""talking about grammar"" - in order to fine-tune meaning-making (and meaning-taking). (As in ""I take you meaning"").

Coincidentally, I read this bit of Paulo Freire yesterday:

""My interest in language included, initially, a joy in studying grammar, without ever giving into grammaticism...""

Grammar vs grammaticism - a fine distinction that Widdowson would be proud of. He goes on:

"" ... my passion was never centred around grammar for grammar's sake. I never ran the risk of falling into a merely technical study of grammar. My passion was always directed toward the mysteries of language in a never anguished but always restless search for its substantive beauty..."".

""...a never anguished by always restless search..."" Hmm. Very dogme.

\*\*\*

## Post 474

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Dear all,

Sorry for having been out of touch for so long. While I haven't been writing I certainly have been reading all of the messages and letting them play their part in my lessons. The most interesting points for me have so far been the discussion over the merits of forming a methodology and the use of student's self analysis in the lesson.

The way we teach, given that we all share similar ideas must be in a way compatible enough to devise a method. I understand the criticism of methods and the balance between limiting creativity and focussing minds on a common goal. What I haven't understood is how dogme could ever become such a controlled method such as Community Language Learning for example. What we have done without a doubt is identify the philosophy behind our lessons. We have also shown the way that certain tasks follow that philosophy. I believe what we need to do is show roughly how many different tasks can be generated from the material we produce ( by material I mean student chat ) and which tasks we should favour.

When I first started trying to use this method I found that I spent too much time in conversation and this only benefitted a percentage of students. Recently I have tried to include in my lessons, writing tasks, listening tasks and grammar drills all from within the lesson and all produced by the students. This has worked well and I get far less requests for 'grammar' on my feedback sheets. I also choose texts based on the structures or vocabulary they provide and use those as reading texts. The only rule I won't break is that the structure or area of vocabulary (by which I mean topic) that is PRESENTED in the class EMERGES from a previous discussion or my recognition of their needs. My distinction there is one based on an idea of a cold presentation of a topic or one that flows from a conversation.

So this has made me feel that a detailing of the way tasks can be generated from a conversational base would be valid and wouldn't limit creative input. The other point of using students self evaluations as part of the lesson is fascinating and I will give it a

trial run. Thanks for that, \*\*\*.  
If anyone has produced reading tasks in the class I  
would be interested in hearing about that.

Thanks

\*\*\*

p.s. Should the forging of a methodology take the form  
of a book I would be interested in taking part.

## Post 475

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

>No worries, \*\*\*. I guess I missed that. I thought you were teaching  
>at an Elementary school. The relationship between a teacher and  
>student in your context is very different. I teach a few smaller  
>private classes that are Dogme based and find I have similar  
>experiences. I will try to follow along a little closer before I  
>post next time. Keep fighting the good fight!  
>Cheers  
>\*\*\*

## Post 476

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

Here's a URL to blogs, videos, etc. on the subject of how the internet  
is affecting childhood.

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/kidsonline/>

\*\*\*

## Post 477

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as non-teaching text.*

Can I be REALLY wicked and ask you, as a dogmeist, what you would say to  
these people about textbooks.

\*\*\*

## Post 478

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.

"Coded as other forum post.

\*\*\* wrote:

> The problem is that now he wants to take the First Certificate Exam,  
> which primarily focuses on writing and grammar. He can't enroll in a  
> course, because he doesn't know the grammar and can't pass the  
> entrance exam, but an easier course doesn't make sense for him,  
> because he doesn't need most of what they do, he only needs to know  
> what grammar goes where in order to pass this entrance exam.  
>

This advertising side banner makes reply almost impossible.

\*\*\*,

This problem is probably more common than you suspect and I'm certain that everyone here who is teaching has seen it frequently. It is also one of the problems that dogme is particularly good at dealing with.

I often have students who complain that the course material they have been set is too easy for them. This is largely because really learning the grammar of a language means that you develop an intuitive sense of it. You cannot go around analysing your every utterance - not even when writing - so you need to be able to ""trust your ear"". One of the ways we develop this intuitive sense is by frequent revision. Materials for advanced students only differ from elementary materials in the scope of topics covered, not in their character. So, we see the simple present tense, prepositions of place, articles, and what not reappearing throughout a series of books, right up to the most advanced levels.

Often I will reassure students who are apprehensive about seemingly simply course materials that learning a language is mostly about practicing and using it. That everyone has two goals: the first is to learn English, the second is to do well in their assessments. Simpler materials make the second goal more easily attainable, but the first goal remains, and that is where most of them should usually focus anyway. They do come to learn English, not to get certificates because in the end, their true competence will be judged by their performance, not by something framed on the wall.

Depending on where you live, your husband may well find a course that he is comfortable taking. It does not have to be a really advanced course. If his main concern is grammar and writing he might consider taking a course geared toward one of the public exams like the American TOEFL or one of the Cambridge Certificate courses. If he's a self starter, he could work through Betty Azar's series of grammar workbooks. Learning to write is something that might be difficult to do with a book. He may be able to find an Internet mailing list that he could participate on and where he could hone his skills, or else enroll in any of a number of on-line writing courses.

I'm sure others here will have some excellent suggestions as well.

Regards,

\*\*\*

## Post 479

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

just a few quick thoughts on \*\*\*'s posting:

Realize I'm in a privileged position having classes of a maximum of 12-15; and I can only talk from my own experience; but what \*\*\* says is actually quite positive in lots of ways. I think it's a shame when students feel 'inferior' to their peers - they can learn a lot from each other both ways, it's not a race or a competition; also, I often see that less confident students learn more from listening to stronger peers than from teachers or coursebooks. But they need to have the right attitude and also feel bonded. Particularly dominant students can pose a different problem - using groups and re-groups can help this, of course. And, perhaps especially with teenagers, presenting a topic or topic choice can sometimes be less well received than working from 'small talk' - or 'doorstep themes' - and seeing what develops from that; obviously all this sort of stuff can be a fair old struggle with certain types of classes; but the results of the struggle seem to be often more positive and motivating - for most of the students anyway? - than no struggle at all, and relative to the alternatives??? Or not??

now I AM finally off - and happy holidays to everyone who's having one!

\*\*\*

## Post 480

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Oh, and another BTW. The grammar-translation lobby and their conservative cohorts will always reply - ""That's the way people used to learn languages [as indeed they did - Latin, Greek, O-level French], so what can possibly be wrong with it?

Is there a lot to said for respecting tradition, and traditional approaches to language teaching? And what do the 'liberation-linguistics' lobby have to offer in reply, apart from an insistence on 'faith' in their



method?

I'm just curious, y'see...

\*\*\*

## Post 481

*Coded as other's teaching experience.*

Dear \*\*\*,

Sure - but the line is fine.

This morning the photocopier was broken!!! (Great!!) One teacher wanted to start a discussion with her group on times they've broken the law (speeding, jaywalking, smuggling - i.e 400 cigarettes) so what did she do? Desperately looked for a handout in one of the resource books only to be reminded that the photocopier was broken. ""But how do I get the ball rolling"", she cried. ""Give them one or two examples"" I said, ""and then get them to brainstorm more"". Is it so difficult to get a ball moving?

\*\*\*\*

## Post 482

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as own learning experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

A gerund is a verbal noun????? Egads!!!!!!!!!! My students wouldnt' care a bit about that. What they do care about is that they can begin to use different expressions like, ""We talked about getting new furniture."" It broadens the scope of English at their command.

By the way, I did learn about ""verbal nouns"" when I was studying Spanish years ago. Was it helpful? Not a bit.

\*\*\*

## Post 483

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\*,

Thanks for reminding us of Sugata Mitra's work and the <http://www.hole-in-the-wall.com/> project.

He was featured in 'El Pais' last month and was in Barcelona for the conference 'Educacin contra la divisin digital' organised by UNESCO and the Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC)

In one of his projects, his project found that in three months and with only one computer, 200-300 kids learned to use it on their own, organising themselves and helping each other to show how it worked. They also learned English through using it and, perhaps most surprisingly, the social life of the village where the computer was installed improved.

The project has been expanded and has had interesting results where a hole-in-the-wall computer has been introduced in a school: attendance to class has risen, and teachers have noticed students have better knowledge of English and algebra in particular.

Sugata suggests it could be a way forward and an effective way of improving literacy.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

On Tue, Dec 16, 2008 at 11:16 AM, \*\*\* wrote:

- > Although I am a long time member of this group I post so infrequently
- > that I probably should re-introduce myself. Perhaps it is enough just
- > now to say that I am one of the co-hosts of the Absolutely
- > Intercultural podcast. And coincidentally the latest show features
- > Prof. Sugata Mitra albeit in extremely condensed format. I met him in
- > Oslo last month and his work is extremely relevant to this discussion.
- >
- > His findings are that the quality of education declines with remoteness
- > and that the marginal benefit of introducing ICT to poor children is
- > much higher than when ICT is introduced to rich children. He has also
- > found through his famous 'Hole in the Wall' experiments or minimally
- > invasive education, which has been discussed on this list before, that
- > children will learn even the most complex things including genetics and
- > a new language when given the tools and when working in groups, all in
- > an informal, non-coercive setting; hence the 'hole in the wall'
- > computers and not the the 'laptop in the classroom' experiment.
- >
- > His proposition is that with millions of children still not in school
- > and no prospect of finding teachers for them anytime within their
- > current childhood, then the best we can do is to promote this 'hole in
- > the wall' type of education as a pragmatic solution. I find his
- > findings and arguments very compelling. There is of course much more
- > detail which you can find simply by entering 'hole in the wall' in

> Google. And if you can you should watch some of the video material  
> about this initiative.  
> \*\*\*  
> Denmark

## Post 484

*Coded as own in class experience.*  
*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

-----Original Message-----

From: \*\*\*

To: dogme@yahoogleroups.com

Subject: [dogme] Re: dogme/eatmydog

A dogme moment could be a number of things...

Perhaps it's just the moment when the interaction becomes real and not mediated by coursebooks, grammar points or stereotypical reactions to the students. But I'd like to go back to a posting I made some time ago: can dogme moments be provocative, i.e. moving students outside their comfort zones?

I have a class of Arabic speakers with very high levels of spoken English and fairly prejudiced views of western behaviour. I spend a whole year trying to introduce them to western ways of thinking and, in a fairly light-hearted way, trying to challenge their views of women. We laugh a lot in my class because they have a very finely developed sense of humour. In one of the last classes they asked me why I always teased the men and not the two women. I answered that with the women it was 'too serious' and they were my support group - there to protect me against the wall of Arabic masculinity that confronted me each lesson. It was definitely a dangerous thing to say but I can't see how otherwise I can challenge them to see a different point of view.

\*\*\*

## Post 485

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*  
*Coded as questioning and answering.*

\*\*\*: > Doesn't ""similar"" imply ""different""? ;)

Well, yes, I suppose this is the most important benefit - allowing for the possibility that taken another country, another school and another batch of students the premises may be the same but the outcome is different. so what you tear out is the attitude and the readiness to

yield to the need but since it is only the attitude you must ""realise it"" in some context and that context may well be your well-known ""usual teaching practice"" or in other words even a textbook!

so it's like what Jung and the mystics and the Taoism say - the nexus of opposites united in harmony. Hum. never thought I had it in me, sich depths... scuse me guys am delirious, I guess. signing off

\*\*\*

## Post 486

*Coded as other forum post.*

Mensaje original-----

De: \*\*\*

Para: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Asunto: Re: [dogme] Accents

\*\*\* & \*\*\*

Your answers are all very well but it still begs the question of who determines what is acceptable and understandable in terms of pronunciation.

\*\*\*

---

Of course. There is no hard and fast rule. It is going to be subjective. But still, a range can be determined by consensus. Examples are the Cambridge exams. Like I said, a range of comprehensibility to a general selection of English speakers, including native and proficient non-natives. But then who determines what is acceptable in a maths exam? A sociology exam? Written essays in 7th grade? Any exam?

""acceptable"" and ""understandable"" in my opinion, for what it is worth, is taken from a general sample of effective communication between speakers of English. As defined by the ALTE guidelines.

\*\*\*

## Post 487

*Coded as other forum post.*

Dear \*\*\*, It is great that you are interested in using the Dogme method. Probably the best way to get answers to your questions is to read in the archives first, because depending on who your learners are (children, adults, teenagers etc) very good answers may be already there. If you paste this link into your browser, you should land in the past history of conversations people have had about

dogme.<https://groups.yahoo.com/neo/groups/dogme/conversations/messages> If you click on the word topics, or follow this

link <https://groups.yahoo.com/neo/groups/dogme/conversations/topics> you will probably

find something relevant to your learners. One of my favourite posts is called Teaching English Using Dogme Methodology by \*\*\*

Fernando. <https://groups.yahoo.com/neo/groups/dogme/conversations/messages/15443> This might be a good place for you to start. I wish you all the best,

\*\*\*

On 09 Jan 2015, at 14:53, \*\*\* wrote:

hello thank you in advance, Thanks to accept me in your group, I am a teacher for about 7 years, but now I want to teach my students reading with Dogme method. How can I perform it in my class? What is the lesson plan for it? What task & activity should I use? I will be glad to get your reply. Best regards \*\*\*

## Post 488

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

I'm glad to hear from \*\*\*, whom I thought I had unintentionally offended. Very happy, indeed that you took none. :-)

Regarding your question about the disillusioned candidates, yes, I meant candidates to a position as instructors in my school.

I realise not everybody is as fortunate as I am to run my own business. ;-)

However, the most difficult part of it still seems to be convincing/showing/proving our students/learners/apprentices (alike with the academically graduated instructors\*) that their traditional views and beliefs about what learning/acquiring a language is, are not necessarily the ONLY ones to be regarded, when dealing with each other i.e.

students/learners/apprentices and teachers/facilitators/instructors.

\*(Yes, there is a couple of highly qualified. i.e. College Graduated, professionals among us.)

The power of the academic brainwashing should never be neglected, nor underestimated. :-)

\*\*\*

----- Original Message -----

> From: ""\*\*\*""

> Sent: Friday, March 23, 2007 11:52 AM

> Subject: RE: [dogme] academia

> Dear \*\*\*,

>

> Thank you for your e-mail and for taking the trouble to contact me off-list.

> My apologies for the delay in replying but I wanted the time to be able to

> sit down and compose reply to you rather than just dashing something off.

>

> I do not take offense in any way, but obviously there has been an element

> of  
> misunderstanding.  
>  
> I do, however, maintain that the majority of people in academia, rather  
> than  
> the brave minority, have the best intentions.  
>  
> A couple of questions. When you say 'disillusioned candidates' are you  
> talking about English learners taking an exam or potential trainers in  
> your  
> school? I am not quite sure. If English learners, what exam are they  
> preparing for?  
>  
> I kind of like the idea of students deciding whether or not an instructor  
> stays, but don't forget some students will vote on a popularity contest  
> rather than the ability to teach effectively. It is like parenting.  
> Sometimes my kids do not like me saying no to them in certain situations  
> and  
> even resent me for it. But I know I have acted with their best interests  
> at  
> heart and my older child has even thanked me for it now she is more  
> mature.  
>  
> Sometimes students need to practice in certain areas to pass an exam that  
> perhaps they would rather not spend time doing. And resent the teacher  
> that  
> recognises that and so attempts to spend time going over these areas.  
>  
> I would be interested in hearing how you get round this problem, or if  
> indeed, it is a problem in your school.  
>  
> Regards  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: \*\*\*  
> Sent: 20 March 2007 19:50  
> Subject: Re: [dogme] academia  
>  
> Dear \*\*\*,  
>  
> I did not mean to offend you in any way. I am deeply sorry that you might  
> have misunderstood my points.  
>  
> Lets see:  
>  
> "" I would argue that the majority of people working in academia do not  
> have  
> hidden agendas, and are talented, qualified people striving to make a

> difference in their field.""

>

> I would repair that statement as follows; where it reads ""the majority"",

> read ""a brave minority"" .

> Also, I am not sure the expression ""hidden agendas"" conveys the same

> meaning

>

> as ""think only of their personal careers and titles."" , which was my

> original

>

> statement.

> ""..and (even fewer\*)are talented, qualified people striving to make a

> difference in their field.""

> \*IMHO.

>

> ""\*\*\*'s experience of teachers is different to mine.""

>

> Not so different, after all.

>

> I too have met both good and bad qualified teachers and lots of absolutely

> useless Highly Credentialed and Titled Phd.'s, doctors and the like.

> "" most of them native speakers funding their way around .... by doing

> some teaching (...). They are itinerant workers, working for a pittance

> paid by the big ... schools and not declaring their income.""

>

> Yes, we do have those around here too. :-)

> Frequently I get illegal aliens trying to work for me! Isn't it ironic?

> ;-)

>

> ""Are the disillusioned candidates \*\*\* refers to unhappy because they

> did

> not pass some kind of examination?"" ( I believe there was/supposed to be/

> a

> question mark at the end of that...)

>

> Well, yes to that, too.

> I have even been threatened with law suits, voodos , etc, by those very

> same

>

> HCTF, to whom I am referring.

> It's just natural. They are out of a (very good) job.

>

> ""If the exam is not related to the real world, then either blame poor

> teaching\* (\* they had in school, yes.)because the candidates were not

> taught

>

> how to pass the exam or just admit the candidates' English was not at the

> required level to pass the exam. ""

>

> Their judges were the students themselves. In my school, trainees get to

> go

>  
> through a whole month with a group, and it is THE GROUP (i.e. the  
> students)  
> who decide if he/she stays.  
> More real life exam than this I don't think has ever been designed.  
>  
> Best regards  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>  
> \*\*\*  
>  
> P.S. I chose to send this reply to you off-list, so we don't get  
> reprehended  
>  
> for creating a flame war. :-)  
> I do not wish that. I think that if the discussions are kept at the (good)  
> level we are keeping, there should be no problem; but I'd really like to  
> hear more people about that. I will always respect and defend your  
> unalienable right to disagree.  
> However, if you do feel that we should continue our debate on-list, I'd be  
> happy to post a non-personal version of this to the list, too.  
>  
>  
>  
> ----- Original Message -----  
> From: ""\*\*\*""  
> To: <dogme@yahoogroups.com>  
> Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2007 3:08 AM  
> Subject: RE: [dogme] academia  
>  
>  
>> Dear List Members  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> I did read further and I still maintain that the original statement is a  
>> sweeping generalization. The phrase 'Yes, there is plenty of exceptions  
>> to  
>> that"" only partially qualifies the generality of the statement. I would  
>> argue that the majority of people working in academia do not have hidden  
>> agendas, and are talented, qualified people striving to make a difference  
>> in  
>> their field.  
>> \*\*\*'s experience of teachers is different to mine. I have met both  
>> good  
>> and bad qualified teachers and lots of absolutely useless unqualified  
>> teachers: most of them native speakers funding their way around Europe  
>> by  
>> doing some teaching to generate pocket money. They are itinerant  
>> workers,



>> working for a pittance paid by the big language schools and not declaring  
>> their income.  
>>  
>>  
>> Are the disillusioned candidates \*\*\* refers to unhappy because they  
>> did  
>> not pass some kind of examination. If the exam is not related to the  
>> real  
>> world, then either blame poor teaching because the candidates were not  
>> taught how to pass the exam or just admit the candidates' English was not  
>> at  
>> the required level to pass the exam.  
>>  
>>  
>> Regards  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> \*\*\*  
>>  
>>  
>> From: dogme@yahoogroups.com [mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of  
>> \*\*\*  
>> Sent: 20 March 2007 02:15  
>> To: dogme@yahoogroups.com  
>> Subject: Re: [dogme] academia  
>>  
>>  
>> I am afraid \*\*\* did not read my message to the end, or else he would  
>> have read:  
>>  
>> ""Yes, there is plenty of exceptions to that.""  
>> NO sweeping generalization.  
>>  
>> To me, having a diploma, degree, etc. only proves that the beholder is  
>> good  
>> at taking orders, follow the rules and fill up forms. Now, this is. ;-)  
>>  
>> \*\*\* states: ""Yes there are teachers with qualifications who are bad  
>> teachers, but I would  
>>> argue that they are outnumbered by qualified teachers who are also good  
>>> teachers. I am not sure the same could be said for teachers with no  
>>> qualifications.""  
>>  
>> My seventeen years of experience in the field have shown that this is  
>> just  
>> NOT true.  
>>  
>> The majority ( not ALL ) of graduated (i.e. supposedly ""qualified"" )  
>> candidates to a position in my school fail miserably at the initial

>> training course.  
>> I believe that it is so, mostly due to their inability to see beyond  
>> what  
>> was taught to them in school, to their unconditional belief that what  
>> they  
>> ""know"" cannot be contradicted.  
>> ""After all, I did not spend 4/5 years in school/college/university, only  
>> to  
>> find out that everything I was taught to be right, just isn't so, in the  
>> real world."" This a common complain I hear from the candidates who have  
>> been  
>>  
>> eliminated.  
>> So, I would most certainly argue that ""fresh"" instructors ( i.e. not  
>> contaminated by the academic dogmas) may not outnumber, but certainly  
>> outperform most ""qualified"" graduates, when it comes to the real  
>> practice.  
>>  
>> \*\*\*, I am glad we have reached some sort of consensus. :-) (sorry,  
>> never heard of John Holt)  
>>  
>> \*\*\*  
>>

## Post 489

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Are not all classes mixed - in the sense that all the people have different strengths and weaknesses?

## Post 490

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

But \*\*\*

It IS teaching, although it may not generate much learning (I said MAY). I am in a situation where I have a class of 16 people who need to get an IELTS score of 5.5 by December. Their writing is, as you will probably guess, way below that level. If I start spending what they regard as valuable time getting them to write sentences, then paragraphs and then essays, they are going to stop coming to my classes and teaching WILL stop.

So, I give them IELTSy essays, following class discussions. They write the first drafts (occasionally with prompts on the WB that arose from the discussions -teaching). The first drafts are highlighted wherever

the errors are to be found (I know, I'm terribly unreconstructed). The students then work in groups, trying to work out why I have highlighted certain parts of their writing (teaching again). Then they go away and write a second draft. I get this electronically and offer suggestions and feedback about what I consider to be the strengths of the writing and its weaknesses. I also highlight surviving errors and new ones and provide detailed explanations of why I have highlighted them (more teaching). Finally, I get the third draft and grade it according to what I imagine it might get in an IELTS exam (following their wishes).

Despite what you argue, I find it often DOES help and I think it is most definitely teaching. That said, I bloody hate doing it.

\*\*\*

## Post 491

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Dear \*\*\*. Not surprised your corpora found ""advices"" since 'Advice' in the sense of a bit of paper that is evidence of a sale of something is countable.

'Informations' is a surprise, but, on reflection, it should'nt be since corpora these days can include what is written on the internet in emails or appears in web pages.

\*\*\*

## Post 492

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

here's just another of many very quotable quotes (or tit bits/tidbits) from said article:

""the fact that we've read the same sort of stuff and even had the same conversation time and time again doesn't invalidate it: some of our best conversations are ones we've had before.""

----- Original Message -----

From: ""\*\*\*\*""

To: ""Dogme"" <dogme@yahogroups.com>

Sent: Sunday, September 28, 2003 12:43 AM

Subject: [dogme] Tabloid dramas and text books

> Thanks for the tip, \*\*\*:

<http://education.guardian.co.uk/tefl/story/0,5500,1049784,00.html>

- >
- > I'd like to comment by saying that Americans have turned 'tit bit' into 'tidbit' and don't you feel ashamed ;-)
- >
- > I agree that ""...once the immediacy [of an article] is lost, some of the point goes with it."" That's one for the dogme compendium, no?
- >
- > I don't know if the author (no names, so as to entice those who have yet to read it?) mentioned \*why\* ""... we should find our own stimulus as far as possible."" I do agree, and perhaps the reasons should be obvious or are stated between the lines of the article, but I think others might not be aware of this. How is adapting ""... course book methodologies to your own students by using your own materials"" equivalent to the author's metaphor of using fresh herbs instead of dried ones? That I get, but I think the 'why' might not be obvious.
- >
- > I could just be too daft or tired to notice something in the article, but I have the feeling a lot of the cynical folks on the Guardian list, for example might ask these same questions. Then again, maybe they don't care to know.
- >
- > I DID enjoy the article, find it useful and strongly recommend having a look via the link above!
- >
- > \*\*\*

## Post 493

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

<traditional grammar is replaced by a functional grammar>

My thought this 4 a.m. was ""Context determines form."" I think that movement in language needs to be complemented by why a deep structure element moved to a particular location in the final spoken (or written) utterance.

My present take on Dogme is that it is a methodology for second-language study that really doesn't have much to do with language meta-knowledge, i.e. grammar, but rather has as its main source of energy the personalization of a student's learning. In what I've heard of Dogme, a student can tailor his/her learning to what interests him/her. That provides the motivation for accepting further formal direction by teacher.

\*\*\*

## Post 494

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

\*\*\*... wrote:

> \*\*\*,

>

> What I find instructive about your anecdote is that it was you who had

> decided that it

> was time to find out what a certain word meant. You set the pace and

> asked the

> question and thereafter noticed it 10 times. I have definitely had

> similar experiences

> here. Certain words I have heard used for years, but never been able to

> pick up from

> context what they mean. Then, unaccountably, one day I ask.

Yes. That's true, and I'll never forget what it means either. But it did take me ten years to ask, and I think that was because I had never before really needed to know what it meant. It is, again, a matter of communicative success, or the lack of it.

Dogme attracts me because it is student-conscious and honest about what a teacher is, about what a teacher really *\*can\** and can't do. I don't believe in methodologies and I think that if there was any science here we would have known about it long before this. What we have are fashion and trend.

The no materials stricture is useful in so far as it forces us, as teachers, to reflect more on what we are doing, to be more creative in our practice. It empowers us so that we can cut ourselves free of the books we so readily bind ourselves to, from fear, from fatigue, and from sloth.

I've been reading an old book on CALL by Alessi and Trollip (Computer-Based Instruction: Methods and Development, Prentice Hall, 1985). Twenty years ago computers are not what they are today and so technology did not overwhelm method.

In their chapter on tutorials the authors list ""instructional factors"" that are relevant to this kind of instruction:

introduction

student control

motivation

presentation

questions and responses

judgment of responses  
feedback about responses  
remediation  
sequencing of lesson segments  
closing of the tutorial

I read this and thought, this is really what I try to do in class - with varying degrees of success.

To return to the original question about what one does with emergent language, I think I generally slide this into judgment of responses, feedback about responses, and remediation.

Not every bit of emergent language needs to be dealt with in this way. But if your students all speak the same L1 you can easily discern patterns of error that you will do need to slog away at very diligently.

Our big problem is the present simple tense, particularly with the verb ""to be"". Arabic has no copula and Arabic sentences do quite happily, and frequently, scamper about verbless.

Judgment of language is the crucial point, and how you do this will depend upon who your students are and how much intervention they are willing to tolerate: this takes us back to student control and motivation.

\*\*\*

## Post 495

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as questioning and answering.*

Hi \*\*\*,

OK, I'll try and answer your questions now that I'm back (at least for a couple of weeks!)

1) If your college is funded by a body such as the LSC, inspected by OfSTED etc then it is a legal requirement for them to have support in place for the students that includes someone who can assess and support them if they have ADS, Dyslexia etc. It may well be that you aren't made aware of who that person is, especially if you teach ESOL or EFL as often the person feels they can't give adequate support when they don't know the students first language.

2) You mention that your Asian Team leader puts up resistance. Well, the question here is whether they really have the interests of the students at heart. Checking to see if there is a logical reason why a student might be having difficulty should not be seen as trying to pass the buck. If anything it should be seen as an attempt to take on more in terms of helping the student out. If the majority of students are succeeding then it's quite clear that the teaching is ok. So, to address the needs of the failing students by looking at what might be holding them back is quite clearly a logical step - maybe it's how this is couched that is the key.

3) I've already answered the question about differentiation in tests.

\*\*\*

## Post 496

*Coded as own in class experience.*

*Coded as Dogme ideology.*

*Coded as logic and hypotheticals.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

This ""not being so keen on certain students"" sparked off a bit of a memory from my class last year where a student started to give a grammatically and lexically superb explanation of how homosexuality was a disease. I sat for a while trying to tell myself I was there to help him with his English, not his bigotry, before giving in to a ""what in the hell.....?"". OK, so Dogme would suggest we are all human beings with opinions etc, but how far is it our job to impose our opinions on anything other than English? If someone goes to a Trinity speaking exam and does a linguistically speaking superb presentation on ""Why Hitler was right"", can and should they be marked down? (OK, so I'm using extreme circumstances here, but do you see where I'm coming from?)

## Post 497

*Coded as other forum post.*

Unlike \*\*\* I haven't got to go off on a 'bus to work. But \*\*\*'s posting has given me something serious to think about. I shall go and potter in the garden and think earnestly about my metaphors.

\*\*\*

## Post 498

*Coded as own out of school experience.*

*Coded as personal knowledge and opinion.*

*Coded as other forum post.*

Thank you \*\*\*, that is much to think about and I appreciate your comment a lot, I will toss around the project element being undogmeic over the next days as for me that was one of the ways of ensuring repetition of language.

On the validation thing you mentioned, I guess that's the web2.0 aspect of life: we all share and discuss our lessons in order to get peer based feedback and those discussions help us to take new directions.

I am, currently, in an unusual teaching situation for some and a common situation for others and for many in this forum, my scenario will become more and more frequent as employment in IT increases throughout the years ahead - no matter their home countries.

I don't know your particular teaching situation however I am a freelancer which basically means I don't have a group of peers around me in physicality - in my former working life I did and we did a huge amount of peer observations and in fact, had a monster part of the library where we all shared the games and activities we made, stored in bags and boxes and categorized folders - so I suppose that ""sharing philosophy"" still hangs around in me even if today that's online with mostly strangers as my peers.

Once again, thnx for the ""stay away from the octopus at starboard"" advice.

\*\*\*

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*\*"" wrote:

>

> \*\*\*,

>

> also with all due respect, the case you pointed out (IT professionals, which I also happen to teach) reflects only a MINORITY.

>

> Hardly anything done with them in class can be replicated with non-IT professionals ( the vast majority of students, not afraid to say ! ).

>

> I see that your class was very, very interesting, and can easily imagine your students having a lot of fun, while learning at the same time.

>

>

> Perfect.

>

> But hardly Dogme. ( Why? well, lots of prep, and tools that are not available in any classroom... the whole concept of ""project"" sounds very anti-dogmetic, IMHO)

>

> And then again, who needs to classify and determine if it is or not Dogme?

>

> Was it effective? Did they really acquire the language they were targeting?

>

> If that is the case, then just go for it !

>

> A great professional, as you certainly are, does not need validation !

>

> You do what you think is best for your ss, and in the end of the day, that's what counts.

>

>

> \*\*\*

>

> From: \*\*\*

> To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

> Subject: [dogme] Re: Group death and Phoenix



>  
>  
>  
> \*\*\*,  
>  
> With the absolute hugest amount of respect what do you do when your learners work in the field of IT and you have the computer room as a classroom? And the language they need to practice includes the ability to use IT jargon naturally and appropriately?  
>  
> Sorry to be one of the vested interests, whatever that really means, it sounds so awfully harsh each time I hear this whether it's aimed at me or someone else, but here you go, here's one of my dogme 2.0 lessons: is it truly dogme? does it fit to the guiding principles - how would I know, I know only that like \*\*\*, I try to make it so.  
>  
> <http://kalinago.blogspot.com/2010/03/creating-cross-culture-guides-dogme-20.html>  
>  
> \*\*\*,  
>  
> --- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\*" wrote:  
>>  
>> I agree with \*\*\* and \*\*\* and others about this. Over the years, a range of vested interests seemed to catch a ride on the dogme bandwagon, with ideas about `virtual' stuff such as Second Life and Dogme 2.0 (e-dogme?), and I don't think these fit with the original spirit of dogme:  
>>  
>> ""We are looking for ways of exploiting the learning opportunities offered by the raw material of the classroom, that is the language that emerges from the needs, interests, concerns and desires of the people in the room.""  
>>  
>> Best regards,  
>> \*\*\*,  
>>  
>> --- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, ""\*\*\*\* Daly"" wrote:  
>>>  
>>> \*\*\*,  
>>> I have been more of a lurker than a contributor on this list but I felt I had to reply to this message as I do feel exactly the same about the 'trying too hard' and the way you see a future group.. I would love to see a new group 'refocus on classroom experience and collective development, a small-culture approach to Dogme, anecdotes from the classroom , a celebration of the original metaphor and Dogme discussed as that very special micro-event or whole class event'  
>>> Really hope i will be able to find this new group. I am terribly inadequate in these matters!!  
>>> \*\*\*,  
>>> ----- Original Message -----  
>>> From: \*\*\*  
>>> To: dogme@yahoogroups.com  
>>> Subject: [dogme] Re: Group death and Phoenix  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>

>>> With regard to 'lurkers'. Things play out as they do. A person who was a 'lurker' in the Dogme list that we have known might have been a regular contributor had things played out only slightly differently. Who knows. Over the last couple of years I've noticed, at least as far as I perceive it, people sometimes trying 'too hard' on the list, and I think this certainly serves to drown some of these would-be contributors out and relegate them to a status of 'lurker'.

>>>

>>> \*\*\*, I will certainly join your Phoenix group, but I would like to suggest that from the outset it is made clear that it is not a competition to see who can be the most Dogme 2.0, have the most answers or post the most messages.

>>>

>>> There's a lot of expertise on the current list, a quick run down of the last 30 messages gives a host of published authors and regular conference speakers and I think this could be a tremendous benefit, especially to 'us little guys and gals' but some of these conversations can read like a clash of the Titans. Imagine someone coming onto the site having dipped into 'the book' or having heard of Dogme from a colleague. What they might find, thinking about some of the stretches of dialogue I've read over the past few years, is a discussion between individuals who seem to know far too much about teaching to need to discuss it with anyone.

>>>

>>> What I would suggest - IF the Phoenix is to feature the name Dogme in it's title - is a refocus on classroom experience and collective development, a small-culture approach to Dogme, anecdotes from the classroom, a celebration of the original metaphor and Dogme discussed as that very special micro-event or whole class event. I'd like to see more experienced 'Dogmetists' mixing it with new arrivals on the site in rather a more humble way, leaving open real avenues for topic development rather than trying to provide all the answers from a 'been there done that' or 'am there doing it better' angle.

>>>

>>> When was the last time you used Dogme in your own class? What does Dogme mean to you? How has the Dogme metaphor contributed to your teaching? These are all threads I would love to read - written by the oldest to the newest members, and it might be nice to kick off your new group with some sort of statement or restatement of where members are at. Of course, you may have something else in mind. In any case I'll be coming along hauling my blubbery bulk across the ice and barking all the way.

>>>

>>> \*\*\*, well done for your hard work and for the original conception of 'the metaphor' - fantastic. I'm not sure these last threads of discussion were quite how you might have envisioned things but by God they have been interesting! I still think some sort of round up, a collection of personal accounts - 'What Dogme has meant to me' etc. - as a celebration of the ending of the list (if it does end), from say 20, 30, 40 teachers, perhaps published as an e-document, or special edition in one of the journals would be a fitting close to this chapter. In any case many thanks. \*\*\*.

>>>

>>> --- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:

>>>>

>>>> Hi \*\*\*,

>>>>

>>>> You might need your binoculars to read this on the tiny screen...

>>>>

>>>> I've used Ning with another group, and I really like it much more than

>>>> Yahoo! for what it's worth.  
>>>>  
>>>> Also, I wonder how interactive and vibrant a forum of lurkers might  
>>>> be. :-)  
>>>>  
>>>> \*\*\*  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> On Mar 3, 2010, at 4:55 PM, \*\*\* wrote:  
>>>>  
>>>>> Hi,  
>>>>>  
>>>>> writing on a tiny screen so this'll be short.  
>>>>> It's Wednesday night, and I said I'd start up a dogme 2.0 list on  
>>>>> Friday if I got around 25 off-list emails by 9pm GMT on Friday.  
>>>>> Well, I've had 21 so far, so... it seems likely.  
>>>>> I also intend to explore Ning as an option - otherwise the Phonexi  
>>>>> will have 'yahoo' tattooed on its back.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> IF and only IF I get those remaining messages, I'll let you know on  
>>>>> Saturday.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> And \*\*\*, interestingly, more than half the off-list messages have  
>>>>> come from 'lurkers' not regular posters, and more than half are from  
>>>>> women! Definitely an unusual balance for dogme....  
>>>>>  
>>>>> 'See' everyone at the weekend, either with a dogme 2.0 url, or to  
>>>>> say 'ciao, hasta luego, and thanks for the fish'.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> \*\*\*  
>>>>>  
>>>>>  
>>>>> --- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, wrote:  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> surprising spate of postings from lurkers and members who like me  
>>>>>> used to be  
>>>>>> active then eased off but are still very much attached - and it  
>>>>>> seems  
>>>>>> obvious that the list fulfills needs of many. eh, \*\*\*?  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> \*\*\*  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> dogme@yahoogroups.com \*\*\*:  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> Hello everyone, I've been surprised to read that the group is  
>>>>>> possibly  
>>>>>> coming to an end. I haven't been an ""active"" member but I've read  
>>>>>> your  
>>>>>> posts and followed the discussions almost every day since I  
>>>>>> joined, I've  
>>>>>> learnt a lot of things, tried some others with my students, followed

>>>>> some online courses suggested by you and the most important I've  
>>>>> dared  
>>>>> to do new things in the classroom. I am deeply grateful of the  
>>>>> group and  
>>>>> its members, specially the moderators, I'd like DOGME to continue,  
>>>>> but  
>>>>> it's all in your hands.  
>>>>> Thanks again from Chile.  
>>>>>

## Post 499

*Coded as own in class experience.*

"When I give dictation I first read the sentence in a conversational tone and then word by word.

\*\*\*

## Post 500

*Coded as other forum post.*

*Coded as teaching text.*

--- In dogme@yahooogroups.com, \*\*\*... wrote: > According to a short report just broadcast on the BBC's Today

programme on Radio 4, > all primary schools in the country are being sent a document suggesting how they can > help their pupils to "" speak properly and listen carefully."" It seems that children starting > school arrive without the ability to talk properly and listen attentively. The watching of > too much TV is blamed.

>

> Amongst other things children are to be taught to debate politely..... >

I listened to the same broadcast on the way into work today as I was reading my book by John Holt. I suspect he would say (and I agree wholeheartedly) that whilst I have no objections to children learning how to speak and listen, I \*do\* object to the idea that they should be taught how to do this."

## Appendix 3: Found posts

This section contains the posts which were found during purposive sampling. Only posts that have been cited in the paper have been included here.

## Post 501

\*\*\*, you have done it again! I love the way that dogme endlessly revisits its origins and reassesses its integrity. This constant reflection is an excellent model for professional development, especially since it is informed by cycles of classroom practice, which again, Rob, you have been so generous in contributing.

Personally, I love the way that dogme morphs and evolves, constantly changing shape and even direction - dynamic, emergent, adaptable, and maddeningly (for some) elusive.

This fuzziness is for me its strength - how else could it have survived for so long? I'm constantly amazed by the way dogme is being picked up by a whole new generation of teachers and appropriated for their own contexts and purposes. Just when you thought it was dead in the water....

So, while I love the way that you have teased out another very suggestive metaphor (remodernism) I'm not sure that a new manifesto, or a definitive statement (of the kind that Dennis Hankers for) is either necessary or advised. This doesn't mean that the exercise of extrapolating dogme principles from another medium isn't useful - in fact, it's through the creation of new metaphors that sciences (including the social sciences) advance. But, as I say, I'm a bit wary of the impulse to nail yet another manifesto on the establishment door.

Also, I'm wondering if the cinema is the most fruitful source of new metaphors, for an educational movement that is predicated on interactivity, above all? Film, after all, is a curiously passive medium - from the point of view of the viewer at least. Maybe - like James Gee - we should be looking at more interactive media - even video gaming - for our inspiration?

(That really was tongue in cheek!)

But thanks once again for thinking outside the box (and keeping us on our toes)!

(And this is offered with the intention of continuing the conversation, not stifling it. Apologies if it reads like the latter)

\*\*\*.

--- In dogme@yahoogroups.com, \*\*\* wrote:

>

> Times have changed since Scott wrote the original ELT Dogme  
> 'manifesto' <http://www.thornburyscott.com/tu/Dogma%20article.htm> It  
> seems ELT Dogme has changed, too. Teachers have tried out 'teaching  
> unplugged' for themselves and, to a large extent, have shaped it by  
> feeding back to it's 'founders', largely through this forum.

>

> Through time, and, on occasion, 'tempest' (ie, 'stormy' debate), ELT  
> Dogme, inspired by the manifesto of the Dogme 95 filmmaking movement,  
> has, in my opinion, become something much more representative of this  
> filmmakers' manifesto: <http://jesse-richards.blogspot.com/2008/08/remodernist-film-manifesto.html>

>

> In the spirit of the times, and in the spirit of Dogme, I therefore  
> feel compelled to reify (or (Occupy?) Dogme by drawing an analogy  
> between ELT Dogme today and this new manifesto, suggesting it might be  
> more befitting our 'movement'. I'll also include notes\* and excerpts  
> from Scott's 'Vow of Chastity' (aka 'Dogme manifesto'), published over

> a decade ago.

> Remodernist Film Manifesto (accessed at <http://rogerebert.suntimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20100608/LETTERS/100609980> on 10/23/2011)

>

> 1. Art manifestos, despite the good intentions of the writer should

> always "be taken with a grain of salt" as the cliché goes, because

> they are subject to the ego, pretensions, and plain old ignorance and

> stupidity of their authors. This goes all the way back to the Die

> Brcke manifesto of 1906, and continues through time to this one that

> you're reading now. A healthy wariness of manifestos is understood and

> encouraged. However, the ideas put forth here are meant sincerely and

> with the hope of bringing inspiration and change to others, as well as

> to myself.

>

> \*This first 'tenet', however ironically, instructs us to consider even

> it's source and progenitor with a 'healthy wariness'. Proponents of

> Dogme have suggested 'The Vow' not be taken too seriously and always

> read in the context of the state-of-the-art pedagogy at the time

> during which it was written. In that sense, this new manifesto adopts

> a more critical perspective on itself than does 'The Vow'. This first

> principle also applies to coursebooks, I believe, although I don't

> like the harshness of the word 'stupidity'. Perhaps \*\*\* should have

> included a similar disclaimer back then. Please understand I do not

> mean to imply \*\*\*, or coursebooks writers for that matter, are

> driven by ego, pretense or stupidity!

> 2. Remodernism seeks a new spirituality in art. Therefore, remodernist

> film seeks a new spirituality in cinema. Spiritual film does not mean

> films about Jesus or the Buddha. Spiritual film is not about religion.

> It is cinema concerned with humanity and an understanding of the

> simple truths and moments of humanity. Spiritual film is really ALL

> about these moments.

>

> \*Detractors have compared the enthusiasm for ELT Dogme to religious

> fervor, while others have patently denied any evangelizing. In the

> classroom, dogmetic teachers continue to explore humanist principles

> and perspectives on education and language learning by giving

> prominence to the lives of students, creating a space for 'moments of

> humanity' among the people in the room, rather than by serving up

> Grammar McNuggets. Understood in this way, there is no 'state of

> grace' to be attained, and Dogme seeks a sort of 'humanist

> spirituality' in the art of pedagogy.

>

> 3. Cinema could be one of the perfect methods of creative expression,

> due to the ability of the filmmaker to sculpt with image, sound and

> the feeling of time. For the most part, the creative possibilities of

> cinema have been squandered. Cinema is not a painting, a novel, a

> play, or a still photograph. The rules and methods used to create

> cinema should not be tied to these other creative endeavors. Cinema

> should NOT be thought of as being "all about telling a story". Story

> is a convention of writing, and should not necessarily be considered a

> convention of filmmaking.

>

> \*Scott asked in his manifesto, "But where is the story? Where is the inner life of the student in all this? Where is real communication?", which suggested that time in natural setting of the classroom was being misspent. I think it has been realized that the emergent language arising from communicative and meaning-oriented interaction or tasks must be supplemented by some sort of attention to form, in order for the story, and the students, to find new meaning and carry on.

>

> As for the 'rules and methods used to create' ELT Dogme, Scott initially wrote "A Dogme school of teaching would take a dim view of imported methods, whether the Silent Way, the Natural Approach, the Direct Method, or hard line CLT. No methodological structures should interfere with, nor inhibit, the free flow of participant-driven input, output and feedback." But it seems clear that the unplugged teacher takes less than 'a dim view' towards these and other methods (eg, CLL and TBL). It is quite possible that the original manifesto (ie, 'Vow'), based on a rather strict code established by a group of Danish filmmakers, would squander possibilities afforded by the more tolerant and inclusive Dogme we see today.

>

> 4. The Japanese ideas of wabi-sabi (the beauty of imperfection) and mono no aware (the awareness of the transience of things and the bittersweet feelings that accompany their passing), have the ability to show the truth of existence, and should always be considered when making the remodernist film.

>

> "The point is to restore teaching to its pre-method 'state of grace' - when all there was was a room with a few chairs, a blackboard, a teacher and some students, and where learning was jointly constructed out of the talk that evolved in that simplest, and most prototypical of situations."

>

> \* As mentioned above, there really is no 'state of grace' as far as Dogme is concerned, and a time without technology is also unimaginable to tool-using creatures like us. Unplugged learning can be co-constructed out of the talk that emerges from extraordinary situations just as well as it can out of simple and prototypical ones. Thus, this Remodernist Manifesto propels Dogme toward a post-method 'state of grace'.

>

> 5. An artificial sense of "perfection" should never be imposed on a remodernist film. Flaws should be accepted and even encouraged. To that end, a remodernist filmmaker should consider the use of film, and particularly film like Super-8mm and 16mm because these mediums entail more of a risk and a requirement to leave things up to chance, as opposed to digital video. Digital video is for people who are afraid of, and unwilling to make mistakes.\*\* Video leads to a boring and sterile cinema. Mistakes and failures make your work honest and human.\*\*\*

- >
- > \*As with the author's reconsideration of the merits of video (cf. 6.),
- > Dogme has, I think it's fair to say, assumed a less hostile stance on
- > the use of digital technology in the classroom. Nonetheless, the
- > smaller formats (Super-8 and 16mm) of a 'stripped down, technology-
- > free kind of film making' are still best suited to a 'poor pedagogy'.
- > Moreover, flaws are commonly seen as opportunities rather than
- > imperfections by dogme enthusiasts.
- >
- > 6. Film, particularly Super-8mm film, has a rawness, and an ability to
- > capture the poetic essence of life, that video has never been able to
- > accomplish.\*\*\*
- >
- > \*Just as Dogme, in my view, prefers, indeed thrives on, raw
- > communication, there can be exceptions \*\*\*, so that whereas Dogma 95
- > dictated that "Temporal and geographical alienation are forbidden.
- > (That is to say that the film takes place here and now)", this new
- > manifesto mandates that, as long as "Learning ... takes place in the
- > here-and-now", the means of interaction might be asynchronous and
- > create geographical distance among the learners.
- >
- > 7. Intuition is a powerful tool for honest communication. Your
- > intuition will always tell you if you are making something honest, so
- > use of intuition is key in all stages of remodernist filmmaking.
- >
- > \*This seems wholly in line with Csikszentmihalyi's concept of flow,
- > cited by Scott here: <http://scottthornbury.wordpress.com/2010/05/30/f-is-for-flow/>
- > Perhaps by no coincidence, Dogme has often been associated with flow
- > by, among others, Luke Meddings
- > <http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/mortarboard/2006/jul/28/letitflow1?INTCMP=ILCNETTXT3487>
- >
- > 8. Any product or result of human creativity is inherently subjective,
- > due to the beliefs, biases and knowledge of the person creating the
- > work. Work that attempts to be objective will always be subjective,
- > only instead it will be subjective in a dishonest way. Objective films
- > are inherently dishonest. Stanley Kubrick, who desperately and
- > pathetically tried to make objective films, instead made dishonest and
- > boring films.
- >
- > \*I'll admit to liking some of Kubrick's films and apply this point to
- > attempts to situate Dogme within a standard framework of qualitative
- > scientific research.
- >
- > 9. The remodernist film is always subjective and never aspires to be
- > objective.
- >
- > \*Likewise, I think Dogme, as Scott has suggested in his most recent
- > posts to the discussion forum, will benefit most when "Research
- > methodologies ... include action research, interaction analysis,
- > ethnographic and narrative inquiry, and curriculum evaluation".



- >
- > 10. Remodernist film is not Dogme '95. We do not have a pretentious
- > checklist that must be followed precisely. This manifesto should be
- > viewed only as a collection of ideas and hints whose author may be
- > mocked and insulted at will.
- >
- > \*Not sure Scott has been mocked and insulted because of his 'Vow' -
- > only he can tell us how he feels - but the fact remains that, just as
- > ELT Dogme has been criticized, the original manifesto (link to article
- > above) has been drawn into question and more or less diminished, at
- > times by Dogme enthusiasts themselves. This post is no exception
- > though it aspires to offer a more rigorous analogy.
- >
- > 11. The remodernist filmmaker must always have the courage to fail,
- > even hoping to fail, and to find the honesty, beauty and humanity in
- > failure.
- >
- > \*Read for yourself how the classroom accounts shared on this forum
- > attest to this.
- >
- > 12. The remodernist filmmaker should never expect to be thanked or
- > congratulated. Instead, insults and criticism should be welcomed. You
- > must be willing to go ignored and overlooked.
- >
- > \*While certainly not 'ignored and overlooked' entirely (and never, I
- > hope, on the discussion forum), the unplugged teachers I've
- > encountered, as with the ELT community in general, typically invite
- > criticism - 'insults', not so much. This new manifesto reflects this
- > humility much more than do the 'Dogme-like' prescriptions of 'The
- > Vow', however tongue-in-cheek.
- >
- > 13. The remodernist filmmaker should be accepting of their influences,
- > and should have the bravery to copy from them in their quest for
- > understanding of themselves.
- >
- > \*Need I say more than Sylvia Ashton-Warner, Paulo Freire and Leo van
- > Lier? See \*\*\* Unplugged Public Library for more at
- > <http://teachertrainingunplugged.wordpress.com/unplugged-public-library/>
- > , all of whom have been mentioned time and again since Scott drafted
- > the original manifesto.
- >
- > 14. Remodernist film should be a stripped down, minimal, lyrical, punk
- > kind of filmmaking, and is a close relative to the No-Wave Cinema that
- > came out of New York's Lower East Side in the 1970's.
- >
- > \*Still materials-lite at heart, after all these years. This new
- > manifesto retains the minimalist call to 'chastity' with less dogma
- > attached.
- >
- > 15. Remodernist film is for the young, and for those who are older but
- > still have the courage to look at the world through eyes as if they

- > are children.
- >
- > \* I leave you alone to mingle with that last bit. For the record, I no
- > longer consider myself young, but I'll be rubbing elbows right beside
- > you just the same.
- >

## Post 502

\*\*\*,

You're right. Questions don't generally lead to theories; it's the other way around, that's why theory is important. By suggesting possible lines of inquiry, theory directs questioning. In turn, the answers we get hone theory.

The theory-question thing is part of a cycle. Theory does not exist for its own sake. We practice, observe, reflect, adjust, then practice and observe again. All four steps in the process are directed by our current understanding of what is happening. That personal understanding is based on assumptions, prejudice, emotion, prior knowledge, and so on.

As teachers, we need to observe and reflect because teaching is not like changing tires or baking bread. Teachers interact with human beings, not inanimate objects, so the activity is dynamic, personal, and ever changing. Even my saying this is based on particular view of the mind: on a theory. That theory states that the human mind is not a static thing and that teaching and learning are part of a dynamic process. Another theory says that teaching is like changing tires.

EL Thorndike was one of the founders of modern psychology. Writing in 1910, in the very first issue of the Journal of Educational Psychology, Thorndike said,

"A complete science of psychology would tell every fact about everyones intellect and character and behavior, would tell the cause of every change in human nature, would tell the result which every educational forceevery act of every person that changed any other or the agent himselfwould have."

Thorndike's theory of the mind profoundly affected American education for more than 70 years. It posits a direct cause-effect relationship between what teachers do and what students learn. It requires only passive involvement of students in the learning process.

If you are wondering why the visceral reaction to student failure is to blame teachers, look no further than Thorndike. What's more, Thorndike and his theories are what lie behind our own relentless focus on methodology today - even here, on this list.

We believe that all we need to do is to find the right method, the right technique, and students will learn. Whether we like it or not, if we follow American educational culture, we are probably following Thorndike. It doesn't matter that we say "We don't like theory," we are still following one, quite possibly a very destructive one, but we are innocent because we don't care.

Theory is only organized and formalized prior knowledge. We can cut formal theory out of the cycle if we want to. Many attempt it. At this point, there are several possibilities:

1. we slavishly follow tradition, teaching much as we were taught;
2. we attempt to follow what colleagues and supervisors think good practice is, again, never really knowing why;
3. we joyfully do whatever we like, never knowing why we do anything, but having a good time anyway.

I suspect that many who follow "dogme" may be perceived as #3 above, and that can't be good.

Interestingly, those who follow 1 and 2 will regard 3 as hopelessly irresponsible and unprofessional. They do not see that the thing that unites all three is a lack of direction and foundation: none have any theoretical basis for what they do and so they are all the same. 1 and 2, however, have the weight of culture to back them up, and that is why nothing ever changes.

If we don't have the patience, vision, and the intellectual discipline to organize our collective prior knowledge and defend our convictions, then we shouldn't expect much to come of any of this.

\*\*\*

\*\*\* <djn@...> wrote:

\*\*\*,

I think I agree with all that you say - certainly with questioning what one does in the classroom and trying to understand why one does it. I disagree, though, that this questing leads to theories. I would say it leads to beliefs, revealed convictions, fruits of experience, deeper self-knowledge,

re-examination of assumptions but not theories.

\*\*\*

## Post 503

I've had a couple of days of reading postings (ok, to be perfectly honest, skimming some) and I am at school at present with a stack of book reports, a stack of news reports and many pieces of writing which all need to be marked sitting on a desk behind me. I allow myself the luxury of checking my e-groups at school because, as my Cantonese is virtually non-existent, I miss most of the irrelevant fluff of staffroom talk - I do mine on the computer!

Anyway - 2 observations. I'm not a CELTA or DELTA person, and I've finally clicked that that is what a lot of the talk here is about. I trained as a language teacher, and did the equivalent of a PGCE (that's for the many Brits I see in here) in Australia. I also have a Diplome dans l'enseignement du francais langue etrangere from Montpellier (another 1 year full-time diploma) and an MA (App. Ling.) from the University of HK (can't say my qualifications aren't geographically varied!). I only really know about CELTAs from working with many young 'backpackers' we employed in the school I worked at in Prague. I can say that I actually learned a lot of interesting - um - circus tricks (oooooh!) from observing their lessons!....

And my point is? Mmmm, not sure. Firstly, perhaps, that in all the talk of CA etc, perhaps people are overlooking the fact that those 'circus tricks' and the teacher-talk-guidelines evolved because, NS or NNS, teachers need to achieve a certain amount of automaticity in their classroom dealings so they can get on with the job. There isn't a lot of time for reflection in the cut and parry of real-life schoolwork.

Secondly, I know that, whilst doing my MA and teaching in a REAL, LIVE HK CLASSROOM (as opposed to some academic notion of Confucian Heritage CULTures blah blah blah) I had to laugh at the out-of-touch-with-reality-ness of most of what we talked about. That's not to say I didn't enjoy myself - I loved the reading and the discussion and the writing and the research - but did it influence my teaching? To be frank? No. It just made it a lot easier for me to justify what I do/did, and to talk the talk.... Academia is a game, really, and most of the researchers and writers about ELT are not from the place where so many learners are to be found - high school classrooms. What happens in language schools and university-based language centres has almost no relationship to what happens in mainstream schools. Unfortunately, those at the sharp end don't have a lot of time for research and reading because we're busy doing duty, attending swimming galas, attending discipline team meetings.....

BTW, my school is really not at all bad - and if you want to know why I continue to teach classes of 40 .... it's because of the money!

\*\*\* :)

## Post 504

Dear List Members,

I'm sorry but this just seems too much of a sweeping generalization to me.

\*\*\* writes "Very little as changed in it (academia) since then.

People in academia tend to think more of themselves than of the students they are supposed to be \*helping\* (not measuring, testing,etc.), their own titles and personal carrers become the sole purpose of their work

Of course there may be such people in academia as there are in all walks of life. But condemning academic excellence and advocating the use of teachers/instructors who have no qualifications just seems perverse to me.

Yes there are teachers with qualifications who are bad teachers, but I would argue that they are outnumbered by qualified teachers who are also good teachers. I am not sure the same could be said for teachers with no qualifications.

For me, this list has helped and continues to help me get past the basic teaching skills I learned on my TESOL course. It helps me question dogmatic teaching principles and helps me develop a style of teaching that I am more comfortable with, more student led. But I do not discount the advantage that academic study has given me, helping me develop a better understanding of why I do what I do. But I also question accepted language teaching practices and am willing to look elsewhere at other successful teaching/training/instructing methods to see if I can use them in my own teaching.

Regards

\*\*\*

---

From: dogme@yahoogroups.com [mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of

\*\*\*

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Subject: Re: [dogme] academia

\*\*\* asks: " What's wrong with academic, university like? Why do teachers so often deride academia as having no place in teaching?"

Well, in my opinion, ( and I hope I will not be crucified for that...), the academia, as we know it, has been the refuge of many hypocrite, pseudo-knowers, self-appointed owners of all the knowledge ( which they are willing to sell to anyone who can afford the price and, most of all, obey without questioning. ), for centuries, since the medieval times. Very little as changed in it (academia) since then, but discussion lists like Dogme surely are a bless in our so-called global village.

People in academia tend to think more of themselves than of the students they are supposed to be \*helping\* (not measuring, testing,etc.), their own titles and personal carrers become the sole purpose of their work. Yes, there is plenty of exceptions to that.

Of course, that is NOT to dismiss some excellent work that eventually would emerge from the academic world. Freire, Krashen, Chomsky, Vygostky, just to name a few, (who have become more of buzz words, which are fashionable to be quoted, however out of context and/or lack of knowledge) have made their valuable contributions to human kind AND are recognized by the academia. ;-)

In my school, one of the best credentials for any candidate to a instructor position is exactly NOT having any(degrees, diplomas, doctorates, phd's and the like).

I'd expect people in our profession to be a little more open-minded, more willing to break rules and adapt, create, instigate creation, and ultimately

achieve that which should be the main goal of any instructor:

To become unnecessary.

We need instructors ( I reject the word "teacher" ) who are themselves successful self-learners, who will be able to pass on to their apprentices the same enthusiasm, the same passion, if you will, they themselves have about learning, discovering, deducing, (making synapsyses?...), and why not, creating themselves their own learning/instructing style.

\*\*\* asks:" We each take from and contribute to this list what is useful to us and what we may feel of use to other list members? What's wrong with that? "

Absolutely nothing. I wholeheartedly agree and have never meant anything to the contrary.

\*\*\*

P.S. - I do NOT mean to start any kind of flame war. My comments are to be regarded as simply that.

## Post 505

My reaction to theoretical writing about TEFL troubles me. ( See my recent posting on Widdowson. ) I wonder if my suspiciousness is just an idiosyncrasy or whether others share my unease.

What I react to, perhaps, is that theory is so often written by people in a different club, they may be ex-teachers, but they are rarely practising teachers. And because they are playing to different rules - and they must also satisfy their academic colleagues reading over their shoulder - it is not rarely that you have to fight their style to wrest meaning from it.

I have to admit I do expect enlightenment from theory. While I certainly have time for theory for theory's sake, just as I've got time for poetry or philosophy, when I'm wearing my TEFL hat I expect a payoff, at least indirectly - I want to understand something about language or learning or social interaction in the classroom a touch better after reading the work in hand than I did beforehand.

But once I tacitly accept the need to read books of theory, something else kicks in. Panic. How can I ever possibly read enough to really understand, to come to an informed, balanced opinion? Isn't it safer for my own peace of mind to fall back on reference to practical teaching experience and intuition, to relax into being "just" a teacher and forget academia?

I've just finished a book that \*\*\* mentioned some time ago on this list, *The Social Turn in Second Language Acquisition* by David Block. As far as I can judge it is a rather impressive book, most of it devoted to a painstaking examination of what is really meant by three key terms - second, language, and acquisition!

He has fascinating things to say about all three, but my panic sets in is because to do so he has consulted (he lists them in his references) about 500 key articles and books. And much of it is very complicated stuff. It requires a clear head and a lot of thinking and re-reading to follow.

It's not surprising that few teachers write theory. How can they have the time to read and understand it let alone write it?As David Block explains of his own case, " This book is the product of a decade of reading and thinking about second languages acquisition."

And I'm still trying not to forget what Kumaravadivelu means by intuitive heuristics...

How do you cope?

## Post 506

Hi \*\*\*,

You said that "the literature is frequently too dense for more newly qualified teachers." I'm not sure what you mean by "the literature" but I'd like to say that there is probably just as much quality information, if not more, in teacher blogs as there is in the literature, and that teachers, newly qualified and otherwise, can learn a great deal by reading one another's blogs, by commenting on them, and by linking and cross linking to them.

Blog participation offers some possibilities that lists cannot accommodate. One of these is an the ability of blog participation focus on what is important to each of us. No matter how narrowly defined a list is, it must still be broadly focused or it will not attract enough traffic to survive. Lists also naturally favor active people over "lurkers" and so more passive learners are left reading mostly about what instrests others.

For example, some months ago someone here posted about complexity theory. He has a special interest in this and has a lot about it on his blog. I was interested in this too and posted about it here but no one was very interested in this. I could have pursued



this by commenting on his blog, linking his to mine and writing on mine. I could have and made myself a node on the complexity theory network. This did not occur to me at the time because I did not understand how Blogs could support this type of learning. I saw Blogs as "public diaries" mostly out there to promote someone's book, professional work. I did not like to comment on Blogs because I saw them as someone else's property.

Blogs can also be a way to produce public reading of the dense literature you refer to, making what is useful in it more accessible and helping to identify what is not worth bothering with.

One way that training courses can start to make better use of blog resources is by asking students to create blogs (call them ePortfolios if you want) ostensibly to document their own work through a complex series of courses. If students are also required to read and comment on each other's blogs, some, if not most, would also begin to see how their learning is becoming focused on the connections they make and on the dialogues they are creating. Rather than talk about social learning as theory, they would begin to practice it, and learn about it by practicing it. Perhaps this would be a Dogme approach.

\*\*\*

\*\*\* wrote:

Thanks for your links \*\*\*. I'd just like to echo what \*\*\* says. There's such a great variety of stuff out there and it's been such a pleasure perusing the blogs of the various people who adorn this list. People are so generous with their time too, and really make the effort to engage with each other. It closes the

gap!

When I started my blog a few months ago I really wasn't sure where it would lead, and I certainly didn't feel particularly 'qualified' to write one in the first place, but the interactive process of writing, receiving comments, reciprocating with other people's blogs etc has really raised my game.

It's a shame that training courses don't tend to make more of blogs as a resource. One is encouraged to read widely after finishing the course, but literature is frequently too dense for more newly qualified teachers. \*\*\* wrote recently about trainee diaries on CELTA courses. Perhaps doing it in real blog form would have the added benefit of encouraging trainees to begin to engage with quality Internet resources from the start.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

## Post 507

Is Dogme a method? No, not in the sense that it prescribes a closed set of procedures that derive from a specific theory of learning and/or of language, as in the audio-lingual method or the Silent Way or task-based language teaching, say.

Dogme may be part of what Kumaravadivelu (in the latest TESOL Quarterly, and mentioned in an earlier posting) calls the postmethod condition, of which he writes:

"One way of conceptualizing a postmethod pedagogy is to look at it three-dimensionally as a pedagogy of particularity, practicality, and possibility. As a pedagogy of particularity, postmethod pedagogy rejects the advocacy of a predetermined set of generic principles and procedures aimed at realizing a predetermined set of generic aims and objectives. Instead it seeks to facilitate the advancement of a context-sensitive, location-specific pedagogy that is based on a true understanding of local linguistic, sociocultural, and political particularities. As a pedagogy of practicality, postmethod pedagogy rejects the artificial dichotomy between theorists who have been assigned the role of producers of knowledge and teachers who have been assigned the role of consumers of knowledge. Instead, it seeks

to rupture such a reified role relationship by enabling and encouraging teachers to theorize from their practice and practice what they theorize. As a pedagogy of possibility, postmethod pedagogy rejects the narrow view of language education that confines itself to the linguistic functional elements that obtain inside the classroom. Instead, it seeks to branch out to tap the sociopolitical consciousness that participants bring with them to the classroom so that it can also function as a catalyst for a continual quest for identity formation and social transformation". (pp 544-555)

One way that teachers can operationalise these (fairly lofty) principles, including "theorizing from their practice", is by "exploring which of the resources learners bring with them can be profitably exploited for learning, teaching, and research purposes, including learners' sociocultural and linguistic knowledge". This strikes me as a fairly basic dogme tenet. As does the notion of social (as opposed to academic) autonomy, related to "learners' ability to function effectively as cooperative members of a classroom community". K. sees the development of academic, social, and what he calls "liberatory" autonomy as fundamental to his three-P platform.

Because coursebooks are laden with excess methodological baggage, including a narrow focus on linguistic competence, and because they are general rather than particular in terms of their reach, and because they foster dependence rather than autonomy, whether academic or social or "liberatory", they don't fit easily into a "postmethod pedagogy". But that does not mean that for some learners in some contexts they might not be suitable or, at least, the lesser of two evils. Dogme, after all, is not anti-coursebook, which would be tantamount to being anti-method. Dogme is simply, post-coursebook, post-method.

\*\*\*

## Post 508

When I first began my teaching career in the late 1960's, methodologists believed that the audiolingual approach was a scientific application to language teaching of the North American Structuralist theory of language and Skinner's behaviouristic account of learning. Nowadays, we use the generative account of second language acquisition to advance the argument that language is more learnable than teachable and that naturalistic communicative practice amongst learners is more effective than teacher-led instruction.

Increasingly, I wonder whether such rationalizations blind us to the much more challenging fact that we constantly seek to repress: that our methodology is principally driven by our attitude to uncertainty. Looked at from this perspective, audiolingualism and its sickly offspring, PPP, are clearly attempts to reduce the uncertainty associated with language learning by ensuring that as much as possible is controlled by the teacher. As a practice-based method, audiolingualism provides a perfect illustration of the harnessing of technology to the uncertainties associated with the human behaviour of language learning.

By way of contrast, recognizing the role of affect in language learning requires a good deal of tolerance of uncertainty and ambiguity.

Earlier this year, I heard Alan Maley giving a talk on the role of repetition in the language learning. In this talk, focus on sameness was distinguished from focus on variation, fossilized repetition from instancial or original repetition, mechanical repetition from context shaping or integrated repetition, repetition of form from repetition of function or meaning, recognition of repetition from production of repetition, explicit or exact repetition from implicit or indirect repetition, institutional repetition from intimate or personal repetition.

As Alan talked his way through this list, I noticed how the first item in each pair was motivated much more strongly by uncertainty avoidance than the second. Thus, if students repeat the form the teacher has used, the teacher can check that they are performing the task assigned. Since they are likely to do this relatively successfully, the teacher's anxiety about their performance is reduced. But if the teacher invites repetition of meaning, the form of the original stimulus will be altered in the repetition and the teacher will then have to deal with the resulting ambiguity. It follows that repetition of meaning will normally be favoured by teachers with weak anxiety avoidance needs and a greater willingness to tolerate ambiguity.

So far I have referred to the concept of uncertainty avoidance in an entirely non-technical way. In Hofstede's classic study of 116,000 informants, the extent to which societies adapt to uncertainty was identified as one of "the four main dimensions along which dominant value systems can be ordered and which affect human thinking, organizations and institutions in predictable ways" (1980:11).

Although the future is equally uncertain for every human being, the extent to which individuals and cultures take steps to try to resolve the ambiguities, which surround them, vary considerably. For some individuals and societies, living with uncertainty is relatively easy and provokes little anxiety, for others impossibly difficult and strongly anxiety provoking. It is unrealistic to suppose that methodology, curriculum design, and classroom management will be immune from the level of uncertainty avoidance prevalent in the wider society. Indeed, as suggested earlier, the very rationalizations on which we suppose our methodology to be based will have been selected precisely because they reflect our culture's degree of uncertainty avoidance.

In our culture's present schizophrenic state, there seem to be two contemporary methodology stances, one reflecting a weak anxiety avoidance psycho typology. We might call the former Learnability methodology and the latter Teachability methodology.

Learnability, or L-methodology is essentially post-methodic and accepts the mentalistic view that language is more learnable than teachable. It is the learner's own in-built syllabus, as Corder (1978) termed it, which determines the route of acquisition. The best approaches will be the most natural, and teacher intervention will be minimized.

Teachability, or T-methodology relies on descriptive linguistics to provide a syllabus in the form of a pedagogic grammar which is conveyed through instruction. Unlike L-methodologists, T-methodologists believe that language is more teachable than learnable -

after all, it is the job of the teacher to determine the boundaries of the subject. This delimited 'subject' will be regarded as the knowledge to be conveyed to the learner.

Because L-methodology leaves more to the learner, it is intrinsically less anxiety driven than T-methodology in which the teacher appropriates the primary responsibility for ensuring learning. This is why T-methodology focuses on paradigms, both formal and functional, and L-methodology on contextualized language. In focusing on paradigms, T-methodology attempts to eliminate the natural indeterminacy of language. In contrast, L-methodology acknowledges the intrinsic indeterminacy of language which is necessary if we are to achieve the economy that allows us to use the same form in many different contexts to mean many different things.

I think there's good reason to believe that most language teaching methods (and learner styles come to that) are directed more to anxiety avoidance than to successful second language teaching and learning. As a result many syllabuses are unrealistically goal directed and much classroom language teaching is conservative and ineffective. In particular, collective anxiety causes teachers to favour methods that allow them to retain control over input, output and learner behaviour generally. The underlying methodology is teachability oriented.

## Post 509

\*\*\*,

My reading of the situation is that there were never claims about the newness of the dogme position. What has always been emphasised and described are ways of reducing the emphasis on the use of textbooks and photocopies and recorded materials.

That's one way of trying to characterize what people on the dogme list write about.

To quote the declaration from the dogme homepage once more:

"We are a mix of teachers, trainers and writers working in a wide range of contexts, who are committed to a belief that language learning is both socially motivated and socially constructed, and to this end we are seeking alternatives to models of instruction that are mediated primarily through materials and whose objective is the delivery of "grammar mc nuggets". We are looking for ways of exploiting the learning opportunities offered by the raw material of the classroom, that is the language that emerges from the needs, interests, concerns and desires of the people in the room".

(It isn't surprising that there is no mention here of examinations).

I also see it as a list where a number of dedicated individuals are prepared to open their classroom doors and let us know what goes on in there. And they are also keen to discuss the rationale of what they are doing in ways that can include theoretical considerations, discussion of new ideas and goes well beyond: "Any tips for teaching the Present Perfect?"

\*\*\*

## Post 510

Hello All,

I have been glad to read this list for a while. It is good to hear so many provocative/interesting ideas thrown out for discussion.

My last post was needlessly brief and cryptic 'cause Real Life was calling. I apologize. Perhaps I will go back and try to clarify, but the "assessing teachers" thread seems to have died...

So I'm trying to filter through all this and arrive at some conclusions.

I agree with someone who quotes \*\*\* as saying that \*most\* learners are not equipped to learn solo. I disagree that motivation is the key missing ingredient. There is just a huge amount of Stuff To Know, and independently re-discovering the wheel, though of course possible, is just irredeemably ineffective. I suspect it is naive to hope that learners can sort through all the huge piles of stuff they \*can\* learn and pick out what they \*need\* to learn for each given context. [I originally put some examples here, but then deleted them as being lengthy and probably covering very-familiar ground.]

I am a little surprised at the hard-core statements I see from time to time. For example: yes, many textbooks are pablum, just useless cr\*p thrown together by business suits cynically cashing in on an eager market. The word "exploitative," which I do not lightly or reflexively use, might even have some place in that description. However, it's difficult -- very difficult -- for me to justify extrapolating from that statement out to a hard-core position which holds that textbooks simply should not be found/used in an Ideal Classroom. With apologies all around, I think that if you strike the word "ideal" and replace it with "idiosyncratic," then you've hit something closer to the truth. The reason I say this is closely related to the above paragraph: good textbooks are convenient distillations of \*useful\* knowledge about the English language, about discourse conventions, etc. etc. They

are convenient to the point of being indispensable, in my opinion.

I am not, however, irredeemably lost. :-) I see much value in a dogmatic approach. However, my position is that a dogme-style approach cannot stand alone. I would not argue aloud with a dogme-adherent who said the converse is also true: that a non-dogmatic approach also cannot stand alone. However, I would desire more than a little justification before I'd be willing to commit to that position.

My ideal classroom would have two formats, perhaps on alternating days (?). Format A would, though hopefully at least somewhat communicative, lie somewhere closer to the evil drill-and-grill end of the spectrum. It would incorporate worksheets, textbooks, and many other things non-dogme. Format B would be something much closer to dogme. However, it would be a bit more restrained than the Strong Version of dogme (which, if I as a newcomer may speculate, seems to be anchored by Diarmuid.. is that a fair statement? If not, then I retract it.) Format B would be \*much\* more communicative and learner-driven.

My key point is this: I think dogme complements rather than replaces a more controlled and top-down paradigm.

Thank you for the excellent discussions.

=====  
Best regards,  
\*\*\*

## Post 511

\*\*\*,

I can't speak for the ramifications for dogme, I'm afraid. I lurk (mostly) on this list to provide a counterpoint to some received and accepted wisdom which is not always as it should be. Whether you take Postman's words out of context or not, the fact is he still said these things and I find his attitude to humanity demeaning and degrading. I really cannot understand why he's come from nowhere to such currency amongst the tech-sceptics.... To me it beggars belief. I prefer my 'heros' to have some empathy with humans, some understanding of their frailty and not to make sweeping statements. The fact he made them ten years ago is perhaps excusable - the fact that some people give credence to these views a decade down the line is, frankly,

untenable.

\*\*\*

-----Original Message-----

From: dogme@yahoogroups.com [mailto:dogme@yahoogroups.com] On Behalf Of

\*\*\*

To: dogme@yahoogroups.com

Subject: Re: [dogme] re: laptops again

Remember I'm taking Postman's words out of context. Also, great minds can be wrong about things, can't they? I do think Postman had a lot to say that is still relevant. I do appreciate your respect for teachers and the work we do. I believe, based on what I know of Postman (possibly not much) that he treasured human beings and education.

What are the ramifications for dogme?

\*\*\*

On Feb 17, 2010, at 2:47 PM, \*\*\* wrote:

> \*\*\*,

>

> My problem with Postman is that there is a seething agenda in there,

> and

> anyone who can say something as spectacularly obtuse and

> wholeheartedly

> wrong as " School teachers, for example, will, in the long run,

> probably be

> made obsolete by television" really should be taken with a pinch of

> salt...

> If he really believed that, then I find his credibility shaky...

>

> Similarly, the quote you have below: "When we begin relying on the

> Internet

> for all of our news and information we will turn into a nation of

> zombies."

> strikes me less as a criticism of technology and more as a comment

> from

> someone who really has no faith in human beings at all, or their

> capacity to

> discern (rather like when a posting on this list said that

> technology was

> alright for the person posting, but not for the poor average teacher

> who

> would find it all so terribly confusing - if we truly believe these

> points

> of view we are not uncovering flaws or dangers with technologies, but

> intrinsic problems with human beings. Totally different thing.

>



> \*\*\*

## Post 512

Hello All

Having lurked for almost a year, I thought I may as well do so a little longer after \*\*\*'s call fro new recruits to present themselves. I've been following this list since IATEFL in Brighton when the Fantastic Four (\*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\*, \*\*\*) were either carried out of he room on our shoulders, or tarred and feathered according to different impressions given on the this list having presented the Dogme idea. It was pone of those "click" moments for me - when someone else puts into words exactly what you would have liked to express, even though you didn't know that you wanted to express it (is this perhaps what we want to give to our students.

I teach in a school in the business district of Paris. We teach a lot of 1-2-1 plus groups of unemployed learners. The scope for Dogme moments is wide and perhaps only limited by the fact that our timetables are decided sometimes the day before, sometimes the hour, and that there is little sequence as to when each teacher has a class (a student can have up to six teachers over a thirty hour course). I think perhaps that we focus too much on the evil of the coursebook on the list as at our place, lots of lessons are taught without coursebook, but this does mean we are concentrating on the resources of the learner, teachers go in with a topic or a structure they want to talk about, and they talk about it. Previously I taught in Cambridge where there was much more scope for Dogme moments.

What I've particularly appreciated about this list, apart from the succour it gives from the pain of isolation on your ideas, is the variety of voices in the postings. They are always interesting and always stimulating.

Two things I reacted to recently, but typically then didn't post, are \*\*\*'s ideas on vocabulary lists, and the discussion of product or service and whether we are happy with it. I think it is important that we engineer moments where vocabulary that has come out of the teacher-learner interaction and that the learner has thought useful is revisited. Yes, people will only truly learn things when they are ready to, and they will suddenly notice a word or phrase all around them that they hadn't noticed before (this is a weekly occurrence for me here in France), but when they only have thirty hours of English, I feel that if they are going to be optimised, then there is a case for artificial re-exposure to the vocabulary.

Tom Topham says ...and if we don't have customers who want our product, we all lose our jobs. This is not a dirty or evil thing, it's just the way the world works. Just because it is the the way the

world works doesn't preclude it from being dirty or evil.

Wow, that's a great feeling after ten months.

\*\*\*

## Post 513

\*\*\*:

Your response is a good example of why computer interaction is no substitute for face-to-face (or vice versa, as I'll get to in a moment), and why I must give my wholehearted support to \*\*\*'s half-hearted suggestion that the next venue for a dogme conference be in this hemisphere and not t'other. Actually, my remarks on Vivian Cook and Van Lier were meant as a response to \*\*\*'s piece on the computer room. I really agree with what you said about the c-room. But I think email really is a deceptive medium. It appears to be interactive and context-embedded. In fact it is neither. That's why most email programs include "quote" functions, and most people, humble self not included, use them to provide context. Without the quote function, it is very hard to see which contribution, or which bit of which contribution, is being responded to.

The length and depth of the contributions on this list, as well as the numerous misunderstandings and misconstruals, are testimony to the context-independent character of email. It's really written discourse, although people treat it as if it were chatting on the telephone and legally it still has the status of faxes and phone calls.

It seems to me that what is essential to dogme is not the physical medium (dogme teachers have always been partial to writing things down, from "boarding" to dictogloss). What is essential to interaction is the opportunity to interact in real time. Only in chatting rooms does that happen through email.

Today I had a good face-to-face lunchtime chat with a professor of testing who complained that there was no good model for performance assessment. On the back of a napkin, we developed one with three axes which Scott will easily recognize: fluency, complexity, and accuracy, which we replaced with comprehensibility. We then proposed the following very rough and ready measures for them, which could be applied to almost any extended discourse sample. Fluency equals total number of turns. Complexity equals average number of words per AS unit (this is really very similar to a C-unit, but slightly better defined). Comprehensibility equals total number of comprehensible turns divided by total number of turns. For transparency and objectivity, what we grade is NOT a tape, but a written transcript. Why a written transcript? Because our model has no standard for pronunciation beyond comprehensibility. In other words, we are treating speech as writing on air. The two dimensions of complexity and fluency are just the width and the length of the

transcript on the page. The comprehensibility is the amount of ink on it, minus the amount of (...inaudible...) and (...incomprehensible...) and (...????).

After all, we test written compositions without looking at handwriting. Why not test oral composition without paying attention to pronunciation?

As with most performance assessment, I'm not really sure what this test is measuring (despite the nonchalant use of "equals" in the formulae above). In a speech contest, though, I bet the result would be pretty close to "writing email ability".

Now, I really suspect this is NOT the same as oral interactive ability, and therein lies the flaw of my model. But where exactly?

\*\*\*

## Post 514

I feel a strong grandfatherly urge to gather every one in the dogme family around a table laden with food and wine and remind them of what they have in common - but having an urge is not the same as being able to perform. (Stop giggling in the back row).

What I haven't experienced on any other list, and I've been involved with more than a few, is so many people prepared so often to argue out in public what they do in the privacy of their individual classrooms, and what they ponder and puzzle over late at night, early in the morning, when they can't sleep or when they have had a lousy lesson.

It seems to me that all the regular contributors on this list are jointly trying to worry out their current but ever emerging and changing (I'm not going to say uncovering...) understanding of what could be involved in educating and learning and facilitating these processes - if processes they are - for their different learners in a range of varied situations. They have a subject in German called Didaktik, which isn't methodology and isn't pedagogy. It was once explained to me as "The theory of theory" but I'm afraid that just awakened the Pooh in me - I just didn't understand. I'm not at all sure that I can sort out my theory from my methodology from my pedagogy from my didactics from my principles and practises, but I'd rather try to do so in this forum than any other I know.

I would add to what \*\*\*, I think it was, just said about \*\*\*. Although he, at times, theorises way up in the stratosphere (this is my individual reader response) he also makes one constantly aware of real learners with real student teachers.

The bottom line for me - and my tendency is to favour reflective theory rather than reject it - is that I'm only interested in the theory if at some level or other it enriches learners' learning through their teachers' practices.

\*\*\*

--

\*\*\*

## Post 515

\*\*\* wrote:

> I have just joined this group - I've  
> delved into a few postings, and I'm a little perplexed, as it  
seems > that 'dogme' is seen as a methodology ...yet I can't fathom what  
the > methodology IS. Is it possible for someone to explain to me in  
simple > terms so I can get more of a feeling? Or should I just hang around  
and > see what comes up?!

I would hang around, \*\*\*. One thing I think you will discover is that dogme (which began life as a metaphor) is not a methodology. Nor a method (if method is taken to be a set of instructional procedures recommended by some "expert"). What has happened is that, over three years or so, a loose affiliation of (not entirely) like-minded practitioners have engaged with this metaphor, to the extent that it has coalesced into a set of largely implicit, loosely held, beliefs. Once, a couple of years back and for the purposes of an article, I tried to gather together these beliefs and put them into words. Here they are, for what they're worth. I think they still hold up - but feedback would be welcome. (I don't think they have appeared on this list in this form before):

The dogme "beliefs" (the scare quotes are intentional; key words are highlighted)

Materials-mediated teaching is the "scenic" route to learning, but the direct route is located in the \*interaction\* between teachers and learners, and between the learners themselves.

The content most likely to engage learners and to trigger learning processes is that which is already there, supplied by the "people in the room."

Learning is a \*social\* and \*dialogic\* process, where knowledge is co-constructed rather than "transmitted" or "imported" from teacher/coursebook to learner.

Learning can be mediated through \*talk\*, especially talk that is shaped and supported (i.e. scaffolded) by the teacher.

Rather than being acquired, language (including grammar) emerges: it is an \*organic\* process that occurs given the right conditions.

The teacher's primary function is to establish the kind of

classroom dynamic which is conducive to a dialogic and emergent pedagogy, where learners want to talk and where they also want to listen.

Providing space for the learner's \*voice\* means accepting that the learner's beliefs, knowledge, experiences, concerns and desires are valid content in the language classroom.

Freeing the classroom from third-party, imported materials empowers both teachers and learners.

Texts, when used, should have \*relevance\* for the learner, in both their learning and using contexts.

Teachers and learners need to unpack the ideological baggage associated with EFL materials to become \*critical\* users of such texts.

(Laid out like this, you can see that dogme is just another avatar of "transformative" teaching.)

\*\*\*

## Post 516

Many thanks for this contribution \*\*\*. I always marvel on this list at the generosity of the contributors.

\*\*\*