シラバスの開発におけるデジタル・ティーチング・ポートフォリオの活用法
−自己の事例から−

James M. Hall*

(2006年2月6日受理)

What Role can a Digital Teaching Portfolio Play in Syllabus Development?
−A Self Study−

Introduction

This paper tells the story of how the author created a Digital Teaching Portfolio (hereafter DTP) to develop the curriculum of his international understanding class (ibunkarikai). More specifically the DTP, called the MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio (see Hall, 2005a for the URL), was used to answer the following two questions :

1)　Were the objectives relevant and attainable?

2)　How can the learning activities be made more effective?

This paper is comprised of two interwoven parts ; a narrative of my experience using a DTP and an analysis of this experience. We will begin with a narrative of the circumstances and issues from which the MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio originated. Next, we will consider what a DTP is and how it was used to develop the curriculum of the international understanding class. Next, we will look at the MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio itself and how it helped me to answer the above questions. In the final analysis, I will argue that the DTP benefited my development as a facilitator of student-centered learning but it did not serve its other purpose of acting as a resource for teachers interested in cross-cultural understanding.

This paper will serve two purposes : One, it will serve as an introduction to DTPs for any educator who is interested in creating one ; two, by describing the MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio itself, it will serve as a reference for educators interested in implementing a multicultural/ cross-cultural understanding element in their classes. The MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio and the class that will be described are case studies of two trial and error endeavors. It is hoped that readers will be able to learn something from the author's successes and failures.

Much of this paper will be referring to content in the MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio. When content is referenced in the portfolio, the title of the portfolio page and section in which the content is stored will appear in parentheses. The table of contents of the portfolio is displayed in Artifact 2. It is recommended that the reader view the MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio on-line while reading this paper.

Narrative　1 : A　Story　of　the　Meeting　of Multicultural Educators

The international understanding class was known to its participants as the Meeting of Multicultural

＊岩手大学教育学部

Educators (hereafter MMCE) and met once a week for 15 weeks between April and August 2005. We tried not to refer to MMCE as a class but rather as a meeting. In MMCE there were no students or teachers, rather everyone had the title of co-learner, and there were approximately 37 co-learners. In the first meeting, MMCE members divided themselves into common learning groups (hereafter CLGs) based on the regions of the world in which they were interested. A total of 7 CLGs were formed with each group focusing on one of the following seven countries : Australia/New

---

Artifact 1 : *The goals of MMCE*

(*Theoretical   Underpinnings   or   Personal Influences for each Goal*)

1. Build a cooperative learning community so we can learn from each other and teach each other. (Don Oliver, Dr. Kai Ming Cheng, Workshop Education)

2. Begin to understand the necessity of multicultural education.(Multicultural Education Theory)

3. Learn from our classmates about the cultures and countries they are studying. (Don Oliver, Post-Modern Curriculum Theory)

4. Understand the daily life, traditions, history and culture of our countries of concentration. (Intercultural Communicative Competence, Multicultural Education)

5. Develop the skills necessary to interact with people from other cultures (For example-the skills necessary to elicit information about a certain culture without offending anyone.) (Intercultural Communicative Competence, Post Modern Curriculum Theory)

   - The ability to share learned information with other people. (Workshop Learning)
   - The ability to investigate generalizations about other cultures and form your own opinions about them. (Intercultural Communicative Competence)

   - The ability to lead discussions or cooperative learning activities. (Workshop Learning)

6. Learn about different ways to look at cultures. (Kai Ming Cheng)

Zealand[1], Colombia, China, England, Kenya, Guatemala, and the United States. The two highlights of MMCE were when citizens of the above countries visited for a two-week Examining National Stereotypes Discussion (see Schedule and Results - Each Meeting in Detail - Meeting 7 and Meetings 8 & 9) and the Final Discussion (see Schedule and Results - Each Meeting in Detail - Meeting 13 and Meeting 14) where members of each of the CLGs formed small groups and shared what they had learned about their target countries/cultures in their 13 weeks of MMCE.

It has been written that the study of culture and the teaching of culture are acts of inquiry. The objectives of MMCE shown in Artifact 1 represented the destinations where I hoped we, the co-learners, would arrive at the end of our inquiries. However, I was uncertain of the best route to take to our destinations. In fact, I was pessimistic as to whether the learning activities and presentations I had planned would actually lead us to our final destination. Two days before MMCE started, I reread parts of a book on curriculum theory written by a former professor of mine at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, Don Oliver, who unfortunately passed away in 2002. I read the book for inspiration but ultimately canceled the entire 15-week learning schedule save for the Examining National Stereotypes Discussion on the 7th and 8th week and the Closing Discussion on the 14th week. This was the influence of Don Oliver.

Oliver argued that "it is misguided to see an educational setting sharply separated into teachers, students, knowledge, curriculum, materials of instruction, and so forth" (Oliver & Gershman, 1989, pp. 161-162). In this, according to Oliver, misguided

view of education, learning can be "caused" by the teacher as long as he provides an adequate curriculum. Instead of this view, Oliver advocated what he called process teaching in which "the teacher is not transferring a piece of knowledge or a skill to the student ; the teacher is seeking to share a common world with the student as the student enters the world of the teacher and vice versa" (Oliver & Gershman, p.162).

In the case of MMCE, I agreed with Don Oliver ; I could not "cause" the students to learn about culture, because learning about culture is an act of inquiry that teachers and students do together. I thought that we could cooperate together and refine our understandings of culture as co-learners. Thus, in MMCE the facilitator did not "move forward to cause something to happen" but rather "when things felt right" (Oliver & Gershman, p.163). In other words, we would go from one theme to another when everyone was ready rather than when the teacher dictated it.

Thus, to accomplish the objectives of MMCE, I would not forge the path to the destination with the other co-learners following aimlessly behind me. Rather, we would navigate our way to the destination together. This sounded great in theory, but I was at a loss as to how to do this in practice with co-learners from an education system where there is great social distance between the teacher and learner in the classroom. Thus, I decided to plan each MMCE meeting on a weekly basis. After each meeting, I uploaded all learning artifacts on the internet, wrote my own reflections on the meeting (when I could), and also posted the reflections of the co-learners. This was the beginning of the MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio. The MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio would work on a micro and macro level ; it would tell us which individual learning activities worked and which did not, and it could also tell us whether the path we blazed had taken us to our planned destination or another place.

Analysis 1 : What is a Digital Teaching Portfolio?

Before we consider what a DTP is, let us consider what a teaching portfolio is. A teaching portfolio is a compilation of class artifacts, student evaluation, and assessment from a superior that demonstrates how the teacher's knowledge and skills developed over time. According to Kilbane & Milman (2005, p.3) the critical attributes of a teaching portfolio are the following :
1) They demonstrate competence associated with the act of teaching.
2) They illustrate this competence through some kind of evidence.
3) They contain an explanation and analysis of the evidence in writing.

Fundamentally, a DTP is no different except that its artifacts are digitalized. Artifacts can include course syllabi, communication with learners, in-class projects, out-of-class work, class handouts, power point presentations, thematic units, photographs and videos. The advantages of using a DTP are it is accessible to a large audience if put on the internet, DTPs support greater creativity by giving the creators access to a variety of multimedia tools (Kilbane & Milman, p.7), and a DTP can store a great number of artifacts that can be simply retrieved by a simple click on a link. One significant disadvantage is that it requires technical knowledge on the part of the creator and acquiring this technical knowledge can be very time consuming. Another disadvantage is in an advantage : Since it is so easy to store a massive amount of material digitally, DTPs can easily become disorganized and overloaded and, thus, not user-friendly.

The MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio was created following the below process advocated by the E-Portfolio Team (2004) :
Stage 1-Collect : All learning artifacts were stored

electronically as they were produced in MMCE (See Hall, 2005b for the original on-line collection up until week 12).

Stage 2-Select : Materials were selected from the collection accumulated in the previous stage to best showcase how the facilitator's skills and knowledge grew. Most of the learning artifacts that were accumulated in MMCE were used.

Stage 3-Reflect : A reflection about the materials collected was written each week. The purpose was to examine the effectiveness of the materials used and the general plan of the meeting. Furthermore, reflections from the co-learners were also included in the portfolio.

Stage 4-Connect : At the ending of the semester, connections were made between the theory behind MMCE, the objectives of MMCE, and the learning outcomes of MMCE. In addition, the DTP had an element of formative evaluation missing in the scheme from the E-Portfolio Team. In this kind of evaluation, the creator of the DTP not only evaluates what he learned up to the point where the artifacts were collected and analyzed, but also considers "What direction do I want to take in the future?" (Barrett, 2004).

Stage 5-Publish : The last step is to publish the DTP. This is also missing in the scheme of the E-Portfolio team but given a great deal of attention in Kilbane & Milman. The primary purpose of this stage is to make the DTP as user friendly as possible. According to Glencoe Online (2005), one should heed the following guidelines when publishing a DTP : 1. The DTP should have an introduction which states its purpose and intended audience ; 2. The DTP should also have a table of contents (see Artifact 2), and the materials should be organized well to make the portfolio easy to navigate.

Narrative 2 : Using the MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio to Enhance the MMCE Experience

Before talking about what was revealed and improved through the portfolio, I would like to talk about the portfolio itself. The MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio was intended for practitioners interested in multicultural education, global education, student-centered learning, and international understanding. The purpose of the portfolio was and is to serve as a resource for practitioners and a means to evaluate whether MMCE met its overall objectives and the effectiveness of individual learning activities.

Artifact 2 shows how the MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio was organized. The introduction was designed to tell the viewer the main purpose of the portfolio and also define the target audience. Because the co-learners were an integral part of the creation of the portfolio, I put a page (*Profile of Co-learners*) in the portfolio with links to the profiles of all the co-learners. The *Philosophy of Education* page detailed the six biggest theoretical and personal influences behind MMCE which included Don Oliver's Process Teaching, the teachings about culture of Dr. Kai-Ming Cheng who was another teacher of mine at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, Byram's (1997) theory of Intercultural Communicative Competence, Doll's (1993) post-modern curriculum theory, the theory of Multicultural Education, and the art of facilitating participatory workshops. The *Schedule and Learning Outcomes* page was the largest. It consisted of four sections : *I Overview of MMCE ; II Outline of the Semester, III Each Meeting in Detail* - a detailed description of each meeting with links to all the learning artifacts as well as the co-learners' evaluations of each meeting, *IV Objectives and Reality* - a consideration of whether MMCE met its objectives. The *Resources* page consisted of a bibliography of all the media used for MMCE. Lastly, there was a section for readers to leave their feedback.

Artifact 2 : Outline of the MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio
1. Introduction
2. Profile of Co-learners
3. My Philosophy of Education 1.Don Oliver's Curriculum Theory 2.Dr. Kai Ming Cheng's Teachings 3. Intercultural Communicative Competence (Byram, 1997) 4.Post Modern Curriculum Theory (Doll, 1993) 5.Multicultural Education Theory 6.The Art of Facilitating Workshops
4. Schedule and results 1.Overview 2.Outline of the Semester 3.Each Meeting in Detail 4.Objectives and Reality
5. Index of Resources 1.Theories on Culture 2.How to Teach About Culture 3.Activities for Teaching about Culture 4.Learner-centered Education 5.Multicultural Education 6.Curriculum Theory 7.World Geography 8.Digital Teaching Portfolios
6. Feedback

How was the MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio used to answer whether the objectives were reached and to evaluate the usefulness of each learning activity? As the following sections will show, answers were made by making connections between education theory, my own learning experiences, the objectives of MMCE, MMCE learning activities, and co-learners' responses to them.

Answer to Question 1 : Are the objectives relevant and attainable?

In the *Overview* section of the *Schedule and Learning Outcomes* page, each goal for MMCE is presented and the theoretical and personal influences for them are also noted (also see Artifact 1). As the theoretical underpinnings are hyperlinked, all one has to do is click on the link to read about it. Furthermore, in the *Objectives and Reality* section, the underlying theory, objective, and whether or not it was met in reality are all discussed.

The first objective was *Building a cooperative learning community so we can learn from each other and teach each other*. This was the enabling objective for the other objectives as all our learning would be cooperative ; i.e., done in groups. In the *Overview* section it is noted that the theoretical underpinnings for this objective came from my learning experiences with Don Oliver and Dr. Kai Ming Cheng as well as the workshop style of learning I had been studying. In his class, Don Oliver encouraged us to speak to and learn from our classmates, because we can learn as much from our peers as we can the teacher! In fact, in his class I realized that not getting to know my peers would have been a tremendous missed learning opportunity. In my other classes at graduate school, my classmates were merely physical matter placed in the seats around me as our attention was directed towards the professor on the podium. Dr. Kai Ming Cheng was another professor of mine at the Harvard Graduate School of Education who taught a class called *Cultural Perspectives in Education*. In this class, all members of the course went by the title of "co-learner" and taught each other about their cultures of interest. Both of these classes could be classified as learner-centered and were extremely rewarding

learning experiences for me because I was able to get to know my peers on a personal as well as intellectual level and learn from them. The last theoretical underpinning, the workshop style of learning, was the type of learning we practiced in MMCE to make the kind of learning communities I enjoyed in Don Oliver and Dr. Kai Ming Cheng's classes.

In the *Objectives and Reality* section, I considered whether objective 1 was reached by examining the co-learners' responses in their MMCE evaluation sheets. First, I looked for any comments about group work and discovered that only two MMCE members referred to their CLGs specifically :

Artifact 3 : Co-learners' comments about their CLGs
"I'm not good at speaking and understanding English. So I had a hard time learning English and homework, but my group had a lot of meeting [sic]. And they helped me. At first I can't talk in English, but gradually, I can enjoy our conversation. Thanks to our group members, I able [sic] to enjoy MMCE." "I felt it was good class that we formed ourselves in groups of some country."

Although few co-learners explicitly mentioned working collaboratively, ten MMCE members wrote that they succeeded in learning about different countries of which they had little knowledge, as the two comments below indicate :

Artifact 4 : *Co-learners' comments about studying different countries*
"We could know about many countries. I hardly knew about Guatemala, China, Kenya etc." "And also, I learned many things about countries,

especially Kenya, so I could broaden my world view, I think."

How are these comments related to building a cooperative learning community? The process of learning about other countries involved members of CLGs working together to gather and analyze information as well as interview citizens of the country they were studying. After this process of compiling this information, different CLGs presented what they learned to each other in small group discussions. Had we not had a cooperative learning community, the small group discussions would not have succeeded.

On the other hand, there were some negative comments regarding group work. These comments, though, criticized the nature of group work and were not opposed to group work itself. Some co-learners lamented that there were not enough opportunities to talk to other MMCE members outside their CLGs :

Artifact 5 : *A co-learner's comment about a negative aspect of group work*
"What I think can be improved was that we had little chance to communicate with other groups. I know there are [sic.] no time to discuss with every one, so if we had much time, I wanted to talk with other groups."

Furthermore, sometimes co-learners felt like I was talking too much and they wanted to do more group work :

Artifact 6 : *A co-learner's comment about MMCE being too teacher-centered*
"Please keep this in your mind, MMCE is not English conversation class, but many students want to have more time to speak the contents in English , and improve their English. Sometimes MMCE seemed to be a teacher-centered, not students-

centered."

The conclusion that can be reached is that we built a strong learning community ; co-learners liked working in groups and speaking to other co-learners. The problems concerning group work were that co-learners wanted more opportunities to speak to MMCE members outside of their CLGs and sometimes I talked too much! Also, because we accomplished objective 1, the two big discussions which were the backbone of MMCE - the *Examining National Stereotypes Discussion* and the *Final Discussion* - ended in success. Thus, objective 3, *learn from our classmates about the cultures and countries they are studying,* objective 4, *understand the daily life, traditions, history, and culture of our countries of concentration,* and objective 5, *develop the skills to interact with people of different cultures* were reached to some extent.

Objectives 2, *begin to understand the necessity of multicultural education,* and 6, *learn about different ways to look at cultures* were not met. Concerning objective 2, the primary reason we did not arrive at its destination was time ; we were so busy with learning activities related to objectives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 that we could not explicitly touch upon objective 2 until the last meeting. Understanding the necessity of multicultural education entails critically examining how non-Japanese residents are treated in Japan.

Objective 6 was also problematic even though we devoted sufficient time to it. Hadley (2000) writes that a problem with the teaching of other cultures is that it treats culture as a collection of facts and establishes rather than dispels the myths of stereotypes. Objective 6 was designed to help us appreciate the complexity of culture by examining different ways of looking at cultures. One such way of looking at cultures was learning about Geert Hofstede's 5 dimensions of culture. According to Hofstede, different cultures can be compared across the following five dimensions :

individualism, power distance, masculinity, long-term/short-term orientation, and uncertainty avoidance (see Hofstede, 2001 ; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005 or the Powerpoint Presentation in *Schedule and Results - Each Meeting in Detail - Meeting 11*). We also attempted to examine cultures we were studying through these dimensions. Unfortunately, this might have had the effect of perpetuating stereotypes as the co-learner below indicated :

Artifact 7 : A co-learner explains the danger of Hofstede's 5 dimensions of culture
"Even if I knew each dimension, I'll start to communicate with some foreigners based on my selfish stereotype image."

We will end this discussion with a formative evaluation of whether MMCE reached its objectives. I learned that the objectives of MMCE are interconnected and should be displayed as such. For example, by accomplishing objective 1, objectives 3, 4, and 5 were easily reached. Thus, I decided to rewrite the goals of MMCE so that objectives 1, 3, 4, and 5 (with it sub-objectives) were grouped together. Also, I decided to include the objectives that we did not reach in next year's objectives. Next year, co-learners will be presented with the goals in Artifact 8.

Artifact 8 : Next year's objectives for MMCE
1) Tell other MMCE members about the cultures and countries we are studying. ★Enabling Objectives ① Build a cooperative learning community so we can learn from each other and teach each other. ② Develop the ability to share learned information with other people. ③ Develop the ability to investigate generalizations about other cultures and form your own opinions about them.

④ Develop the ability to lead discussions or cooperative learning activities.

⑤ Develop the skills necessary to interact with people from other cultures (For example - the skills necessary to elicit information about a certain culture without offending anyone.)

⑥ Understand the daily life, traditions, history and culture of our countries of concentration.

2) Learn and evaluate ways of looking at culture.

3) Begin to understand the necessity of Multicultural Education (in Japan).

The biggest problem with the *Learn and Evaluate Ways of Looking at Culture* objective was sequencing : We studied Hofstede's 5 dimensions of culture in detail after *the Examining National Stereotypes Discussion*. Seelye (1993, p.63) writes that although stereotypes can "capture characteristics that are common in a large society", they are problematic in that they "lead us to ignore the considerable variety of personalities that make up a society". The sequencing of MMCE should be changed so that we initially examine the cultural dimensions of each culture we are studying and then experience first hand through the *Examining National Stereotypes Discussion* that although societies can have common characteristics each member is an individual with his or her own unique pattern of thinking.

Lastly, concerning the *Begin to Understand the Necessity of Multicultural Education objective*, I believe that we should not just consider how non-Japanese live outside of Japan but also how non-Japanese live inside Japan. During the *Examining National Stereotypes Discussion*, we will ask our guests to talk more about their lives in Japan. Also, we will have the *Final Discussion* earlier so was can spend the last two weeks talking about how non-Japanese live in Japan.

Although we did not have a clear route to our destinations, we the co-learners of MMCE, arrived at 4 of 6 together. Next year, I am looking forward to the challenge of arriving at 6 of 6 destinations.

Answer to Question 2 : How can the learning activities be made more effective?

Answer 1 : *Refrain from all-class discussions unless participants have adequate time to plan what they will say.*

"All-class discussions" never worked well even after we invested a lot of time in community building. This was particularly evident in meeting 10 where I showed a shocking video of an American comedy show parodying a Japanese Game Show and a Japanese variety show parodying foreigners. As was evident from the reflections posted on the DTP under Meeting 10 (see *Each Meeting in Detail* on the *Schedule and Learning Outcomes* Page), many of the co-learners had strong opinions about this subject. However, not one member, save for a Brazilian co-learner, said what they thought in front of their fellow co-learners. In my experience, MMCE members could speak their opinions in groups and then present to the rest of MMCE as a group but were very reluctant to speak out individually before all of MMCE. What is to be learned is that MMCE members need the opportunity to discuss topics in groups and then plan as a group what they will say in front of the other members. Also, co-learners will need time to plan what they want to say. Speaking can never be rushed.

Answer 2 : When planning a group learning activity give the co-learners ample time to warm up and make sure the seating or standing arrangement does not inhibit the activity.

Small group discussions can work well but they will not succeed if not planned carefully. Particular attention must be paid to the physical seating or

standing arrangement of the co-learners. This includes such considerations as how seating and standing room can be arranged in such a way that will make interaction among co-learners easier. An example of a group learning activity not succeeding because of poor planning was the Anbura and Leba activity in Meeting 6 (see *Each Meeting in Detail* on the *Schedule and Learning Outcomes* Page). In this activity, co-learners role-played being members of two different cultures, the Anbura and the Leba, with comically different customs of interaction. Although some co-learners evaluated this activity highly, others did not like it. The problem with this activity was explained very well by the co-learner below :

Artifact 9 : *The problem with the Anbura and Leba activity*
"The idea was good, but needed more time to warm up, and to have enough room to act. Then everybody could grasp the situation and enjoyed their play more."

The main problem was that I did not think of how much space we would need to conduct this activity and the end result was the co-learners pretending to be Anbura and Leba had no room to interact. Another problem was the co-learners did not have enough time to warm-up and learn their roles. Thus, they performed a role-play they were not prepared for in a space that was too cramped for them. After the role-play, I attempted to conduct a discussion with all the MMCE members but it was mostly an exercise in being silent. The reason was because the role-play was not successful. In many cases, planning a learning activity was a collaborative process between me and another CLG. Next year we will have to ensure that our fellow co-learners have the necessary space and time to prepare to benefit from a learning activity.

Final Analysis

The preceding represents a fraction of the discoveries that were made. The reason why so many discoveries could be made was the easy accessibility of a wide array of material on the MMCE Facilitator's Porttolio. Theoretical influences of MMCE, co-learner reactions, learning artifacts, and resources were available with a few clicks of the mouse, which, in turn generated a lot of material for analysis.

The original purpose of the MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio was to serve as a way to evaluate the author's MMCE syllabus and improve it. It was also designed to be used as a resource for educators interested in a novel approach to handling cross-cultural topics in the classroom. Although the portfolio has been very beneficial to its creator, it has had few visits from people beside me and not one person has written any feedback on the portfolio. One of the reasons for this is that the portfolio is written primarily in English and must be changed to Japanese to attract a wider audience in Japan.

Another reason might lie in the portfolio having too many purposes ; perhaps a DTP can be either a showcase of how the author's knowledge and skill as an educator changed over time or a resource for other teachers but not both at the same time. In creating the MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio, I skipped the select stage so that as many resources as possible would be available to fellow educators. However, a portfolio should show only the artifacts that demonstrate how the author's skills and knowledge changed over time. For the MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio to be a better resource for teachers, its content should be organized by type of material (i.e., discussion activities, teaching about culture, learning about multiculturalism in Japan, etc.) rather than in the sequence in which they were used. Also, perhaps educators do not care so much about the connection between my personal education, the curriculum of MMCE, the learning activities and

the learning outcomes. Rather, they want a theory of multi-cultural education, ideas for activities, suggestions for carrying them out and a list of useful resources.

In conclusion, this narrative shows the power of the DTP in helping a teacher connect his own learning experiences, education theory, class planning, and student reaction to improve the syllabus of a class. The formative element also shows how a teacher can use the DTP for professional development, as I was able improve upon the objectives of MMCE and propose how to make specific learning activities more effective.

The shortcoming of this project, though, is that it failed to attract a wide audience and the author had very little feedback from anyone outside of MMCE. Thus, the next project will be to create a *Multicultural Educator's Reference Website.*

Barrett, H. (2004). Digital Stories of Deep Learning. Retrieved February 3, 2006 from
http : //electronicportfolios.com/digistory/epstory.html

E-Portfolio Team. (2004) Preparing an E-Portfolios. *E -Portfolio Portal*. Retrieved February 1, 2006 from
http : //www.deskootenays.ca/wilton/eportfolios/preparing.php

Glencoe On-line. (2005) Creating Professional Portfolios, Teaching Tips of the Week. *Teaching Today*. Retrieved February 5, 2006 from
http : //www.glencoe.com/sec/teachingtoday/weeklytips.phtml/21

Hadley, A.O. (2000). *Teaching Language in Context*. United States : Heinle & Heinle.

Hall, J. (2005a) *MMCE Facilitator's Portfolio*. Retrieved February 3, 2006 from
http : //www.englisheducation.iwate-u.ac.jp/Hall/TopPageFrame.htm

Hall, J (2005b) *On-Line Handbook of Multicultural Education*. Retrieved February 6, 2006 from

http : //www.englisheducation.iwate-u.ac.jp/Hall/MMCE/MMCE.htm

Hofstede, G. (2001) Culture's Consequences. London : Sage Publications.

Hofstede, G & G.J. Hofstede.(2005). Cultures and Organizations : Software of the Mind. New York : McGraw Hill.

Oliver, D.W. & K.W. Gershman. (1989). *Education, Modernity, and Fractured Meaning*. Albany : State University of New York Press.

Seelye, H.N. (1993). *Teaching Culture. Illinois :* National Textbook Company