Combining extensive reading while listening (ERWL) with cooperative learning

[1]Kaoru Tsuda, [2]Noriko Muramatsu, [3]Willy A Renandya, [4]George M Jacobs

[1]*Graduate College of Education, Temple University, Japan Campus, JAPAN*
[1]*1-14-29 Taishido, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo*

[2]*Meiji University Meiji High School and Meiji Junior High School, JAPAN*
[2]*4-23-25 Fujimi-cho, Chofu-city, Tokyo*

[3]*Department of English Language and Literature, Nanyang Technological University, SINGAPORE*
[3]*1 Nanyang Walk, Singapore 637616*

[4]*Department of Language and Literacy Education, Faculty of Education, University of Malaya, MALAYSIA*
[4]*50603 Kuala Lumpur Malaysia*

ABSTRACT

In this teaching-oriented project, we propose an extensive reading while listening (ERWL) program in which cooperative learning (CL) tasks are also implemented. We believe that by implementing ERWL combined with CL tasks, teachers can invite their learners to improve all four language skills while simultaneously enhancing their motivation for ERWL. We will first explain the benefits of ERWL and CL for second language (L2) learners and then the rationale for combining these two learning methods. Next, we will present CL tasks designed for students to improve all four language skills while doing ERWL.

How to cite (APA Style):
Tsuda, K., Muramatsu, N., Renandya, W.A., Jacobs, G.M. (2023). Combining extensive reading while listening (ERWL) with cooperative learning. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature)*, 8(1), 125-145. https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v8i1.26128

Kaoru Tsuda, Noriko Muramatsu, Willy A Renandya, George M Jacobs

Input plays an essential role in second language (L2) acquisition (Day & Robb, 2015). This article provides ideas on how to increase the comprehensible input that L2 learners provide themselves via extensive reading (ER) and extensive listening (EL). The article then suggests that student can beneficially combine these two by listening while they do extensive reading in the form of Extensive Reading While Listening (ERWL). Furthermore, output activities can be added to ERWL in the form of cooperative learning (CL). In this way, students can enhance the quantity of the input they receive, thereby potentially boosting their receptive language skills: listening and reading. At the same time, students can enhance the quantity of the output they produce, thereby potentially boosting their productive language skills – speaking and writing. Details are provided.

Extensive Reading and Extensive Listening
Extensive reading (ER) refers to "the reading of a large amount of material with high comprehension and minimal interruptions" (Waring, 2023, p. 384) and a substantial body of research has suggested that ER can promote the acquisition of reading skills of L2 learners by enhancing their word recognition skills, vocabulary, grammar, reading comprehension, reading fluency, and positive attitudes toward reading (Brown et al., 2008; Jacobs & Gallo, 2002; Jacobs & Renandya, 2015; Nation & Waring, 2019; Renandya & Farrell, 2011; Renandya & Jacobs, 2002; Waring, 2023).

Extensive listening (EL) rests on foundations similar to those of ER and involves listening to a large amount of comprehensible and enjoyable auditory input (Chang & Millett, 2014; Chang et al., 2019; Renandya & Farrell, 2011). Compared with ER, whose effectiveness in improving reading skills has been well validated, EL is a comparatively new concept. However, some studies have suggested that EL can improve learners' L2 proficiency in general especially for foreign language learners who do not receive sufficient meaningful auditory input outside of the classroom (Pamuji et al., 2019; Renandya & Farrell, 2011).

Extensive Reading While Listening
Extensive reading while listening (ERWL) is a combination of ER and EL, where learners extensively read comprehensible reading materials (i.e., written scripts) while simultaneously listening to auditory input. Advanced learners can use authentic materials created for native speakers, such as podcast programs and their scripts, and books and their audio versions for ERWL. For elementary and intermediate learners, however, such authentic materials can be too challenging, and therefore, ERWL programs for elementary and intermediate learners are often implemented using graded

readers, which are books specifically written for L2 learners with vocabulary and grammar control and less sentence complexity (for detailed information on graded readers, see Chapter 2, *What Are Graded Readers?* in Nation & Waring, 2019). Some studies have suggested that ERWL can improve listening comprehension (Chang & Millett, 2014; Chang et al., 2019), reading comprehension (Woodall, 2010), a rate of incidental vocabulary acquisition (Brown et al., 2008), vocabulary recognition and reading rate (Gobel & Kano, 2014), and enhance positive attitudes for ERWL both for adult (Brown et al., 2008; Chang & Millett, 2014; Chang et al., 2019; Woodall, 2010) and young learners (Tragant & Vallbona, 2018).

Two studies are particularly important in understanding the effectiveness of ERWL in improving listening comprehension. Chang and Millett (2014) investigated the effects of three different input modes, reading only (RO), listening only (LO), and reading while listening plus LO (RWL+LO) on listening comprehension as measured by one pre-test and one post-test created based on both familiar and unfamiliar texts. The study involved 113 lower intermediate university students in Taiwan who formed three groups, and all groups studied 10 level-1 graded readers for 13 weeks, each group with a different mode. Each group had a 100-minute reading and a 100-minute listening class per week. The RO group read graded readers without audio (reading class) and practiced listening using a coursebook (listening class), the LO group practiced reading using a coursebook (reading class) and listened to audio graded readers without texts and simultaneously answered listening practice questions (listening class), and the RWL+LO group read while listened to graded readers (reading class) and listened to the same audio graded readers without texts and simultaneously answered listening practice questions (listening class). The RWL+LO and LO groups showed statistically significant improvement both for familiar and unfamiliar texts while the RO group did not for neither text. Among the three groups, the RWL+LO group showed the highest and most consistent gains.

Chang et al. (2019) conducted a study involving 69 higher beginning and lower intermediate college students in Taiwan, the design of which was similar to that of Chang and Millett (2014) but with one major change, i.e., in the latter study 10 level-1, 10 level-2, and eight leve1-3 graded readers were used for 13 weeks for each level (39 weeks in total). Three post-tests created based on both practiced and unpracticed texts with three corresponding levels were administered after the participants finished each level (post-tests 1, 2, and 3). The RWL+LO group showed a statistically significant improvement in all three post-tests for both practiced and unpracticed texts. The LO group also showed a statistically significant improvement in all three post-tests for practiced texts and in the post-test 1 for unpracticed text, but the gains were smaller than those of the RWL+LO group. The RO group showed no

significant improvement in their listening test scores. Considering only the RWL+LO group consistently showed high listening comprehension both for practiced and unpracticed texts even when the difficulties of the texts and speech rate of the audio were increased, Chang et al. (2019) concluded that the RWL+LO group's superior performance probably resulted from listening support (i.e., texts) and repeated listening practice (i.e., practicing first RWL and then LO) and that such textual support and repetition could motivate learners to continue listening by helping learners experience enjoyable and successful listening.

Possible Explanations for Effectiveness of RWL
Researchers have offered possible explanations why RWL can be advantageous compared with RO and LO. RWL can be helpful especially to foreign language learners whose reading comprehension is significantly better than their listening comprehension, because RWL can bridge the gap between their reading and listening comprehension (Brown et al., 2008; Chang et al., 2019) by helping learners segment texts and form letter-sound correspondence (Brown et al., 2008; Chang et al., 2019; Stephens & Aoki, 2021; Tragant & Vallbona, 2018; Woodall, 2010). It is considered that this assisted decoding might impose a lighter cognitive load, which in turn enables learners to deal with the input more efficiently and hence achieve better listening comprehension (Chang, 2009; Chang & Millett, 2014; Chang et al., 2019), reading comprehension (Woodall, 2010), and a higher rate of incidental vocabulary learning (Brown et al., 2008). Woodall (2010) argued that RWL could be helpful especially for beginning level L2 learners, because learners at this level have difficulties in forming connections between sounds and written words even for familiar words.

Furthermore, in Brown et al.'s (2008) study, the 35 participants (Japanese university students with lower intermediate or intermediate level proficiency in English), after experiencing three different modes (RWL, RO, and LO), were asked to choose their most preferred mode, and 25 (72%) chose RWL, 10 (28%) RO, and none chose LO. The researchers investigated the reason for the overwhelming preference for the RWL mode and concluded that "a key reason for favoring the reading-while-listening mode was that the necessity of having to segment or chunk the text of the story as they read it was done for them by the narrator on the cassette" (Brown et al., 2008, p. 156). The researchers further hypothesized that the higher comprehension achieved by assisted decoding increased learners' enjoyment of the listening/reading experience, which led to the participants' positive attitudes toward RWL.

Conklin et al. (2020) conducted an eye-tracking study involving 31 first language (L1) and 32 L2 speakers of English to identify how eye-movement

patterns differ in RWL and reading-only modes. The L2 participants were students in a UK university with an advanced level of English of different L1s. In the reading-only condition, the L2 participants had longer and more fixations (i.e., slower reading) than their L1 counterparts. In RWL, on the other hand, L1 and L2 readers had very similar eye-movement patterns: the eye movements of both L1 and L2 readers were generally not aligned to the auditory input (L1 readers' reading and the audio were aligned about 17% of the time, while L2 readers' reading and the audio were aligned about 33% of the time), and when reading and the audio were not aligned, the reading generally preceded the audio for both groups (L1 readers were ahead about 89% of the time, and L2 readers about 79%), although L2 readers had more instances where their fixations lagged behind the auditory input. Furthermore, results of vocabulary size tests for both the L1 and L2 participants suggested that vocabulary size was a significant predictor of reading ahead or behind and that the participants with larger vocabulary sizes had less alignment between visual and auditory words and higher odds of reading ahead. Conklin et al. (2020) concluded that "[i]t seems plausible that having visual cues about segmenting upcoming auditory information might be helpful to listeners" (p. 273), indicating that reading *while* listening is probably in fact reading *immediately before* listening. They also argued that the fact that the L2 participants' reading was aligned with the audio more frequently than the L1 participants' might suggest that L2 readers make more use of visual texts as a support for their listening than L1 readers and that RWL might be more beneficial to less proficient L2 learners with smaller vocabulary.

Implementation of ERWL Programs
These studies suggest that ERWL can be effective in enhancing L2 proficiency in general. The implementation of ERWL, however, can be more challenging than ER or EL, because most learners are probably unfamiliar with this learning method, i.e., reading and listening simultaneously. Therefore, if learners do not receive adequate explanation on how to implement ERWL and what benefits they can possibly gain from it, they are likely to become demotivated especially when an ERWL program is implemented not as in-class activity but as homework. Furthermore, teachers need to be aware that the speed of the audio may exceed learners' reading speed (Stephens & Aoki, 2021) and that when the audio is too fast for learners, they might not be able to use written scripts as visual support for upcoming auditory information because they cannot read ahead of the auditory input. Therefore, when choosing materials for ERWL, it is recommended that learners actually practice not only RO but also RWL with a part of the audio and choose a level in which they can understand stories comfortably in RWL mode. As for the

time to be allotted to ERWL, although there are no fixed criteria, it is advisable that students spend at least half of the class time on ERWL (25 minutes for a 50-minute class and 45 minutes for a 90-minute class) and if possible, an hour or more in total per week, based on the suggestion of Nation and Waring (2019) that learners should practice ER for at least an hour a week. Moreover, 45 minutes of ERWL might help learners prepare for standardized tests, because such tests tend to have long listening sections (Brown et al., 2008). For example, the listening section of the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) iBT Test is 41–57 minutes and that of the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) is 45 minutes. However, according to Gobel (2011), an average of 16 minutes of RWL per week seemed to have a positive effect on TOEFL scores of Japanese university students. Therefore, teachers might want to give ERWL a try even with a small amount of time as one way of increasing the amount of auditory input.

Motivation is crucial for ER, EL, and ERWL programs because the amount of comprehensible input can be an important predictor of learning gains both in ER (Nation & Waring, 2019; Renandya & Jacobs, 2002) and RWL programs (Gobel, 2011; Gobel & Kano, 2014), and in order to encourage learners to read and listen extensively, teachers need to keep learners motivated. There are different ways to increase learners' motivation, and one possible way is to combine ER or ERWL with cooperative learning (CL).

Combining Cooperative Learning with Extensive Reading while Listening
Cooperative learning (CL) is defined as "[p]rinciples and techniques for helping students work together more effectively" (Jacobs et al., 2002, p. ix). Unlike impromptu group activities done without any forethought, group activities based on the principles of CL are "group activities done with thought" (Jacobs & Kimura, 2013, p. 7) and help learners work with each other effectively. Different CL theorists have proposed different sets of CL principles. Many, however, consider *positive interdependence* to be the most important principle in CL (Jacobs & Farrell, 2012; Jacobs & Gallo, 2002; Jacobs et al., 2002). Positive interdependence is "a feeling among group mates that everyone is important and necessary and that what helps one member helps others and what hurts one group member hurts the rest" (Jacobs & Kimura, 2013, p. 19). This positive interdependence is usually lacking in ER or ERWL, because they typically involve independent reading without peer interaction. However, by combining ER or ERWL with CL (i.e., combining individual reading with cooperative activities such as group activities on reading), ER or ERWL can become a cooperative activity where learners can increase each other's motivation through peer interaction such as providing each other with an audience in discussions on their reading and peer book suggestions (Jacobs & Farrell, 2012; Jacobs & Gallo, 2002; Jacobs & Renandya, 2015). Furthermore,

ER, EL, and ERWL are all input-focused activities where learners are exposed to a large amount of comprehensible input, while CL tasks are output-focused activities where learners are encouraged to produce comprehensible output. Learners should be provided with both input- and output-focused activities because both input and output are crucial for language acquisition. According to Krashen's input hypothesis (1982, 1985), language learners acquire their L2 by receiving L2 input that is slightly more advanced than their current level. Moreover, according to Swain's output hypothesis (2005), output plays a significant role in language acquisition by providing learners with opportunities to notice the gaps between what they want to say and what they can actually say. Thus, an ERWL program combined with CL tasks can motivate learners to read, listen, speak, and write in meaningful ways, which in turn can improve all of these four language skills in an enjoyable way.

This ERWL program with CL tasks can be implemented in-class for different levels of L2 learners. It is recommended that learners each choose their own ERWL materials (most probably graded readers with accompanying audio) and individually perform RWL using earphones and an audio player, so that students can enjoy a sense of autonomy in choosing their books according to their own interests and levels, and in their ability to control the pace of the audio. However, previous studies have suggested that in-class ERWL programs in which the entire class reads the same books can also be successful in both improving reading (Woodall, 2010) and listening (Chang & Millett, 2014; Chang et al.) comprehension and enhancing positive attitudes toward ERWL (Brown et al., 2008; Chang & Millett, 2014; Tragant & Vallbona, 2018; Woodall, 2010).

Nation and Waring (2019) argued that getting learners to understand how to implement ER and what effects they can get from it can motivate them to read and recommended teachers to discuss goals and issues of ER with learners on various occasions. Therefore, it is assumed that also for ERWL programs, it is crucial that students understand the programs' potential effectiveness in improving their L2 proficiency and how to practice ERWL. CL tasks also need explicit teaching of CL techniques (examples below) and cooperative skills such as asking for clarification and disagreeing politely in order to be successful (Jacobs & Chau, 2021; Jacobs & Farrell, 2012; Jacobs & Gallo, 2002; Jacobs et al., 2002). Therefore, in the first class, as well as in later classes, teachers should explain the why and how of both ERWL and CL while referring to the evidence as to their efficacy provided by previous studies. Teachers should also conduct a demonstration as to how to do ERWL. Last, but not least, students need to experience initial success. Thus, initial ERWL texts should be easily comprehensible, and initial CL tasks should be fairly easy to do.

Cooperative Learning Tasks
We present four CL tasks which can be combined with ERWL: (1) circle of interviewers (Jacobs et al., 2002), (2) dictogloss, (3) book recommendation, and (4) class readers. All of these CL tasks are aimed at improving learners' cooperative skills and enhancing motivation for ERWL. Please note also that CL activities can be varied according to circumstances. Thus, teachers and students can (and certainly should and will) tweak the techniques described below.

CL Task 1: Circle of Interviewers
Circle of interviewers (Jacobs et al., 2002) is a cooperative speaking task which involves both pair and group work. In this task, students first form pairs and take turn interviewing their partner (i.e., asking questions and taking notes). After the interviews, each pair joins another pair, creating a group of four, and then group members take turn reporting their partner's answers to the other pair in their foursome. Because students are required to report about what their partner has told them in the reporting phase, they are motivated to listen attentively to their partner in the interviewing phase, as well as providing their partner with comprehensible output. Circle of interviewers, as with other CL techniques, can be used with any topic, for example, CL itself (e.g., possible benefits and drawbacks of CL, reflection on their experiences of working collaboratively with others), different modes of reading and listening (i.e., RWL, RO, and LO) and their possible benefits and drawbacks, or books students have read for their ERWL program (i.e., book discussions).

Book discussions are particularly useful because they can enhance students' motivation to read more by providing them with opportunities to discuss what they have read. Plus, discussion provides more chances for more L2 input, as well as output and interaction. Furthermore, book discussions also work as peer suggestions for new books. For book discussions, it is recommended that students be provided with support such as guidelines (e.g., Appendix A) especially for elementary and lower intermediate learners. Students, however, do not need to adhere strictly to the guidelines. Rather, students should have the freedom to add their own questions individually and as a class.

CL Task 1: Circle of Interviewers

Collaborative Speaking Task: Circle of interviewers	Procedure	Collaborative Principles Used
Objectives Students will be able to: 1. Improve their cooperative skills while enhancing their speaking fluency. 2. Improve their motivation for continuing their ERWL by providing each other with an authentic audience and book suggestions. **Teacher instruction** The teacher should: 1. Carefully observe peer interaction to analyze which cooperative skills they are using (or not using) and whether their usage is effective or not. 2. Take notes if there are recurrent and prevalent mistakes in pragmatics, grammar, suitable wording, etc., and later point them out to the whole class. The teacher, however, needs to be aware that the main focus of this activity is to develop collaborative skills and enhance motivation for ERWL.	(pre-task preparation) Teacher and students discuss a topic and students write down their ideas in dot points. Note: Students jot down key words for their ideas for personal use only. In order to encourage students to listen carefully to each other, these personal notes should not be shared with others. (Step 1: interviewing in pairs) Students form pairs and take turn interviewing their partner. (Step 2: reporting in a group of four) Each pair joins another pair, creating a group of four. Group members take turns reporting answers of their partner to the whole group. (post-task activity) The teacher gives feedback mainly on the content of students' discussions and also their use of collaborative skills. If necessary, the teacher can also do a mini-lesson on a collaborative skill on which students might need help. Note: Teaching collaborative skills includes teaching set phrases for particular situations, showing video clips in which the target	**Positive Interdependence**: In this task, a gain for one student is a gain for another (students can provide each other with new ideas and an authentic audience). Furthermore, students absolutely need each other to perform the task. **Individual accountability**: Each student first needs to form their ideas during the pre-task preparation and then perform the roles of interviewer, interviewee, and reporter, i.e., individual public performance is required. **Equal opportunity to participate**: Each student takes turns assuming the roles of interviewer, interviewee, and reporter for the same amount of time. Thus, their participation has the opportunity to be more or less equal. The teacher, however, needs to teach students how to encourage their peers to speak more by asking questions to confirm their comprehension and giving hints. **Maximum peer interactions**: During Step 1, 50% of students are speakers at any given time and in Step 2, 25%. Thus, this task encourages maximum quantity of peer interaction. Furthermore, because in Step 2, each student needs to

Collaborative Speaking Task: Circle of interviewers	Procedure	Collaborative Principles Used
	skill is used, and roleplaying. More detailed explanation on how to teach collaborative skills can be found in Chapter 7, *Principle: Collaborative Skills* of Jacobs et al., (2002).	report their partners' responses, not their own, to the others in their foursome, students may feel the need to engage in active interactions with their partner in Step 1 (maximum quality of peer interaction).

CL Task 2: Dictogloss

Dictogloss is a collaborative writing task which consists mainly of three steps: (1) the teacher reads a short text at normal speed while students take notes, (2) learners reconstruct the text together in small groups based on their notes, and (3) learners compare their reconstructed versions with the original text as a whole class and the teacher gives feedback (Swain, 2001). In most versions of dictogloss, teachers read a text twice in the second step: first at a normal speed while students just listen without taking notes and then at a slower speed while students take notes. In dictogloss, learners can enhance their four language skills: listening (to the teacher and their partner), speaking (to their partner), reading (notes, the reconstructed text, the original text), and writing (taking notes and reconstructing the text), while enhancing their cooperative skills through active peer interactions during the reconstruction (Jacobs & Small, 2003). Furthermore, the effectiveness of dictogloss in improving learners' accuracy has been pointed out by researchers (Swain, 2001; Swain & Lapkin, 2001; Swain & Watanabe, 2013). They have argued that dictogloss can encourage learners to pay attention to not only meaning but also grammatical forms, which can lead to their improved accuracy because dictogloss provides learners with a highly proficient speaker model text to be analyzed, and the activity requires learners to produce written language collaboratively by putting their joint attention on grammar (Swain, 2001; Swain & Lapkin, 2001; Swain & Watanabe, 2013). Texts used for dictogloss need to be suitable for learners' level both in length and difficulty (i.e., vocabulary, grammar, and sentence complexity). For this task, book descriptions and/or short passages of various graded readers of different genres (e.g., fantasy, non-fiction, and biography) which students can choose as their next book can be used.

However, various kinds of texts can be used for dictogloss as long as they are suitable for learners' proficiency level.

CL Task2: Dictogloss

Collaborative Writing Task: Dictogloss	Procedure	Collaborative Principles Used
Objectives Students will be able to: 1. Improve their cooperative skills while enhancing their four language skills. 2. Improve their motivation for continuing their ERWL by listening to book descriptions and passages from different books and deepening their understanding on different styles used in different genres. **Teacher instruction** The teacher should: 1. Observe students carefully during Step 3 and give feedback. The purpose of this task is learning collaborative skills and enhancing all the four language skills. The focus of the writing is accuracy, and thus the teacher needs to give feedback on grammar when necessary.	(pre-task preparation) The teacher writes the title of the book on the whiteboard and shows the front cover of the book to the whole class using a projector and then asks students to guess the genre of the book and what it is about. Students write down their ideas in dot points. (Step 1) The teacher reads the text aloud at normal speed as students listen for comprehension without taking notes. (Step 2) The teacher reads the text again at a slower rate and students take notes. (Step 3) Students form pairs and reconstruct the text in full sentences. Note: the reconstruction does not need to be a word-for-word copy of the original text, but students are encouraged to reconstruct the meaning and grammar of the original text as accurately as possible. Pairs who have finished their reconstruction are asked to help other pairs. (Step 4)	**Positive Interdependence**: In this task, students need each other to reconstruct the text successfully. **Individual accountability**: Each student first needs to form their ideas during the pre-task preparation and then individually takes notes during Step 2. **Equal opportunity to participate**: Each student has different notes to contribute to the reconstruction, which encourages all students to participate. **Maximum peer interactions**: This task mainly involves a simultaneous interaction in each pair (maximum peer interaction in quantity). Furthermore, each pair has a clear goal (reconstruction) to achieve and they need to discuss both the meaning and grammar of the original text (maximum peer interaction in quality). **Group autonomy**: During the reconstruction, students are encouraged to help each other as pairs and then extend their help to other pairs before the teacher's presentation of the original text. Thus, they can learn to help each other and

Collaborative Writing Task: Dictogloss	Procedure	Collaborative Principles Used
	The teacher displays the original text to the whole class using the projector and students compare their reconstruction with the original text in terms of meaning and grammar.	develop mutual respect and comradery.

These two tasks, circle of interviewers and dictogloss, can be regularly implemented at various points of the class time.

CL Task 3: Book Recommendation

Book recommendation is a writing task in which students create small cards which contain their book recommendation in order to recommend appealing books they have read to future listeners/readers or to warn peers about books they might not enjoy. It can be difficult for L2 learners to find materials that are both appealing and at the appropriate difficulty levels. Here, peers can help, as they are likely to be closer to each other as to interests and proficiency. Peer suggestions can lead students to take a chance with unfamiliar genres, authors, and topics. Although the actual writing of book recommendations is done individually by students, this task can enhance students' sense of collaboration because they can help each other find interesting books through their book recommendations. If teachers prefer to add more collaboration to writing, a teacher and students can collaborate to write guidelines for book recommendations or even a sample recommendation. Alternatively, students can provide each other with peer feedback on their writing. Research has suggested that peer feedback can help learners become both better readers and writers by providing each other with useful comments and a specific audience (Rollinson, 2005). Teachers, however, first need to carefully prepare students for peer feedback (see for example, Chapter 8, *Implementing Peer Response* in Ferris, 2003).

In order to implement this task, teachers need to explain to students in advance that they are going to write book recommendations and thus need to finish reading their book by a certain class in which they create book recommendations. Teachers should provide students with cards (e.g., Appendix B) and examples (i.e., book descriptions of various graded readers) and explain that they need to include three points for fiction books: (1) main character(s), (2) a main event (problem to be solved and/or goal to be achieved), and (3) a reason to read or not to read the book and three points for non-fiction books: (1) main topic, (2) interesting information (facts and ideas) readers can learn, and (3) a reason to read or not to read the book. Book

recommendations can be posted on a bulletin board and/or kept with recommended books (e.g., a pocket made of an envelope can be attached to the inside of a front book cover to keep book recommendations). If teachers provide students with easy access to those book recommendations including via online media (e.g., class blogs), they can share their recommendations with students from different classes and different times. Book recommendation task can be implemented not just once but several times during an ERWL program to provide students with sufficient opportunities to introduce books they have read for the program.

CL Task 4: Class Readers
Class readers is a collaborative reading and speaking task in which collaborative comprehension of stories is achieved through peer assistance. Students, by providing assistance to each other, can achieve a better comprehension of the story, vocabulary, grammar, and cultural aspects. For example, Ro (2019) analyzed ER book club interactions and found that the participants not only focused on the content of the book but also on language forms (e.g., pronunciation, spelling, and morphological form) and thus expanded their linguistic knowledge through their peer interactions. Peer assistance, which is the core of class readers activity, is valuable because peers are more accessible and can provide personalized, localized, and contemporized assistance. Furthermore, this peer assistance can lower the anxiety of reading a whole book and enables students to enjoy the story.

This task is suitable for students who have already become used to doing in-class ERWL and therefore they can practice ERWL individually out of class. If students are still not familiar with how to practice ERWL, ERWL can be implemented as an in-class activity, but only until they understand the procedure, and the class time should be spent for group activities.

The same book is assigned to the whole class. Teachers need to choose books for class readers carefully. The level of the book should not be too difficult in terms of background knowledge and language (i.e., vocabulary, grammar, and sentence complexity), because if books are too difficult, students will not be able to enjoy the story. Therefore, if a story has a very different setting from what students know, it is probably necessary for teachers to provide students with some background knowledge before starting the reading. Also, the content of the book should include topics that are suitable for class discussion (i.e., teachers need to avoid topics that are too sensitive to discuss in class).

For group discussions, groups of four are recommended because with groups of four, the circle of interviewers' task can be easily implemented, when necessary, as a part of group discussion. Although students may prefer working with their friends, heterogeneous grouping in terms of proficiency

level, work attitude, personality, gender, etc. is recommended because students may learn to collaborate with people with different ideas and backgrounds through working together to achieve a common goal (Jacobs et al., 2002). Before forming groups, teachers should explain to students the benefits of heterogeneous grouping. For example, with heterogeneous groups, students can practice how to work with a diverse group of people, which is a crucial skill for any student, because in life, people seldom get to choose their groupmates. Instead, people need to interact with different kinds of people as colleagues, customers, etc. (Jacobs et al., 2002), and this skill is becoming more important than ever in this increasingly global world. Moreover, when a group consists of students of different proficiency levels, not only can less proficient students learn from more proficient students, but also more proficient students can learn by teaching others. This ability to teach others is also crucial in life, because people often need to help others understand information, procedures, etc. (Jacobs et al., 2002) (for more practical ideas to help groups function well, see Chapter 15, *Helping Groups That Aren't Functioning Well* in Jacobs et al., 2002). Also, if students seem to have a fear of risking their own chances of academic success by improving their classmates' outcomes especially in norm referenced assessment (i.e., a student's learning progress is compared to that of other students for evaluation, instead of being compared to fixed standards), teachers can refer to Jacobs and Greliche's (2017) study, which explained, using mathematical calculations, that when students help peers, there is only a small chance for students to suffer negative impacts on their own grades and their scores on standardized exams.

The class readers task consists of mainly two activities, ERWL and group discussions. Students individually practice ERWL of the same book out of class, and during the class time, teachers provide discussion questions at regular intervals (e.g., after finishing every chapter). Teachers should ask not only summarizing/factual questions (e.g., Who did …? When did … occur?) but also interpretation questions (e.g., How and why did they do it?), hypothesis questions (e.g., If you were the character, what would you do in that situation?), and personal opinion/evaluation questions (e.g., Was the action of the character good/bad? Why?). Teachers can also encourage students to discuss their prediction of what will happen in the next chapter of the story before starting a new chapter.

CL Task 4: Class Readers

Collaborative Reading and Speaking Task: Class Readers	Procedure	Collaborative Principles Used
Objectives Students will be able to:	(Step 1) Students form groups of four. The teacher	**Positive Interdependence**: In this task, students need each other to conduct group

1. Enhance their motivation for continuing their ERWL through group activities and improve their listening and reading skills through ERWL and their speaking skill through the activities.
2. Learn to read an English book in detail through discussions.
3. Provide peer assistance to each other using their cooperative skills.

Teacher instruction
The teacher should:
1. Prepare general comprehension questions according to the level of students.
2. Observe group activities and give hints or aid to those whose discussion is not proceeding well, or if a group does not comprehend the story correctly.

provides some background information of the story if the setting is unfamiliar to students. A handout can be provided in which the setting and relationships of main characters are explained.

(Step 2)
The teacher provides discussion questions and students have group discussions. The teacher goes around the groups to check their answers and/or briefly confirms students' answers as a whole class.

discussions and provide peer assistance.

Individual accountability:
Each student first needs to practice ERWL individually out of class and then provide answers during group discussions in class.

Equal opportunity to participate:
Each student has different ideas to contribute to discussions.

Group autonomy:
Students are encouraged to help each other comprehend the story. Through this mutual peer assistance, they can learn how to teach and learn from each other.

CONCLUSION

We have proposed an ERWL program combined with CL tasks, which can help students improve their four language skills and collaborative skills in an enjoyable and friendly environment. Reading is normally seen as a solitary activity, and in a world where many people plug their headphones into mobile devices, such as smart phones, listening is also often an activity done alone. However, if you combine reading and listening with CL activities, students can take part in lively collaborative activities which can not only help them learn second languages but, crucially, also enjoy reading and listening. If students come to enjoy reading and listening, they will probably become independent learners who continue learning even when teachers are not hovering over them. We hope that our proposal will help practitioners understand and implement ERWL and CL tasks and encourage researchers to

investigate their efficacy in different aspects of language learning, such as four language skills and motivation.

REFERENCES

Brown, R., Waring, R., & Donkaewbua, S. (2008). Incidental vocabulary acquisition from reading, reading-while-listening, and listening to stories. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *20*(2), 136–163. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ815119.pdf

Chang, A. C.-S. (2009). Gains to L2 listeners from reading while listening vs. listening only in comprehending short stories. *System*, *37*(4), 652–663. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.09.009

Chang, A. C-S., & Millett, S. (2014). The effect of extensive listening on developing L2 listening fluency: Some hard evidence. *ELT Journal*, *68*(1), 31–40. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct052

Chang, A. C-S., Millett, S., & Renandya, W. A. (2019). Developing listening fluency through supported extensive listening practice. *RELC Journal*, *50*(3), 422–438. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217751468

Conklin, K., Alotaibi, S., Pellicer-Sánchez, A., & Vilkaitė-Lozdienė, L. (2020). What eye-tracking tells us about reading-only and reading-while-listening in a first and second language. *Second Language Research*, *36*(3), 257–276. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658320921496

Day, R., & Robb, T. (2015). Extensive reading. In D. Nunan, & J. C. Richards (Eds.) *Language learning beyond the classroom* (pp. 3-12). Routledge.

Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Routledge.

Gobel, P. (2011). The effect of reading while listening on TOEFL gains. *Forum of Higher Education Research*, *1*(1), 44–51. https://ksu.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=repository_uri&item_id=1694&file_id=22&file_no=1

Gobel, P., & Kano, M. (2014). Implementing a year-long reading while listening program for Japanese University EFL students. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *27*(4), 279–293. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2013.864314

Jacobs, G. M., & Chau, M. H. (2021). Two approaches for promoting student centered language learning: Cooperative learning and positive psychology. *Beyond Words*, *9*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.33508/bw.v9i1.3042

Jacobs, G. M., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2012). *Teachers sourcebook for extensive reading.* Information Age Publishing.

Jacobs, G. M., & Gallo, P. (2002). Reading alone together: Enhancing extensive reading via student-student cooperation in second-language instruction. *Reading Online, 5*(6).

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234652426_Reading_Alon
e_Together_Enhancing_Extensive_Reading_via_Student-
Student_Cooperation_in_Second_Language_Instruction

Jacobs, G. M., & Greliche, N. (2017). Convincing students that their
groupmates' success can increase, not diminish, their own success.
Insight, *12*(2017), 145–157.
https://researchonline.jcu.edu.au/50241/3/50241%20Jacobs%20and%
20Greliche%202017.pdf

Jacobs, G. M., & Kimura, H. (2013). *Cooperative learning and teaching*. TESOL
International Association.

Jacobs, G. M., Power, M. A., & Loh, W. I. (2002). *The teacher's sourcebook for
cooperative learning: Practical techniques, basic principles, and frequently
asked questions*. Corwin Press.

Jacobs, G. M., & Renandya, W. A. (2015). Making extensive reading even
more student centered. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *4*, 102–
112. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v4i2.691

Jacobs, G. M., & Small, J. (2003). Combining dictogloss and cooperative
learning to promote language learning. *The Reading Matrix*, *3*(1).
https://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/jacobs_small/article.pdf

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.*
Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.

Nation, I. S. P., & Waring, R. (2019). *Teaching extensive reading in another
language*. Routledge.

Pamuji, K. D., Waring, R., & Kurniawan, E. (2019). EFL teachers' experiences
in developing L2 proficiency through extensive listening. *TEFLIN
Journal*, *30*(2), 257–273.
http://dx.doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v30i2/257-273

Renandya, W. A., & Farrell, T. S. (2011). 'Teacher, the tape is too fast!'
Extensive listening in ELT. *ELT Journal*, *65*(1), 52–59.
https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq015

Renandya, W. A., & Jacobs, G. M. (2002). Extensive reading: Why aren't we
all doing it? In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya, (Eds.), *Methodology in
language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 295–302).
Cambridge University Press.

Ro, E. (2019). How learning occurs in an extensive reading book club: A
conversation analytic perspective. *Applied Linguistics*, *40*(1), 152–175.
https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx014

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT
Journal*, *59*(1), 23-30. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci003

Stephens, M., & Aoki, Y. (2021). Student difficulties when reading-while-
listening. *Extensive Reading in Japan*, *14*(1), 7–9.

https://hosted.jalt.org/er/sites/jalt.org.er/files/ERJ/erj_issue_14.1.pdf

Swain, M. (2001). Integrating language and content teaching through collaborative tasks. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *58*(1), 44–63. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.58.1.44

Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471–483). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2001). Focus on form through collaborative dialogue: Exploring task effects. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching, and testing* (pp. 99–118). Longman.

Swain, M., & Watanabe, Y. (2013). Languaging: Collaborative dialogue as a source of second language learning. In C. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 3218–3225). Wiley-Blackwell.

Tragant, E., & Vallbona, A. (2018). Reading while listening to learn: Young EFL learners' perceptions. *ELT Journal*, *72*(4), 395–404. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy009

Waring, R. (2023) Extensive reading. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of practical second language teaching and learning* (pp. 384–394). Routledge.

Woodall, B. (2010). Simultaneous listening and reading in ESL: Helping second language learners read (and enjoy reading) more efficiently. *TESOL Journal*, *1*(2), 186–205. https://doi.org/10.5054/tj.2010.220151

THE AUTHORS

Kaoru Tsuda is a master's student currently studying TESOL at Temple University, Japan Campus. Her research interests include extensive reading while listening (ERWL), shadowing, and multilingualism. She has been practicing ERWL as a learner for more than 15 years for different languages.

Noriko Muramatsu is an English teacher and Director of International Collaboration at an affiliate school of Meiji University in Tokyo, Japan. Her research interests include the effects of extensive reading in the EFL context and teaching teenagers.

Dr. Willy A Renandya teaches language education courses at the National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. He has extensive experience teaching in Asia and has published extensively in the area of second language education. He maintains a large teacher professional development forum on FB called Teacher Voices: https://www.facebook.com/groups/teachervoices

George M Jacobs has a PhD in Education from University of Hawaii at Manoa. His research interests include cooperation, student-centered learning, ecolinguistics, and humane education. Many of his publications can be found on ResearchGate.

Kaoru Tsuda, Noriko Muramatsu, Willy A Renandya, George M Jacobs

(Appendix A: Circle of Interviewers Guidelines)

Circle of Interviewers Guidelines

Procedure

1: You are invited to interview your partner about the book s/he read. Follow the questions below, and please feel free to add more.

2: Your partner may wish to interview you. Thus, you might wish to prepare your answers in English.

3: After the interviews, the other two members of your group might enjoy hearing from you about your interviewee's book.

<u>Do NOT prepare your answers in sentences, but you may take notes of words and phrases.</u>

Sample Interview Questions:

(1) What is the title and who is the author of the book?
　Title:
　Author:

(2) What is the setting of the story? When does it take place? Over what period of time does the story take place, e.g., a year?
　The story takes place in …

(3) Who are the main characters in the story?

(4) What happens in the story? (Don't tell the ending! No spoilers.)

(5) What is your favorite section in the book? Why?
　My favorite section is …

(6) Did you like the book? Why or why not?

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Thank you for the interview.

(Appendix B: Book Recommendation Card)

Name: _____   Date: _____

Book recommendation

Title: _____   Series: _____
Author: _____   Genre: _____

Evaluation: ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆