

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

WELCOME TO M-CAMPUS!
**Raising awareness of skills and motivation through an
electronic learning module**

A Pro Gradu Thesis in English

by

Sisko Keski-Levijoki

**Department of Languages
2004**

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA KIELTEN LAITOS

Sisko Keski-Levijoki

WELCOME TO M-CAMPUS! Raising awareness of skills and motivation through an electronic learning module.

ProGradu-tutkielma

Englannin kieli

Maaliskuu 2004

111 sivua + 1 liite

Konstruktivistisen oppimiskäsityksen mukaan opiskelijoiden aikaisempia tietoja ja kokemuksia tulisi käyttää hyväksi mahdollisimman paljon uusissa oppimistilanteissa. Lisäksi kielitietoisuustutkimus osoittaa, että oppimiselle on hyvät edellytykset, kun tiedostutaan siitä, mitä ei vielä osata.

Tässä tutkielmassa kuvataan yliopisto-opiskelijoiden kieliopintoihin liittyviä metakognitiivisia taitoja sekä opiskelumotivaatiota kehittävän elektronisen oppimismoduulin 'm-campusen' suunnittelu ja toteutus sekä pilotointi Jyväskylän yliopiston Kielikeskuksen opiskelijoilla. Tutkielmassa esitetään myös jatkokehitysehdotuksia opiskelijoiden antaman palautteen ja heidän työskentelynsä sekä tutkijan omien havaintojen perusteella. Oppimismoduuli sijaitsee Internetissä osoitteessa <http://kielikompassi.jyu.fi/omatila/mcampus/>.

Oppimismoduulin pilotointiin osallistui syksyllä 2003 kolme yliopisto-opiskelijaa. Heidän motivaatiotaan kartoitettiin sekä työskentelyn alussa että lopussa elektronisen lomakkeen avulla. Työskentelyn lopuksi opiskelijat täyttivät palautelomakkeen, jossa heitä pyydettiin kommentoimaan opintojaan 'm-campusella' ja moduulin eri osia. Pilotoinnin tarkoituksena oli selvittää, kuinka 'm-campus' onnistuu opiskelijoiden motivoinnissa ja auttaako se opiskelijoita tulemaan tietoisiksi taidoistaan ja motivaatiostaan.

Pilotointivaiheen tuloksia ei voida yleistää sellaisenaan, koska mukana oli vain kolme opiskelijaa, mutta heidän mielipiteensä voidaan nähdä ainutlaatuisina näkökulmina materiaaliin. Tulosten analyysi viittaa siihen, että tietoisuudella taidoista ja motivaatiosta on yhteyttä toisiinsa. Kun opiskelijat pystyvät määrittelemään kehitystarpeensa konkreettisesti, heidän motivaatitietoisuutensa ja motivaatio ylipäänsä lisääntyvät. Kaiken kaikkiaan 'm-campus' oli opiskelijoille melko neutraali kokemus, vaikka tehtävät koettiin liian vaikeiksi ja hieman yksipuolisiksi. Tähän voi olla syynä se, että opiskelijoita ei kenties ohjattu tarpeeksi tehtäviin eivätkä he osanneet suhtautua tehtäviin niiden vaatimalla tavalla.

Asiasanat: teaching materials, electronic learning module, raising awareness, motivation

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION	5
2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	10
2.1 VIEWING SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING	10
2.1.1 Constructivism.....	11
2.1.2 Psychological and social constructivism	13
2.1.3 Constructivism and instructional technology	15
2.2 MOTIVATION IN SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING.....	17
2.2.1 Motivation and instructional technology.....	19
2.3 SELF-IMAGE AND SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING	22
2.3.1 Self-concept.....	23
2.3.2 The foreign language self-concept	24
2.4 AWARENESS.....	26
2.5 POINTS OF DEPARTURE FOR THIS STUDY	28
3 PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR PLANNING A LEARNING MODULE.....	32
3.1 DESIGNING MOTIVATING MATERIAL	32
3.2 DESIGNING MATERIAL THAT RAISES AWARENESS	35
3.3 DESIGNING MATERIAL IN ELECTRONIC FORM	39
4 FRAMEWORK FOR THIS STUDY.....	43
4.1 OVERVIEW OF THE 'M-CAMPUS' PROJECT.....	43
4.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE MATERIALS.....	48
4.2.1 General.....	49
4.2.2 The DIALANG-test	51
4.2.3 Introduction to 'm-campus'	52

4.2.4 Motivation form 1	52
4.2.5 Study hall.....	53
4.2.5.1 The Background class	56
4.2.5.2 The Listening class	60
4.2.5.3 The Speaking class	62
4.2.5.4 The Reading class	65
4.2.5.5 The Writing class	67
4.2.5.6 The Miscellaneous class	72
4.2.6 Graduation and motivation form 2.....	73
4.2.7 Cafe	73
4.2.8 Library	75
5 RESULTS OF THE PILOTING PHASE AND DISCUSSION	76
5.1 PILOTING PROCEDURE	76
5.2 PARTICIPANT PROFILES.....	77
5.2.1 Participant 1.....	77
5.2.2 Participant 2.....	79
5.2.3 Participant 3.....	80
5.3 MAIN TRAITS FOUND IN THE RESULTS	82
5.4 OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS.....	100
6 CONCLUSION.....	102
7 BIBLIOGRAPHY	106
APPENDIX: THE LEARNING MODULE ON A CD-ROM DISK	

1 INTRODUCTION

WELCOME TO M-CAMPUS!

...m-campus is a place where you will work on different kinds of language learning tasks and find out more about yourself as a language learner...

On m-campus we believe in motivating our students!
Come and have a look!

This is how learners are welcomed on the home page of the electronic learning module 'm-campus' which has been compiled in order to make foreign language learners at university level more aware of their language skills and motivation to learn English. At the same time the module aims at enhancing their motivation to learn. The primary purpose of this module is to develop learners' metacognitive skills and motivation to learn English, the secondary purpose being to develop their language skills while they work on the tasks in the learning module. In the module there are tasks related to the four skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and the emphasis is on the learners' own reflection regarding these skills and regarding their performance of different language learning tasks. This kind of a learning module has not been tried out before in this scope and thus it is important in its own right.

The context for this study is independent learning in a technological environment: the learners work independently on the learning module situated on the Internet pages of the University of Jyväskylä Language Centre on the address <http://kielikompassi.jyu.fi/omatila/mcampus/>. The material is aimed for Language Centre students. One of the aims of teaching at the Language Centre is to promote ICT skills and transferable, life-long, independent language learning skills. The 'm-campus' learning module supports this aim.

The theoretical starting point for this study is the constructivist view on learning. When creating a basis for the learning module, constructivist views, such as emphasising learners' previous knowledge and previous experiences, making learning meaningful and relevant, paying attention to the learning process as a whole, and supporting active and independent learning, have been used as guidelines. Motivation as a concept and its application to a technological environment have been investigated on the basis of research conducted by Gardner (1985) and Keller (1983).

The third area of research that this study is based on consists of the findings related to self-image and self-concept, foreign language self-concept in particular. In general learners should be viewed as emotional, social and cognitive entities and the foreign language self-concept can be seen as a significant motivational force in the language learning process. An additional focus in this study has been to stress the importance of learners' previous experiences when developing positive foreign language self-concepts. Finally, the theoretical framework of this study includes research findings on language awareness and awareness raising. James and Garret's (1991) view that learning takes place when learners find out what they do not know yet and make plans for further learning i.e. they become aware of deficits in their knowledge structures is considered essential in this study.

It is important to consider how successful the 'm-campus' tasks are in fulfilling the goals set for them and how they could be improved. Thus the aims of the study could be condensed into developing the learning module on the basis of the theoretical anchor points, testing and evaluating the material, and giving suggestions for improvement. The participants' feedback, which is gathered both during 'm-campus' work and afterwards on a feedback form, is the central basis for analysing the

successfulness of the 'm-campus' approach. The participants are asked to comment on the module as a whole, some sections of the module, or individual tasks in particular. It has to be, however, taken into account, that the participants' estimates of which parts of the module work or do not work are clearly their subjective opinions and may vary depending on many personal factors, for example. Still this information is important because it comes from people who actually have worked on the learning module and who represent the target group of the module in general and thus their comments can be used in developing the learning module further. The participants are university students who do not study languages as their major or minor subjects but who need to take language courses at the Language Centre as part of their degree requirements.

The research questions that this study aims to find answers are based on the aims presented above and are the following:

1. How does the 'm-campus' learning module succeed in motivating the participants?
 - a) How does the successfulness of the 'm-campus' approach reflect in the participants' comments?
 - b) How do the tasks on 'm-campus' influence the participants' motivation?
 - c) How do the participants comment on screen design and other technical factors?
2. Does 'm-campus' help the participants in becoming aware of their skills and motivation?
 - a) What do the reflective questions reveal of the participants' level of awareness?
 - b) How can this be seen in the participants' comments on their motivation?

Whether the participants become aware of their skills and language learning motivation by completing the learning module is the largest theme to be investigated in this study. Changes in the participants' awareness of their language learning motivation are sought by

examining the participants' answers to different reflective questions which they have to answer while working on the learning module. It is presupposed that these answers can give away some clues on changes in the participants' thinking. Furthermore, the participants are asked about their attitudes toward motivation after working on the learning module and whether introducing motivation in the beginning of their work and the different tasks had any influence on their awareness of motivation. In practice, determining the changes in the participants' levels of awareness is, however, a rather difficult task and thus only tentative observations can be made from the basis of material gained during the piloting phase.

Several things need to be considered when planning motivating material that should also increase the learners' awareness of their motivation. Based on suggestions from previous research, this has been strived at by allowing the participants to reflect on their experiences when working on the learning module tasks and by making them see what they do not know yet and what they should do in order to develop their language skills further. I find it important that the learners find out both about what they can and about where they should develop and how. Thus 'm-campus' gives the learners the possibility to do this. The learners are also introduced to the concept of motivation and thus awaken to pay attention to their own motivation.

This study makes a practical contribution to research on awareness of skills and motivation and learning on a metacognitive level in the form of a learning module. The learning module can be used to find ways to make language learners pay more attention to and become aware of their skills and motivation to learn English. The material could be described as supporting and developing students' learning skills. The purpose of the study is to try to find out how successful the 'm-campus'

approach is in making the learners motivated to learn English and aware of their skills and motivation. This has been done by creating the learning module, testing it in practice, collecting users' opinions about the learning module and the successfulness of its different parts, and by giving suggestions for improvement.

The structure of the thesis follows the organisation presented below. Firstly, in chapter 2 the theoretical framework, which consists of research on the constructivist view on learning, motivation, the importance of learners' self-image and findings on awareness, is reviewed. In chapter 3 the practical considerations for planning motivating, awareness raising and electronic material are presented. Chapter 4 includes the general framework of the study with an outline of the stages of the 'm-campus' project and a description of the materials that 'm-campus' comprises of. In chapter 5 the results of the piloting phase and discussion of the results are presented. In order to make references easier, the piloting procedure is shortly explained and the participants of the study are described through concise profiles before presenting the main traits found in the results. The thesis culminates in chapter 6 where the results of the study are pulled together and the significance of the work done and implications and future steps are dealt with.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework of this study is divided into five main parts. In chapter 2.1 second language learning is considered from the point of view of the constructivist learning theory. Constructivism was chosen to be the predominant learning theory in this study because it is versatile, even if, in practice rather difficult to apply comprehensively. The constructivist theory and its main assumptions are presented and the connections of the theory and instructional technology are discussed. Chapter 2.2 concentrates on introducing and defining the concept of motivation by reviewing Gardner's (1985) research on motivation and the basic concepts in Keller's (1993) motivational-design model which combines motivation and instructional technology. In chapter 2.3 the focus is on defining self-image, self-concept and in particular the foreign language self-concept and their importance in the second language learning process. Chapter 2.4 describes the concept of language awareness and what kinds of benefits becoming aware of one's skills has for the learning process. Finally, in chapter 2.5 the theoretical framework is summarised more precisely from the point of view of the aims of this study.

2.1 Viewing second language learning

Language learning has been examined from several points of view over time. Perhaps the most common of all views on learning or at least the most widely known one is behaviourism. The advocates of the behaviourist view have seen learning broadly as transferring information from books and the teacher to the learner. As cognitive psychology started to challenge the behaviourist view, the perspective changed so that information was seen to be constructed both socially

and through individual activity. The learner selects information, interprets it and tries to understand new information with the help of previous knowledge. (Ellis 1985:20-23; Johnson 2001:41-43; Ojanen 2000:39)

The constructivist learning theory is perhaps the most widely known trend of the cognitive view on learning. The main idea behind constructivism is that thinking is described as constructing knowledge, which means the ability to interpret given and gained information on the basis of the previously learned, previous experiences and expectations that the learner has. Furthermore, according to the constructivist view learners construct knowledge and meanings continually and hence knowledge is dynamic and constantly changing. (Ellis 1985:20-23; Ojanen 2000:41-42)

2.1.1 Constructivism

In the following the basic tenets of constructivism, i.e. the view on learning and learners, and the terms reflection and metacognition which have an important role in this study, are discussed.

Constructivism is based on the notion that in the learning process learners create their own understandings which have their foundation on previous knowledge structures and beliefs. Learning occurs when the learner discovers an inconsistency between current knowledge structures and new experiences, and changes his or her views in some way. (Dalgarno 2001:184; Puolimatka 2002:82; 238; Richardson 1997:3) Learning is not seen as mere ability to repeat information but as a change in the learner's conceptions that relate to the phenomenon to be learned. Research has shown that many everyday beliefs are based on unconscious presuppositions that may prevent learning and make

understanding more difficult. For an individual to experience the need to change these everyday beliefs, the old balance needs to be upset by some new experience or information. This upsetting of the old balance needs, however, to be combined with conscious reflection in order for learning to occur. Reflection can be defined as “recapturing one’s experience, thinking about it, mulling it over and evaluating it” (Bond et al. 1985:18). Reflection is necessary because it helps learners to make active and aware decisions about their learning. Basically this means becoming aware of one’s own beliefs, ideas, thinking, and ways of doing things, evaluating these critically and if necessary reforming one’s thinking. (Bond et al. 1985:18-19; Puolimatka 2002:238)

Bond et al. (1985:26-27) divide the reflective process into three phases. Firstly, learners go through the learning experience and highlight the essential points. Secondly, they pay attention to feelings that they have had during the learning experience and try to determine, for example, possible causes for these feelings. The third phase is to reassess the experience and compare it to goals, combine new knowledge gained during the experience to already existing knowledge, and finally to integrate new knowledge to one’s conceptual framework. (Bond et al. 1985:26-27)

According to the constructivist view learners should be encouraged to direct their own learning. This refers to learners’ spontaneous abilities to gain information, i.e. to metacognitive abilities. According to O’Malley and Uhl Chamot (1990:8), planning for learning, monitoring comprehension or production, and self-evaluation after the learning activity are examples of metacognitive strategies that learners can employ. Metacognitive knowledge includes information about people as learners and the strategies used in activities. If learners are metacognitively aware they think about the effectiveness of the learning

strategies they are using during learning activities. Dunlap and Grabinger (1996:71-72) emphasise that metacognitive strategies and effective thinking are not learned automatically but these need to be taught to learners. This can be done for instance by encouraging them to reflect on the learning process, to compare strategies, and to evaluate their effectiveness. O'Malley and Uhl Chamot (1990:8) also contrast metacognitive strategies with cognitive strategies, which in turn are related to the actual processes that the learner engages in when processing the learning materials.

2.1.2 Psychological and social constructivism

In general, two broad interpretations of constructivism prevail: psychological constructivism that derives from Piagetian theory (see e.g. Piaget 1988 and Piaget 1977) and social constructivism mostly associated with Vygotsky (see e.g. Vygotsky 1978). These different trends see learning from somewhat different points of view and emphasise either individual construction of information (psychological constructivism) or social construction of information where interaction between learners and their peers is seen necessary (social constructivism). (Dalgarno 2001:184; Duffy and Cunningham 1996:175; Richardson 1997:4)

According to the psychological constructivist view, learning occurs when learner's expectations in the learning situation are not met and the learner must resolve the discrepancy between what was expected and what actually was encountered (Duffy and Cunningham 1996:175). Psychological constructivism interprets the constructing process as concerning the individual learner, who should be educated so that his or her interests and needs are supported. The activity of the language learner and uniqueness in the learning process are important because it

is assumed that meanings created by individuals vary from each other. The individual is in the focus of teaching and the goal is to help the learner understand one's own learning and the world in general. The social perspective has to some extent influenced this view as well as it has been for instance acknowledged that social interaction often does provide cognitive challenges that lead to learners restructuring their views. Still, the focus is on the individual meaning-making process, which is facilitated by creating situations where problems and dilemmas arise and which make learners think. (Puolimatka 2002:239; Richardson 1997:5; 7)

Important terms in psychological constructivism are schemas, assimilation and accommodation. A schema refers to an abstract but organised memory structure that consists of concepts linked together. Schemas are dynamic i.e. they change through experiences and instruction and they provide a context for analysing and interpreting observations and information. (Piaget and Inhelder 1977:14-15; Winn and Snyder 1996:117) Assimilation refers to attaching new observations, information or experiences to an existing schema and accommodation refers to a situation where observations and experiences do not fit the already existing schema. In a situation like this the learner needs to adjust the existing schema so that a new information structure is formed. Restructuring schemas is an important part of learning because this results in changes in ways of thinking and world view. (Piaget 1988:26-27; Piaget and Inhelder 1977:14-15)

In comparison to psychological constructivism, social constructivism emphasises the social situation in the construction of knowledge. Individual development derives from social interaction within which cultural meanings are shared by the group and eventually internalised

by the individual. In the learning process both the learner and the environment change. (Richardson 1997:7-8; Schunk 2000:245)

Two terms related to social constructivism, zone of proximal development and scaffolding, are introduced by Vygotsky (1978:85-86). In his theory Vygotsky presents that the actual developmental level of the learner is determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development is determined through problem solving under guidance of teacher or peers or other devices. This can be referred to as the zone of proximal development. Success in the zone of proximal development requires support and this is called scaffolding. This includes support from, for example, other learners and artefacts in the learning environment that afford support.

2.1.3 Constructivism and instructional technology

In the following, firstly, some criteria for learning environments where constructivist principles have been applied are given, secondly connections to constructivist theories are made, and finally hypertext and its pedagogical effects are discussed.

Technology can influence language learning in several ways. It is clear that computers can offer new possibilities to approach the different language activities such as listening, reading and writing and thus influence language learners' motivation by providing language learning experiences that the learners have never had before and encouraging them to explore more. Still it is important to note that technology should not be seen as merely one possible means to an end but something that brings added value to learning. From the constructive perspective technology can be seen as a supporting factor in the learning process. Computers can be used to make knowledge

construction more effective, searching for information smoother, simulating real-world contexts more logical, and in general they can rationalise the learning process. (Jonassen 2000:8-9)

Learning environments can be reviewed in order to determine how they have been designed to support learners in completing tasks. The support should be such that learners can discard it if they no longer need it. This is in accordance with the theory of the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky 1978:85-86) discussed above.

An important feature of instructional technology which relates closely to constructivism is hypertext which Jonassen (2000:208) defines as “a nonsequential, nonlinear method for organising and displaying text that was designed to enable readers to access information from a text in ways that are most meaningful to them.” When hypertext is used learners have more control over what they read and in what order they read it. As the material is organised openly and the same information can be organised in many different ways, learners have the possibility to try out many perspectives. (Jonassen 2000:210) This is highly congruent with the constructivist view of allowing learners to construct their knowledge structures independently as hypertext is based on the assumption that the organisation learners impose on a text is more personally meaningful than that originally planned by the teacher. Still, Duffy and Cunningham (1996:189) point out that hypertext is often viewed rather traditionally and much attention is paid to guaranteeing that learners cover all material presented to them. For example tools which restrict access to other parts of the material until prerequisites are handled are designed or learners are guided through pre-specified paths. Also Dalgarno (2001:187) shares this view as he states that learners should be provided with structures that encourage them to, on the one hand, to follow a sequence of tasks provided to them but, on the

other hand, also gives them the possibility to try out alternative ways of proceeding.

In the text above, the principles of constructivism were discussed, firstly, from a somewhat general viewpoint of how learning is seen and what kind of a role the terms reflection and metacognition play in the constructivist theory. After this, constructivism was divided into psychological and social constructivism and the viewpoints of the two were discussed. Terms such as schema, assimilation and accommodation associated with the psychological constructivist view and zone of proximal development and scaffolding associated with social constructivism were presented and their relevance discussed. Finally, the relationship between constructivism and instructional technology was dealt with. Important in this was especially finding the benefits of hypertext.

2.2 Motivation in second language learning

In the following motivation as a factor affecting second language learning is reviewed from the viewpoint of Howard Gardner's (1985) research as his definition of motivation can be considered versatile and extensive. Additionally, John Keller's (1993) motivational-design model is introduced and discussed in order to illustrate the relationship between motivation and instructional technology.

Gardner (1985:50) defines motivation as a combination of four points: "a goal, effortful behaviour, a desire to attain the goal, and favourable attitudes toward the activity in question". The goal cannot be measured in any way but differences in the levels of motivation of different individuals are reflected in differences in effort, desire and attitudes. Language learners may possess the same goal, but they can vary, for

example, in the amount of effort that they put into trying to achieve this goal.

What type of motivation an individual has is defined by the reasons that the individual has for studying the language. This refers to what goal the individual tries to reach. The goals can be identified as orientations which roughly fall into integrative and instrumental categories. Learners with **integrative orientation** want to learn about the language, interact with the target language speakers, or become closer to the second language community. **Integrative motivation**, on the other hand, is a combination of the integrative orientation and motivation which consists of attitudes, desire to learn and motivational intensity. If a learner is **instrumentally orientated**, his or her reasons for learning vary from, for example, wanting to learn a language for career or other practical purposes such as to get more social appreciation. These reasons combined with attitudes, desire to learn and motivational intensity form **instrumental motivation**. (Gardner 1985:51; 54)

Gardner (1985:54-55) proposes that learners who are integratively oriented are often also more motivated than learners with an instrumental orientation. He stresses, however, that evaluating integrative orientation as somehow better than instrumental orientation should not be made haphazardly and that depending on the learner also instrumental orientation may be connected with extremely high motivation. Furthermore, a learner may have one or another orientation but lack motivation altogether. In this study, integrative and instrumental orientation are viewed equally practicable and seen to produce similar learning results as long as the learners are made aware of what type of motivation they have and allowed to pursue their goals accordingly.

2.2.1 Motivation and instructional technology

The relationships between motivation and instructional technology are discussed below by presenting the motivational-design model of Keller (1993).

Keller (1993) combines motivation and the usage of computers as an aid in language learning in his motivational-design model. According to Keller (1983:385) motivation can be divided into four categories: interest, relevance, expectancy, and satisfaction. Firstly, interest refers to arousing and maintaining learner's curiosity in the learning process. Keller emphasises that both arousing and maintaining are as important and should be paid similar quantity and quality of attention. Arousing and maintaining curiosity can be done e.g. by providing perceptual variation and variation in content, giving learners possibilities for being creative, and taking care that the risk of failing is not too high or too low. Thus, when thinking about the visual layout of the material it is important to note that all pages should not look the same but there should be some surprising elements as well. On the other hand, it is also important to remember that a certain kind of familiarity is important as well and, for example, some recurring visual elements can create this feeling.

According to Keller (1983:401) interest is aroused when something unexpected happens or when the learner perceives a gap between what is known and what should be known in order to solve some question. He also says that perceptual curiosity, i.e. sensory level reaction, is easier to arouse and that epistemic curiosity, i.e. curiosity aroused by problem-solving or information-seeking, is more difficult to maintain. He also emphasises that epistemic curiosity is necessary for meaningful learning and thus it should not be discarded. Keller also gives

suggestions for how to increase curiosity. For example, using surprising events to arouse attention and adding an emotional element to the intellectual material are quite simple solutions. Other ways include creating a good balance between familiar and unfamiliar and unexpected information, using analogies and this way making it easier for learners to internalise new issues and giving new points of view to familiar issues.

The second element of Keller's (1983:407) theory, relevance, implies that instruction needs to satisfy some of the learner's personal needs in order for motivation to increase. This can be accomplished by providing interesting and important content and examples to the learner. Keller (1983:408-414) divides values into personal-motive values, instrumental values, and cultural values. These imply that motivation is increased when a task satisfies a personal need or motive, is seen as a step for reaching a future goal, or when a goal is seen to correspond to values of different reference groups. In practice, relevance can be reached for instance by providing learners with opportunities for certain types of choice and power regarding their learning, providing a safe learning environment, emphasising earning power and career opportunities reached by education, and providing role models that support learning.

The third factor, expectancy, refers to the combination of what the likelihood of the learner to be successful in learning is and to what extent he or she is in control of that success. Both the person's own expectations and the expectations of others can have an effect on actual events. The learner should be given clear expectations for learning, reasonable possibilities for success, and some form of control over the learning process. Keller (1983:418) suggests that expectancy and motivation are related so that when expectancy for success increases so does motivation. He also emphasises that learners should be provided

with chances to experience success so that they would learn to expect success in general. Also the requirements for success in particular tasks should be clearly presented, learners should have some type of control over success, and feedback should be used in such a way that it would help learners connect success with their personal abilities. (Keller 1983:419-420)

The final component, satisfaction, is a combination of learner's intrinsic motivation and reactions to extrinsic rewards. Keller (1983:424-427) points out that intrinsic motivation is maintained if rewards that relate to the task as a whole are used and not rewards that actually are not related to the task. Furthermore, rewards should be unexpected and non-contingent, and when considering feedback, it should be positive, motivating immediately after the performance, and formative just before the next practice opportunity.

Above motivation was firstly discussed from the viewpoint of Gardner (1985), who has divided motivation into four parts and named the parts integral for motivation. Although Gardner (1985:54-55) clearly sees integrative orientation as more recommendable than instrumental orientation when thinking about, for example, motivational intensity, he also admits that both integrative and instrumental reasons can work well depending on the learning situation. In this study, especially this point of view is accentuated and the participants of the study are shown that either type of motivation can lead to good learning results. The participants are familiarised with both types of motivation and told that a mixture of integrative and instrumental features is quite common as well. Thus, they are not categorised in any way depending on their motivation. In this study it is considered important to make the learners aware of their motivation and it is left to their own assessment what they think about their motivation.

It is also important to consider that the perspective of this study is somewhat different from traditional motivation research, such as that conducted by Gardner, which is involved with measuring different types of motivation, finding out what type of motivation would produce the best learning results or presenting comparisons between people with different types of motivation. In this study, the approach is more practical as the central goal is to find out how to motivate the learners and how to make them aware of their motivation. Still, Gardner's research and the forms he has used when researching the motivation of his subjects has been used as an important basis for the motivation forms of this study because when used by Gardner in his extensive and thorough research projects they have proven to be suitable for effectively finding out about language learners' orientations and motivation. When applied to this study the motivation forms are a tool for both the learners to find out about their motivation and reasons for studying languages and the researcher to examine the learners' motivation in a compact format.

2.3 Self-image and second language learning

The purpose of the following chapter is, first, to clarify the importance of the learner's personality in language learning. This is followed by definitions of self-concept and foreign language self-concept. These terms highlight the importance of individualising language learning and making learning meaningful. Additionally the research on these theoretical concepts supports the viewpoint that a person's language learning history plays an important role when engaging in new learning experiences and the history should be dealt with before new experiences in order to make clearer to learners where their views on language learning come from. This makes learners' further development possible.

Learning is a combination of emotional, social, and cognitive factors and it is closely connected to learners' self-image and how learners perceive themselves. It has been noticed that if learners start to perceive themselves as not capable of succeeding academically, they will most certainly start having difficulties in their studies. (Burns 1982:v-vi). If learners have successful experiences in the learning environment there is, however, no certainty that they will also have a positive self-concept as learners. Still, it can be assumed that successful experiences do increase the possibility of this being so. It is evident that unsuccessful experiences almost automatically lead to a negative academic self-concept and negative self-concept in general. (Kash and Borich 1978:9)

2.3.1 Self-concept

Kash and Borich (1978:28) define self-concept as "an individual's total concept of self or the systems of beliefs, attitudes, and hypotheses that individuals hold about themselves". Thus, in order to deal with the whole person in the learning situation there is a need to apply theories about personality and especially the self-concept, which is regarded as the core of personality (Laine 1988:5). Previous research indicates that success in learning is related to a positive self-concept (Canfield and Wells 1976:7). If learners have been successful in the past they will be more eager to take risks and will not see failure so grave a threat as learners with learning histories full of failures. Canfield and Wells (1976:7) suggest that fear of failure can be dealt with by dividing the learning situation into small parts and thus leading learners through the situation with small successes or a few small failures instead of one large failure and thus building toward a more positive self-concept.

What new information is learned and what is not depends on the importance of this information to the learner. If the learner feels that the

new information is not important, it is not learned, at least not as well as it would be if the learner would see the information as in some way significant. According to Bills (1981:6) the self-concept determines whether something is important or not. If information is consistent with the self-concept it is learned more easily. Bills (1981:7-8) emphasises that if learners are allowed to engage themselves in meaningful tasks they will gain more from the learning experiences. It is, however, important to note that simply stating that some information will be useful sometime in the future is not enough to make learning meaningful to all learners because many people need immediate fulfilment from learning tasks and are not satisfied with mere future benefits.

2.3.2 The foreign language self-concept

According to Laine and Pihko (1991:17) the foreign language self-concept is a part of the learner's academic self-concept, in other words his or her view of him or herself as a learner. The academic self-concept is a part of the learner's global self-concept, which defines the learner as a human being. The foreign language self-concept includes the actual self, the ideal self, self-esteem and inhibitions that are connected with language learning. Laine and Pihko (1991:24) continue that the foreign language self-concept can further be divided into three components: the general, specific and task specific foreign language self-concept similarly as the general self-concept of an individual. The general foreign language self-concept refers to the learner's overall perception as a language learner, the specific target language foreign language self-concept refers to the learner as a learner of a specific language such as English, and the task specific foreign language self-concept refers to the learner as a performer in particular language learning tasks such as listening.

The foreign language self-concept includes dreams and hopes regarding language learning. This is the so-called ideal foreign language self-concept. It includes also a critical element that defines what the learner would like to be. Motivation to learn is influenced by the gap between the ideal self and the cognized self (i.e. what the learner can actually do as a language learner). If the gap is not that eminent, motivation is at its best as the learner feels that he or she is able to reach the goals that he or she sets for language learning. Thus successful learning adds self-confidence. (Laine & Pihko 1991:17-18)

Laine (1988:10) defines the foreign language self-concept as “person’s notions of himself as a foreign language learner” and sees it as an influence on how learners view studying, and what they expect and demand from language studies. Just as the general self-concept, so can the foreign language self-concept be either positive or negative. Positive experiences of language learning develop the foreign language self-concept towards a positive direction as they strengthen self-esteem and get the learner to believe more in one’s own possibilities as a language learner. The foreign language self-concept is an important motivational force which directs learners’ activities in language learning because the way learners see themselves as language learners determines how thoroughly they engage themselves in language learning. (Laine & Pihko 1991:15-16)

The research presented above supports the notion that learners should be seen as an emotional, social and cognitive entities and that learners’ self-image, self-concept and foreign language self-concept should be supported and guided to a more positive direction during the learning process. Thus providing positive learning experiences and adding learners’ confidence in their own abilities is an important objective in the ‘m-campus’ project. The importance of learners’ previous

experiences in the language learning process has been accentuated when focusing attention on previous language learning experiences and material for the learners' further development has been drawn from them.

2.4 Awareness

In the following, language awareness is defined and its components presented. After this James and Garret's (1991) view of making learners aware is discussed. Additionally, the benefits of personalising language and the two steps of becoming aware are discussed.

James and Garret (1991:xi) define language awareness as "a person's sensitivity to and conscious perception of the nature of language and its role in human life". Furthermore they define awareness cognitively as awareness of language patterns, social-psychologically as developing attitudes or evaluative judgements, and sociologically as improving language learners' effectiveness as members of society (James and Garret 1991:4).

Language awareness can be divided into five domains. Firstly, the affective domain refers to making language activities personally interesting and taking learners into account as whole persons. Secondly, the social domain comprises making relations between different ethnic groups in a society better, raising learners' awareness of the origins of their own language, and of the place of their own language in a wider context of world languages. Thirdly, the 'power' domain includes making learners aware of ways to manipulate with language, and what kind of hidden meanings can be communicated through language. Fourthly, the cognitive domain comprises making learners aware of the patterns, contrasts, systems, units, categories, and rules of language

and, furthermore, getting learners to reflect upon these variables of language (James and Garret 1991:13-15). Finally, the performance domain can be viewed by considering whether the learners' awareness of language also improves their performance or command of the language. James and Garret (1991:17) suggest that heightened awareness of language may lead to learners more actively seeking language resources and developing their command of the language.

James and Garret (1991:19) conclude that it is possible for language learners to make progress in their language skills only when they become aware of the fact that language produced by them is not identical when compared to language by their models. Thus "we learn by becoming aware of what we do not know" (James and Garret 1991:19). Becoming aware requires comparing one's own performance with that of others and noticing the differences. Furthermore, James and Garret (1991:19) accentuate that awareness of language is also raised by providing learners with appropriate feedback and models of what their language proficiency should be like. Learners need to identify the errors that they make and have the possibility to work on them later on. Improvement in learners' language skills can be seen when implicit knowledge is raised into awareness and learners have the possibility for self-evaluation.

An important benefit of awareness work is personalising language. It is assumed that learners are especially interested in what they can do and achieve. Thus it is important to connect one's knowledge of the foreign language tightly to oneself. This can be achieved by precisely stating how one has used the language in the past, how one is using it at the moment, and how it will be used in the future. Furthermore, it is important to make clear to learners how they can use the language to develop themselves. (James and Garret 1991:108)

Becoming aware of one's needs in the language learning situation requires two steps. Firstly, learners need to define what they think that language is, how language is used, and how languages are taught and learned. The second step is to compare this information with what actually happens to them in language learning situations. When learners have the possibility to make comparisons of this type they will find out what they have to do in order to reach the goals that they have set for themselves and have greater possibility to reach them. When learners are confronted with questions about the learning process, it will not remain an undefined entity that is difficult to approach but it will be easier for the learners to plan their language learning. (Chryshochoos 1991:150; Hedge and Gosden 1991:191)

From the discussion above emerged that learners can make progress in their language skills better when they realise what they do not know yet and start to develop their skills after this. Additionally, it is important to compare own performance to models. Awareness is seen to be related to motivation as well, as it is suggested that when finding out about one's skills, learners also become more personally related to language and thus become more interested in what they can do.

2.5 Points of departure for this study

The theoretical framework presented in the previous chapters is rather extensive in its nature and many different areas of research are discussed. This is, however, necessary when thinking about the purpose of the study. Theory has to be studied extensively before starting to design material that has a particular aim; in this case making the learners aware of their skills and motivation and more motivated to learn.

In this study, the constructivist theory on learning is not seen strictly from either the psychologist or the social constructivist point of view but the two are combined so as to form a certain balance between emphasising the importance of the individual and social interaction. The learners' independence is accentuated and their own interpretations of issues to be learned are given much value but, on the other hand, they are also provided with possibilities to interact with one another and to take advantage of the benefits of there being a community of learners working on the same tasks. The learners' previous knowledge and experiences are brought to foreground as often as possible and this is combined with the new experiences so as to make comparisons and construction of new knowledge structures possible.

Motivation research conducted by Gardner (1985) is used as a basis for determining how to approach motivation in this study, although the practical approach to motivation is much less quantitative than that of Gardner. The terms integrative and instrumental motivation presented and determined by Gardner form a concrete reference point which can be used when introducing the learners with the concept of motivation and when giving them a reference point regarding their own motivation. Keller's (1983) motivational-design model is applied in many parts of the material package and in the implementation phase, as well. Taking into account Keller's views brings several benefits to the learning module and facilitates the attainment of the goals set for it. For example, special attention is paid to arousing and maintaining interest, keeping the material relevant, taking into account the possibilities that the learners have in succeeding in the tasks and providing relevant rewards.

Researchers (Canfield and Wells 1976; Ericksen 1974; Kash and Borich 1978) accentuate that the learner should be seen as an emotional, social and cognitive being. When learners are provided with positive experiences and confidence in their own abilities is emphasised, there are greater possibilities for learners to become motivated to study. The importance of accentuating learners' previous experiences in the language learning process cannot be underestimated either as this forms the basis for the foreign language self-concept. A notable theoretical foundation for planning many of the reflective questions which chart the learners current skills and their plans for the future, is the theoretical finding of the gap between the ideal self and the cognized self as a factor influencing motivation to learn presented by Laine and Pihko (1991:17-18).

What becoming aware actually means and what kinds of benefits becoming aware has was used as a basis when planning how to actually make the learners aware of their skills and motivation to learn languages. This was considered especially from the viewpoint of James and Garret (1991) who see learning as learners becoming aware of what they do not know and cannot do yet and after this, making plans for further learning tasks. This viewpoint is applied in this study in several connections and thus in the learning module the learners are provided with opportunities for comparison and challenged with varied tasks that require them to apply their current skills in somewhat surprising connections.

As can be seen, many of the theoretical foundations of this study, although gathered from different researchers and different areas of study, clearly have similarities that together form a firm basis that this study can be anchored on. In summary, when taking the learner into account as an entity with one's own personal characteristics and

experiences who also needs social interaction in order to develop, it is possible to design material that has high potential for succeeding in making the learners aware of their skills and motivation and more motivated to learn languages.

3 PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR PLANNING A LEARNING MODULE

In the following chapter practical considerations for planning a learning module are divided under three subheadings: 3.1 Designing motivating material, 3.2 Designing material that raises awareness, and 3.3 Designing material in electronic form. The discussion is at points complemented with references to the 'm-campus' learning module and even to particular tasks if necessary. This has been done in order to clarify how the practical considerations have been implemented in the 'm-campus' learning module.

3.1 Designing motivating material

Learning materials should be motivating because as, for example, Ericksen (1974:44) emphasises motivating materials are more easily remembered, organised in the learner's mind, and applied to situations outside the classroom. The definitions for motivating materials presented in this chapter relate rather much to the definition of motivation provided by Gardner in 2.2 as it can be concluded that the quality of the material affects the attitudes that the learners have toward the material and thus also their motivation.

Newby et al. (2000:78) give four principles that one should follow when aiming for motivating material. Firstly, there should be some way to hold learners' attention throughout the learning experience. Secondly, learners should be made to see the relevance of the information that they are receiving. Thirdly, learners' confidence in their own learning should be somehow increased and, finally, their satisfaction in learning should somehow be brought about. In the 'm-campus' learning module, Newby et al.'s four principles are taken into account the following way.

In order to hold the learners' attention individual tasks have been kept quite short and the longer tasks have been divided into more manageable chunks. The relevance of the information that the learners gain through working on the tasks is emphasised by encouraging them to ponder where they could use the information that they have gained from the tasks and bringing up the importance of the information for them as language learners and language users in general. Additionally the topics come from real-life situations so the learners should be able to identify themselves in these situations and thus see their relevance to their own lives. The learners' confidence in their own learning is increased by allowing them to make decisions about their own learning, for example, in tasks where there are possibilities to choose between topics and in tasks where the learners can choose what types of answers they prefer to provide. Satisfaction is increased by providing the learners with rewards after tasks. The rewards include, for example, tips on how to deal with specific language learning situations (e.g. understanding texts without paying too much attention to difficult words that make understanding more difficult) but it is also emphasised that the information the learners gain about themselves as learners is highly useful in the future and should be seen as a reward in itself.

Newby et al.'s (2000:78) principle of holding the learners' attention is comparable to Hawkins' (1987:192) opinion that tasks which are too easy or too difficult are boring for learners and affect their motivation negatively. Thus learning materials should be so variable that some tasks can be completed by all learners in a particular group but others are such that they present enough challenges to learners of all proficiency levels. This has been of special importance when planning the tasks for the learning module as the learners' level of language proficiency is not precisely known and it can only be assumed that their

language level varies rather randomly. There are some rather difficult tasks included in the learning module (see. 4.2.5.4 Reading Task 2 and 4.2.5.5 Writing Task 5). The aim has, however, been to present the difficult tasks in such a way that despite the fact that they are difficult all learners will still be able to do at least something. This has been strived at by utilizing the possibilities that computers have for designing tasks and making new ways of dealing with texts possible. This element can also be seen as a way of maintaining the learners' interest also during the more difficult tasks as they have the possibility to work on the task in a new way. Furthermore, the learners are provided with the possibility to give their opinions on the tasks and thus ease their discomfort if a task has proven to be too difficult.

Cunningsworth (1984:59) describes motivating materials as follows: they include "variety and pace, attractive appearance and feel, activities leading to personal involvement and "self-investment" in the learning process, and activities with a competitive or problem-solving element in them". He also supports the whole-person approach which emphasises the need to consider all aspects of learner personality. Good material should arouse emotions, tasks should enable interaction between students, and the students should be able to commit themselves to the material. Furthermore, the material should have potential also outside the language learning situation. (Cunningsworth 1984:60-61) On 'm-campus' many tasks (see e.g. Speaking Task 1, Speaking Task 2 , Writing Task 3) require the learners to proportion their personal language usage experiences to those presented in the tasks. This is planned to increase their commitment to the tasks and get them to see that the tasks they are working on have real life comparability.

According to Covington (1998:140) motivating assignments should turn work into play. The same is brought up by Rinvoluceri (1984:3) who

stresses that fun is the key element in activities that generate the energy for learning. This is why, before anything else, when planning materials for language learning one should include also some fun elements to tasks. In the 'm-campus' learning module the topics of many tasks or the materials used in tasks are humorous in nature and thus they should increase the learners' interest in working on the material. Still this depends highly on the personality of the learner; what is humorous for one may be considered merely childish or irritating by another.

From the principles for designing motivating materials discussed above especially increasing confidence and satisfaction in own learning proved to be challenging to achieve when designing 'm-campus'. Finding reasonable ways to support the learners in their independent work and arranging suitable rewards relates in general to how the learners actually benefit through working on 'm-campus' and what they learn. On 'm-campus' I chose to include both concrete rewards as in the form of learning tips but also saw the abstract feeling of learning something or understanding oneself better as a language learner as a reward. Another notable challenge related to the discussion above was task difficulty. On the one hand, it was clear that too difficult or too easy tasks influence motivation negatively but, on the other hand, they were both needed to a certain extent to make learning meaningful.

3.2 Designing material that raises awareness

Materials that raise awareness have been examined from several points of view. For example, Wright and Bolitho (1993), Parsonage (1991), Canfield and Wells (1976), Hawkins (1987), and Ellis and Sinclair (1989) are researchers whose findings have been applied when considering awareness raising on 'm-campus'.

When making learners aware of what they are learning it is beneficial to follow certain steps. The starting point should be the learners' own previous learning experiences and the kind of expectations and assumptions the learners have formed on the basis of these experiences. These experiences need to be analysed and developed further, and learners need to be provided with new related experiences for a basis of comparison. As important as these previous experiences are, it is also important to note that learners need to have the possibility to reflect on their new learning experiences and effectively make note of what kind of information they currently have added to their language information storage. (Parsonage 1991:30) In the 'm-campus' learning module the learners reflect on their previous language learning experiences in general and also in relation to the particular skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and then compare their previous experiences with those that they gain through working on the tasks in the learning module. They are also asked to think about their future language learning needs and make predictions on how they will work in the future.

When raising learners' awareness it is important to ask open-ended questions, use simulations or provide examples of different ways of approaching tasks or topics, challenge assumptions, and require reflection on the work done (Parsonage 1991:30). All of these points are taken into account in the 'm-campus' learning module at least to some extent. The amount of open-ended questions has been, however, restricted and they have quite often been replaced with yes/no questions or questions that have ready made answers that the learners can choose from. This choice was made in order to avoid frustration that is often the result of large amounts of open questions and in order to make the workload of the learners more manageable. Still it is also important to think carefully what kinds of questions are actually asked.

Open questions give learners much more room to work on and they can express themselves freely and thus these questions have much more potential for revealing information on the learners' personalities and also give more to the learners themselves. The learners are presented with statements about language learning and language use and they are encouraged to think about their own assumptions. They also have the possibility to compare their own beliefs with those of others and they are also asked to reflect on the tasks that they have worked on and on their own learning. This is aimed to result in increased awareness of skills and motivation.

A basic philosophy behind the reflective questions which on 'm-campus' aim at making the learners aware of their skills and motivation is adopted from Canfield and Wells (1976:10), who emphasise that learners can be asked to examine their own behaviour, the consequences of their actions, and hypothesise for alternative ways of action, but that all this should be done in a non-judgemental way. The goal should be to give learners more options to choose from rather than judging their present state as somehow deteriorated and in need of improvement. It may easily happen that a teacher or researcher engrossed in work begins to "broaden the student's perceptions, heighten their awareness, and expand their consciousness" without taking into consideration the learner's present state and how it is connected to the learner's self-concept. Instead of changes toward the direction desired by the teacher or researcher there may be completely opposite results as learners see the situation as a threat to their self-concepts and ignore or reject information given to them. Still, as Ellis and Sinclair (1989:1) emphasise, it is important to give learners a chance to consider their own work and their strategies so that they might also become more effective.

Hawkins (1987:74) points out that awareness raising activities often have an indirect effect and the results may not show up immediately. For example, in the case of 'm-campus' it is important not to make hasty conclusions from the learners' answers to questions on how their skills have developed but see their work more as the first push toward becoming aware. Also Wright and Bolitho (1993: 298) describe awareness raising as a gradual process where attitudes and beliefs change at a slow pace. Thus, awareness raising should be seen as an objective to be attained over a rather extensive time span. In this process the learners should become aware of their limitations and potential as language learners.

As a summary of the considerations for planning materials that raise awareness the following can be said. Firstly, in the 'm-campus' learning module the central way of action was to follow the procedure of discussing learners' previous experiences, providing new experiences, and reflecting on the new experiences because this way the learners seem to get the most out of their work. Secondly, getting the learners personally involved in their work on 'm-campus' was one of the things that caused much trouble because it is not easy to get actual personal involvement without so many factors working in harmony. It was necessary to take into account, for example, that the learners may feel too much personal involvement as threatening or some parts of the learning module as frustrating or ridiculous. Finally, perhaps the largest challenge that this study had to face was to take into account that the awareness raising process is a gradual one and thus its successfulness cannot be determined immediately. One of the goals of this study was to consider whether the learning module makes the learners aware of their skills and motivation but it may not be reasonable to examine this right after the learners have worked on 'm-

campus'. This was, however, a risk that one had to take and whereby one had to operate.

3.3 Designing material in electronic form

It is a widely shared belief that using computers in instruction can bring great educational improvements. It is, however, important to consider what kind of an added value tasks that are in electronic form can bring to language learners. For example, Roblyer and Edwards (2000) and Newby et al. (2000) have presented views on this.

Roblyer and Edwards (2000:12-13) see technology as a way of influencing learner motivation because it is useful in gaining learner attention - learners nowadays are attracted to computers and multimedia. In the 'm-campus' learning module this has been taken into account by trying out new task types such as, for example, providing the possibility to move sentences on the computer screen with the help of a mouse (see 4.2.5.5 Writing Task 5). Furthermore, using computers increases learners' feeling of control of their own learning. The computer can also provide learners with unique instructional possibilities by linking them to interesting information resources, and making visualisation of problems and their solutions easier. (Roblyer and Edwards 2000:12-13) These are, however, attained only if learners are proficient enough or gain enough support.

When using computers in instruction it is advisable to strive to provide learners with the same content via different media such as text, audio and video. This supports different learning styles and the possibility to repeat information in different ways. (Newby et al. 2000:129-130) The 'm-campus' learning module does not provide the same information via different media, but different media is used in different tasks. On the

basis of my experiences of designing electronic material for 'm-campus' I can say that the difficulties and the challenges that using different media brings to the designer and the user may, however, at times exceed the benefits, as it may prove to be problematic to find appropriate programs for listening to audio clips or for watching video extracts and even updating programs may not help in all cases. Additionally it is important to question what kind of an effect these kinds of technical difficulties may have on the learners' motivation or whether they became frustrated or tired of the material when forced to struggle with technical difficulties. The goal when designing electronic teaching material should, after all, be to allow learners to concentrate on mere language learning and not bother them with technical issues. When thinking about the technical implementation of, for example, sound clips, it is difficult to determine which format to use because using the newest formats may result in the sound clips not working on older computers and using older or varying formats may result in programs not recognising the format. Even if the computer is new and programs are updated, problems may still arise. One solution would be to provide, for example, the dialogues presented in the sound clips in text. This is not, however, a practical solution on 'm-campus' because there the important thing is to provide the learners with the possibility to listen to English speech. The possibility to repeat information also accentuated by Newby et al. (2000:130) is taken into account on 'm-campus' by not restricting the learners in how many times they are allowed, for example, to listen to sound clips. This should help in internalising the material and also ease understanding.

Newby et al. (2000:130) stress that when using computers in instruction the level of interactivity should be as high as possible and learners should be able to individualise their learning as far as possible. Additionally, feedback should be informative, screen displays as simple

as possible, and learners informed of their progress and performance. On 'm-campus' the learners have the possibility to interact on the discussion area. Individualisation is guaranteed so that the learners can in many tasks freely choose what type of responses they produce and they are not restricted in their work. The learners are informed of their progress and performance through e-mail.

When designing material in electronic form one should pay considerable attention to screen design, learner control and navigation, use of feedback, student activity, and video and audio elements. When the screen is well-designed it is easy for the learner to focus on important information, stay interested, process information successfully, and find the required information. This is closely related to clear navigation which gives learners a feeling of knowing where they are. Audio material should not be too long and video should be used as an advance organiser or when presenting abstract material that has an emotional impact. (Roblyer and Edwards 2000:167) On 'm-campus' the pages are designed so that they are as clear as possible and there is only the absolutely necessary information on each page. Darkened words are used in the navigation bars to make it clearer where the learners are. There is also a sitemap which is designed to help the learners to organise their work and keep records of which tasks they have already worked on. The audio materials on 'm-campus' vary in length but even the longest sound clips are just about two minutes long. Of the two videos, which can be found in the 'm-campus' learning module, the first is an advance organiser that introduces the situation at hand and the second video shows how the situation develops. Using video in this particular task is also justified because the situation is rather emotional and thus it makes it easier for the learners to internalise the situation.

Summarising the findings above, it is clear that the possibilities that technology has for presenting information need to be taken advantage of as thoroughly as possible. The technical choices made on 'm-campus' reflect the principles presented above in a moderate manner as they have taken shape in practice during the process of creating the learning module. Additionally, in my opinion, it seems necessary also to point out that when designing electronic material the focus should not merely be on how information is presented on the computer screen or what kinds of technical structures are used although these are important as well, but on considering what the learner is required to do on the computer and how this develops learners' abilities.

4 FRAMEWORK FOR THIS STUDY

The following chapter is divided into two major parts: in 4.1 the general outline of the 'm-campus' project is presented and in 4.2 the 'm-campus' learning module is described in detail. When particular theoretical constructs or practical considerations can be identified from, for example, the Study hall tasks references are made explicitly.

4.1 Overview of the 'm-campus' project

The 'm-campus' project can be roughly divided into three stages. **The first stage** included constructing the theoretical basis, finding the materials, and giving shape to the learning module. **The second stage** consisted of piloting the learning module and gathering feedback on it. **In the third stage** the material gathered during the piloting phase was analysed in order to make conclusions on the participants of the study and to find suggestions on how to develop the 'm-campus' learning module further on the basis of the participants' feedback.

The 'm-campus' project started in autumn 2002 with becoming familiar with research relevant to the project and making preliminary plans for how to actually carry out the project. The theoretical framework was revised and specified during the project as new viewpoints emerged. The outlines for the 'm-campus' learning module took shape on the basis of previous study and on the basis of what I wanted to include in the learning module. The timetable for the project was planned so that the learning module would be ready at the end of spring term 2003 and the piloting of the material would take place in May – June 2003. This timetable, however, had to be adapted as the planning of the tasks took somewhat longer than expected and there were also difficulties in organising the basic solutions for the 'm-campus' interface. These

difficulties postponed the piloting phase until autumn 2003. This enabled a more thorough concentration, for example, on the visual appearance of the learning module.

The gathering of material and editing of the tasks lasted from December 2002 to approximately May 2003, after which the first versions of the tasks were ready to be put into electronic form. Ideas for the tasks were gathered from several sources, such as Ellis and Sinclair 1989; Jolly 1984, and these ideas were adapted on the basis of how they could be implemented in a technological environment. In addition to this, they had to serve the overall purpose of making the learners aware of their skills and motivation, suit the theoretical foundations of the study, and support the pedagogical principles that I wanted to promote in the tasks. For the most part these principles follow the ideas of constructivism presented in chapter 2.1 and I especially wanted to accentuate the learners' own responsibility for their learning.

Some texts that are used in the tasks were adapted from existing sources and the sources are appropriately marked after each text in the 'm-campus' learning module. Other texts, which have no external source marked, were written by me. The sound clips in the Listening Tasks were planned and recorded by me with the help of fellow students who agreed to have their speech recorded and the video clips in Speaking Task 1 are the result of a project which a student group participated in at the Centre of Applied Language Studies at Jyväskylä University during spring term 2003. From June 2003 to August 2003 the tasks were edited several times as new viewpoints and ideas emerged and during this time focus was also on designing and realising the visual form and the interface of 'm-campus'. The interface is roughly based on another similar project 'Netro' (Ahtikari and Eronen 2004) as the designer of the interface was the same in both projects.

The three participants for the study were contacted in August 2003. These particular people were chosen as participants because I knew them beforehand and knew that they possessed the necessary qualities that were required for the participants of this study, i.e. they were university students who did not study languages as their major or minor subjects and who needed to take an English course as part of their degree requirements. Knowing the participants beforehand is both an advantage and a disadvantage from the point of view of the study. On the one hand, a certain social pressure guarantees that the participants are more eager to stay on the project but, on the other hand, their comments on 'm-campus' may reflect certain desire to please and not to offend or criticise the researcher too harshly.

To make the study truly valid it would have been better to test the learning module on a larger group of participants such as on some language course. In fact this was the original plan but after thorough contemplation I came to the conclusion that I preferred to follow how a few people proceed on 'm-campus' rather than to attain information from a large group of participants. I thought that a larger group would have made the observations patchy although they, on the other hand, would also have given more material to work on. There were several reasons that I saw to support the decision to include only three participants in the study. Firstly, this made the piloting phase of the material more straightforward as there were not that many people involved. Secondly, focusing on the participants as individuals and gathering information in order to write a profile of each became possible. Thus it was possible to gather in-depth information on the participants' experiences and, in a way, they were allowed to tell about their experiences in their own words. Thirdly, supporting the participants and following their progress became less stressful. Perhaps the largest problem that having only three participants caused was the

quality and quantity of interaction on the discussion area. More participants would have guaranteed more interaction and more possibilities to react to contributions made by others and given more to the participants. Additionally, no far reaching conclusions can be made from the participants' comments on 'm-campus'. It is also important to notice that the three participants represent the target group of the learning module in general so their feedback is most relevant.

Weeks 38-43 in autumn 2003 were reserved for the piloting of the 'm-campus' material. The first step was to determine the participants' level of language proficiency which was done through the DIALANG test (see 4.2.2). The participants were given instructions to work on the test on their own but they were also encouraged to contact the researcher in case of difficulties. The participants returned their results of the test complemented with comments on the test, how they felt about working on it, and evaluation on the accuracy of the results. After this the participants were sent e-mail where they were told about the preliminary enquiry form, the timetable of the project, and given general instructions on how to work on the 'm-campus'. On the preliminary enquiry form the participants' background information such as personal data, computer usage habits, and previous language studies at the Language Centre were charted. After filling in the form they were directed to the actual 'm-campus'. There they first worked through the introductory section where among other things their motivation to study languages was brought up for the first time (see 4.2.3). During the following weeks the participants worked on the Background, Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing Classes.

As the participants worked on the learning module, their responses to different tasks, reflective questions and their comments on the individual tasks and on the learning module as a whole were collected

and they were transmitted to the researcher through e-mail so that she knew all the time how the participants were progressing and what the situation on 'm-campus' was. The participants' answers were identified with their e-mail addresses. From the researcher's point of view, the participants' answers were considered an important insight into how the participants saw their skills and how aware they were. Furthermore, as the researcher was able to follow the participants' performance and understanding, it was also possible, if necessary, to intervene and give guidance and other kind of support. The participants' answers were, however, also used as a means to control their behaviour and to make sure that they did all the required tasks in the learning module. This was important because the participants got a credit from working on the learning module.

In order to chart the approximate time needed to complete the 'm-campus' learning module, the participants were asked to pay attention to how long it took them to complete each task and write the time down. The participants were also provided with a timetable that they were asked to follow and this timetable included instructions on which parts of the learning module they should work on at which time. The timetable was important, firstly, because there being only three participants the timetable guaranteed that they worked on the same tasks approximately at the same time. This made, for example, the discussion area tasks more meaningful. Had there been more participants, it would have been easier to allow them to work more freely on the learning module because this way it would have been more likely that more than one student would have been working on some particular task. Secondly, the timetable was provided so as to keep the research project in schedule and to guarantee that the participants worked on the material regularly. It is important to note that the timetable was in fact rather contrary to the ideals of 'm-campus'

as allowing the learners to work in their own pace on the material and control over their own learning was emphasised. Still the timetable was essential for the piloting to succeed. The participants also wrote notes in their diaries on the discussion area and commented on their progress. On week 43 the Graduation section was added to 'm-campus' (see 4.2.7). This included the second handling of the participants' motivation and an extensive feedback form related to 'm-campus'.

After the piloting phase, the participants' answers to tasks and reflective questions and their contributions in their diaries were analysed, firstly, in order to find signs of changes in the level of awareness of skills and motivation, and, secondly, in order to consider how the learning module could be developed from the basis of the participants' feedback. Profiles of the participants were written and suggestions for improvement on the basis of their feedback were collected.

4.2 Description of the materials

The following chapter concentrates on describing the contents of the 'm-campus' learning module. The DIALANG –test is described in this chapter as it is closely connected to the project. The 'm-campus' learning module can be found on the Internet at <http://kielikompassi.jyu.fi/omatila/mcampus/>. The material is also burned onto a CD-ROM disc accompanying this text so that it is possible to see 'm-campus' even if there is no Internet connection. It is advisable to examine, for example, the task descriptions together with the learning module itself because it is difficult to get a complete picture of the tasks through a mere written description as many tasks include, for example, visual elements. Including the CD-ROM is justified also

because it does justice to the interactive nature of the pages which mere screen shots would not have done.

4.2.1 General

The learning module is titled '**m-campus**'. To make it more concrete and not a mere collection of tasks the module is presented in the form of a university campus, where the learners go to study. The campus consists of three buildings. The tasks of the learning module are in the '**Study hall**', the discussion area where the learners work on four discussion tasks and write their diaries is called the '**Cafe**', and the links used in the learning module are collected to the '**Library**' for further reference. As the learners start their work they are presented with a map of the 'm-campus' area where they can familiarise themselves with the different buildings.

The general principle of the 'm-campus' learning module can be examined on a continuum of previous experiences, new experiences, reflection, and plans for the future. Firstly, all the classes in the Study hall begin with questions related to the learners' previous experiences. The questions are designed to orientate the learners to the tasks. Secondly, the 'm-campus' tasks provide the learners with new experiences. Thirdly, reflection is included after the tasks and the classes and the learners are given the possibility to compare their previous experiences with new ones and to make plans for the future after each class. All these questions are in English and this is seen as a practical possibility for the learners to practice their English skills while answering. They have, however, the possibility to add comments in Finnish as well if they so wish. The questions are also in many respects planned to develop the learners' metacognitive skills as they are directed to think about the learning process, make plans for further

learning and evaluate their performance. This approach is designed to make the learners aware of their skills and motivation.

The learning module consists of eight different classes (Introduction, Background, Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing, Miscellaneous, and Graduation). The skills are presented separately in order to guarantee that the learners focus on the different skills thoroughly enough but there are also tasks where they have to combine their skills and thus the tasks resemble real-life language use situations more. Still the main purpose of the tasks is not to teach the learners, for example, new words but the emphasis is on them becoming aware of their skills and motivation by working on the tasks and reflecting on their performance.

The tasks in the learning module are not presented in any particular order but are merely grouped under headings **'Listening'**, **'Speaking'**, **'Reading'**, **'Writing'**, and **'Miscellaneous'** and the learners are in principle free to work on the tasks in the order they prefer. It is also possible for the learners to return to tasks that they have already completed if there is, for example, something that they want to go through again. This emphasises the learners' possibilities to influence their own learning and it is designed to increase their motivation.

To alleviate the learners' difficulties with vocabulary there is a link to a dictionary page on the Internet that can be used while working on the learning module. The link is located on the main navigation bar and it opens in an own small window so that it does not disturb the learners or make them get lost. The original plan was to explain the somewhat more unfamiliar but essential words straight away by using small pop up windows. This, however, proved to be technically extremely time consuming and thus this plan was given up. These kinds of pop up

explanations would have been especially important for those learners who do not have that high motivation and who may get discouraged if they do not understand some word. They may not have enough motivation to start seeking for the meaning of the word in the Internet dictionary, either. Additionally, the pop up explanations would have worked as a scaffolding help to the learners. Providing the learners with translations of the important words would have also made it somewhat surer that they understood what they were being asked and thus gave accurate answers. As the technical implementation of this proved to be too time consuming the pop up windows were replaced by paying particular attention to wordings, for example, in the instructions so that they would be as understandable as possible.

4.2.2 The DIALANG-test

The DIALANG test is the result of a European project that aims at developing a language test for 14 European languages. The test diagnoses language learners' language abilities and combines this with self-assessment. DIALANG can be accessed through the Internet and it is possible to use it for testing reading, writing, listening, grammar, and vocabulary skills. Language learners of all levels can use the test and suitability is assured by letting the learners assess their language proficiency before the test. DIALANG provides learners with feedback on how they perform on different tasks and gives suggestions on how to improve their language proficiency. (DIALANG project 2002 <http://www.dialang.org>, cited on 10 March 2003) The results of the DIALANG –test vary on a scale A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2 where A1 is the lowest grade and C2 the highest, almost native like proficiency. More information on the DIALANG-test can be found on the Internet pages related to the DIALANG project at <http://www.dialang.org>.

4.2.3 Introduction to 'm-campus'

On the introductory tour of 'm-campus' the different parts of the learning module are examined and the learners are shown what they are required to do. The campus guide, Mona, instructs the learners and tells them how to proceed. This guide is used in the learning module to introduce the different Study hall classes (Background, Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing, and Miscellaneous) and in the end of 'm-campus' studies to instruct the learners in finishing their studies. The main reason for using the guide was to include a rather comical drawn character to bring liveliness to 'm-campus'. Still the guide can also be seen as an organising character that gets the learners to notice that something important is happening such as the beginning of a new class, or that it is time to reflect on one's motivation.

The introduction to 'm-campus' consists of the following sections: First, the Study hall and the contents of the classes are examined. Second, instructions on how to work at the discussion area Cafe are given and the learners are asked to try out the Cafe for the first time and introduce themselves on the discussion area. Third, the tour continues to the Library where brief instructions on how to use it are given. Fourth, the learners familiarise themselves with the 'm-campus' philosophy, motivation, and then work on the first motivation form (see 4.2.4). The introductory tour ends with practical tips for working on 'm-campus'.

4.2.4 Motivation form 1

On the introductory tour the learners are introduced to the concept of motivation and they fill in a form where they reflect on their motivation to learn languages. This activity can be seen to orientate the learners to becoming aware of their language learning motivation. On the form

there are statements about language learning and the learners answer the statements with either agree or disagree. They can choose whether to answer to Finnish or to English statements. The possibility to choose the language at this stage is provided to the learners because as the purpose of the form is to orientate to the area of motivation it is not necessary for them to do this in English. After filling in the form the learners find out what type of motivation they have at the moment. The different types of motivation that they are presented with are integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, or a mixture of these two. The learners are instructed to read more about these different motivation types and after this they fill in a form where they indicate what type of motivation they have.

4.2.5 Study hall

The Study hall consists of six classes: Background, Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing, and Miscellaneous. The Background and Miscellaneous classes are somewhat different from the other classes (see 4.2.5.1 and 4.2.5.6 below) but the other classes follow a rather similar organisation. The Listening, Speaking, and Writing classes start with questions related to the learners' feelings towards the particular skill in question, questions on their previous experiences of practicing the skill and questions on their expectations for succeeding on the learning module tasks. The question types vary from open questions to yes/no questions and the learners are also provided with scales where they can choose which statements describe them and their skills best. Although open questions that would require the learners' thorough pondering of issues would result in much more cognitive and metacognitive work there are many varying types of questions because mere open questions would require the learners too much work. This is seen also from the point of view of motivation because the amount of work required from

the learners should be manageable and not require too large contributions of them. Still open questions do not restrict the learners' answers as much as multiple choice questions would and thus it could be assumed that their answers to open questions reflect their thoughts more accurately. The questions are in English and thus the learners will get much practice in using the language as they try to understand what they are being asked and when formulating their answers.

Whether understanding and answering the questions is too difficult to the learners depends on their level of language proficiency. This is one reason why there are also yes/no and scale questions so that all the learners would be able to answer at least some questions thoroughly. The questions have, however, been designed so that they would not be too difficult to understand. The learners are also provided with the possibility of complementing their answers in Finnish if they have the feeling that expressing themselves accurately enough in English is too difficult. The questions are designed to get the learners orientated to the 'm-campus' tasks in the different classes. The Reading class starts somewhat differently because instead of questions of the above mentioned type the learners are asked to go to the discussion area (see 4.2.7 for a description of the discussion area) and to describe the weirdest text that they have ever read in English and to give comments on texts that the other learners describe.

Answering the questions gives the learners a chance to reflect on and find out about their own learning. They find out about their strengths and weaknesses on different language skills and this deepens their understanding of their own skills and gives them the possibility to develop their skills further. Furthermore, it is important to note that it is quite common not to pay attention to what one actually learns by completing an exercise if one does not reflect on the working and

learning process (Canfield and Wells 1976:21-22). As the learners continue with this kind of reflection on different tasks they gather valuable information about themselves as learners which they can use as a basis for their future choices.

The orientating questions in the beginning of each class lead the learners to the actual tasks related to the particular skills. (See descriptions of tasks in 4.2.5.2, 4.2.5.3, 4.2.5.4, and 4.2.5.5) The general purpose of the different tasks is either to awake the learners to see in what kinds of situations they actually might need to use English, to awake their awareness of skills and motivation, or simply to get the learners to see that using a foreign language can be fun and interesting.

After most of the tasks there are tips on language learning. These tips are in Finnish because they include metalinguistic terms and it is not seen as necessary at this point to make the learners try to figure out things that are difficult enough already in Finnish. These tips can be seen as certain kinds of rewards for the learners for working on the tasks but they are also designed to increase their awareness of skills and motivation. After Listening Task 3, Writing Task 1 and Writing Task 5 the learners are also encouraged to go and write in their diary on the discussion area about their feelings after completing the task. These tasks were chosen because they proved to be especially challenging in the design phase or there was something in the tasks that made them somewhat difficult, too complicated or they did not work quite as well as was hoped. As the text above shows, these questions relate more to the piloting of the material where comments on the implementation of the tasks were sought. Still these questions also involve analysis of own performance and thus they are applicable also if the tasks are used as part of some course because the learners' answers give important

information to the teacher about how the learners see these tasks and their work in general.

After working on the tasks related to the different skills the learners are asked to comment on the tasks, compare the tasks to their previous experiences and to make predictions about their future needs regarding the skills. They are also asked to write down what they think they would need to practice in the future in order to succeed better in language learning tasks. In the end of each class there is still 'a thermometer' where the learners evaluate how their feelings toward the different skills have developed on the scale of -30 to 30 degrees. After choosing the degrees they press 'answer' and see what others have thought. This is used in order to increase the learners' feeling of community as they after pressing 'answer' see what others have thought at this particular point. Additionally important is that the learners get the information immediately and they see how their own reactions relate to those of others without any delay.

Finally, in each class there are links related to language learning in general or to the particular skills. A technical detail concerning the links is that all of them open in a new window. This makes it easier for the learners to find their way back to the learning module after they have worked on a link.

4.2.5.1 The Background class

The learners are advised to start their work in the **Study hall** from the **Background class**. This class is in general designed so that it offers the learners different ways to view their language learning background. Special attention has been paid to the formulation of questions that are aimed to inspire the learners to think about their past as language

learners. Variation between easy and quick and demanding and time-consuming questions is planned to make the learners' work more rewarding. Furthermore, it is hoped that the learners will answer the open questions more enthusiastically as they notice that not all questions require that much work. The answer boxes for the open questions are designed so that the box sizes vary depending on how long an answer is expected. It is assumed that this visual clue gets the learners to realise how long an answer is expected. Still it is important to consider what the learners are being asked and why, rather than to merely observe the technical implementation of the questions. On 'm-campus' most of the open questions include personal involvement from the learners as they are required to describe personal events or feelings. It is thought that these kinds of contributions are best gathered through free texts and not through predetermined alternatives. Additionally, it is not possible to guarantee that the learners would choose the option 'something else' and write about their experiences there if they have the possibility to simply choose by ticking boxes.

Part 1 of the Background class starts with short open questions related to the learners' language learning background in general and they are free to write as much or as little as they wish. The learners are asked about their first memories of language learning, whether they like learning languages, and what they think are good or bad ways to learn languages. In part 1 of the background class there are also dichotomies where the learners are required to determine what they think that language is and in what kinds of situations they learn languages best. These dichotomies are presented with pictures and the learners are required to choose the picture that describes them most accurately. The pictures are used both as visual stimulants and they also make the dichotomies more concrete. Additionally they bring variation to the page which otherwise would contain mere text. This can be derived

from Keller's (1983:401) motivational-design model and from arousing learners' perceptual curiosity and thus increasing their interest in their work. The questions on in Part 1 are rather personal in their character and they are planned to get the learners more personally involved in their 'm-campus' work.

Part 2 of the Background class consists of five short statements about language learning and the learners' task is to determine whether they agree or disagree with them. The learners click on either an agree or a disagree button and after clicking they see a graph showing the percentages of what other learners have thought about the statements. It is thought that when the learners are able to see the choices that others have made they, firstly, get the feeling that they are not alone working on the tasks. Secondly, they see that they are not alone with their thoughts but that others think similarly or that if they feel really powerfully about something they will get another point of view as they will see that others may see things differently. Creating this feeling of community and providing a certain type of interaction between the learners rises especially from Newby et al.'s (2000:130) findings.

In part 3 of the Background class 'Trying to find the language learner you' the learners evaluate themselves as language learners and their study habits again on a rather personal level. They are also asked to describe their previous English studies and give concrete examples of methods and materials if possible. The last question "Have you used the Internet in your language studies? If you have, explain how and why?" leads the learners to **part 4 of the Background class** which concentrates on the learners' past experiences on using the Internet in their language studies. The learners are advised to try out links aimed for high school students and afterwards they are asked, firstly, to comment on the links and exercises that they tried out on the pages.

Secondly, the learners are asked to estimate how using this kind of material on the Internet would have influenced their language learning in high school. This part of the Background class is included because it gives the learners the possibility to reflect on their earlier experiences of using the Internet in their language studies and this can be used as a basis for their work on 'm-campus'.

In part 4 of the Background class 'Using the Internet in language studies' the learners are directed to a link collection on the Internet and they can freely choose which links they want to work on. The links vary from grammar explanations and grammar exercises to sites describing English speaking countries, or traditions. The learners are provided with tips on which links to try out if the long list of links seems too overwhelming and so they are directed to authentic sites but not disorientated initially by having to choose from a lengthy list. These tips are important especially for those learners who do not have high enough motivation to randomly start trying out different links. This part of the Background class is important because it introduces the Internet as a language learning resource to those learners who have not used the Internet for language learning before. Afterwards the learners are asked to evaluate the tasks that they worked on and give their opinions. The links that are provided as tips can be seen as one type of scaffolding (Dalgarno 2001:191) as the learners can use them depending on their need for support.

The Background class ends with **part 5 'Wrapping it up'**. This is a creative task where the learners are asked to describe themselves as language learners in writing. They can freely choose what type of a text they want to write. This will hopefully encourage them to write at least something without hesitating on the quality or length of the text. All texts are collected to a page on the Internet and the learners can freely

read what others have written. The purpose of this task is to provide them with an opportunity to see how differently people actually can think about language learning. As the learners' contributions are collected to a page on the Internet and are there for the others to see and comment, their motivation to work on the tasks will hopefully be somewhat higher. A discussion area task is combined to this task so that the learners are asked to go and comment on the discussion area on some of the texts that they think is interesting or surprising. In this task the learners are again engaged rather personally in the task, they have total control over what type of a text to produce and the feeling of community is present as the learners are asked to comment on texts produced by others. Thus the task supports the findings of, for example, Newby et al. (2000:131) and Roblyer and Edwards (2000:167) presented above.

4.2.5.2 The Listening class

In **Task 1 'Predicting what comes next in a dialogue'** the learners listen to the beginnings of six dialogues and write down what they think could be an appropriate continuation. The dialogues vary from very easy to difficult. The learners can listen to the sound clips as many times as they wish. This is planned to increase their feeling of control over the learning situation and also to make understanding easier.

After the learners have listened to all the dialogues and written their answers they are asked to compare the dialogues and choose which of the continuations was the easiest to predict and why. This task is designed to make the learners more aware of the fact that when listening one can make wide assumptions on how the text will continue just by hearing the beginning of an utterance or a dialogue. This will hopefully encourage the learners to make predictions when they are in

situations where they have to listen to a speaker using English. In the end of the task the learners are given tips in Finnish on how important predicting during listening actually is. In this task the learners are challenged intellectually and there is a problem solving element involved in the task which according to Cunningsworth (1984:59) increase learners' motivation.

In **Task 2 'Connecting a picture with a dialogue'** the learners are asked to listen to three dialogues and then combine the dialogues with pictures that represent the situation on the dialogue. There are more pictures than dialogues so that the task becomes more challenging and the pictures are not that unambiguous. After listening and connecting the pictures and dialogues the learners are asked to compare the dialogues and identify which things helped them to combine the dialogues with the pictures. After this they are provided with tips in Finnish on what kind of information they could use when combining dialogues with pictures. This task is similar to the previous one in the sense that it is designed to make the learners more aware of the importance of previous knowledge and noticing special features in texts that make understanding easier. This will hopefully encourage them in listening in the future. Additionally, the learners are not provided with a transcription of the dialogues and thus they are directed to concentrate more on observing the pictures while listening. This may prove to be an important skill in real life situations. Here the learners are in a way faced with multiple representation of information. Additionally, they are challenged by requiring them to use both their listening and visual skills.

Task 3 'Listening feelings' consists of five monologues where the speakers are not native speakers of English. The learners listen to the sound clips and afterwards they are asked to comment on the English

that they hear, evaluate the speaker and their own understanding and decide whether they would like to speak similarly when compared to the speaker. After listening to all the samples the learners are asked to choose their favourite sample and justify the choice. Finally, they are asked to comment on the quality of this task (whether it was, for example, boring or difficult), how they succeeded in the task, and if they would have organised the task somehow differently. These diary questions were added to the end of this task because the task may actually seem somewhat grinding with the same questions repeated over and over again after each sound clip and in the piloting phase it was necessary to get feedback on this.

This task was designed to make the learners more aware of differences in ways which people speak English and of their own opinions on different ways to speak English. The aim was to make the learners see that not everyone speaks similarly but they still can get their message through when they simply try. This is designed to increase the learners' confidence in their own skills as well. The task contains the element of surprise as the learners are posed with questions that are not that commonly asked in traditional listening tasks. This can be seen as a way to arouse the learners' interest to the tasks and especially epistemic curiosity introduced by Keller (1983:401).

4.2.5.3 The Speaking class

Task 1 'Where could I buy a stamp?' consists of two pages which both have a short video clip and questions related to the videos. On the first page the learners first watch a video where a foreigner asks a Finn where one could buy a stamp. After watching the first part of the video the learners reflect on their own similar kinds of experiences and evaluate what they would do especially in this situation. After

answering the questions they move on to watch the second video where the situation develops. After watching the second video the learners evaluate the actors' performance and reflect on, for example, what they would have done differently in this situation. After the task the learners get tips in Finnish on how to act in a situation where one has to give directions. This task is designed to make the learners aware of the many everyday situations where one might be required to use English and what kind of difficulties one may encounter. Comparisons with the learners' own experiences are used to make identification presented by Newby et al. (2000:78) possible. The video is used in this task because it makes the situation more approachable and the learners can relate themselves to the situation and to the roles of the discussion participants better when they can, for example, see the expressions and gestures of the participants. Thus, the video gives additional value to the task. Additionally, the video can be seen as an advance organiser i.e. an item that introduces the situation at hand to the learners (Roblyer and Edwards 2000:167).

In **Task 2 'How do I speak?'** the learners are asked to evaluate their own speaking. Originally this task was designed so that the learners would have been able to record their own speech and then afterwards listen and evaluate their speech according to criteria given to them. It was not, however, possible to realise the recording technically and thus the task had to be changed so that the learners first think back on some situation when they have had to use English and describe this situation as thoroughly as possible. After this they familiarise themselves with speech evaluation criteria that are provided both in English and in Finnish and then evaluate their own level of English speaking proficiency. The criteria are short statements that are loosely based on the self-assessment grid provided by the European Council (The Common European Framework in its political and educational context

2001). After the task the learners get tips in Finnish on what kind of benefits knowing one's level of language proficiency can have. The purpose of this task is, on the one hand, to introduce the concept of self-evaluation to the learners and, on the other hand, to give them the possibility to evaluate their own speech. This can be seen as one type of learner control (Roblyer and Edwards 2000:167) as the learners have the possibility to evaluate themselves with the help of the statements and they do not have to rely on some authority.

In **Task 3 'Listening and comparing'** the learners listen to nine short samples of English speech and compare their own speaking to the samples by marking whether they think that their own speaking skills are better or worse when compared to each sample. The learners are not provided any information on what level of language proficiency the people speaking in the samples have but they just compare their own skills on the basis of what they hear and what they feel their own skills are. This emphasises the learners' own awareness of their speaking skills and not some external quarter that would have determined the level of language proficiency of the people speaking in the samples. After listening and marking all the samples the learners are asked to write what they think that they learned about their own speaking skills through this task. After the task the learners are given tips in Finnish on why it is beneficial to compare one's own speech to that of others. This task provides the learners with the possibility to compare their own skills to other speakers effortlessly. The task can also be seen to emphasise the learner' confidence in their own learning (Newby et al. 2000:78) as they have the possibility to listen to samples of rather poor speakers and thus get more confidence in their own skills. Additionally comparing themselves to the good speakers gives them models toward which they can strive.

4.2.5.4 The Reading class

Task 1 'Missing words' is a multiple choice task with four different types of texts (a newspaper article, a fairy tale, a historical text, and a humorous text). The learners can freely choose which of the texts they want to work on. In the task they are required to choose suitable words to sentences from three possible alternatives. The words vary between grammatical and lexical items and the alternatives that the learners are provided with require them to understand lexical differences and grammatical constructions. Some alternatives are trick questions as the learners are required to choose between synonyms or specific knowledge on the topic is required. After working on a text the learners can read the original text and compare their answers. The learners are also asked to answer questions about their choices of words and describe their feelings toward the task. Finally, they also have the possibility to familiarise themselves with additional information through links related to the topics of the texts.

The purpose of this task is not merely to get the learners to choose between words that might fit the sentences. As they have the possibility to compare their own word choices with the original text, the learners can become more aware of the fact that there are no absolutely right choices. Furthermore, they may also notice that there are many things in texts that make it easier to find suitable words to fill the gaps. With the help of the questions, which the learners work on after choosing the words for the sentences, the learners are guided in two ways. Firstly, they are encouraged not merely to concentrate on guessing a word which might fit the sentence, but to try to find reasons for choosing a particular word. Secondly, when seeing the original text they get a new point of view to the text and see the text in a somewhat different way. Thus it is important to encourage the learners to think about their own

choices. The task is divided into two parts so as to hold the learners' attention (Newby et al. 2000:78). Additionally the first part of the task is made rather easy by providing alternatives to the learners and thus allowing them to concentrate more on the actual analysing of the words.

In Task 2 'Puzzling words' the learners choose one text from three possible choices. The texts are extracts from books by famous authors and a short description of each of the texts is provided so that it would be easier for the learners to choose a text. In the texts some words are replaced with nonsense words that do not mean anything. The learners are asked to read the text and after reading comment on the level of difficulty of the text and complete the list of nonsense words with either English or Finnish words that they think mean the same. The learners should also try to compare how difficult it is to find meanings to the nonsense words. Next the learners can read the original text and compare it to the text with nonsense words in it. After the task they get tips in Finnish on how to get through if there is a word that one does not know but that one should use. The purpose of a task like this is to make the learners aware that understanding a text without knowing all the words is possible. The basis for using nonsense words instead of complicated English words can be justified with the fact that as the learners have no way of knowing what the strange words mean it becomes clearer that there is no need to try to find them out. Using complicated English words would result in the learners more easily relying on a dictionary. The second justification for this task is that the learners notice that it is really not necessary to find out the exact meaning of all the unfamiliar words in order to understand a text. This task also poses the learners with a challenging problem-solving element (Cunningsworth 1984:59).

In **Task 3 'Comparing Finnish and English texts'** the learners compare their reading speed of Finnish and English texts and try to find reasons for differences in reading time. There are three topics to choose from (an instruction manual, a film review, and an article on ice hockey) and the Finnish and English texts have approximately the same content and the texts are also approximately the same length. The learners read the texts and note down how long it takes for them to read the English text and the Finnish text. After this they are asked to write down possible reasons for differences in reading time. After the task the learners are provided with tips on how people generally approach texts written either in their mother tongue or in a foreign language. Through this task the learners can become more aware of how differently they approach texts written either in their mother tongue or in English and whether they should perhaps transfer some skills from one language to another. In the task language is personalised as comparisons between the learners' mother tongue and the foreign language are made (James and Garret 1991:108).

4.2.5.5 The Writing class

In **Task 1 'Extending vocabulary'** the learners can choose a topic from three possible choices (sailing, basketball, and dentistry) and they are provided with a list of words which they are asked to memorise. The reason for choosing exactly these topics for the task was that they are areas that are not that familiar to most people and thus it is more likely that the learners working on this task do not know the meanings of that many words beforehand. The topics are also quite surprising and challenging.

In the first part of the task, the learners can determine on their own how long they want to spend on memorising the words. The meanings of the

words are provided in different ways (picture, sound, definition, word in context, or translation) which gives additional value to the task as different channels are used efficiently to present the words. This supports different learning styles and encourages the learners to find out about their learning styles and how to possibly make learning more effective, as emphasised by Newby et al. (2000:129-130). When the learners feel that they have spent enough time on memorising the words they move on to the next part of the task where they are asked to visit a page on the Internet where there is a quiz on the same topic as which the words have. After the learners have worked on the quiz they return to the task and are asked to comment on the quiz. This phase in the task is designed to disturb the learners' short-term memory. It is more probable that in the following parts of the task the learners will work on words that they have transferred to their long-term memory by internalising the meanings of the words and not merely generate a list of words from their short-term memory.

After commenting on the quiz, the learners are in a way tested on how well they remember the words. They are provided with the same word list as in the beginning but without the explanations. The learners are given a title and they are asked to write a story where they should use the words from the list. After writing the text they are asked to reflect on how well they remembered the words and whether they remembered the meanings of some words better than others. They are also asked to evaluate what is the best way to present the meanings of words so that they would remember the words well. They should also ponder on how they could use the information gained through working on this task in their language learning.

After the task the learners are asked to comment on the task in their diary. Comments are asked especially on the difficulty of the task and

on what the learners think that they learned through this task. Through this task the learners can become more aware of the fact that learning words is not mere reading of lists but that one can use many kinds of associations when trying to remember the meanings of new words. The learners should become more aware of the ways that they remember words best and hopefully they also become motivated to study words in new ways. The task is quite long but it has been divided into chunks that have rather different types of subtasks. This supports Newby et al.'s (2000:78) theory of holding learners' attention through the task.

In **Task 2 'Relationship to grammar'** the learners are asked to write a story, a poem, a metaphor, or whatever type of text that they like and describe their relationship to grammar. The texts are collected to a page on the Internet and there the learners can read what kind of opinions the others have of grammar. This task is important in bringing up the fact that grammar is a highly emotional thing and grammar is approached from a rather different point of view when compared to mere grammar exercises and perhaps, for example, asking afterwards comments on difficulty. Rinvolucri (1984:5) has emphasised that grammar is not merely cognitive but also affective issue to the foreign language learner and he thinks it is important to make learners aware of their feelings toward grammar. According to Rinvolucri (1984:7) bringing up the affective dimension brings the learning process nearer to the learner and makes it more interesting as well. The learners should be made more aware of the reasons that they have for thinking about grammatical structures the way they do. Also, when the learners see what kind of opinions and feelings the others have regarding grammar they see that others may have come up with similar kinds of opinions. After the learners have familiarised themselves with the texts they are asked to go and comment on one of the texts on the discussion area.

In the first part of **Task 3 'Comparing writing experiences'** the learners are asked to choose a topic and write for about five minutes all the time paying attention to grammar and that the text makes sense. After writing they move on to part 2 where they choose another topic and write for five minutes without worrying about mistakes. After this they are asked to compare the two writing experiences. After the task the learners are given tips in Finnish on how to write a convincing text in English. When choosing a topic merely the title, the title and some questions, or a given topic without a title is provided. The learners also have the possibility to choose a topic of their own if they do not want to write about any of the provided topics. This kind of a task is designed to make the learners more aware of the role that grammar plays in the writing process. Additionally in this task the learners have control over what they write and how they do it so their control over their own learning is emphasised as advised by Roblyer and Edwards (2000:167).

Task 4 'Beginnings, ends and middles' has three phases. In the first phase the learners are asked to write a beginning to a text extract, in the second phase an end and in the third phase a middle to an extract. The learners have four beginnings, four ends and four middles and they choose one of each. The extracts represent different types of texts such as a fairy tale, a newspaper article or a scientific text. When choosing the beginning the learners are not provided with any information at all on what the text type is or what the text is about, when choosing the end the text type is provided approximately, and when choosing the middle the topic of the text is provided precisely. After working on the task the learners get tips in Finnish on how to write a clear and consistent text in English.

In the end of the task the learners are able to compare the writing experiences from the point of view of how it was to choose a text to

write on when the amount of information provided on the text differed in the above mentioned way. They are also asked to compare the writing experiences in general and reflect on what they learned about themselves as writers through this exercise. Through this task the learners can become more aware of how texts are structured and what kinds of things there are in texts that they can use as tips when writing. The task is divided into three parts which all have a somewhat different point of view and this is seen as a way to increase the learners' interest in the task (Newby et al. 2000:78).

In **Task 5 'Organising sentences'** the learners have four short texts to choose from. The topics of the texts are related to British history. The sentences are mixed and the learners' task is to try to organise the sentences so that they form a logical text. After working on the text the learners have the possibility to compare their own text with the original and answer questions on how they tried to figure out in which order to put the sentences, what kind of clues they got from the sentences, why they chose precisely this order of sentences, and what they learned about organising texts through this task. They are also asked to comment on the difficulty of the task and how the task is constructed. Although the texts are short as such it is rather difficult to organize the sentences in a logical order. It is however believed that this new way to work with the sentences made possible with the computer will help in maintaining the learners' interest in the task. Additionally, as Hawkins (1987:192) has pointed out also difficult tasks are needed as long as attention is paid to implementation of the tasks. Furthermore, the learners do not need to spend too much time on the task but when they feel that they have worked enough they can press 'ready' and get to see the original. Thus working and learning through this task is their own responsibility, they have been provided with the learning opportunity and they can choose for themselves how to use it. After the text there

are links that are related to the topic of the text and the learners can work on these links if they want to.

In this task the important thing is not that the learners organise the sentences identically with the original but that they work on them. As the learners move the sentences around on the screen and try to figure out what kind of clues they can get from the sentences in order to determine in what order to put them, they will also become aware of some of the ways in which texts are usually organised. As it is technically possible for the learners to move the sentences around on the screen, they have the possibility to see what kind of a story the sentences form in which order. Thus the technical implementation of the task gives it additional value.

4.2.5.6 The Miscellaneous class

The Miscellaneous class is optional and the learners can work on the tasks if they have the time and energy to do so. There are seven topics: Music, Sports, Quizzes, Mixed, Movies, Nature, and Life. The tasks vary from exercises on the Internet that the learners can work on and comment on to finding information on some interesting topic and writing a text on it. The links to the Miscellaneous class have been chosen so that they would cover as wide an audience as possible so that most of the learners would find something that they are interested in and would like to work on. Another criterion for the links has been that the content on the pages is of good quality and also at least somewhat humorous. The Miscellaneous class follows Covington's (1998:140) suggestions of turning work into play.

4.2.6 Graduation and motivation form 2

The Graduation section has two parts. In the first part the learners fill in a similar type of a motivation form as they did before starting to work on the learning module. They are provided with either an English or a Finnish form similarly as in the beginning. The purpose of the form is to show the learners whether there have been some kind of changes in their motivation and whether their thinking and awareness has changed. To make comparisons between the two forms as reliable as possible they are almost identical. There are, however, some changes in the statements and there are not as many statements in form 2 as there were in form 1.

The second part of the Graduation section is a rather extensive feedback form which was used in the piloting phase to collect feedback from the participants. When in actual use as a part of some course, for example, the feedback section can be skipped if so desired. On the form the learners are asked to comment on the learning module in general and also the different tasks that they have worked on in particular. They can comment on the usefulness and successfulness of the learning module, and also evaluate which parts of the module are successful and which not. Additionally they can give suggestions for improvement if they have some. Finally, they are also asked to comment on their own motivation during their studies on 'm-campus'.

4.2.7 Cafe

Although the learners work alone on the learning module it is important to provide them with the feeling that there are the other learners working on the material as well. As, for example, Alessi and Trollip (2001:24) and Ericksen (1974:171) point out, it is important to

allow interaction between the people who work on the material. Thus, one part of the 'm-campus' learning module is an electronic discussion area, Cafe, where the learners have the possibility to exchange opinions on different topics and on their experiences on working on the learning module.

Finding relevant, interesting and difficult enough interactive tasks is challenging. It is easy to ask the learners to go and comment on tasks or topics but to get actual interaction between the learners and get them to exchange opinions is a challenge. The tasks that require the learners to go to the discussion area are designed so that they demand the learners' own opinions on issues that have personal relevance and thus it is hoped that these kinds of topics create at least some discussion. There are only a few tasks that require the learners to go to the discussion area but otherwise they are encouraged to go and comment on issues on the discussion area any time they feel like it.

There are four discussion area tasks in the 'm-campus' learning module. In the first task, which is a part of the introduction, the learners are asked to go and introduce themselves to others. In the second task in the Background class the learners are asked to comment on the other learners' opinions of themselves as language learners. In the third task in the Reading class the learners are asked to go and describe the weirdest text that they have ever read, and in the fourth task in the Writing class the learners reflect on their relationship to grammar. All these tasks are complemented with instructions to comment on other learners' opinions.

The learners should also write notes in their diaries on the discussion area. They are encouraged to go and write in their diaries every time they encounter problems or difficulties or when they feel that

something has worked out especially well. The learners are also asked to go and comment on Listening Task 3, Writing Task 1 and Writing Task 5 in their diaries. As the discussion above reveals, the diary is at this stage mostly related to the piloting of 'm-campus' as the purpose of the diary is to collect the learners' experiences on working on 'm-campus' as fresh as possible and thus receive further information on how to develop different points of 'm-campus'. If used, for example, as a part of some course the diary might work especially well in collecting the learners' general experiences of their studies.

4.2.8 Library

The Library is a collection of all the links that can be found in the 'm-campus' learning module. This collection of links is provided because the learners may want to visit some links again and trying to find one particular link when there are as many pages as there are on 'm-campus' it may prove to be difficult. At the Library the learners find a floor plan of the library building where the different rooms are named in accordance with the different classes. By clicking on the different rooms the links related to that particular skill appear. The room marked with a question mark is where the learners can find the librarian who is designed to entertain the learners.

5 RESULTS OF THE PILOTING PHASE AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, in section 5.1 the piloting procedure is described briefly so as to recapitulate the process of gathering the material for this study. Second, in section 5.2 concise profiles of the participants of the study are presented in order to make references to the participants in section 5.3 clearer. Third, in section 5.3 the results of the study are examined from the point of view of the research questions and the findings from the participants' answers are discussed and analysed in order to find ways to develop the 'm-campus' learning module further. Fourth, an overview of the results and analysis of the piloting phase is presented in section 5.4.

5.1 Piloting procedure

The piloting phase of this study can be divided into four stages. Firstly, the participants worked on the DIALANG test which was used to determine their level of language proficiency. Secondly, they were directed to fill in the preliminary enquiry form where their background information, personal data etc. were charted. Thirdly, the participants started their work on 'm-campus' where they among other things filled in the first motivation form. As they worked on the learning module, their responses to different tasks, reflective questions and their comments on the individual tasks and on the learning module as a whole were collected. The participants also wrote notes in their diaries and commented on their progress. Finally, the participants worked on the Graduation section where they filled in the second motivation form and the extensive feedback form. The Graduation section was added to the learning module only in the beginning of the last piloting week. This was done in order to guarantee reliability of the feedback form.

5.2 Participant profiles

In the following, the three participants of the study are presented through concise profiles. Each profile includes the participant's background information collected through the preliminary enquiry, DIALANG results (A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2; A1 being the lowest grade, C2 the highest, almost native like proficiency), results of the two motivation forms (integrative, instrumental, mixture), and a general description of the participant as a language learner on the grounds of his or her contributions on 'm-campus'. Conclusions about the participants as language learners, their motivation and awareness of their skills and motivation are made on the basis of the tendencies found in their answers. These conclusions, however, have to be seen as mere assumptions made on the basis of the nuances that emerge from the participants' answers and they most certainly reflect my views on language learning and motivation. Still I have aimed at finding diverse points of view and examined the answers as objectively as possible. The profiles are designed to ease the examination of section 5.3 where the participants' comments are used as the basis for discussion.

5.2.1 Participant 1

Participant 1 is a twenty-two year old mathematics student with computer sciences and chemistry as minor subjects. She began her studies at the University of Jyväskylä in 2000. On the preliminary enquiry form she reported using computers mostly for sending e-mail 3-5 times per week and for programming as part of her computer sciences studies. She described herself as rather skilled in using computers but stressed also that she does not consider herself to be an expert with computers although she studies computer sciences. She reported having a computer with an Internet connection at home. At

the time of the 'm-campus' studies she participated on an English course aimed for exchange students at the Language Centre. She had used computers in her language studies in text processing.

Table 1. Participant 1's DIALANG results.

Placement test	Listening	Writing	Reading	Grammar	Vocabulary
607	C2	C1	C1	C1	C1

As the results in Table 1 show Participant 1's skills were very high and this showed also in her contributions on the 'm-campus' tasks. Participant 1 evaluated the DIALANG -test to be long and especially the writing test difficult. She concluded that on the basis of the test her understanding skills are better than her productive skills.

Table 2. Participant 1's motivation form results.

Motivation form 1	Motivation form 2
Mixture	Integrative

Many of Participant 1's comments during the 'm-campus' studies, both in her diary and on the reflective questions, indicated that she was interested in studying English and that her motivation was rather high already before studying on 'm-campus'. One factor that highly influenced this was that she was planning to leave for Ireland in spring 2004 to study there. Participant 1 emphasised on several occasions that she needs to practice everyday language skills because she is going to study abroad. Thus changes in Participant 1's motivation presented in Table 2 may be the result of her wishing to become closer to the target language community. In general, Participant 1's answers showed that she regarded language learning rather openly and saw language learning, all in all, positively.

5.2.2 Participant 2

Participant 2 is a twenty-four-year-old mathematics student who started his studies at the University of Jyväskylä in 1998. His minor subjects include physics, computer sciences, and pedagogy. On the preliminary enquiry form Participant 2 described himself to be a professional in using computers and reported using computers daily. He uses computers for sending e-mail, surfing on the Internet, finding information on the Internet, text processing, visiting chat rooms, and playing games but he has not used computers in his language studies. He has a computer with an Internet connection at home and he uses computers in his studies for finding information, and writing essays and exercises. At the Language Centre he had studied Swedish on a basic course.

Table 3. Participant 2's DIALANG results.

Placement test	Listening	Writing	Reading	Grammar	Vocabulary
896	C2	B2	C1	C1	C1

As the results in Table 3 show Participant 2's language proficiency was at a high level and this showed also in his answers on the 'm-campus' tasks. He produced fluent texts and his answers showed almost no hesitation or uncertainty of being able to express himself in English. Participant 2 described the DIALANG test, altogether, to be long and time-consuming and he also commented that the evaluation on the test was too strict when small spelling mistakes were seen as grave as if the testee would have not answered anything. Still, he saw that the test results described his skills well.

Table 4. Participant 2's motivation form results.

Motivation form 1	Motivation form 2
Integrative	Integrative

Participant 2 had integrative motivation both in the beginning and at the end of his 'm-campus' studies. He thought that 'm-campus' did not motivate him to study English and that he did not think about his motivation after the first motivation form. He also thought that he did not get beneficial tips for language studies from 'm-campus'. It may be that his expectations regarding studies on 'm-campus' were rather different to what he actually experienced and he indeed commented that he prefers traditional teaching methods more than this 'm-campus' type of an approach. As a language learner Participant 2 seemed to be rather determined but also critical regarding the tasks and questions that he was asked to work on.

5.2.3 Participant 3

Participant 3 is a twenty-five-year-old Finnish history student with general history, social sciences and pedagogy as minor subjects. He started his studies in 1997. On the preliminary enquiry form Participant 3 evaluated himself as a professional in using computers and he reported using computers daily for writing e-mail, surfing on the Internet, searching information on the Internet, and for text processing. He has a computer with an Internet connection at home and he has used computers in his studies for writing essays. He has studied English and German at the Language Centre on text courses and Swedish on a basic academic course and on a culture and society course. He had not used computers as an aid in language studies.

Table 5. Participant 3's DIALANG results.

Placement test	Listening	Writing	Reading	Grammar	Vocabulary
502	B1	B1	A2	B1	B2

Participant 3's DIALANG results presented in Table 5 are lower than those of the other participants. Before the test he had, however, thought that his skills would be better at least on some areas. Participant 3 seemed to regard the 'm-campus' studies seriously and wanted to make sure that he understood all the instructions correctly. This may have had something to do with the level of his language skills or the fact that he had not worked on anything similar before.

Table 6. Participant 3's motivation form results.

Motivation form 1	Motivation form 2
Integrative	Instrumental

Participant 3's work on 'm-campus' polarised into two opposites. The first few weeks on 'm-campus' were rather successful for him whereas the last 'm-campus' weeks proved to be rather challenging. All in all, Participant 3 seemed to evaluate 'm-campus' merely on a scale of easy – difficult because, for example, when asked to give reasons for his decisions to choose some tasks to be his favourite, he quite often explained his choices with the task being easy. This may also reflect in Participant 3's motivation form results presented in Table 6 which show that instrumental views increased towards the end of 'm-campus' studies.

5.3 Main traits found in the results

The research questions of this study gave rise to the following five areas into which the results are divided: **1. Feelings after 'm-campus' studies, 2. Tasks, 3. Cafe and library, 4. Screen design, and 5. Awareness of skills and motivation.** The first four areas are mainly based on the results of the feedback form that the participants filled in after their 'm-campus' studies. The analysis concentrates both on pedagogical thinking behind the solutions on 'm-campus' and on usability and technical implementation. Some feedback form answers are also complemented with participants' answers during their 'm-campus' studies because these shed light on the participants' thinking. The fifth area is mostly based on analysis of the participants' answers on the 'm-campus' tasks and reflective questions but they are at times complemented with some answers to the feedback form questions. Quite many direct quotations from the material are used to exemplify the participants' reactions. All in all, there are both English and Finnish quotations. The findings are complemented with discussion on what may have lead the participants to answer in some particular way and also suggestions for further development of 'm-campus' are presented when considered necessary.

1. Feelings after 'm-campus' studies:

When evaluating the successfulness of the 'm-campus' approach it is important to consider the general atmosphere on 'm-campus' and what kind of feel the participants had after their 'm-campus' studies. This describes the participants' attitudes toward the learning module, reveals what kind of experiences they had while working and how they saw 'm-campus' as an environment. In the following, the participants' comments on 'm-campus' and regarding the different classes in

particular and also their comments on the usefulness of 'm-campus' are discussed.

In the beginning of the feedback form, the participants were asked to comment on their studies on 'm-campus' with a few sentences.

Participant 1: Joskus työlästä, toisinaan hauskaa. Yksi osio viikossa oli sopiva tahti. Määrätietoisuutta tarvitsin, että pysyin aikataulussa.

Participant 2: Jouhevaa. En tiedä opinko mitään, mutta mukavaa oli. Ehkä aavistuksen verran monotonisia olivat tehtävät.

Participant 3: Ne oli kaiken kaikkiaan ihan mielenkiintoisia. Osa tehtävistä oli kyllä melko vaikeita.

As these answers show, the participants brought up both positive and negative issues concerning their work on 'm-campus'. The answers can be compared to their answers to questions after the different Study hall classes. For example, when asked to evaluate whether they liked the Listening Tasks on a scale of *'a lot / they were ok / little / not at all'* Participant 1 answered *'a lot'* and Participants 2 and 3 *'they were ok'*. After the other classes the participants were asked whether they liked the tasks and were asked to answer either *'yes'* or *'no'*. All the participants answered that they had liked the Speaking Tasks and Participants 1 and 2 reported to have liked the Reading and Writing Tasks. What this implies is that at least at this point the participants' view of 'm-campus' was rather positive. Still, it would have been beneficial to ask the participants more precisely how their opinions on the classes had formed. This would have given a more solid basis for evaluating the successfulness of the 'm-campus' approach.

As the participants also brought up negative issues, such as difficulties in staying on schedule, the monotonous nature of the tasks, or that

some of the tasks were rather difficult it could be concluded that 'm-campus' seems to have been a rather typical learning experience. Learners often have both positive and negative opinions about learning situations and, in my opinion, it could be assumed that they also report both when neither positive nor negative experiences have been so notable that they would overshadow all other experiences.

The participants' opinions on the usefulness of 'm-campus' are to be considered next. These opinions varied notably from one participant to another. Participant 1 analysed her work and what she got from her 'm-campus' studies in a rather profound manner on the feedback form.

Participant 1: Luulen, että hahmotin itseäni kielen oppijana ja käyttäjänä jonkin verran tarkemmin kuin ennen. Olen tässä syksyn aikana muutenkin huomannut, ettei kielitaitoni ole enää samalla tasolla kuin vanhoina huvinä lukioaikoina. Sekään taso ei ole kovin paljon, jos haluaisi kirjoittaa tieteellistä tekstiä. m-campus auttoi varmaankin ymmärtämään, missä ovat puutteeni ja toisaalta mitkä ovat asiat, joita olen pitänyt melkein itsestäänselvinä.

Also Participant 3 stressed the importance of finding out about one's skills during the 'm-campus' studies:

Participant 3: Sai ainakin realistisen kuvan omasta kielitaidostaan.

Still, how useful 'm-campus' was seemed to depend on what kinds of language learning plans the participants had for the future. At least Participant 2 commented on the feedback form the usefulness of 'm-campus' the following way:

Participant 2: En opiskele englantia. Mielenkiintoista ehkä, hyödyllistä, tuskin.

From this comment it could be concluded that Participant 2's experiences on 'm-campus' were not that notable for him that they would have changed his opinions on studying English.

All things considered it seems that the general atmosphere after 'm-campus' studies was rather neutral as the participants reported both positive and negative issues and did not judge anything to be completely unsuccessful. On these grounds 'm-campus' could be thus classified as a rather typical learning experience with its ups and downs. How useful 'm-campus' was seen varied from one participant to another depending on their view on language learning.

2. Tasks:

The tasks on 'm-campus' were designed so that they would provide the participants with new experiences in language learning, awake their motivation to learn languages and make them more aware of their skills and motivation. In the following the tasks are handled as an entity although references to some particular tasks are made as well. The tasks are viewed from three points of view; variability, difficulty, and language used in the tasks. Additionally, the reflective questions which were an important part of the awareness raising process are discussed separately.

The first theme to be discussed here is task variability. The participants were asked to evaluate the tasks on a scale of '*too many similar kinds of tasks / enough variation on task types / too many different kinds of tasks*' (Originally in Finnish: liikaa samanlaisia tehtäviä / sopivasti vaihtelua / liikaa erilaisia tehtäviä). All the participants chose the option '*too many similar kinds of tasks*'. When evaluating this in the light of participants' answers while working on the learning module and their

comments after the individual tasks, this generalisation on the feedback form seems somewhat surprising because, as mentioned above, the participants reported that they had liked most of the tasks. It could be concluded that the participants would not have answered that they liked the tasks if the tasks had been boring or frustrating.

One part of the learning module that clearly is monotonous is the questions before and after the tasks and the questions after the different Study hall classes which do follow a rather similar organisation. Similar questions recur there because in the design phase it was noted that there were some questions that needed to be asked either in the beginning of a class, such as *'What kind of previous experiences do you have of listening to English speech?'* or after a class, such as *'In what kind of situations do you think you will need your English listening skills in the future?'*. The process of finding variable ways to present these types of questions was, however, not completed successfully and this is one of the issues that most certainly requires more attention in the future.

The next theme to be considered is how difficult the tasks were. The participants commented on this on a scale of *'all tasks were too difficult / some of the tasks were too difficult / there was enough variation in the level of difficulty / some tasks were too easy / all the tasks were too easy'* (Originally in Finnish: *kaikki liian vaikeita / osa liian vaikeita / sopivasti vaihtelua vaikeustasossa / osa liian helppoja / kaikki liian helppoja*). All the participants chose the option *'all tasks were too difficult'*. This result is rather surprising because, firstly, as mentioned earlier, the participants' opinions after individual tasks were for the most part positive and they judged only Reading Task 3 and Writing Task 5 as very difficult. Secondly, much attention was paid to designing the tasks so that there would be variation in the level of difficulty in the tasks and I considered only Writing Task 5 as very difficult before the piloting phase. Additionally, the results of the DIALANG test showed that the

participants' skills were averagely on level B2-C1 so most of the tasks should have been suitable for them. Still, the level of language used in the tasks was based on my own evaluation and this may be bias, for example, because I knew the tasks rather well after working on them for such a long time and thus I may not have examined them objectively enough. Still I strived at providing tasks where the language would be suitable to most learners.

Whether the types of tasks in themselves were difficult is not easy to determine but some conclusions can be made. After the different classes, the participants quite often commented that they had not worked on these types of tasks before. This could be seen, on the one hand, as positive as it shows that the tasks were such that they provided the participants with completely new learning experiences. On the other hand, it may, however, be concluded that as they had no previous experiences on these tasks types they became overwhelmed and considered the tasks to be difficult as they did not follow their expectations for the tasks. For example, after Listening Task 3 Participant 1 commented that she had been really surprised by the questions that were asked after the sound clips in the task because she had expected more questions regarding the contents of the sound clips and not, for example, evaluations of the speakers. The participants' comments on their expectations before starting to work on the different tasks were positive and they expected to do well. When viewing these expectations now, it could be said that the participants, in all probability, expected the tasks to be similar to tasks that they had worked on before and thus when the task types were not that familiar they may have got confused, seen the tasks difficult, and their attitudes toward the tasks may have grown more negative.

In my opinion many of the participants' comments show that they saw 'm-campus' too traditionally as a place where one works on language learning tasks and the most important thing is to find the right answer. For example, Participants 1 and 2 commented on Listening Task 3 the following way:

Participant 1: Some parts were difficult, like the one where young man describes an accident with a computer monitor. I didn't know what to say. I had no idea, where he would possibly live.

Participant 2: I guess I could have done better with this task... I couldn't quite figure out who these people where. I mean, that I probably didn't guess there origins or professions correctly.

Perhaps it was too much to assume that the participants would notice that the aim in this task was not to get correct answers to the questions but to see how differently people actually can speak English and how this affects listening. Perhaps it would have been beneficial to mention this in the instructions more precisely and thus make it more obvious. This may mean that the tasks would have required more prompting and that the goal of the tasks did not become that clear to the participants. The clearest solution would have been to include thorough objectives in the beginning of, for example, each class or even before each task. Still, this was not considered necessary as the goal was to include these objectives in the tasks indirectly, for example, in the form of the questions asked after the tasks and the participants' thoughts were additionally guided with the help of the tips after the tasks. Another solution to this might have been to include a meeting in the beginning of 'm-campus' studies where the principles of the tasks would have been introduced to the participants in more detail. Additionally, if the material were to be used with a larger number of learners the discussion area could be used as an aid so that the learners

would be encouraged to discuss there, for example, what the purpose of the tasks is. This would add the element of community to the awareness raising process more concretely.

All in all, it seems that it would have been beneficial to introduce the participants to the tasks more and stress that many of the tasks do not follow a traditional organisation and that the expected outcomes of the tasks are not as strictly outlined as in more traditional tasks. This way the participants would have been able to view the tasks from a somewhat different point of view.

Another viewpoint to the difficulty of the tasks can be taken by comparing the times that the participants spent on different tasks to the texts that they produced in this time. After most of the tasks, the participants were asked to note down how long it took them to complete the task. This was done in order to find out how long learners would approximately spend on working on the tasks and this information can be used when using 'm-campus' as a part of some course. In the following the times are discussed especially from the point of view of variation in times between participants in different tasks and this is related to the level of difficulty of the tasks. Possible reasons for this variation and what kinds of implications this has for the learning module in general are dealt with. The times are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Time per task.

Task	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3
Listening task1	10 minutes	5 minutes	5 minutes
Listening task2	5 minutes	6 minutes	4 minutes
Listening task3	15 minutes	10-12 minutes	20 minutes
Speaking task1	5-10 minutes	10 minutes	15 minutes
Speaking task2	about 10 minutes	8 minutes	5 minutes
Speaking task3	7 minutes	7 minutes	5 minutes
Reading task1	13 minutes	8 minutes	8 minutes
Reading task2	14 minutes	10 minutes	10 minutes
Writing task1	about 1 hour (did other things simultaneously while working on this task)	15 minutes	30 minutes
Writing task3	20 minutes	17 minutes	22 minutes
Writing task4	about 1 hour	20 minutes	45 minutes
Writing task5	12 minutes	8 minutes	9 minutes
In total:	about 233 minutes	about 125 minutes	about 177 minutes

It is not possible to calculate the total time that the participants spent working on 'm-campus' because the above figures need to be complemented with the time that the participants spent on answering the questions both before and after the different classes, and on the discussion area as well. Still, as the figures on Table 7 show the participants did not spend that much time on the individual tasks. Additionally, the time that the participants spent on the different tasks does not vary that much from one participant to another but, all in all, time spent on some tasks is rather surprising when compared to the answers that the participants provided for the tasks as in some tasks participants had spent quite a long time in working on the task but the output was rather small. This is most evident in the Writing Tasks. For example, Participant 3 spent 45 minutes on Writing Task 4 but produced only eighty words. In general this may reflect the level of difficulty of the task and Participant 3 did comment the Writing Tasks

in general to be difficult. Still Participant 2 produced approximately 260 words in 20 minutes in Writing task 4 and when their DIALANG results on the writing test are compared (Participant 2 B2, Participant 3 B1), the differences in their skills does not seem to be that notable. This cannot be reliably compared to Participant 1 who produced approximately 400 words in Writing Task 4 because her result in the DIALANG writing test was C1 so it was to be expected that she would produce more than Participants 2 and 3. The answer to the differences may lie in the type of the task and how the two participants were able to internalise its purpose.

The third point regarding the tasks is the language used in them, which the participants commented on a scale of *'too difficult / suitably challenging / too easy'* (Originally in Finnish: *liian vaikeaa / sopivan haastavaa / liian helppoa*). All the participants chose the option *'too difficult'*. This result is understandable when thinking about, for example, the authentic texts which were not made easier in any way, but otherwise significant amount of attention was paid to the level of language difficulty, for instance in the instructions. Participant 1, however, commented that she did not completely understand the instructions in all the tasks. This is a rather important issue and it is worth considering whether it would have been reasonable to include the instructions also in Finnish. This could have been implemented, for example, by using pop-up windows where the learners could verify whether they have understood the instructions correctly. This would have been a rather simple solution and would have guaranteed learners of all levels understanding the instructions properly.

The fourth point to be considered are the reflective questions which can be considered the most difficult part of the tasks as these questions required metacognitive work from the participants. They were also the

most salient way to increase the participants' awareness of their skills and their motivation to learn languages. On the feedback form the participants were asked to comment on the reflective questions and to evaluate their usefulness.

Participant 1: Vaikeitahan ne olivat. Mikä on helppoa/vaikeaa -osioissa oli aina helpompi keksiä ne ongelmakohdat. Se osa, joka sujuu, on huomaamaton. "Mitä sinun pitäisi kehittää" -kysymykset olivat alkuun todella ärsyttäviä, mutta luultavasti kaikkein hyödyllisimpiä. Pitää tietää taitonsa ennen kuin niitä voi kehittää.

Participant 2: Vaikeita, ellei mahdottomia vastata. Kai sitä jo ennestään tietää millainen on. Tai sitten ei. :)

Participant 3: Ne oli ihan tarpeellisia. Ainahan on hyödyllistä analysoida omaa kielitaitoaan.

As can be seen from the answers, the participants saw these questions as rather difficult but, on the other hand, also rewarding. When viewing the participants' work on the reflective questions it seems that especially Participant 1 had internalised the purpose of the questions thoroughly and, all things considered, her answers were most profound when compared to the other participants. Participant 2 produced rather critical answers and at points even questioned the purpose of the reflective questions while Participant 3 quite often answered with merely a few words and relied on statements about being able to do something or not and thus stayed on a rather superficial level.

The findings made on the 'm-campus' tasks can be summarised as follows. Firstly, variability in tasks may not be as high as it was thought to be before the piloting phase. This refers especially to the questions before and after classes. The perceived difficulty of the tasks may result from the participants' different expectations regarding the tasks. This could be developed by introducing the ideas of the tasks more clearly.

Language used on 'm-campus' was considered difficult. Adding Finnish instructions might be a solution for this. The reflective questions were considered difficult but also rewarding and well-designed as such.

3. Cafe and library:

The Cafe and the Library were not in that large part when the participants worked on 'm-campus' but their comments are, however, important when developing the 'm-campus' further. Next, the quantity and quality of discussion at the Cafe and the usefulness of the Library are discussed.

The discussion area Cafe was included on 'm-campus' in order to provide the participants with a feeling of community and a possibility to interact with one another. It was, however, noted already before the piloting phase that more participants would have made interaction on the discussion area more dynamic and it would have probably also given the participants more. The diary part of the discussion area was included in order to allow the participants a place where they could freely report on their feelings during their studies. The participants were, however, also directed to answer particular questions concerning some of the tasks in their diaries. For example, the tasks that the participants were asked to comment on more profoundly in their diaries (Listening Task 3, Writing Task 1, and Writing Task 5) were such that they had either proven to be especially challenging in the design phase or they were considered especially difficult or too complicated. Thus it was important to find out what the participants thought especially about these tasks. The participants' answers did provide some useful tips on how to develop the tasks. Participants 1 and 2 commented that the diary was not that useful for them but

Participant 3 saw it as beneficial at least when compared to other parts of the discussion area.

The participants evaluated the discussion area all in all to be 'ok'. They commented that there should have been more people working on the discussion area before it would have worked properly. Participant 1, however, also commented that the discussion area succeeded in providing her with a feeling of community that it was supposed to do:

Participant 1: Ehkä se kuitenkin oli hyödyllinen siinä mielessä, että sai jonkinlaista käsitystä, mitä muut ajattelevat ja ovat tehneet. Ei tullut yksinäinen olo.

Only Participant 1 commented to have used the Library and all the participants commented that the Library was not useful. In this context where the participants were required to do all the tasks and work on all skills this seem reasonable but, for example, if a learner was working in order to develop some particular skill and needed to find out whether there is something related to that on 'm-campus', the Library could be useful.

4. Screen design:

As 'm-campus' is an electronic learning module it is valid to consider also the technical implementation. In the following especially illustrations, navigation and the general layout are discussed based on the feedback form answers.

The participants opinions on screen design, illustrations on the pages and navigation varied somewhat but the general impression was that the solutions were rather successful. For example, the participants either had not paid any attention to the illustrations on the pages or

judged them to be nice. Navigation was considered clear although Participant 1 commented that it was somewhat confusing when after tasks on the discussion area there were no clear instructions on how to continue to the next task. As a matter of fact, in some tasks there was just the instruction *'After you have written in your diary, you can move forward.'* while in others the instruction was more precise such as *'After you have written in your diary, you can continue to the next writing task.'* or the instruction was complemented with a link to the page where the participants were asked to continue such as *'After writing on the discussion area you can start working on the reading tasks.'* It is quite clear that these instructions could have been more systematic and similar and when viewing them now it seems that an instruction with a link seems to be the most practicable solution as these kinds of instructions direct the learners explicitly. Still these kinds of links may also direct the learners too much and not allow them to choose their paths on 'm-campus' freely enough. Here at issue were, however, merely the instructions after the discussion area tasks so their effect on the learners' freedom to choose their paths is not that notable.

The participants commented on the general layout and outward appearance of the pages rather positively and said that the similar outlook of the pages all through the learning module increased familiarity. This was one of the issues that was paid particular attention to when designing the visual appearance of 'm-campus' and it was a calculated choice to make the pages follow a similar organisation. A technical detail that was, however, commented on was the size of some of the answer boxes for the open questions. As was mentioned earlier, some of the answer boxes were left small in order to encourage short and concise answers. Participant 1, however, favoured long answers also to these questions and found it annoying that she was able to see only a short extract of what she had written at a time. It seems that it

would have been better to keep all the answer boxes similar in size and leave it to the participants' own estimation how long answers they like to provide. This way all the participants would have been treated similarly.

Screen design may prove to be a rather important factor for motivation especially if there is something wrong with it. The participants did not note any crucial deficiencies in the screen design of the 'm-campus' learning module. When following the participants' work on 'm-campus' I, however, noticed that at least one technical point could be improved. The learners should be able to change their answers also in the multiple choice tasks. Now, for example, when the learners are provided with the choice *yes / no* and they choose *yes* it is not possible to change the answer to *no* unless they clear the whole page and start all over again. This results from me not knowing the possibilities of html-language enough in the time of coding the pages. Now I know that it is possible to define the html-code so that changing the answer is possible.

5. Awareness of skills and motivation:

Awareness of skills and motivation was the large theme that 'm-campus' concentrated on. In the following the participants' answers from both the feedback form and on the reflective questions on 'm-campus' are analysed in order to find signs of awareness of skills and motivation and of their possible connections.

Increasing the participants' awareness of their skills was realised by using questions which required the participants to consider what is easy or difficult regarding the skills, what they learned about tasks or about themselves as language learners when working on different tasks, and what they would need to do in order to develop their skills

further. When answering the questions about their future development needs, Participants 1 and 2 quite often noted down points that had been highlighted in the tasks. For example, *'guessing the parts I do not hear'* (Participant 2 after Listening Tasks), *'it might be useful to be a better guesser when it comes to the meanings of the words'* (Participant 1 after Reading Tasks), *'different styles of writing... using "binding words'* (Participant 1 after Writings Tasks) are all skills that were introduced either in the instructions to the tasks or in the tips in Finnish after the tasks. It could be concluded, that Participants 1 and 2 had noticed issues accentuated in the tasks and thus become more aware of them. Participant 3, on the other hand, quite often answered these questions with a list of adjectives or nouns such as *'practice, patience, interest'* (after Listening tasks) or *'application, discipline and interest'* (after Reading Tasks). He did not mention skills emphasised in the tasks. Additionally, when comparing these answers to those of Participant 1 and 2 it is clear that Participant 3's answers remained on a rather abstract level whereas Participants 1 and 2 had included more concrete examples of what kinds of things they would need to develop in order to become more fluent in the different skills. From this could be concluded that being able to concretely point out the weak points also means that one has become more aware of one's skills especially when combined with emphasising skills that were brought up in the tasks.

Motivation as a concept was presented to the participants in the beginning of their 'm-campus' work and handled again in the end but it was not accentuated notably during the learning module. The purpose was to get the participants to notice the concept of motivation and to think about their reasons for studying English and thus become aware of their motivation. While working on the learning module the participants were exposed to language learning from new viewpoints and the intention was to increase their motivation by providing new,

motivating and positive experiences. On the feedback form the participants were asked whether filling in the motivation form in the beginning of the 'm-campus' studies made the participants think about their language learning motivation. Participants 1 and 3 answered 'yes' to this question and they also agreed that 'm-campus' had motivated them to study English. It would have been beneficial to include a question requiring the participants to specify how 'm-campus' motivated or did not motivate to study English because now these statements remained rather superficial.

It is difficult to determine whether the participants became aware of their motivation because this may transpire only indirectly from their answers. Still one could combine the previously discussed awareness of skills with awareness of motivation and say that becoming aware of skills and also determining the future language learning goals concretely may advocate becoming aware of one's motivation. Additionally, it could be said that if one is able to determine goals concretely and if the goals are realisable then it is in a way easier to reach these goals and thus one becomes also motivated to reach them. Still it seems that there are other factors which need to be taken into account as well and thus it is not reasonable to directly conclude that Participants 1 and 2 would be more aware of their motivation to learn languages than Participant 3. For example, as mentioned above, Participant 3 commented that he became motivated to study English while working on 'm-campus' and it could be concluded that he also became aware of his motivation and what motivates him.

The results and discussion above on awareness of skills and motivation can be summarised as follows. Firstly, it could be said that Participants 1 and 2 may have become aware of their skills because they were able to point out concrete goals for their future learning. As these goals were

also realisable it could be concluded that Participants 1 and 2 also became aware of their motivation because now they know exactly what they need to do and all that is required is that they take action. Still there are other factors that need to be taken into account and thus it cannot be directly concluded that Participant 3 would not have become aware of his skills or motivation.

5.4 Overview of findings

In this chapter the findings of the piloting phase of the 'm-campus' project presented above are pulled together so as to give a concise overview of what kinds of results the piloting phase produced.

The participants' feelings after their 'm-campus' studies seemed rather neutral. They had had successful experiences but there were difficulties as well so, all in all, 'm-campus' could be evaluated as 'typical learning experience'. Two of the participants saw 'm-campus' as useful in that it gave them more information about themselves as learners where as one of the participants did not get much from his 'm-campus' studies.

Participants did not consider 'm-campus' tasks as variable enough. After comparing and analysing their answers during 'm-campus' work and on the feedback form it was concluded that especially the questions before and after classes need further development in order to be more variable. Additionally, the participants saw all the tasks as too difficult. One reason for this may be the participants' expectations regarding the tasks. Language used on 'm-campus' was also considered difficult. Adding Finnish instructions might be a solution for this. Finally, the participants evaluated the reflective questions to be difficult but also rewarding.

The quantity and quality of discussion at the Cafe were not high as there were not enough learners working on the tasks. The Library proved not to be useful in this context. The participants commented screen design rather neutrally and thus it could be concluded that it is mostly successful.

Awareness of skills and motivation was the most difficult feature to explain on the basis of the results. Participants 1 and 3 reported that 'm-campus' motivated them. Participants 1 and 2 may have become aware of their skills because they mentioned skills accentuated in the tasks among their future development plans. Additionally it could be said that they may have also become aware of their motivation. Still it cannot be directly concluded that Participant 3 would not have become aware of his skills or motivation.

6 CONCLUSION

The 'm-campus' project can in its entirety be described as a notably extensive and challenging enterprise. Although the text above is dominated by the discussion of the two latter stages of the project, piloting the learning module and analysing the participants' feedback, I find it necessary to begin this conclusion by emphasising the importance of the first stage. The background work of planning the learning module, searching for materials, revising the materials to suit the goals, and the actual handwork of coding the Internet pages and organising the interface structure was unquestionably the largest, most demanding, and most time-consuming phase of the 'm-campus' project. On the other hand, it was also the most rewarding phase for me because I was able to see concretely how the ideas and tasks that I had planned took shape and formed the 'm-campus' learning module. I learned much and through the different designing and constructing phases I got diverse experiences from both on how to plan and to implement electronic material. When this was additionally complemented with the goals set for motivating material and material that raises awareness of skills and motivation the project became even more challenging.

The second phase of the 'm-campus' project, piloting the learning module, had two goals. Firstly, the purpose was to examine the successfulness of the 'm-campus' approach in motivating the participants. This was done on the basis of the comments that the participants of the study provided on 'm-campus' both during and after the piloting phase. Related to this was also to consider the character of the tasks and their influence on motivation and the general technical implementation. Secondly, in the piloting phase 'm-campus' was viewed from the point of view of whether it helped the participants in

becoming aware of their skills and motivation. The participants' answers to reflective questions and their comments on their motivation were used as a basis for the analysis and these were additionally complemented with my own observations.

Although the results of the present study cannot be generalised as such as there were only three participants their reactions to the different tasks on 'm-campus' can, however, be seen as original points of view and valuable as such and they provide an interesting point of view to awareness of skills and motivation. The most challenging task when analysing the participants' feedback was, however, to determine how to actually find out whether they became aware of their skills and motivation while working on 'm-campus'. On the grounds of examining these learners, it seems that becoming aware of one's skills can be perceived by reviewing learners' future language skill development plans in comparison to what kind of instructions they have been given in tasks. Additionally, if these goals are rather concrete and thus feasible as such they influence the learners' motivation by giving them a firm foundation from which it is perhaps easier to start than when the goals would be more abstract. Still, it needs to be catered for that awareness is difficult to observe, and as both Hawkins (1987:74) and Wright and Bolitho (1993) have noted, awareness develops slowly. Perhaps the participants' awareness of their skills and motivation could be seen more clearly when they for the next time work on language learning tasks.

On the whole, it was interesting to follow how the participants proceeded in their studies on 'm-campus' and how they reacted to the tasks and 'm-campus' in general. Personally I believe that their contributions were largely dependent on their own personalities, how important they actually saw the 'm-campus' project, and how much

time they had to invest to the project. These personalities emerge clearly from the participant profiles presented in chapter 5.2. Although there were only three participants, prominent differences in the quality and quantity of their answers could be detected. Thus it could be concluded that had the number of participants been larger, the answers would have been even more variable and provided even more diverse ways to understand and view the material. Nonetheless then it would have, in all probability, been possible to classify the answers in some broad categories and evaluate the learning module more thoroughly. Still the piloting of 'm-campus' can be judged most significant because although conducted in a small scale it revealed many interesting points that may have remained hidden without the piloting phase. If 'm-campus' is used as part of some course this information is important.

When evaluating this project it seems that although especially beneficial already in its current form especially the piloting phase could have been planned and implemented more thoroughly. First of all there could have been more participants so that it would have been possible to make wider generalisations. Additionally, especially the questions that the participants were asked on the feedback form should have been considered more thoroughly before the piloting phase. It is clear that more justifications for their opinions would have made it easier to analyse their answers and thus the researcher's subjective view on the material would have not emerged that much. Still, the importance of the piloting phase even in its present form really cannot be underestimated as it provided extremely beneficial information regarding the further development of 'm-campus' as the strengths and weaknesses of the material came forward.

Reviewing the 'm-campus' learning module now when the participants have worked on the tasks and it has been possible to follow their work

and take their feedback into consideration, it is clear that although the participants' general impression of 'm-campus' was good some features on 'm-campus' need development. Especially the questions before and after classes should be made more diverse, tasks should be made more variable, and the language level of the tasks needs to be taken under scrutiny. The tasks could be developed, for example, by taking the learners away from the computer and making them experience live language usage situations and asking them to work on these experiences later on the computer in some way. Additionally, it is crucial to develop the instructions on what the learners should focus on in the tasks. Although the general idea of finding out more about oneself as a language learner for the most part did become clear to the participants the tasks level goals may have remained hidden. Furthermore instructions for studying were included as tips after the tasks but they could be stressed even more.

For me 'm-campus' was a challenging and rewarding learning experience and project. Although at times the workload seemed overwhelming I can say that it was unquestionably worth it because I learned so much. I can also without hesitation admit that if I were able to start the project again from the beginning there would be many things that I would do differently. Still this is definitely a good way of thinking because this shows that I have learned much during the project. Especially important has been my own development as a designer of electronic material but the effect that this project had on the participants of the study cannot be underestimated either. What the participants gained during the 'm-campus' project will hopefully show in their future language learning in a positive way.

7 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahtikari Johanna, and Sanna Eronen 2004. *On a journey towards web literacy – The electronic learning space Netro*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä: Department of languages.

Alessi, Stephen, and Stanley Trollip 2001. *Multimedia for learning: methods and development*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

Bills, Robert 1981. *Self-concept and schooling*. Indiana: A kappa delta pi publication.

Bond, David, Rosemary Keogh, and David Walker 1985. Promoting reflection in learning, in D. Bond, R. Keogh, and D. Walker (eds.), *Reflection: turning experience into learning*. London: Kogan Page Ltd, 18-40.

Burns, Robert 1982. *Self-concept development and education*. Dorset: Henry Ling Ltd.

Canfield, Jack, and Harold Wells 1976. *100 ways to enhance self-concept in the classroom – a handbook for teachers and parents*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

The Common European Framework in its political and educational context. Council of Europe 2001. [online] [cited on 12 April 2003], available at <URL: <http://culture2.coe.int/portfolio/documents/0521803136txt.pdf>>.

Covington, Martin 1998. *The will to learn: a guide for motivating young people*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chryshochoos, Nicholaos 1991. Learners' awareness of their learning, in C. James and P. Garrett (eds.), *Language awareness in the classroom*. London: Longman, 148-162.

Cunningsworth, Alan 1984. *Evaluating and selecting EFL teaching materials*. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.

Dalgarno, B. 2001. Interpretations of constructivism and consequences for computer assisted learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology* 32, 2, 183-194.

DIALANG project 2002. [online] [cited on 10 March 2003], available at <URL: <http://www.dialang.org>>.

Duffy, Thomas, and Donald Cunningham 1996. Constructivism: implications for the design and delivery of instruction, in D. Jonassen (ed.), *Handbook of research for educational communications and technology*. London: Macmillan, 170-198.

Dunlap, Joanna, and Scott Grabinger 1996. Rich environments for active learning in the higher education classroom, in B. Wilson (ed.), *Constructivist learning environments. Case studies in instructional design*. Englewood Cliffs: Educational Technology Publications, Inc, 65-82.

Ellis, Gail, and Barbara Sinclair 1989. *Learning to learn English – a course in learner training. Teacher's book*. Glasgow: Bell and Bain Ltd.

Ellis, Rod 1985. *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ericksen, Stanford 1974. *Motivation for learning: A guide for the teacher of the young adult*. Michigan: Ann Arbor. The University of Michigan Press.

Gardner, Robert 1985. *Social psychology and second language learning; the role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hawkins, Eric 1987. *Awareness of language: an introduction. Revised edition*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Athenaeum Press Ltd.

Hedge, Nicki, and Hugh Gosden 1991. Language awareness and EAP courses, in C. James and P. Garrett (eds.), *Language awareness in the classroom*. London: Longman, 186-197.

James, Carl, and Peter Garret (eds.) 1991. *Language awareness in the classroom*. London: Longman.

Johnson, Keith 2001. *An introduction to foreign language learning and teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Jolly, David 1984. *Writing tasks. Teacher's book*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Jonassen, David (ed.) 1996. *Handbook of research for educational communications and technology*. London: Macmillan.

Jonassen, David 2000. *Computers as mindtools for schools engaging critical thinking*. Upper Saddle River: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Kash, Marilynn, and Gary Borich 1978. *Teacher behavior and pupil self-concept*. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Keller, John 1983. Motivational design of instruction, in C. Reigeluth (ed.), *Instructional design theories and models: an overview of their current status*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc, 383-434.

Laine, Eero 1988. *The affective filter in foreign language learning and teaching. Report 2: A validation study of filtering factors with a focus on the learner's FL self-concept*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. Department of English.

Laine, Eero, and Marja-Kaisa Pihko 1991. *Kieliminä ja sen mittaaminen. The foreign language self-concept and how to measure it*. Jyväskylä: Kasvatustieteiden tutkimuslaitos.

Newby, Timothy, Donald Stepich, James Lehman, and James Russel 2000. *Instructional technology for teaching and learning; designing instruction, integrating computer and using media 2nd edition*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall inc.

Ojanen, Sinikka 2000. *Ohjauksesta oivallukseen; ohjausteorian kehittelyä*. Saarijärvi: Palmenia-kustannus.

O'Malley, Michael, and Anna Uhl Chamot 1990. *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parsonage, Bob 1991. Language awareness. A modular approach. *Language Learning Journal*. No 3, p. 30-33.

Piaget, Jean 1977. *The development of thought: equilibration of cognitive structures*. New York: Viking.

Piaget, Jean 1988. *Lapsi maailmansa rakentajana: kuusi esseetä lapsen kehityksestä*. Suom. Saara Palmgren. Porvoo: WSOY.

Piaget, Jean, and Bärbel Inhelder 1977. *Lapsen psykologia*. Suom. Mirja Rutanen. Helsinki: Gummerus.

Puolimatka, Tapio 2002. *Opetuksen teoria; konstruktivismista realismiin*. Vammala: Tammi.

Richardson, Virginia (ed.) 1997. *Constructivist teacher education; building a world of new understandings*. London: Falmer Press.

Rinvolucri, Mario 1984. *Grammar games – cognitive, affective and drama activities for EFL students*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roblyer, Merrill, and Jack Edwards 2000. *Integrating educational technology into teaching 2nd edition*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education.

Schunk, Dale 2000. *Learning theories; an educational perspective*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall.

Vygotsky, Lev 1978. *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Wilson, Brent (ed.) 1996. *Constructivist learning environments. Case studies in instructional design*. Englewood Cliffs: Educational Technology Publications, Inc.

Winn, William, and Daniel Snyder 1996. Cognitive perspectives in psychology, in D. Jonassen (ed.), *Handbook of research for educational communications and technology*. London: Macmillan, 112-142.

Wright, Tony, and Rod Bolitho 1993. Language awareness: a missing link in language teacher education? *ELT Journal*. 47/4, p. 292-304.