

# **Within-Self Diversity: Implications for ELT Materials Design**

Dr. Stephanie Houghton  
University of Kitakyushu, Japan  
houghton@kitakyu-u.ac.jp, steph\_houghton@hotmail.com

## **Abstract**

Houghton (2008a) suggests that the identification of within-self diversity is a key mechanism through which intercultural communicative competence can be developed in the mono-lingual, mono-cultural foreign language classroom. Having provided an overview of a study (Houghton, 2007) in which value differences between Japanese students were exposed through reflection (Schwartz 1995, 1997), key findings will be highlighted. Firstly, students may reflect on their own experience and undergo conceptual and value shift in response to challenge by other students. Secondly, identifying diversity within the student group may bring student within-self diversity to the surface in the form of discrepancy between their own ideal values, actual values, stated values, target values and behaviours. Internal conflict between these components creates within-self diversity, and conflicts arising from it may be resolved over time in different ways. The implications of these findings for ELT materials design will be considered and illustrated. A sample of teaching materials used in the original study will be presented and ways will be suggested in which they could be adapted in the light of the findings. Specifically, teaching materials designed to help students reflect on their values should encourage students to focus on their ideal values, actual values, stated values, target values and behaviours separately, and to identify discrepancies between them through critical evaluation (Byram 1997, 2008). It is hoped that this will help students take control of their own development in response to others over time, making self-development sustainable and fostering respect for difference in the process.

## **1. Introduction**

Houghton (2008a) suggests that the identification of within-self diversity is a key mechanism through which intercultural communicative competence can be developed in the mono-lingual, mono-cultural foreign language classroom. The author writes from the standpoint of a participant on the government-funded Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) Program in the years 1993-1996 who went on to teach English at the university level in Japan from 2000 to 2009. During these 12 years, despite the concerted effort made by the Japanese government to diversify its citizens since 1987, virtually all the English language classes taught by the author have been mono-lingual, mono-cultural

classes of Japanese students. Under such circumstances, when the teacher is the only foreigner and the students share the same language and culture, how can student classroom experience of diversity be enhanced? Both Parekh (2000: 3-4) and Wood (2003: 88-96) consider the multiplicity of meanings of the term 'diversity' in its modern sense. Three meanings identified by the former include sub-cultural, perspectival and communal diversity, and three identified by the latter include categorisation, representation and ideology. Contained within Parekh's notion of sub-cultural diversity lies the notion that diversity is a process through which sub-groups attempt to diversify shared culture from within, which seems to lend itself to education when conceived of as a process. Houghton (2008a) argues that it is possible to diversify the shared culture of students from within by drawing upon stereotype research.

Increasing the perception of within-group diversity can in turn diminish the perceiver's ability to make sweeping generalizations about the group, thereby undermining one of the hallmarks of stereotyping.

Hamilton and Uhles (2000: 469)

In short, highlighting the existence of within-group diversity of out-groups is one way of undermining stereotypes. By extension, highlighting the existence of in-group diversity may also diminish the perceiver's ability to make sweeping generalizations about groups more generally. In this paper, I will start by presenting an overview of a study (Houghton 2007) in which value differences between Japanese students were exposed through reflection, highlighting key findings to illustrate the concept of within-self diversity. The implications for ELT materials design will be considered and illustrated, a sample of teaching materials used in the original study will be presented and ways will be suggested in which they could be adapted in the light of the findings.

## **2. Research Design**

Qualitative data were gathered an action research case study carried out over a nine-month period from thirty-six Japanese student participants (in three different classes) and the author as a British teacher-researcher who had lived in Japan for about

twelve years at the time the study was conducted. Data collection techniques included pre-course questionnaires then used as a basis for individual interviews, audio-recording of classes, gathering of student work as forms of documentary data, post-class teacher diary, post-class interactive student diary in which students emailed diary entries to the teacher and discussed them freely by email thereafter, mid-course and post-course group interviews in English with the researcher, and mid-course and post-course group interviews in Japanese with a Japanese research assistant. Ethical issues were duly considered (Cohen et al 2000: 50-64; Creswell 2003: 62-65; McDonough and McDonough 1997: 68).

### **3. Syllabus Design**

Referring to McDonough and Shaw's (1993: 5) framework for planning a language programme, an intercultural language course was designed. The view of identity taken was that socialisation leads to the development of the self, and self-concept forms the knowledge-base for social interaction (Nishida, 1999). Lantolf (1999: 31) argues that people tend to be unaware of how far their self-concept is influenced by the shared cognitive resources of a community, which implies the need for consciousness-raising and for this reason, a conceptual framework was provided within which to raise student cultural presuppositions to the surface (Lantolf 1999: 31-32; Endicott et al 2003; Byram 1989: 107-108, 112-119; Fantini 1995). Developing student ability to accept both value and language difference were aims of this course (Bennett 1993: 47-51) but the main focus was on values, the concept of which was broken down into more detail to set up enough conceptual categories to reveal value difference between students using Schwartz et al's (1995, 1997) taxonomy of ten universal value types. The values were introduced to students and various tasks were designed to promote student self-reflection.

Having identified the values built into short dialogues, students were asked to reflect on their values and discuss them with reference to new topics to expand the conceptual framework prior to homework activities in which students had to write a series of four paragraphs reflectively describing their values with a view to presenting them to other students in the form of a speech. Students also made a value chart ranking

the relative strength of their ten values on a scale from minus 5 to plus 5. At this point, within-group diversity became clear enough to represent both graphically and numerically such that both teacher and students could identify value difference between specific and readily identifiable students at a glance. Having identified areas of value difference between students by juxtaposing their individual value charts, I paired students up by value difference and asked them to focus their attention on that difference before imagining a potential problem that might be caused by the value difference and writing a short dialogue to illustrate it. A third student was then placed into some pairs to mediate conflict prior to reflecting upon the activities in follow-up essays. In this way, actual within-group diversity was not only activated but students were asked to respond to it.

#### **4. Within-self diversity**

As the course progressed and data were collected, value differences between students were revealed and various dynamics came into play as tasks were carried out. Data will be presented below to illustrate how the concept of within-self-diversity emerged over time. In sum, as a student comes to terms with value difference through reflective analysis of experience, the within-group diversity may emerge as discrepancy between one's own values comes to the surface as differences and conflicts arise and are resolved over time.

In data set 1-4 below, it can be seen that by week 2, student A7 has identified a value difference between herself and another student in relation to power. Although student A7 claimed that she did not value power, the fact that she wanted to become a teacher caused her to wonder whether she did value in fact power, if she hoped to gain a position of power in the future. By week 25, student A7 had established not only that she valued power but also that she valued a particular aspect of it (i.e. leadership), contrasting herself with another student on this point. This data series exemplifies a student who clarified her values and concepts over time in response to value difference. Further, she discovered within-self diversity as parts of her self came into inner conflict in weeks 2-10. Identifying within-group diversity thus brought within-self diversity to the surface as differences and conflicts were resolved over time.

**Data 1:**

Student A7: Student Diary: Week 2

I found that one of my friends is very power type person and **I am a kind of achievement type.** I think I want to be the power type, because that personality is strong and has power to everything. I don't have such a strong nature and such a responsibility, so maybe I am the achievement type. I have one question for you. Which do you think about your ambition type? *I think your job, to teach people, is some kind of work that needs power. I want to be a teacher in the future, so do I need to be power type??*

**Data 2:**

Student A7: Speech on Values: Week 6

I don't value Power well. I like to lead people, though I don't have such a confidence. Certain leader needs as such confidence, so I cannot be a leader. I just do my best for myself.

**Data 3:**

Student A7: Student Diary: Week 10

I ask you again that I am confusing whether I should include my HOPE in the values or not.

**Data 4:**

Student A7: Speech on Summer Assignment: Week 24

**Considering power, we have different idea about it. Student A9 doesn't value so much though I do.** The one of our differences between us is that **I think it is important to have a leadership.** The common point is that we both think it is not necessary to seek for wealth or high position in social status.

By relating this to Roger's (1951) description of self-structure presented below, we can say that a configuration of student A7's perceptions of herself was becoming admissible to her awareness changing in the process. Rogers (1951) suggests that the self-structure is composed of various elements including the perceptions of one's

characteristics, and goals and ideals. Student A7's description of her own characteristics (highlighted in bold in data 1 above) clearly conflicts with her ideals (underlined in data 1 above). The conflict results in the posing of a question to the teacher (italicised in data 1 above) and the resulting confusion continues over a number of weeks finally resolving itself in week 24 when student A7 admits she does value power, described as a characteristic rather than as an ideal or a goal (highlighted in bold in data 4 above) but the concept of power has been linked to leadership and dissociated from wealth, high position and social status indicating that the meaning of the value itself has been clarified.

The self-structure is an organized configuration of perceptions of the self which are admissible to awareness. It is composed of such elements as the perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities; the percepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and to the environment; the value qualities which are perceived as associated with experiences and objects; and the goals and ideals which are perceived as having positive or negative valence. It is, then, the organized picture, existing in awareness either in figure or ground, of the self and the self in relationship, together with the positive or negative values which are associated with those qualities and relationships, as they are perceived as existing in the past, present and future.

Rogers (1951: 501).

Having provided an illustrative example of how within-self diversity may emerge as elements of the self come into conflict in response to interaction with a different other, let us note that a wide range of possible elements exist (beyond the personal characteristics and hopes/ideals highlighted in data set 1-4 above). Indeed, Houghton (2007) found that students who familiarised themselves with Schwartz's (1995, 1997) taxonomy of values before breaking their value and concept system down into component parts through self-analysis seemed to find that their values comprised the following key elements, each of which, as concepts in of themselves, could each be broken down into smaller conceptual parts:

1. stated values (i.e. what students said they valued)
2. values evident in their behaviour (i.e. the values students inferred from their behavioural patterns)
3. real values (i.e. what students actually valued regardless of what they claimed they valued)
4. ideal values (i.e. what students thought they should value)
5. target values (i.e. what students claimed they wanted to value in the future)

Further, Houghton (2007) found that since all the various components and sub-components of the system as a whole may conflict when considered together, and can be evaluated separately and differently, students may be noticing discrepancies and internal inconsistencies within their own systems that can generate change as students select, reject or reprioritise values, concepts and their sub-components. This process may be impacted upon by others through interaction at different stages of the interactive processes, which can take place at the unconscious or conscious level. Time is another important dimension insofar as students may be considering past, present or future selves during the process of self-analysis, perhaps reorienting themselves to the future in the process. The relevance of time is also highlighted by Rogers (1951) above. Next, the implications of these findings for ELT materials design will be considered and illustrated.

## **5. Implications for ELT materials design**

Following some reflections upon the implications for syllabus design, a sample of teaching materials used in the original study (Houghton, 2007) will be presented and ways will be suggested in which they could be adapted in the light of the findings. The view of identity taken in syllabus design was that socialisation leads to the development of the self, the cognitive component of which is known as self-concept, which refers to the information a person stores in schemata in memory about their own attributes, which form the knowledge-base for social interaction. This phrasing suggests that the self exists as a single rather unified whole but a better way of conceptualising identity in the light of the findings described above may be as a set of components that carry the potential to conflict with each other. Nishida (1999) does in fact suggest that self-concept may

contain both current and possible selves, which implies a time-related dynamic may come into play. Also, Houghton (2008b) noted that the view of identity shaping syllabus design in Houghton (2007) was conceived of in largely individual terms and may have worked quite well in materials design since the teacher was working alone. However, Houghton (2008b) suggested that a more emergent, interactional view of identity needed to be taken in class such as Collier and Thomas' (1988) view of culture as an emergent phenomenon evident in human discourse as facets of identity are advanced during interaction.

But whilst there may be some merit to sometimes viewing culture in terms of people presenting themselves differently depending upon situational variables, the issue lying at the heart of paper is how language teachers should work with the potentially conflicting set of components, dynamic over time, that collectively constitute the various selves of their students. A highly differentiated and dynamic view of the self is thus called for that will neither allow language teachers or students to talk of 'their identity' in the singular or materials designers to entitle a textbook "Identity" (Shaules, Tsujioka and Iida, 2004). Whilst it is true that the concept of values was broken down in this course into ten sub-categories using Schwartz et al's (1995, 1997) taxonomy of ten universal value types, which takes a somewhat differentiated view of values, presenting values in this way rested upon the assumption that students would be able to say what they valued after a period of reflection, which falls into category 1 below meaning that categories 2-5 below had not been anticipated in materials design in the original Houghton (2007) study.

1. stated values (i.e. what students said they valued)
2. values evident in their behaviour (i.e. the values students inferred from their behavioural patterns)
3. real values (i.e. what students actually valued regardless of what they claimed they valued)
4. ideal values (i.e. what students thought they should value)
5. target values (i.e. what students claimed they wanted to value in the future)

Next let us move onto materials design to see what the category 1 teaching materials looked like considering ways of adapting them by also taking categories 2-4



into consideration. In task 1.1 students had been given the following definition of culture from Lustig and Koester (1999: 30) that distinguished values, beliefs and norms, and were asked to discuss it with their group. Culture was defined as “a learned set of shared interpretations about beliefs, values and norms, which affect the behaviours of a relatively large number of people”. After more detailed definitions of beliefs, values and norms had been presented, students were given a range of simple tasks to help them recognise and distinguish the three components, promoting self-reflection along the way. Tasks 1.4 and 1.5 illustrating values and norms are presented below by way of example.

**Task 1.4: What are values?**

Read the paragraph about values and number the items below from clean (1) to dirty (5.) Compare your answers with your group.

Values involve what a culture regards as good or bad, right or wrong, fair or unfair, just or unjust, beautiful or ugly, clean or dirty, valuable or worthless, appropriate or inappropriate, and kind or cruel. Values differ from culture to culture. Some things can be deeply valued in one culture but not so strongly in another. Some things positively valued in one culture may be negatively valued in another.

Adapted from Intercultural Competence  
by Lustig, M. and Koester, J. (1999)

**Clean and Dirty**

1. (...) Letting a cat sleep on your bed
2. (...) Taking a bath in water someone else has used
3. (...) Wearing shoes indoors
4. (...) Lying on your bed with your shoes on
5. (...) Wearing plastic slippers hundreds of other people have used
6. (...) Letting your dog live indoors
7. (...) Drying your hands with the same towel used for drying dishes

### **Task 1.5**

What are norms?

Read the paragraph and identify the Japanese norms from the list below. Compare your answers with your group.

Norms are the surface characteristics of culture and are based on beliefs and values. Norms are ways of behaving and communicating, so they can easily be observed. People are expected to do or say certain things in certain situations and if a person does not do or say these things, they may be criticised. As a result, people from all cultures come to believe that their cultural norms are `right` and sometimes that the norms of other cultures are `wrong`. There is a strong connection between beliefs, values and norms.

Adapted from Intercultural Competence by  
Lustig, M. and Koester, J. (1999)

#### **Japanese norms?**

1. (...) Ladies wear veils to cover their faces in public
2. (...) High school students spend up to twenty hours a week on club activities
3. (...) Neighbours weed the local area together on some Sunday mornings
4. (...) 18-25 year olds go to the pub and go dancing every Friday night
5. (...) High school students often take a year-off before going to university
6. (...) People change jobs and homes regularly
7. (...) People seek lifetime employment from their employer

If we relate the definition of culture presented in task 1.1 with the definition of values presented in task 1.4 above, we can see that the two main emphases lie upon the identification of shared patterns of valuing with a cultural group and the fact that the same phenomenon may be valued either positively or negatively by each group. Thus, because of the focus on culture and shared patterns of valuing, no attention was paid in the definition of values to intra-individual elements, which implies the need for (at least) a dual focus in materials design upon (a) shared cultural patterns, and (b) intra-individual elements within any given group. The same thing can be said of task 1.5 but in addition, the definition of norms given did in fact highlight behavioural norms as surface elements

of culture, which implies in turn that something lies beneath and this was in fact clearly identified in the definition as comprising both beliefs and values. This implies in turn that norms can be based on values and conversely that values can reveal themselves through norms. Whilst the strong connection between beliefs, values and norms was highlighted in the definition, it was ignored in materials design and deserves more attention in future.

Let us move on to consider the week 2 materials. Week 2 materials took the two values of power and achievement as their theme, whereas materials for weeks 3-5 considered the remaining values. In general, the structure of the week 2 materials remained the same for weeks 3-5, so the week 2 materials can be considered representative of the set as a whole. In sum, to illustrate how values shape interaction in hidden ways, I drew upon my own schemata to write short dialogues containing hidden values for students to discover having learned the value definitions. To this end, I selected and used the following unifying concepts to link two or three of Schwartz's values to related ideas, arranged around central themes to set up different value underpinnings in each dialogue and open up entry points into learner schemata:

Week 2: Ambition

Week 3: Voluntary Work

Week 4: Summer Holidays

Week 5: Free Time

Having identified the values in each dialogue, students were then asked to reflect on their own values, discussing them with reference to new topics that further expanded the conceptual framework. This would increasingly activate schemata prior to homework activities in which students had to write a series of four paragraphs reflectively describing their values with direct reference to Schwartz's value types, which they would present to other students in the form of a speech in weeks 6-8. Week 2 materials are presented below by way of example.

### Task 2.1: Ambitions

Answer the questions. Then, read the two dialogues with your partner and fill in the table below.

1. Are you ambitious?
  - a. If so, what are your ambitions and why?
  - b. If not, why not?

#### Dialogue: Stephen and Laura

Laura: Are you ambitious, Stephen?

Stephen: No, not really. I have everything I need; a nice job, a home and a lovely girlfriend. We're planning to get married. I wouldn't change anything for the world. How about you?

Laura: Well, I want to be a politician. I'm not power-hungry but if you really want to bring about social change, you have to be in a position to make decisions that really count. I'd like to be an M.P. by the time I'm thirty!

Stephen: That sounds like a lot of hard work but I know what you mean. I have to make lots of decisions as captain of the football team, which is a big responsibility. Sometimes we win, sometimes we lose but the other players seem to respect me and I like that.

	Stephen	Laura	Tom	Alison
Is s/he ambitious?				
What are his/her ambitions and why?				
If not, why not?				

### **Task 2.2: Who values power and achievement?**

Read the paragraph about power and achievement and then read the two dialogues. What does each person value? Circle one or both of the values and give a reason for your answer.

People who value power care about social status and prestige. They like to have control over other people or resources and value wealth and authority. People who value achievement care demonstrating their competence according to social standards. They want to be capable and influential. Personal success is very important to them, so they tend to be ambitious (adapted from Schwartz et al: 1997.)

2. Laura values power/achievement because ...
3. Tom values power/achievement because ...
4. Stephen values power/achievement because ...
5. Alison values power/achievement because ...

### **Task 2.3: Power and achievement in your life**

Are power and achievement important to you? Choose one of the options in brackets and complete the sentences below. Compare your answers with your group.

1. I (would/would not) like to have a job with high social status because ...
2. Money is (not/quite/very/extremely) important to me because ...
3. I (do/do not) enjoy being in a position of authority because ...
4. Winning games is (not/quite/very/extremely) important to me because ...
5. Passing exams is (not/quite/very/extremely) important to me because ...
6. I (never/sometimes/always) try to influence people around me because...

### **Week 2: Homework: Task 1**

Write a paragraph (5-10 sentences) about power and achievement in your life.

In tasks 2.1 and 2.2 presented above, it can be seen that priority is placed upon identifying the values hiding behind language when the value is not expressed explicitly. In this sense, the approach is not attempting to work within any of the 5 categories below, except that there is an underlying assumption that hidden values can be inferred from language and expressed more clearly. Insofar as the materials are aiming at a clear statement of underlying values, albeit from the students on behalf of the fictional characters in the dialogue, the tasks are oriented towards category 1 below.

1. stated values (i.e. what students said they valued)
2. values evident in their behaviour (i.e. the values students inferred from their behavioural patterns)
3. real values (i.e. what students actually valued regardless of what they claimed they valued)
4. ideal values (i.e. what students thought they should value)
5. target values (i.e. what students claimed they wanted to value in the future)

But in the dialogue presented in task 2.2 above, were any of the other categories represented by chance? Stephen claims that he is not ambitious because he has everything he needs including a nice job, a home and a lovely girlfriend, and that they are planning to get married. Since he claims to value those three things, his statement falls into category 1. Laura claims that she wants to be a politician to bring about social change and that she would like to be a member of Parliament (an MP) by the age of the thirty. Since she claims to value those two things, her statement falls into category 1 and whilst wanting to achieve something by a future age may seem like a target value, it is not because the value exists in the present and target value is a new value that differs somewhat from the present values. However, when Stephen talks about being captain of the football team, he notes that he likes the fact that other players respect him whether they win or lose and this alludes to observations made upon a pattern of events and tendency to react in a certain way.

This points us towards category 2 above insofar as Stephen recognises that the behavioural norms of his subordinate team members tends to triggers him to value a

certain way, although Stephen is not commenting upon any of his own behavioural norms, perhaps expressed through language for example, that may be rooted in this value. The question thus arises as to how stated values, values evident in behaviour, real values, ideal values and target values should best be represented in dialogues. On the one hand, if the goal is to define and illustrate Schwartz' ten value types and to remain true to the theory, perhaps it is best to focus on stated values at least in the early stages. Alternatively, the other types of values could be hidden in the dialogues in the early stages and students could be led through task design to discover the stated values earlier in the course and the others later spiralling syllabus design in the process, implying in turn that different tasks can be set for different levels and that later levels can be built upon earlier ones introducing complexity to the course as a whole. Or, the other types of values could be hidden in the dialogues in the early stages and students could be led to discover them all through task design. Clearly, decisions made about this will then impact upon the design of task 2.3 which could be left as it is and supplemented later or amended to bring the various types of values into play straight away.

In task 2.3 above, it can be seen that priority is placed (by chance) upon what students think they would or not like to have (i.e. stated values), what is important to them (i.e. stated values), what they (tend to) enjoy being (i.e. values evident in their behaviour) and what they (tend to) try to do (values evident in their behaviour). It is likely that the author intuitively knew at the materials design that values can be inferred from behavioural patterns, which would explain why the latter two types are of that nature. Clearly, the various types of values could be represented at this stage (perhaps two examples of each making a total of eight questions). This would help students develop the habit of looking for the different kinds of values even if attention is not explicitly drawn to them in the early stages of the course. Alternatively, when students are asked to write a homework paragraph, the five categories of values could be laid out clearly for students consider bringing together the various threads running through the unit into the final task in each unit impacting in turn upon the speeches students make about all ten values in weeks 6-8. Some tasks are presented below by way of example where it can be seen that as students made their speeches on values, listeners were asked

to compare and contrast their own values with those of speaker, judging and justifying with reasons as they performed critical evaluation as recommended by Byram (1997, 2008).

### **Task 6.1**

#### Critical Evaluation

Listen to each speaker. Identify key points about their values. Identify which of Schwartz's value types they are referring to. State your value type. Are your value types similar or different? (Circle similar or different.) Judge the speaker on each point. (Circle positive or negative.) Give a reason to justify your judgment. (A table was then given for students to complete that has not been presented here by reason of complexity).

### **Task 6.2**

#### Questions

After each speech, ask the speaker questions to find out more information and develop your notes.

Here, we can see that the series of tasks that promoted student reflection upon their values has been combined with instruction on how to perform critical evaluation of self and other, bringing the values of the listener into play and increasing the complexity in the process. In fact, even though only stated values had been dealt with systematically in the original study, Houghton (2007) found that the complexity of values complicated the listening task itself as illustrated in the data below. Failure to do gather enough information meant that students could not complete the task because they could not remember the content of the speeches later (see data D30 below).

#### **Data A20: Student A9: Week 6 Student Diary**

I have been very busy in this class. I have to listen to the speech of others and take a note. And guess their values. This is little stressful for me, but it is very important to listen other people's idea.



### Data D30: Student A8: Week 15 Homework

When I missed to hear and note other's presentation, to recall them was so difficult and more, it was serious, because I had to compare and judge them later. I thought I could not say anything when I don't grasp it, because my statement may make someone uncomfortable and give misunderstandings, especially in this case, about values.

The question arising from this discussion is how different learning objectives should be prioritised at different stages of the course. By weeks 6-8, students were expected to have grasped the idea of values and the different forms they could take and were moving on to a more advanced task that involved comparing and contrasting self and other. Despite the fact that the complexity of values was complicating this task, the central issue remains not whether or not to change the task because of this complexity but to address the original conceptualisation of values that appears to have been incomplete. For insight into how learning objectives should be sequenced, we can turn to Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) who recommend the following taxonomy of learning objectives for learning, teaching and assessing (based on the work of Benjamin Bloom). The cognitive process and knowledge dimensions are presented below in tables 1 and 2 respectively.

**Table 1. The Cognitive Process Dimension.**

<b>The Cognitive Process Dimension</b>					
1. Remember	2. Understand	3. Apply	4. Analyse	5. Evaluate	6. Create
Retrieve relevant knowledge from long-term memory	Construct meaning from instructional messages, including oral, written and graphic communication	Carry out or use a procedure in a given situation	Break material into constituent parts and determine how parts relate to one another and to an overall structure or purpose	Make judgments based on criteria	Put together elements to form a coherent or functional whole; reorganise elements into a new pattern or structure

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognise</li> <li>• Recall</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpret</li> <li>• Exemplify</li> <li>• Classify</li> <li>• Summarise</li> <li>• Infer</li> <li>• Compare</li> <li>• Explain</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Execute</li> <li>• Implement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Differentiate</li> <li>• Organise</li> <li>• Attribute</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Check</li> <li>• Critique</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generate</li> <li>• Plan</li> <li>• Produce</li> </ul>
---	--	--	--	---	---

Considering the knowledge dimension of Anderson and Krathwohl's (2001) taxonomy presented in table 2 above, it can be seen that the definition and classification of values falls most clearly into the category of conceptual knowledge in the form of classifications and categories as basic interrelated elements within a larger structure that function together. Similarly, knowing how to do the cognitive moves of critical evaluation can be considered a kind of procedural knowledge.

**Table 2. The Knowledge Dimension.**

<b>The Knowledge Dimension</b>		
<b>A: Factual Knowledge</b>	The basic elements students must know to be acquainted with a discipline or solve problems in it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of terminology</li> <li>• Knowledge of specific details or elements</li> </ul>
<b>B: Conceptual Knowledge</b>	The interrelationships among the basic elements within a larger structure that enable them to function together	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of classifications and categories</li> <li>• Knowledge of principles and generalisations</li> <li>• Knowledge of theories ,models and structures</li> </ul>
<b>C: Procedural Knowledge</b>	How to do something, methods of inquiry, and criteria for using skills, algorithms, techniques and methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of subject-specific skills and algorithms</li> <li>• Knowledge of subject-specific techniques and methods</li> <li>• Knowledge of criteria for determining when to use appropriate procedures</li> </ul>
<b>D: Meta- cognitive Knowledge</b>	Knowledge of cognition in general as well as awareness and knowledge of one's own cognition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic knowledge</li> <li>• Knowledge about cognitive tasks, including appropriate contextual and conditional knowledge</li> <li>• Self-knowledge</li> </ul>

Thus, the various aspects of tasks can be categorised and sequenced using Anderson and Krathwohl's taxonomy when the two dimensions are presented together in table 3 below, which suggests various ways of combining different aspects of the tasks at different stages of the course, and the development of conceptual knowledge precedes later tasks. The question remains however as to whether to include a more complex definition as a new starting point within a spiral syllabus that revisits and develops earlier teaching points.

**Table 3. The Cognitive and Knowledge Dimensions of Task Flow**

The Knowledge Dimension	The Cognitive Process Dimension					
	1. Remember	2. Understand	3. Apply	4. Analyse	5. Evaluate	6. Create
<b>A: Factual Knowledge</b>		Listening to the content of a speech (e.g. inferring/ classifying values)				
<b>B: Conceptual Knowledge</b>	Recognising/ recalling the taxonomy of values and their definitions		Note-taking on a structured handout			
<b>C: Procedural Knowledge</b>				Critical evaluation		Negotiate/ Mediate value difference
<b>D: Meta-cognitive Knowledge</b>						

Now let us move on to weeks 9-12 in which students went onto negotiate and mediate value difference. In week 5, when students wrote an essay on all ten values, they also made a value chart ranking the relative strength of their ten values on a scale from minus 5 to plus 5. At this point, within-group diversity became clear enough to represent both graphically and numerically such that both teacher and students could identify value difference between specific and readily identifiable students at a glance. Having identified areas of value difference between students by juxtaposing their individual

value charts, I paired students up by value difference and asked them to focus their attention on that difference before imagining a potential problem that might be caused by the value difference and writing a short dialogue to illustrate it. A third student was then placed into some pairs to mediate conflict prior to reflecting upon the activities in follow-up essays. In this way, actual within-group diversity was not only activated but students were asked to respond to it. The negotiation and mediation of value difference lie at the highest level of cognitive learning in this sequence of tasks and clearly depend upon the success of prior stages, but without further research, it is not possible to tell how these tasks would have been affected by more complex definition of values early on in the course.

## **6. Conclusions**

Let us start by recapping some different ways of viewing identity. The initial view of identity taken by Houghton (2007) in syllabus design was that socialisation leads to the development of the self-concept but rather than viewing the self as a single rather unified whole, it also needs to be considered as a set of components that carry the potential to conflict with each other. Whilst there may be some merit to sometimes viewing culture in terms of people presenting themselves differently depending upon situational variables, the key issue is how language teachers should work with the potentially conflicting set of components, dynamic over time, that collectively constitute the various selves of their students. A highly differentiated and dynamic view of the self is thus called for that takes into account not only stated values but also values evident in behaviour, real values, ideal values and target values.

Next, let us recap some different ways of viewing culture. The initial view of identity taken by Houghton (2007) in materials design emphasised the identification of shared patterns of valuing with a cultural group and the fact that the same phenomenon may be valued either positively or negatively by each group. Thus, because of the focus on culture and shared patterns of valuing, no attention was paid in the definition of values to intra-individual elements, which implies the need for (at least) a dual focus in materials

design upon (a) shared cultural patterns, and (b) intra-individual elements within any given group. The strong connection between beliefs, values and norms was highlighted in the task 1.1 definition was ignored in materials design by Houghton (2007) but needs to be unravelled more carefully in future.

In tasks 2.1 and 2.2, priority was placed upon identifying the values hiding behind language when the value is not expressed explicitly. In this sense, Houghton's original approach (2007) simply assumed that hidden values could be inferred from language and expressed more clearly, and thus aimed to elicit only stated values. The dialogues illustrating values could be developed to represent not only stated values but also values evident in behaviour, real values, ideal values and target values whether the tasks draw student attention to them in the same lesson or later in the course within a spiral syllabus that treats values at different levels of definition and classification. Later tasks will clearly be affected accordingly.

In task 2.3, it was seen that in the original study, Houghton (2007) happened to prioritise what students thought they would or not like to have (i.e. stated values), what was important to them (i.e. stated values), what they (tended to) enjoy being (i.e. values evident in their behaviour) and what they (tended to) try to do (values evident in their behaviour). It was suggested in this paper that not only stated values but also values evident in behaviour, real values, ideal values and target values the various types of values could be represented at this stage (perhaps two examples of each making a total of eight questions). This would help students develop the habit of looking for the different kinds of values even if attention is not explicitly drawn to them in the early stages of the course. Alternatively, when students are asked to write a homework paragraph, the five categories of values could be laid out clearly for students consider bringing together the various threads running through the unit into the final task in each unit impacting in turn upon the speeches students make about all ten values later in the course, although without further research it is unclear how this task would be affected.

Also important is the fact that the definition and classification of values precedes the later tasks of critical evaluation, value negotiation and mediation lying at a lower cognitive level in the cognitive process dimension of learning objectives, according to Anderson and Krathwohl (2001). The question remains as to how best to handle values in all their complexity at all levels of the learning process described in this paper, especially since the complexity of values itself seemed to complicate the later tasks. The question arises as to whether to define and classify the values in all their complexity early in the course or whether to include a more complex definition as a new starting point within a spiral syllabus that revisits and develops earlier definitions and classifications. Whilst both options are possible, let us remember Anderson and Krathwohl's definitions of analysis, evaluation and creation presented in table 1 above:

1. Analysis: Break material into constituent parts and determine how parts relate to one another and to an overall structure or purpose
2. Evaluation: Make judgments based on criteria
3. Creation: Put together elements to form a coherent or functional whole; reorganise elements into a new pattern or structure

The identification of discrepancy between value elements probably takes place in the analysis stage as information is broken into constituent parts that are then related and found not to make sense when considered together sparking development of the idea in creative ways that can also result in self-development, which clearly took place on many occasions throughout Houghton's original (2007) study. An example of this was provided in data set 1-4 above. In sum, then, the conclusion of this paper is that the teaching materials presented above as examples of similar teaching materials in the course need to be developed to help students reflect not only on their stated values but also their ideal values, actual values, stated values, target values and behaviours, and to identify discrepancies between their own values and those of others through critical evaluation as recommended by Byram (1997, 2008). In this way, it is hoped that this will help students take control of their own development in response to others over time, making self-development sustainable and fostering respect for difference in the process.

## References

- Anderson, L.W. & Krathwohl, D. (2001). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Bennett, M. (1993). Towards Ethnorelativism: A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. In *Education for the Intercultural Experience*, ed. R.M. Paige, Yarmouth, Me: Intercultural Press.
- Byram, M. (1989). *Cultural Studies in Foreign Language Education*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. (2008). *From Foreign Language Education to Education for Intercultural Citizenship: Essays and Reflections*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K., (2000). *Research Methods in Education*. London, New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Collier, M. and Thomas, M. (1988). Identity in Intercultural Competence: An Interpretive Perspective. In Y. Kim and W. Gudykunst (eds.), *Theories of Intercultural Communication. International and Intercultural Communication Annual XII*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. pp. 99-120.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Method Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage Publications.
- Endicott, L., Bock, T. and Narvaez, D. (2003). Moral Reasoning, Intercultural Development and Multicultural Experiences: Relations and Cognitive Underpinnings. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 27 (4), pp 403-419.
- Fantini, A. (1995). Introduction – Language, Culture and Worldview: Exploring the Nexus. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 19, pp143- 153.
- Hamilton, D.L. and Uhles A.N. (2000). Stereotypes. *Encyclopedia of Psychology* 1, pp466.
- Houghton, S. (2007). *Managing the Evaluation of Difference in Foreign Language Education: A Complex Case Study in a Tertiary Level Context in Japan*. Ph.D. thesis, The University of Durham.

- Houghton, S. (2008a). Enhancing Diversity in the Mono-lingual, Mono-cultural Foreign Language Classroom: A Case Study in Japan. *The International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations* 8 (4).
- Houghton, S. (2008b). Teacher and Student Identities at Play in the ELT Classroom. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*. Fortune Institute of Technology, Taiwan.
- Lantolf, J. (1999). Second Culture Acquisition: Cognitive Considerations. In *Culture in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, ed. E. Hinkel. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp 28-47.
- Lustig, M. and Koester, J. (1999). *Intercultural Competence: Interpersonal Communication Across Cultures*. New York: Longman.
- McDonough, J. and Shaw, C., (1993). *Materials and Methods in ELT: A Teacher's Guide*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- McDonough, J. and McDonough, S. (1997). *Research Methods for English Language Teachers*. London: Arnold.
- Nishida, H. (1999). A Cognitive Approach to Intercultural Communication based on Schema Theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 23 (5), pp 753-777.
- Parekh, B. (2000). *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Rogers, C. (1951). *Client-Centred Therapy*. Constable.
- Schwartz, S. and Sagiv, L. (1995). Identifying Culture-Specifics in the Content and Structure of Values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 26 (1), pp 92-116.
- Schwartz, S., Verkasalo, M., Antonovsky, A. and Sagiv, L. (1997). Value Priorities and Social Desirability: Much Substance, Some Style. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 36, pp 3-18.
- Shaules, J. Tsujioka H. and Iida, M. (2004). *Identity*. Oxford University Press.
- Wood, P. (2003). *Diversity: The Invention of a Concept*. San Francisco, California: Encounter Books.