AC 2007-2210: PRACTICAL ENGLISH: TEACHING TECHNICAL COMMUNICATION ABROAD BASED ON A PREEXISTING TECHNICAL WRITING COURSE IN MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY'S BAGLEY COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Alexis Powe, Mississippi State University

Alexis D. Powe is a technical writing instructor for the Mississippi State University Bagley College of Engineering's Shackouls Technical Communication Program. She received her B.A. in English from Mississippi State University in 2002, graduating summa cum laude with a minor in history, and her M.A. in English from Louisiana State University in 2004. She is a member of the American Society for Engineering Education and the Modern Language Association. Address: P.O. Box 9544, Mississippi State, MS 39762-9544; telephone: (+1) 662.325.4240; e-mail: apowe@engr.msstate.edu.

Practical English: Teaching Technical Communication Abroad Based on a Preexisting Technical Writing Course in Mississippi State University's Bagley College of Engineering

Abstract

This paper describes a technical communication course offered at Kyungpook National University (KNU) in Daegu, Korea, during the summer of 2006. I, an American technical writing instructor employed by Mississippi State University's Bagley College of Engineering, taught the course, Practical English. This course was modified from an existing technical writing course required of all engineering and computer science undergraduates at Mississippi State University (MSU).

This article's purpose is twofold. Its first purpose is to describe my personal experience and encourage other engineering educators to pursue similar experiences. While teaching abroad intimidates some, including me initially, modifying an existing course makes the idea much more attainable for the average educator. The paper's second purpose is to describe the course itself in detail, thereby giving other educators considering teaching abroad ideas for modifying their own courses. A brief description of the course upon which Practical English was modeled, MSU's GE 3513 (technical writing), is also provided.

Topics discussed include my descriptions of teaching and living in Daegu, Korea; a brief description of GE 3513; a detailed description of Practical English, including the course objectives and schedule; major course assignments in Practical English and modifications to these assignments; grammatical challenges faced and grading standards used; students' expectations of the course; and quantitative and qualitative student assessment of the course.

Keywords: technical writing, Practical English, international students, teaching abroad, Korea

I. Introduction

In fall 2005, an associate dean in MSU's Bagley College of Engineering circulated a call for engineering educators to spend the summer teaching in the Republic of Korea (South Korea). I submitted my curriculum vitae and proposed course syllabus to Kyungpook National University's Office of International Affairs, doubtful that a technical-writing course would be welcomed by KNU's engineering program. Instead, the course was well received by KNU's Department of English Language and Literature. By June 2006, I was teaching and living abroad—only my second time ever to travel overseas and my first time to travel internationally alone.

Teaching and living abroad, even if only for one summer, was one of my most professionally challenging and personally rewarding experiences. Not only has the experience expanded my teaching repertoire, but it has also informed and improved my interactions with and pedagogical approaches to my colleagues and students, respectively—both internationals and natives—since I returned home. And my experience is hardly unique.

The benefits of living and teaching abroad, both to educators and students, have been well documented. Educators frequently report that teaching abroad positively informs the way they react to students at home and abroad.[1, 2, 3] Learning to adapt their pedagogical approaches to differing student needs—sometimes radically different—makes educators increasingly able to adapt to their students after returning home.[1] Navigating a foreign setting and culture also lends educators increased sensitivity to their international students and colleagues back home.[4] For engineering educators in higher education, sensitivity to international students and colleagues becomes more important every year. According to the Institute of International Education's October 2005 Open Doors survey, current enrollment of international students in American higher-education institutions is estimated at 564,766, with the top four nationalities of these students being Indian, Chinese, Korean, and Japanese.[5] Higher-education institutions responding to the survey reported increasing international student enrollment, especially among Chinese and Korean students.[6]

Study-abroad opportunities offer students skills and global awareness that they could not obtain otherwise, giving these students a unique perspective not necessarily shared by their classmates. Cornell University reports that, for American students, "[e]nrollment in a university abroad often entails a great deal of independent study, which requires a level of interaction different than that required by the guided instruction to which students may become accustomed [….] Many students abroad engage in traditional classroom study for their course work, perhaps in combination with field study and experiential learning. Increasing numbers of students use study abroad as a part of pre-professional education and select a program that includes an internship."[3] With these kinds of benefits, no wonder increasing numbers of students are choosing to study abroad. The Open Doors survey reports that U.S. students studying abroad numbered 205,983 in 2006, double that of 1998.[5]

The demand for native-English-speaking educators abroad is also growing. English "has become the language that provides access to higher education and job opportunities, and has become almost exclusively the language of diplomatic discussion and business negotiation."[7] Many educators are hesitant to work abroad for fear of a language barrier,[2] but often a bigger obstacle is lack of adaptability.[8] According to Badley, teaching international students at home and teaching abroad are closely related; both require developing global competence. According to Badley, "[t]eaching [in general] has to be seen as context-related, uncertain and continuously improvable with a central function of recognizing different ways of encouraging different students to learn using different sequences of material and learning tasks."[8] Therefore, "[i]t is the requirement that we must respect diversity in our teaching which takes on an especially crucial significance when we are abroad since there we have to become even more sensitive not only to our own, but also to our students', inevitable otherness."[8]

Those eager to teach abroad but unsure of how to approach such an endeavor should consider modifying an existing course for the purposes of teaching abroad. Such was the approach of almost all of the educators involved in the visiting-scholar program at KNU in the summer of 2006. Eight educators (aged 25 to 70) who spoke English natively or extremely fluently converged at KNU from higher-education institutions in Canada, the United States, France, and the Netherlands to offer eight separate courses in computer science, business ethics, chemical

literature review, introduction to psychology, international marketing, meteorology, philosophy, and technical communication ("Practical English").

Practical English was based on a preexisting, junior-level technical writing course required of all engineering and computer science undergraduates at Mississippi State University, an American partner university of KNU. Practical English was a three-hour course (like GE 3513) that met from June 26 to July 21 from 12-3 p.m. on weekdays except Tuesdays. (Each educator received one free weekday.)

Topics discussed include my descriptions of living and teaching in Daegu, Korea; a brief description of GE 3513; a detailed description of Practical English, including the course objectives and schedule; major course assignments in Practical English and modifications to these assignments; grammatical challenges faced and grading standards used; students' expectations of the course; and quantitative and qualitative student assessment of the course.

II. Teaching and living in Korea

To encourage educators to work abroad, I recount my personal experiences with teaching and living in Korea in this section. In summary, I found the Korean culture beautiful and its people overwhelmingly hospitable. Though North Korea test-fired seven ballistic missiles during my stint abroad, which was disconcerting for my family back home, the South Koreans always remained relaxed and welcoming.

Office accommodations: Each visiting scholar was provided office accommodations by his or her sponsoring department, so accommodations varied drastically. I was given a temporary office in the department's library, along with a computer with Internet access. I used a printer and copier in the departmental main office. Each visiting scholar was also given a temporary access permit to KNU's state-of-the-art library.

Classroom accommodations: My classroom, and most that I saw on campus, had chalkboards, individual wooden desks, presentation screens, and slideware capabilities, the latter of which were controlled through an electronic podium. Most visiting scholars described similar classroom accommodations, although the computer science educator had a fully "wired" classroom. Only one of my classroom activities—showing video documentaries of ethics-related engineering disasters—required reserving an A/V classroom through the department, which the departmental secretary easily handled. In lieu of a textbook, the KNU library copy center bound course handouts into a booklet, which students purchased for the equivalent of about $8 US. (KNU professors traditionally do not require summer students to purchase textbooks because courses last only one month.)

Language: Other than a few terms I learned in the optional language classes offered to visiting scholars, I spoke no Hangul (Korea's national language). Fortunately for me, generally KNU students begin learning English at young ages and speak it well; in 1997, South Korea's government initiated English instruction in public elementary schools.[9] Most of my students (some of whom had studied in English-speaking countries previously) spoke English well enough for me to understand them easily, and students in return reported ease in understanding

me once they adjusted to my accent. (The reader may wonder if my accent was difficult for my students, but it apparently was not. However, one of the visiting educators had a Scottish accent, to which the KNU students had difficulty adjusting.) In the Department of English Language and Literature, I had no difficulties in communicating with faculty and staff. At KNU, professors are encouraged to complete their doctorates in English-speaking countries and are given incentives to teach classes in English, so many of them speak English fluently.

Student attitudes and work ethic: According to KNU's Office of International Affairs, KNU students are typically expected to study abroad in a native-English-speaking higher-education institution before graduation. Thus, many of my students used my class to prepare themselves for upcoming American graduate-school entrance examinations or approaching trips abroad.

Korean students' strong work ethics are culturally engrained. According to Lee and Carrasquillo, "[e]very Korean child learns from a very early age that education is the ultimate criterion for one's advancement in life. In fact it is their outright responsibility to their parents and to their family name that they perform at their best in all scholastic endeavors. Because of this belief many Korean students perform schoolwork energetically with resilience, tenacity, and a positive outlook," though Lee and Carrasquillo also caution of the negative impact such perfectionism can have on Korean students' psyches.[10] Grade concerns were evident among my students. Many considered a grade below an "A" unsatisfactory.

Regarding class environment, my students were quite talkative given the slightest encouragement, although some visiting scholars reported that their students were reticent. This tendency is perhaps due to the Confucian belief that "respect and absolute obedience to parents, elders, and teachers is the cardinal rule [….] Therefore, Korean students expect the teacher to control the classroom, and open-ended discussions or exploratory learning exercises are likely to be met with bewilderment."[10] My students reported that KNU professors traditionally employ a strictly lecture format where students sit quietly and take notes, but my students adjusted quickly to my pedagogical approach.

Population: Upon arrival, I did not experience culture shock but rather population shock. Starkville, MS, the site of Mississippi State University and my hometown, has community and university populations of approximately 22,000[11] and 16,000[12], respectively; Daegu's population is approximately 2.5 million,[13] and KNU's current enrollment is approximately 24,000.[14]

Transportation and travel: I and the other visiting scholars utilized Daegu's extensive and cheap public transportation systems (taxis, buses, and trains) to explore the city and country. To navigate around town, each visiting scholar was given a card with his or her dormitory address written in English and Korean to show to taxi drivers. We were also given detailed maps of the campus and city. We were free to travel anywhere we chose, but for convenience, KNU's Office of International Affairs arranged several day trips for the instructors, which included touring a nearby LG Electronics, Inc. manufacturing facility and visiting the ancient Korean capital city of Gyeongju. Four instructors, including myself, took a train to Seoul for a bus tour of the restricted demilitarized zone between North and South Korea, which we arranged using a travel agency on the KNU campus.

Living accommodations: All visiting scholars lived in campus dormitories for the month. I shared a three-person suite with two female educators on an otherwise vacant floor. The suite contained three small, separate bedrooms, each bedroom containing two twin beds, two closets, and two desks. We shared one toilet and shower, a living/kitchen area, and a washing machine (clothes were hung to dry). The kitchen area contained a table, chairs, and refrigerator (no microwave, oven, or dishwasher). Internet access was provided in each room, and the suite had a telephone for campus calls. We used an Internet service called Skype™ to telephone off campus and internationally. Air conditioning was provided; a television was not. (However, some professors had rooms with private bathrooms and showers, hot plates, and televisions. Two visiting scholars were a married couple who stayed in a suite together.) Each instructor was responsible for supplying bedding, towels, pillows, adaptors, personal toiletries, clothing and clothes hangers, and other personal effects. A small gym with minimal equipment (free weights, a treadmill, and a stair climber) was located in our dormitory basement, and another gym was on campus, along with various ball courts. The campus post office, a bank (for currency exchange), and an international ATM were within easy walking distance of the dormitories.

Food and shopping: I and the other visiting scholars often chose traditional Korean fare over "Americanized" food, the latter of which was plentiful. (For curious readers, Daegu is home to various pizza chains, McDonald's®, Subway®, Krispy Kreme Doughnuts®, Burger King®, Outback Steakhouse®, Bennigan's Grill & Tavern®, and more.) Visiting scholars typically lunched on campus at one of several cafeterias, which in my experience cost about $4 US per meal. Numerous restaurants were available just off campus; we relied on convenience stores for packaged groceries and street vendors for fresh fruit and vegetables. We also took advantage of various ethnic restaurants, such as Indian and Vietnamese. Shopping, as one may imagine, is plentiful: street vendors sold food, clothing, and home goods, and Daegu is home to several large outdoor markets.

Weather: I traveled to Korea during monsoon season, which meant light showers to heavy rain on most days. Otherwise, the weather was typical of the hot, humid weather Mississippi experiences in summer.

The remainder of the article describes GE 3513 (technical writing), Practical English's evolution from it, and student assessment of the course.

III. Description of GE 3513

GE 3513 is a traditional, three-hour university class spanning an average 16-week semester with a typical enrollment of 20-25 students per section. The following objectives are excerpted from my spring 2006 syllabus[15]:

> GE 3513 Technical Writing is designed to provide science and engineering students with instruction and practice in the technical communication process. The course focuses on the broad goals of recognizing specific writing and speaking situations and the objectives that arise out of them; analyzing audiences and suiting format, content, and tone to these audiences; designing documents and presentations that are structurally and mechanically effective; and writing and revising these documents to achieve clarity and correctness.

> Other major areas of emphasis include developing and using graphics and writing collaboratively as well as persuasively.

The above objectives are important to note because, while specific paper and presentation assignments change (sometimes dramatically) from semester to semester, the major emphases of GE 3513 remain steadfast. Practical English was based on the spring 2006 version of GE 3513, for which students were required to submit three major papers (an individually written technical description, an individually written journal article related to ethically problematic engineering disasters, and a collaboratively written group proposal, collectively worth 45 percent of the overall course grade), deliver three oral presentations based on the paper assignments (collectively worth 25 percent), write a final exam during the three-hour exam period (an individually written technical report based on a brief scenario distributed in class, worth 15 percent), and participate in numerous in-class writing- and discussion-based activities (collectively worth 10 percent). Students earned the remaining 5 percent of the course grade through service to the Bagley College of Engineering. Several articles describing the program in greater detail are available,[16, 17, 18] or one may visit the Shackouls Technical Communication Program's home page at http://www.engr.msstate.edu/current_students/technical_communications_program/.

IV. Practical English course objectives and schedule

Practical English initially resembled GE 3513 in both major emphases and intended student enrollment and makeup. It was designed for a section of 20-25 junior- to senior-level science and engineering majors. However, the course changed substantially to accommodate student interest in the course and departmental needs. At its beginning, the class had an enrollment of 50 sophomore- to senior-level students from various majors, about half of which were technical and half of which were non-technical.

Practical English, like GE 3513, was designed to expose primarily science and engineering majors to types of professional writing common to their fields. The course rationale was as follows[19]:

> The ability to communicate clearly and effectively is an invaluable life skill, as well as one of the biggest indicators of an individual's future success. Strong English writing and speaking skills will help students planning to study or work in the U.S. succeed in their courses and later in their professions. While this course alone cannot guarantee successful English communication skills (students must practice for the rest of their academic careers to graduate with those), it can at least set students on the road to developing them.

Practical English's objectives, like those of GE 3513, were "recognizing specific writing and speaking situations and the objectives that arise out of them; analyzing audiences and suiting format, content, and tone to these audiences; designing documents and presentations that are structurally and mechanically effective; and writing and revising these documents to achieve clarity and correctness."[19] Students were also exposed to basic principles of designing a document, developing and using graphics correctly, and collaborating effectively. In hindsight, these objectives were unrealistic for a four-week course, which is primarily due to my inexperience teaching summer classes (having taught only one summer course prior to teaching Practical English); however, the course was never intended to explore all of these subjects in

depth, but rather to expose students to the basic writing, speaking, and design skills needed to help them succeed in an American university or workplace. Also, I strove to ensure that KNU students received an authentic American class experience by keeping Practical English and GE 3513 as similar as possible.

Practical English assignments consisted of two major papers (collectively worth 45 percent of the overall course grade), including an individually written technical description and a collaboratively written journal article based on ethical disasters; one major oral presentation, which was a collaboratively delivered oral version of the previously mentioned group paper (15 percent); numerous in-class writing- and discussion-based activities (10 percent); a midterm exam consisting of an individually written business letter and accompanying memo (15 percent); and a final exam consisting of an individually written formal report based on a technical scenario provided in class during the three-hour exam time (15 percent).

The original course schedule is provided in Appendix A.

V. Modifications to Practical English assignments

The course content, however, was sometimes altered due to the large enrollment and to student or departmental needs. As stated earlier, though the course was intended for up to 25 students from technical majors, the course was sponsored by KNU's Department of English Language and Literature, and enrollment was open to all students due to tremendous student interest. Initial course enrollment was 50 students (25 of whom remained enrolled throughout the course's entirety). Approximately half came from science or engineering backgrounds (mechanical engineering; electrical, electronics, and computer engineering; biotechnology; chemistry; etc.), while the remaining students hailed from a variety of majors, including economics and trade, Chinese, French, English language and literature, English education, Russian, marketing, and political science. The 25 students who completed the course included eight students majoring in electrical, electronics, and computer engineering; four majoring in English language and literature; three majoring in management; two majoring in English education; two majoring in biotechnology; one majoring in chemistry; one majoring in applied chemistry (leaning toward a career in nutrition); one majoring in Chinese language and literature; one majoring in French language and literature; one majoring in political science; and one majoring in economics.

Based on the students' diverse majors, some course assignments were altered to accommodate students with non-technical backgrounds. Appendix B contains a table describing each major assignment in its original version (closely based on that used in GE 3513) and its revised version for Practical English. Discussion of the assignments and modifications made is provided in the remainder of this section.

The first paper assignment (an individually written description of a technical process, concept, or mechanism relevant to a student's field of study) was well suited for all majors, so the course assignment was unmodified from its original state except for length and time limit. These modifications allowed students to acclimate to a native English speaker, seemingly improved the

content and mechanics of the shortened assignment, shortened the grading time, and familiarized students with my grading system (a 10-point grading scale based on non-quantitative rubrics).

The second paper assignment was a collaboratively written argumentative article in which students were grouped according to major—or as closely as possible—and required to provide a minimum of six full, double-spaced pages conforming to the *Journal of Engineering Education*'s manuscript requirements[20] and a simplified version of IEEE style.[21] For paper 2, students analyzed the ethics and communication of engineers and managers involved in the *Challenger* accident and another ethically problematic disaster related to the group's major(s). The second paper assignment remained largely unmodified. However, instructional methods pertaining to paper 2 were modified to accommodate student needs. In GE 3513, I and the other instructors provide students reading packets on the *Challenger* shuttle disaster and show them video documentaries related to the *Challenger* before discussing the information in class. However, the documentaries were extremely ineffective in Practical English, largely because of interviewees' thick regional accents, brisk speaking pace, and use of slang and colloquial expressions. Students found verbal classroom discussion and visual graphics/diagrams representing the *Challenger* accident much more helpful than the videos.

The oral presentation assignment also remained unchanged; groups were given 10-12 minutes to deliver a persuasive presentation based on the topics, the positions they took, and the evidence they used in paper 2.

The midterm exam consisted of a technical correspondence exercise based on a scenario I provided in class (closely modified from an assignment in Mike Markel's *Technical Communication*).[22] The material was not overly technical to warrant a change of assignment. In the midterm, students individually wrote a letter and a memo regarding a faulty product, the letter being an adjustment letter sent to a retailer and the memo being an explanation of the situation and resulting adjustment to the students' fictitious supervisor. Students were asked to base their adjustment letters on ethical guidelines and codes of ethics analyzed in class in relation to paper 2.

The final exam was adjusted significantly; originally I planned to give Practical English students a fairly technical writing scenario from which they would individually write a technical report during the three-hour exam time. The same exam, when given to GE 3513 (technical writing) students, takes approximately 2-2.5 hours to complete in class. However, after reexamining the assignment, I instead provided Practical English students with the technical scenario and the completed report excluding the executive summary. Students were given three hours in which to read the scenario and report and fill in the executive summary for the report based on their understanding of the information. This modification was made to accommodate the students from non-technical backgrounds and to ensure students had sufficient time to write and proofread their exams. The modification proved beneficial because the KNU students devoted significant time (approximately 30-45 minutes) just to looking up the definitions of American colloquialisms and technical terms used in the scenario (even after I rewrote the scenario to eliminate many of these phrases).

Three major assignments used for the course—the two major papers and the presentation—are provided in Appendix C. Since the midterm and final exams used in Practical English are sometimes used in GE 3513 for testing purposes, the assignments are withheld here.

VI. Grammatical challenges faced and grading standards

As stated in the Practical English syllabus, "the course [was] not mechanics/grammar based but [focused] rather on the broad steps of analysis, development, and revision."[19] To clarify, students' written work was always marked for grammatical errors, though grammar factored into grades differently for each assignment. Students were graded for content and mechanics in paper 1, whereas paper 2 was graded for content, persuasiveness, and a group's ability to express its ideas clearly. In this way, Practical English departed from GE 3513, in which students' grades always reflect their documents' content, grammar, mechanics, and style.

Minimizing grammar instruction was always my intent for Practical English. Students taking Practical English (similarly to those taking GE 3513) were expected to enter the class with basic grammar and mechanics mastered; the purpose of this class was to teach students to apply previously learned writing and grammar skills to technical information. Students needing basic grammar instruction had various English-grammar classes available to them.

Brief grammar review was required, however, and students identified in a preliminary survey five specific grammatical/stylistic issues that they wished to discuss in class: appropriate use of the subjunctive mood, appropriate use of articles ("a," "an," and "the"), differences in meanings of English prepositions, appropriate formal expressions for American business writing, and the specific difference between "while" and "during." The grammar review also briefly covered topics such as techniques for improving flow in one's writing, parallelism, clichés and euphemisms, and offensive versus inoffensive language.

To give the reader a better understanding of the quality of written work submitted by Practical English students, Appendix D is a verbatim student submission of paper 1 (the individually written technical description).[23]

All major course assignments—including the two papers, the oral presentation, the midterm, and the final exam—were graded using traditional, non-quantitative rubrics, with which an instructor typically predetermines the criteria for an "A," a "B," and so forth and compares an assignment to the rubric to determine the overall grade. Since the rubrics used in Practical English were closely modified from rubrics currently used in GE 3513, the rubrics are withheld here. However, to give the reader an understanding of holistic rubrics in general, a sample GE 3513 rubric created strictly for explanatory purposes is included in Appendix E.[24]

Several articles describing the program and its grading standards in greater detail are available,[16, 17, 18] or one may visit the Shackouls Technical Communication Program's home page at http://www.engr.msstate.edu/current_students/technical_communications_program/.

Overall, Practical English students responded well to the course work and grading policies. Their initial expectations for the course and assessment of the course upon its completion are provided next.

VII. Students' initial expectations for the course

At course onset, students completed an introductory survey (which also served as one of two writing diagnostics) asking about their course expectations. The survey is shown in Appendix F. Students expressed clear desires for the course: the opportunity to converse with the instructor and their classmates in English; extensive opportunities to write in English; job/graduate school interview preparation (including typical interview questions and proper interview etiquette); preparation of resumes and cover letters; completion of job/graduate school application packets; preparation of written articles and statements of purpose for graduate school/professional school applications; exposure to a native English speaker; exposure to American colloquialisms and slang expressions; exposure to American culture and mannerisms; grammar/mechanics review; delivery of a formal presentation in English; observation of American teaching style; and preparation for the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL®), Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), and Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC®) exams.

VIII. Quantitative and qualitative course evaluation

Practical English students were asked to complete an anonymous quantitative survey based on a traditional 1-5 Likert scale at course completion. Of the 25 students who completed the course, 20 responded (five were absent for various reasons). The survey and results are shown in Appendix G.

In addition to completing a quantitative survey, students were asked to respond in written format to a qualitative survey, the results of which are more relevant to this paper and are summarized in the remainder of this section. (The questions and students' responses are provided in their entirety in Appendix H to show the various English proficiencies represented in the class. Students completed the questionnaire in class using only their electronic dictionaries to assist with word choice and spelling, leaving them no time to revise or seek outside help, so their responses can be considered "pure" writing samples.)

Responses varied to the first qualitative survey question asking students about their initial expectations for the course and whether it met them. Similarly to the beginning of the semester, they listed improving their speaking and writing skills, interacting with a native English speaker, acclimating to a "real American collegiate class," learning colloquial English, and communicating with classmates in English as their primary expectations for the course. While some enrolled in the course specifically to learn to write and speak in a professional or business setting, others were surprised by the technical nature of the course work. One wrote, "Actually, I expected to learn writing skills in general settings. But, this course was focused on professional writing. Anyway, I got to know a bit about formal writings in business setting, so I'm satisfied!!" Another stated, "Especially, I expected that I learn the colloquial English from you. However, our topic in class was not related to the usual life. So, I don't get that from you. But

other topics made me satisfy." Most responded that the course met or exceeded their expectations. One student requested more writing assignments, stating, "I think this course meets my expection [sic] mostly. But I want more exercise for writing. I wrote three papers—business letter, final exam and paper 1. I think it's not enough because in Korea, there is not much chance writing in English. Especially formal writing." Two wanted more oral assignments and in-class discussion opportunities. One wrote, "Writing assignments were helpful tools to learn about some essential principles and skills, but compared to writing part, speaking opportunities were not given much. But, working on presentation was good experience to be familiar with speaking." Another stated, "I wanted to communicate with classmate in English. In this course, I just listened her speech. But, it is good to learn techinical [sic] writing skill." Two students believed the class would have been improved if it had lasted longer than one month.

To the second survey question, asking students about information they wanted to learn in the course but did not learn, students expressed general satisfaction with the course, although three reported wanting more individual speaking time in class. Two reported wanting more graded speeches in front of the class and "America style interviews." As one stated, "it would be good to have more opportunities to practice and give a speech in front of audiences. Not only presentations, but job interviews can be good chances to practice speaking in real situation." Another wanted to learn business etiquette, or "the manner of business field in American culture," stating, "I think if I meet American people for business, it must be very helpful for me." Another wanted more individual "practical" grammar instruction: "Actually, the grammars she explained were things I already knew. It would be helpful if she gives me more practical usage of sentences or words case by case."

To the third question, which asked students to report their favorite assignments or course aspects and the reasons they liked them, responses were again varied. Eleven respondents reported that they liked paper 2 (the argumentative ethics paper) and accompanying presentation the best. Several reported these assignments as the most enjoyable *and* the most challenging. According to one student, "I learned how to cooperate with others well. Also to make a presentation, I had to read lots of related information and write paper. So I could improve my English intensively for this presentation." Another stated, "[t]he paper 2 assignment was pretty interesting. I had to think about both my writings and speakings. Usually I have not though [sic] about moral and ethical matters that much [sic] It was a good chance to learn the aspects of things I don't know." Four most enjoyed the midterm (the formal business letter and memo). Two most enjoyed paper 1 (the technical description) because they learned to use simplified IEEE style and to express ideas clearly. Two enjoyed the written feedback on their papers. One stated, "I like to read Powe's checking of my assignments. Generally, in my Korean classes, I almost couldn't know my grade per each assignment and why I recived [sic] that grade. If I want to know, I have to go a professor's room and the total grade is made." Listening to a native English speaker, feeling comfortable in class, and learning how to format a paper correctly received one vote apiece as students' favorite assignments or aspects of the course.

When asked their least favorite assignments or aspects of the course, two students apiece most disliked the in-class grammar review, the final exam (because "most students already knew that skill [writing an executive summary for a report]"), the group presentation, and insufficient time

to complete group assignments. One student most disliked the *Challenger* documentaries, one most disliked the midterm exam, one most disliked paper 1 (the technical description), and one most disliked the technical nature of the coursework, stating that "[m]ost subjects of this course was [sic] concentrated on technical and engineering field, so to some people whose majors were not related to it found a little distance from the subjects. However, on the other hand, it was a good chance to experience and learn about different filed [sic]."

When asked if they felt more prepared to write English in a professional setting after taking Practical English, only three responded negatively. According to one, he or she did not feel more prepared for a business setting but reported, "that's enough to improve my English." Another's comment was partially illegible, but the student seemed to express the sentiment that the course was taught at an inappropriate level. The third student did not provide reasons for his or her dissatisfaction for the course.

To the sixth question asking students to suggest improvements for the course, three students wanted more presentations and in-class discussion exercises, two suggested that assignments be more evenly spaced and that the course be taught over a longer time period, one student suggested limiting discussion in class to English only, and one requested "more 'simple' and 'short' assignments for practice." Two other comments had ambiguous meanings: these students wanted to learn "the nede [sic] of business writting [sic]" and "more formal forms as possible as time permits."

Finally, when asked if they felt Practical English would help them succeed in their academic or business careers, seventeen of the eighteen students who responded to this question reported that the course would benefit them. The eighteenth student wrote, "It was good experiment." The qualitative feedback shows that students felt challenged by the course but recognized its benefits. Their primary complaint was insufficient in-class speaking time, both graded and ungraded.

Self assessment of the course reveals that Practical English students responded well to the same activities to which GE 3513 students respond, such as group assignments, in-class activities and discussions, and peer revision. Like my American students, my Korean students were also highly motivated by candy-reward games and bonus-point competitions. (A bonus-point competition to motivate students to learn simplified IEEE style was particularly effective.) The students also immensely enjoyed a pizza party that I funded at the end of the semester.

IX. Conclusion

Students received Practical English well overall, and, despite a large enrollment of students from non-technical majors, the course accurately represented a real American collegiate class. Practical English assignments were closely modified from preexisting GE 3513 assignments, Practical English students actually completed more writing assignments than their GE 3513 counterparts did over the same summer term, and Practical English students acclimated to a traditional 10-point American grading scale based on non-quantitative rubrics.

Teaching abroad was a worthwhile experience that I strongly urge other educators to consider. It has positively informed my interactions with both international and native students and colleagues since I returned home, and I am eager to travel abroad again.
Additionally, five Korean students who completed Practical English in July 2006 traveled to Mississippi State University in August 2006 to begin a pre-arranged one-year exchange. A follow-up article presenting their feedback about their first year as American university students (their best and worst experiences, their major challenges in and out of the classroom, and Practical English's effects on their American educational experiences) is underway.

Acknowledgments

I thank Mr. John Brocato, Ms. Kelly Agee, and Ms. Amy Barton, all of whom are current or former technical writing instructors in the Shackouls Technical Communication Program with whom I have worked to develop teaching materials for GE 3513 (technical writing). Without these materials and Mr. Brocato's and Ms. Agee's support, my trip would have been impossible. I also extend thanks to Ms. Sa-rang Jung for the use of her paper 1 submission, Dr. Donna Reese and others in the Bagley College of Engineering who encouraged me to teach abroad, the KNU officials and students who made my trip professionally and personally rewarding, and the 2006 KNU visiting scholars for their advice and companionship. *Kamsamnida*.

References

[1] Bodycott, P., and Walker, A., "Teaching abroad: lessons learned about inter-cultural understanding for teachers in higher education," *Teaching in Higher Education*, vol. 5, iss. 1, pp. 79-94, 2000.
[2] Fields, C. D., "Go abroad, and save the excuses," *Black Issues in Higher Education*, vol. 18, iss. 12, p. 28, 2001.
[3] "Study abroad expands perspectives," *Human Ecology*, vol. 30, iss. 4, p. 10, 2002.
[4] Garson, B., "Teaching abroad: a cross-cultural journey," *Journal of Education for Business*, vol. 80, iss. 6, pp. 322-326, 2005.
[5] "Open Doors 2006 fast facts," *Institute of International Education*. 2006. http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/file_depot/0-10000000/0-10000/3390/folder/50084/Open+Doors+2006_FastFacts_FINAL.pdf
[6] "Fall 2005 international student enrollment survey," *Institute of International Education*. 2005. http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=Fall2005Survey
[7] Jeon, M., and Lee, J., "Hiring native-speaking English teachers in east Asian countries," *English Today*, vol. 22, iss. 4, pp. 53-58, 2006.
[8] Badley, G., "Developing globally-competent university teachers," *Innovations in Education and Training International*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 244-253, 2000.
[9] Butler, Y. G., and Lee, J., "On-task versus off-task self-assessments among Korean elementary school students studying English," *Modern Language Journal*, vol. 90, no. 4, pp. 506-518, 2006.
[10] Lee, K.S., and Carrasquillo, A., "Korean college students in the United States: perceptions of professors and students," *College Student Journal*, vol. 40, pp. 442-456, 2006.
[11] 'Starkville, MS houses and residents," *Starkville main page*. 2007. http://www.city-data.com/housing/houses-Starkville-Mississippi.html
[12] "Fall 2006 unduplicated headcount enrollment – total campus," *Mississippi State University*. 2007. http://www.msstate.edu/dept/oir/fall06_tot_enrl.pddf
[13] "South Korea," *South Korea - City Population*. 2007. http:www.citypopulation.de/KoreaSouth.html
[14] "Facts & Figures," *Kyungpook National University*. 2007. http://wwwkyungpook.ac.kr/2002_eng/html/eng10_Facts&Figures.html

[15] Powe, A., "GE 3513 technical writing," spring 2006 course syllabus, unpublished.
[16] Brocato, J., and Picone, J., "Writing while designing: combining ECE senior design with an existing technical writing course," *Proc. ASEE Southeast Section Conference*, Chattanooga, TN, 2005.
[17] Brocato, J., Chapman, B., and Harden, J., "Improving the writing-evaluation abilities of graduate teaching assistants in ECE labs," *Proc. ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition*, Portland, OR, 2005.
[18] Powe, A., and Moorhead, J., "Grading lab reports effectively: using rubrics developed collaboratively by ECE and technical writing instructors," *Proc. ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition*, Chicago, IL, 2006.
[19] Powe, A., "Practical English," summer 2006 course syllabus, unpublished.
[20] "Publications – manuscript requirements," *Journal of Engineering Education*. 2007.
http://www.asee.org/publications/jee/guide.cfm
[21] "2005 IEEE Standards style manual," *Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers*. 2007.
http://standards.ieee.org/guides/sytle/
[22] Markel, M., *Technical Communication*. 7th ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1985.
[23] Jung, S., "South Korea's role of balancer in northeast Asia," unpublished.
[24] Brocato, J., "Lantana Industries rubric," unpublished.
[25] Powe, A., "Paper 1 – technical description," unpublished.
[26] "Bagley College of Engineering logo," *James Worth Bagley College of Engineering*. 2007.
http://www.bagley.msstate.edu/publications/identity_standards/index.php
[27]Powe, A., "Paper 2 – ethics, communication, and the *Challenger* disaster," unpublished.
[28] Powe, A., "The group presentation – ethics, communication, and the *Challenger* disaster," unpublished.

Appendix A: Practical English original course schedule (June 26, 2006, through July 21, 2006)

Dates	Major Topics	Assignments
Week 1	Introduction to the course and the writing process; diagnostic exercise; basic elements of and guidelines for effective technical communication; audience and purpose; technical definitions and descriptions; effective sentences (grammar review); source use and plagiarism; IEEE style[21]; peer revision exercise; ethics	**For Wed.:** Read course syllabus and handouts entitled "Grading Information" and "Plagiarism." Brainstorm possible topics for paper 1, which can include the topic you wrote about in your diagnostic exercise. **For Fri.:** Bring four copies of your paper 1 rough draft to class for peer revision.
Week 2	Ethics, cont.; correspondence; paper 2 topic selection; effective oral presentations; differences between individual/collaborative presentations; PowerPoint® slide design	**For Mon.:** Submit one hard copy of the final draft of paper 1 to me at the beginning of class, with the references section, all source copies, and all rough drafts attached. Submit one electronic copy to me (either as a Word or PDF document) by 5 p.m. Read the *Challenger* packet. **For Thurs.:** Prepare for midterm examination (midterm to be administered in class on Thursday, July 6). **For Fri.:** Every member in each group must bring at least one potential topic for the paper 2/presentation assignment. Read assigned articles on PowerPoint® slide design.
Week 3	Presentation outlines; basics of argumentative writing; document design; effective graphics; proposals; abstracts versus introductions; presentations; peer revision exercise; report-writing exercises begin (how to write an executive summary)	**For Mon.:** Research paper 2/presentation topic as a group and bring your research to class. Begin preparing for presentations outside of class. **For Wed.:** Each group member must prepare a rough draft of his/her section of paper 2 and bring it to class (hard and electronic copies). Practice presentations outside of class. Oral presentations due in class July 13-14, depending on the presentation schedule. **For Thurs.:** Bring paper 2 rough drafts to class (five hard copies per group) for peer revision exercise. **For Fri.:** Submit one hard copy of the paper 2 final draft to me at the

		beginning of class with the references section, all source copies, and all rough drafts attached. Submit one electronic copy to me (either as a Word or PDF document) by 5 p.m.
Week 4	Methods versus instructions; mousetrap exercise; report-writing exercises continue; last business and preparation for the final exam	**For Tues.:** Groups must e-mail an electronic copy of their report-writing assignment section to me by 12 p.m. (noon). Attach the assignment as a Word or PDF document. **For Thurs.:** Prepare for final exam (final to be administered in class on Thurs., July 20).

Appendix B: Description of assignment requirements (original and modified versions)

Assignment Title and Percentage of Overall Grade (%)	**Assignment Description**	**Original Assignment Requirements**	**Revised Assignment Requirements**
Paper 1 (22.5)	Individually written description of a "technical" process, concept, or mechanism in the student's field of study	Minimum of two full, single-spaced, typed pages in 10- to 12-point type; must include at least one substantive graphic	Minimum of one full, single-spaced, typed page in 10- to 12-point type, including minimum of one substantive graphic
Paper 2 (22.5)	Collaboratively written journal article (an ethical analysis comparing the space shuttle *Challenger* disaster to another ethical disaster/dilemma related to the group's major)	Minimum of six full, double-spaced pages conforming to abbreviated IEEE style[21] (discussed in class) and *Journal of Engineering Education* manuscript requirements[20]	None to the assignment itself, although pedagogical approach in teaching the materials regarding the *Challenger* accident were modified
Oral Presentation (15)	In the same groups as for paper 2 assignment, students presented a persuasive presentation based on position and evidence presented in paper 2	Presentations consisted of 10-12 minutes and had to contain a clear introduction, body, and conclusion; students had to speak approximately equal lengths of time, and each student had to cover substantive material in his/her section; slideware was required with the presentation	None
In-Class Activities (10)	Various brief writing- and discussion-based exercises conducted during the class period; graded strictly for attendance and	Varied by assignment (sometimes individual, usually collaborative)	None

	participation		
Midterm Exam (15)	Individually written adjustment letter and company memo regarding a faulty product (not overly technical, based on scenario closely adapted from Mike Markel's *Technical Communication*[22])	Students were asked to base their adjustment letters and the memos explaining their adjustment to their employer on ethical guidelines discussed in class and codes of ethics distributed in class. Students were required to follow conventional formats for professional letters and memos (discussed in class). Limitations: written in class in a maximum of 3 hours	Students were allowed extra time to complete the assignment outside of class and submit it at the next class period
Final Exam (15)	Individually written analytic report based on a fairly technical writing scenario	Students were to be given a fairly technical writing scenario to use in writing a formal report. Limitations: written in class in a maximum of 3 hours	Students were originally intended to complete the entire analytic report, with four major sections: executive summary, introduction, methods, and results/conclusions. Students were instead provided the scenario and the completed report minus the executive summary; students were required to write the executive summary in class during the 3-hour exam time

Appendix C. Major paper and presentation assignment sheets used in Practical English

Paper 1 - Technical Description[25]

For first and final draft deadlines, please see your syllabus.

For paper 1, write a **two-page** (no more, no less) description of a technical concept, process, or tool/piece of equipment basic to your field of study. The scope of the assignment is fairly broad, but do not write about relatively basic pieces of equipment (like common household appliances) or processes (a description of a toaster, how to build a computer, etc.). Instead, write about a concept that you would actually explore in one of your engineering classes or a process/piece of equipment that you might encounter in a professional setting.

This description should be written for a lay audience, one that possesses no specialized knowledge of your field of study or of the specific subject of your document. Other guidelines follow:

Content

1. Write only on a subject about which you already know something. Writing on a brand-new subject (a) will take far too long, and (b) will necessitate too much reliance on sources. You **can** use sources for this

paper if you wish, but these sources should be used sparingly and should only reinforce your description. Your paper should **not** be merely a collection of paraphrases and quotes taken from outside sources.

2. Make sure you provide sufficient details about your subject. Consider every possible angle: What are its physical dimensions? How many steps are in the process? Who first explored this idea? Etc., etc., etc. Pick and choose the most important details to include in your two-page paper.

3. Include at least one graphic illustrating your subject in some way, and make sure you integrate this graphic appropriately. All graphics should be numbered (e.g., "Fig. 1"), titled (e.g., "The Mississippi State University Bagley College of Engineering Logo"), cited if taken from an outside source (e.g., "[1]"), referenced textually, and placed closely after the first textual reference. Other guidelines for incorporating graphics effectively will be discussed and distributed in class.

Figure 1--The Mississippi State University Bagley College of Engineering Logo [1][26]

Format

1. Your paper should be exactly two pages long, single spaced, in no larger than 12-point font, with one-inch margins. A title page is unnecessary; put your paper's descriptive title and your name at the top of the first page, and start the text of the paper immediately below the title and name.

2. Your paper should follow some form of introduction-body-conclusion: one or more introductory paragraphs announcing your subject, purpose, scope, background, and structural preview; several body paragraphs discussing your subject in detail, with one paragraph devoted to each major step in the process or part of the mechanism; and a concluding paragraph that effectively closes the paper without excessive repetition. A system of subheadings, though not required, may help to divide a paper into logical sections and can make the writing process easier overall.

3. If you use outside sources, use IEEE style[21] (explained in class) to document these sources.

Paper 2 – Ethics, Communication, and the *Challenger* Disaster[27]

***For first and final draft due dates, please see the syllabus.**

TOPIC

Write a journal paper according to the *Journal of Engineering Education* (*JEE*)'s "Manuscript Requirements"[20] at http://www.asee.org/publications/jee/guide.cfm on the ethics of the technical communication generated during the *Challenger* disaster. More specifically, compare management's and engineers' actions preceding and/or following the *Challenger* disaster to the actions of people involved in

another real-life disaster within your own field where people were hurt or killed. In your paper, you may consider both written and oral communication.

WHAT DOES "ETHICAL" MEAN?
For the purposes of this assignment, focus on **professional ethics** as defined in class; as defined by different professional/technical organizations (like the Online Ethics Center for Engineering and Science at http://www.onlineethics.org/ and the National Society of Professional Engineers at http://www.nspe.org/ethics/home.asp, to name a few examples); and as explained in various ethics books.

FORM AND CONTENT
Follow the *JEE* guidelines on document organization (abstract, introduction, appropriate use of headings, placement of graphics, etc.). In addition, ensure that your paper has a well-defined point/thesis--a statement somewhere in the introduction that conveys to the reader precisely what your ***subject*** is, what your ***position*** is, and how you proceed to ***support*** this position. Remember that a thesis is a promise to the reader that you are going to discuss one specific, main idea; the rest of your paper is how you go about keeping that promise. Every paragraph and section should be obviously related to the thesis, all paragraphs and sections should be obviously related to one other, and all sentences in a paragraph should be obviously linked to one other and should refer back to the paragraph's topic sentence.

Remember too that your audience, though educated, possesses no specialized knowledge of the *Challenger* situation; this fact means you must provide a brief but thorough technical explanation of what happened to *Challenger* in clear, precise language.

You must also include **at least one graphic and cite at least four references** in your paper. The graphic(s) must serve a substantive purpose--it should not merely be space-filling eye candy, meaning you must think carefully about what areas of your content might be helped by visual representation and what types of graphics (photos, diagrams, tables, charts, etc.) will most effectively accomplish your purpose. These graphics may certainly come from outside sources as long as you cite them appropriately. Your sources are necessary to provide authoritative support for your ideas and to give credit for supporting ideas that do not belong to you. Use the IEEE style handout to format your in-text citations and your references page.

RESOURCES & RELEVANT LINKS
http://www.onlineethics.org/moral/boisjoly/RB-intro.html (plus all related, embedded links): a good background on the *Challenger* situation from an engineering perspective

Report to the President by the Presidential Commission on the Space Shuttle Challenger *Accident*: available in an incomplete online version here

http://www.hq.nasa.gov/office/pao/History/transcript.html: the actual transcript of the *Challenger* crew as recorded during the 73-second launch sequence; note the chilling last two lines

http://science.ksc.nasa.gov/shuttle/missions/51-l/docs/rogers-commission/Appendix-F.txt: a series of personal observations by Richard Feynman, the late Caltech physicist and member of the Rogers Commission

RULES AND REQUIREMENTS
Write only on the topic described above. Topical variations not approved beforehand will result in penalties ranging from the loss of a letter grade to a permanent zero on the assignment.

- Unless noted otherwise, follow the *JEE* guidelines above exactly. Variations in these guidelines will result in the loss of multiple letter grades.

- Adopt and maintain a formal, professional writing style and tone. Avoid slang, contractions, emotional writing (**thinking**, not feeling), and second person ("you"). Use first person ("I") with purpose and caution.
- Be afraid of abstraction and vagueness. Be keenly aware of the difference between fact and opinion, know when you are supplying each, and understand that you must be able to defend **every** opinion or assertion you offer. It is never enough simply to state an opinion as if readers should accept what you say on faith; you, as a writer, are **always** responsible for supporting the claims you make.
- The paper must be a minimum of six full, double-spaced pages, with 12-point Times New Roman or Arial fonts (note the difference between this requirement and the *JEE*'s length criteria).
- As stated above, use IEEE style for your citations and your references page.
- Any text or images borrowed from the list of resources above and used in your paper **must** be cited as a source. Failure to cite such uses properly can give the impression of plagiarism, which can lead to an F in the course.
- Be smart: do not use another student's paper as your own, and do not consult any of those ridiculous research-paper web sites for "help" with this assignment. Either of these infractions may result in an F for the course and a report filed with the KNU Dean of Students. Ensure that you understand plagiarism as defined in class and by KNU policies.

Tip: In working on this assignment, make sure you read at least two to three articles out of the *JEE*. Why is this a good idea?

1. Seeing the types of papers that actually get published in a journal is an excellent way to find out just what the journal wants from its submissions.
2. Reading examples of published, professional writing is good for your writing style because (a) you encounter sentence structures, diction, and idioms that you may be able to use in your own writing*; and (b) you encounter bad writing that you must learn to avoid (yes, some published articles are not well written even after they get through the editorial process).
3. In general, the more you read, the better you write. Reading is practice for writing.

I have several copies of the *JEE* that you can borrow if you wish.

Sample shuttle papers will be made available in my office and/or distributed as handouts in class. I do not distribute samples to be used as templates; rather, I want you to notice the quality and flow of the writing, the use of outside sources (or the lack thereof) to support the writer's arguments, and the organization/layout of the sample documents. As with any sample paper I distribute, under no circumstances are you allowed to copy sentences or long phrases from samples for use in your own document. Such copying is plagiarism.

*2(a) above is **not** plagiarism. Here I am talking about general sentence patterns or useful terms or phrases, not lifting specific passages out of specific documents. One way writers improve is by emulating more accomplished writers, although this must be done with caution so as not to qualify as plagiarism.

The Group Presentation – Ethics, Communication, and the *Challenger* Disaster[28]

For presentation due dates, please see the syllabus.

This assignment is a group presentation of your journal article (paper 2). Your oral presentation must be 10 to 12 minutes long, not including the question-and-answer period afterward. As this presentation corresponds to paper 2, you should discuss the same general points that appear in your journal article. Refer to the following additional guidelines for further instruction.

- As with any presentation, begin with a clear introduction that explains your subject/purpose and previews the major points you will discuss; present your evidence in a well-organized "body" (with appropriate transitions between points); and have a clear conclusion that summarizes your key argumentative points appropriately but without abruptness or excessive repetition.

- Although this talk is based on a written document, **do not read to the audience**. Note cards or outlines are an excellent way of keeping your place or jogging your memory if needed, but **do not use your paper as a memory aid** because (a) the size of the paper itself is often distracting to the audience, and (b) the amount of text on the paper often increases the chances that you will read instead of talk.

- As we will discuss in class beforehand, adhere to the physical basics of public speaking: maintain consistent eye contact, speak loudly and articulately enough so that everyone can understand you, and move your body naturally (no stiff arms or chicken dances).

- **This presentation requires the use of PowerPoint® or a similar slide-creation software**. In a professional environment, you will almost always be required to use visuals during a presentation, so you need to practice creating slides and other such visual aids now. Furthermore, visual aids can help a talk immensely by allowing the audience to **see** what you are talking about (in addition to hearing about it). Even something as simple as a handout can give the audience something to follow and to take with them when they leave.

- Each group member must discuss a **major** segment of the presentation; no one should behave like a *Price Is Right*® model (i.e., a pretty face with nothing substantive to say). All group members should speak approximately equal lengths of time.

- Since this is an oral version of your written argumentative paper, the persuasive element should exist in your presentation as well. Your ultimate goal is to convince your readers of your viewpoint.

- Groups should target the presentation to a college-educated lay audience with no prior knowledge of the *Challenger* disaster or of the other disaster chosen by the group. Therefore, each group must give a brief, technical description of each disaster.

- Groups should strive to create one unified presentation rather than several small ones. Group practice is the only way to create a smooth presentation.

The following are a few points for the audience:

- You are responsible for attending class each day of presentations, even if you are not presenting that day. For each missed presentation day, I will lower your presentation grade by 10 points. This penalty applies to the individual only, not to the entire presentation group.
- You must listen closely, thinking of possible questions to ask the group.
- After presentations, you will be asked to evaluate the group as a whole and individual speakers within the group. Failure to participate in peer evaluations will result in a 10-point deduction per day to your individual presentation grade.

Appendix D: Student-submitted technical description (with student errors)[23]

South Korea's role of balancer in Northeast Asia

In March 2005, President Roh Moo-hyun declared a new diplomatic guideline which assrts the role of South Korea as a balancer in Northeast Asia. Although the initiative was created for worthy motives of keeping peace and cooperation in the region, South Korea, in fact, has some limitations in its ability to carry out the plan.

The role of a balancer relates to the concept of the balance of power, which is a policy to maintain peace in international relations by preserving the balance among conflicting powers that would try to hinder any one of them from becoming too strong to control over the rest. They would keep each other in check to pursue their own national interests. A balancer is the force that mediates the balance among them. In 19th century, Great Britain performed the role as a balancer. It isolated itself from all kinds of international alliances in peace time, but once the peace of Europe was threatened by some expansionistic countries, it actively engaged in world affairs, helping opposite weak countries to fight back the threats and return to normality in which the balance of power was preserved. Contrarily, Poland which sought a balancing role between Germany and the Soviet failed its goal because of its weak national power. It ended up in a divided country occupied by both Germany and the Soviet after the W. W. II. The idea of South Korea as a balancer in Northeast Asia emerged from current political situation in the region in which the tension between America-Japan ally and China-North Korea ally is getting intense rapidly. The new role calls for the positive role of South Korea to ease the tension and prevent a war, thus securing peace in the region. South Korea has potential to be a balancer as it has a geographical advantage of a peninsula to experience different cultural characteristics of both continent and the sea. Also, its trade and cooperation with other nations in various fields including economy, culture, and human resources have developed greatly. However, neither the military now the economic power of South Korea is strong enough the support the role as a balancer. The actual condition of Korea is more similar to the case of Poland than to that of Britain. Moreover, South Korea might be alienated from America, one of its most significant allies, which has regulated the order in the Northeast Asia tacitly on the basis of its alliances with South Korea and Japan respectively. Considering the power of South Korea, for the time being, strong force represented by American military is needed to keep the market economic order and political peace in the region

South Korea's new role of balancer in an epochal attempt to reestablish its position in rapidly changing circumstances in Northeast Asia. However, it is premature to execute the plan at this point of time in view of Korea's insecure military and economic strength. [map of Northeast Asia provided]

Appendix E. Sample grading rubric[24]

Lantana Industries Rubric

This is a sample rubric like the ones used to grade papers, homework, and exams in GE 3513. The form and content of the document being graded are compared with the categories below, and the category to which the document best corresponds determines the document's grade. Pluses and minuses (**A+**, **C-**, etc.) are assigned when a document either barely meets or barely misses the requirements for a category. For example, a document clearly meeting all the requirements for a **B** and clearly meeting all the requirements for an **A** except one would likely earn a **B+**; a document clearly meeting four of the requirements for a **C** but barely meeting the fifth requirement would likely earn a **C-**. A document not meeting the requirements for a **D** would earn an **F**.

D (Has a chance of working):

- Has the facts straight: correct name for devices, people, and company
- Is clearly structured into correct sections
- Gives some idea of procedures and results
- Recommends converting from the LaPaglia Injection System to the Hershey-Rush Injection System
- Does not destroy reader's confidence with numerous grammatical/mechanical errors

C (Is likely to work, with some difficulties):

- Introduces the document well: specific subject, purpose, scope, plan of development
- Attempts to provide logical support for the injection-system conversion
- Mentions recommendation(s) in the executive summary
- Conveys data and other results in a graphical format
- Has few grammatical/mechanical errors (especially serious ones – see **B** below)

B (Is under control of reader, facts, structure, language):

- Reports specifically, strongly, professionally: no ambivalence or abrasiveness, no overly personal or conversational writing
- Exerts proper control over structure: procedures, results, options discussed in correct, clearly defined sections
- Mentions specific, sufficient supporting details: production history, work stoppages, etc.
- Has very few gram./mech. errors, especially serious ones (subject-verb agreement, sentence fragment, comma splice, misspelling, incomprehensibly mixed construction, etc.)

A (Is clear, efficient, convincing, and a pleasure to read):

- Tone, design, and extent of details beyond reproach: no ambiguity, no supporting details omitted
- Incorporates graphic(s) correctly
- Conveys the severity of the situation; points out that NOT converting to Hershey-Rush will cost Lantana in time, money, and reputation
- Has no more than one gram./mech. error and no serious ones

Appendix F: Introductory course survey

Student's Name:
Semester/Year:
Major:
Expected or target career (what profession do you want to enter after school?):
1. Why are you taking this course?

2. What do you want to learn in this course? (Please be as specific as possible.)
3. What can we do in class to improve your formal writing/speaking abilities? Are there any grammatical issues on which you would like to focus?
4. Please describe the importance of formal writing/speaking **as you perceive it** in your target career (i.e., what kinds of situations will require you to write/speak formally, how frequently do you think you will have to write/speak formally, and how important do you think formal writing/speaking is to your career advancement?).
5. Please describe your past experiences with formal writing/speaking in an academic setting, professional setting, etc. Have they been generally positive or negative, and why?
6. Please rate your confidence in your formal writing abilities at this time:
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   (1 is "no confidence"; 10 is "extremely confident")
7. Please rate your confidence in your formal speaking abilities at this time:
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   (1 is "no confidence"; 10 is "extremely confident")

Appendix G: End-of-course quantitative student feedback (survey and results*)

Practical English Course Evaluation

Please circle your responses to the following questions based on the scale provided. <u>Please do not sign your name to this form. Your comments will not affect your course grade in any way</u>. THANK YOU!

1=Strongly disagree
2=Disagree
3=Neither agree nor disagree
4=Agree
5=Strongly agree

1. The instructor makes the material interesting and holds the attention of the class.
   1 2 3 4 5
2. The instructor makes the material relevant to my field of study.
   1 2 3 4 5
3. The instructor is knowledgeable about the course material.
   1 2 3 4 5
4. The instructor communicates clearly.
   1 2 3 4 5
5. Presentations by the instructor are well organized.
   1 2 3 4 5
6. The instructor knows if the course content is being understood.
   1 2 3 4 5
7. The instructor is reasonably accessible to students outside of class.
   1 2 3 4 5
8. I have had to work hard in this course.
   1 2 3 4 5
9. I have become more competent in this area because of this instructor.
   1 2 3 4 5
10. Grading and evaluation procedures by the instructor seem fair and objective.
    1 2 3 4 5
11. The instructor encourages students to think and speak for themselves.
    1 2 3 4 5

*For each category of responses, the percentage of the class who responded in that category is provided, and the actual number of respondents is provided in parentheses.

Question	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree	Average Class Response
The instructor makes the material interesting and holds the attention of the class.	(0)	(0)	5%(1)	35%(7)	60%(12)	4.55
The instructor makes the material relevant to my field of study.	(0)	5%(1)	20%(4)	15%(3)	60%(12)	4.30
The instructor is knowledgeable about the course material.	(0)	(0)	5%(1)	15%(3)	90%(16)	4.75
The instructor communicates clearly.	(0)	(0)	(0)	5%(1)	95%(19)	4.95
Presentations by the instructor are well organized.	(0)	(0)	10%(2)	35%(7)	55%(11)	4.45
The instructor knows if the course content is being understood.	(0)	(0)	10%(2)	45%(9)	45%(9)	4.35
The instructor is reasonably accessible to students outside of class.	(0)	(0)	10%(2)	30%(6)	60%(12)	4.50
I have had to work hard in this course.	(0)	(0)	15%(3)	20%(4)	65%(13)	4.50
I have become more competent in this area because of this instructor.	(0)	(0)	(0)	60%(12)	40%(8)	4.40
Grading and evaluation procedures by the instructor seem fair and objective.	(0)	(0)	5%(1)	25%(5)	70%(14)	4.65
The instructor encourages students to think and speak for themselves.	(0)	(0)	5%(1)	25%(5)	70%(14)	4.65

Appendix H: Qualitative student feedback: survey questions and student responses (with student errors)

In addition to completing a quantitative survey, students were asked to respond in written format to a qualitative course survey. Survey questions and the students' responses are provided verbatim in the following section. The following comments also provide the reader with a better understanding of the various English writing proficiencies represented in the class. These comments were written in class, leaving students no time to revise or seek outside help.

1. What were your expectations for this course, and did it meet them? Why or why not?

I learn pratical english

My expectations were improving my speaking and writing skills. I learned about a lot of technical writing skills, especially citation and references. They will very useful! Thank you [drawing of a heart]

I want to participate in English native speaker course.

I wanted to listen to someone who speak in english, Powe was the right person.

I want to improve my English writing skills. I think this course meets my expection mostly. But I want more exercise for writing. I wrote three papers—business letter, final exam and paper I. I think it's not enough because in Korea, there is not much chance writing in English. Especially formal writing.

My expectations: to become accustomed to the class which to increase my ability in English writing. Through the class, I had many chances to write down memo letters in English and also made a speech in English. So I feel more comfatable in English class.

I wanted to improve my writing and speaking skill. The most important thing is to practice for intense writing. So, this class give many opportunities to practice writing. It was a great time!!

Especially, I expected that I learn the colloquial English from you. However, our topic in class was not related to the usual life. So, I don't get that from you. But other topics made me satisfy.

I expected real American collegiate class, and it did meet my expectation. I have never experienced class like this in KNU: The instructor really cared about student's understanding, evaluated student's work very carefully.

I wanted to learn how American classes are progressed, and it's harder than my expectation. Of course, it's also because the term is too short [smiley face]. And I wanted to learn how to write business stuffs or formal reports in English. I could learn them in the class.
Learning fundamental and effective skills of writing, practicing speaking English and making a good speech.
Writing assignments were helpful tools to learn about some essential principles and skills, but compared to writing part, speaking opportunities were not given much. But, working on presentation was good experience to be familiar with speaking.
Yes. I could have many chance to write articles and speak. So I can improve my ability from them.
Actually, I expected to learn writing skills in general settings. But, this course was focused on professional writing. Anyway, I got to know a bit about formal writings in business setting, so I'm satisfied!!
I wanted to improve my professional English and I think I got it almost. Because now I know the writing method, how to write business letters, professional report, and so on.
Writting and speaking in public and business time were my expectations in this course. The system was quite good. But the period was quite short, exactly one month. Every information was great and helpful.
Learning to write formal letters and papers was helpful. During the course, I discovered what weakness I had in my writing.
I wanted to communicate with classmate in English. In this course, I just listened her speech. But, it is good to learn techinical writing skill.
I wanted encouraging my writing skill. And I had learned from the lecture, making formal paper and letter, which I didn't expected. So I think it was very helpful and interesting.
This class was the very one I had to take. I am lack of the writing abilities, and Powe pointed out many mistakes I made. That was really helpful and made me think one more time before I choose certain words.

2. Was there anything you wanted to learn in this course that you did not learn?
The right, utility is not important. For any people. You impress that. As that is justice and unique [pertains to class discussion regarding ethics in engineering]
I think that if I had more time to speak in English, it would help me a lot.
No
"Interview" I want to experience America style interview. Most of students will get through this.
Free talking
I wanted to discuss with other classmates in class. But we don't have much time to talk with classmates in English.
No, there was not.
Nothing particular. But it would be good to have more opportunities to practice and give a speech in front of audiences. Not only presentations, but job interviews can be good chances to practice speaking in real situation.
Yes.
The manner of business field in American culture. I think if I meet American people for business, it must be very helpful for me.
We got many things related to using English in practical.
Learning how to write a paper that has very technical content.
It is enough to learn techinical writing. I recognize the importance of technical writing.
Just like formal format of the homework (report)
Actually the grammars she explained were things I already knew. It would be helpful if she gives me more practical usage of sentences or words case by case.

3. What aspects/assignments of this course did you like most and why?
Presentation. It is hard but I didn't miss it.
I feel challenged about all assignments. Because it's my first time to write something technical. I like mid-term exam best! It was very interesting to write business letter.
I heared English speaker.
Powe commend [sic: comment] all the assignments. It costs her much time. I think it's very impressive.
Presentation. It's the hardest work of this course, but it make me have self-confidence
Team presentation…I learned how to cooperate with others well. And to make a presentation, I had to read lots of related information and write paper. So I could improve my English intensively for this presentation.
First writing assignment is most interesting. Because I learned IEEE style!
Giving a presentation is a hard thing. However, through this course, I learned a lot of thing: cooperation and way to give a presentation nicely.

The paper 1. I learned how to manage things I already know about to make clear other people.
I like to read Powe's checking of my assignments. Generally, in my Korean classes, I almost couldn't know my grade per each assignment and why I recived that grade. If I want to know, I have to go a professor's room after the total grade is made.
I liked the overall atmosphere of this course. Free discussions and lots of participating activities were very helpful to practice and learn English. Writing assignments—business materials, papers—were also effective to advance writing skills and learn about different (new) styles of US/bussiness writing.
Business letter and Group presentation
It's presentation. It is interesting and helpful to improve my English ability.
All the assignments were big burden to me. Because English is my second language, I wasn't confident to write. However, I made it. The acheivement of assignments seems to give me confidence.
The presentation is my favorite part in this class because I can check my presentation skill by the native speaker.
Making a business letter and note (midterm) and presentation were impressive. On making the letter and memo, that reminded me the importance of management. In presentation, it was a good chance to make a speech in English.
Discussions and Presentations
Paper about business letter It is impressed.
Writing paper 2 and presentation
It was very helpful to understand how to write a paper I didn't know how to write a paper form exactly.
The paper 2 assignment was pretty interesting. I had to think about both my writings and speakings. Usually I have not though [sic] about moral and ethical matters that much It was a good chance to learn the aspects of things I don't know.

4. What aspects/assignments of this course did you like least and why?
Video. It is just sleeping.
It was pity that I didn't have enough time to practice the presentation. Group work was a little difficult because of the tough topic.
No
Paper I. I got low grade. [drawing of face with tongue stuck out]
All assignments are good!
The memo. I had little information about the form of memo, so I lost many points on that part. However, it was all my fault because I did not attend that class; I think you might give the information on that day.
The works were so hard, especially the presentation!! It wasn't so easy as much as you said!! [drawing of face that looks like it may be screaming]
Most subjects of this course was concentrated on technical and engineering field, so to some people whose majors were not related to it found a little distance from the subjects. However, on the other hand, it was a good chance to experience and learn about different filed.
It's Presentation, too. Because it's very hard assignment.
The [executive] summary is the worst part in this class because most of students are used to do that. It means they already knew that skill.
Discussing with team, there was a problem. But, time to solve the problem was too short.
Learning grammar
Asking a question to student was very good idea but the questions about structure of writing, which is too simple, were hard to answer or they were too specific to answer
Final exam. I had fun but, was too much for me. That's just because of my personal schedule but the purpose of that test was nice.

5. Do you feel more prepared in this aspect of your education (writing in English for a professional setting)?
I still want to learn some more and practice more. But Powe helped me a lot to upgrade my skill.
Of course. Especially writing a paper, because I want to study abroad in graduate school in America.
Yes. This course was good practice.
Not. The level she taught us [illegible] appropriate.
No, I don't. That's enough to improve my English.
At least I got to know the formats in a professional setting. That's a big progress.
Yes.
Through the course, I could improve writing in English for a professional setting.

Of course. I'm not familiar with citation and not pretty good at grammers and spelling. Also, I have to try more my speaking in English—I felt it during my presentation.
Absolutely. I learned how to write business letter and memo.
Yes. I want to be an English teacher. So, it is helpful for my career.
No.
Yes. I learned some format of technical writing and now I'm not very nervous.
I think the professor prepared good.

6. What improvements to this course would you suggest?
I decided to practice speaking in English more through the presentation.
No.
Convinient with english. I listened to live english for a month.
The course is well organized. But because of schedule, the course was too tight.
In case of the class for foreign students, please make your standards to think 'it is easy' is lower. [smiley face]
A little more chances to practicing speaking.
I think if everybody in the class speaks only English, it must be good to all of students.
The nede of business writting.
The last two weeks were very busy, while the first two weeks weren't.
Speaking English.
More formal forms as possible as time permits
More "simple" and "short" assignment for practice?

7. Do you believe this course will help you succeed in your education and/or professional career? Why or why not?
Doing presentation with trying to use formal expression ws really good practice. Yes I do believe.
Yes. Though it could be very basic forms to American students, for foreign students preparing a graduate course, it was very effective.
Very useful
Yes
Of course. Because, a lot of thing in my field are written and spoken in English. So, this course will be very helpful. The only thing I want is time. The time was too short.
Yes, I do. Because most of materials from this class are directly related to my career.
Yes, definitely! I found what a teacher should do. I was impressed by Powe's polite, patient and understand attitude.
Yes. I learned a lot of English writing skill and speaking skill. Above of, I learned the importance of teamwork.
Yes [smiley face] I learned many things, and thank you for teaching. I can't forget this summer.
It will be very helpful. I could improve and practice my English skills overall.
I'll be helpful when I write reports and something like that. Because I'm going to student in MSU!! See you soon in MSU!!!
Absolutely, yes! [smiley face]
Yes! It was really help me!
Yes
It was good experiment.
Yes. Practical writing is very important and I have enough practice and also I want to study more about it.
Yes, technical writing will help me a lot! Especially citation and business letter!! Thank you very much [smiley face]
Yes. I believe that. I learn to do presentation, to write a letter memo. It is so useful