This research reports a two-year EAP-oriented teaching reform at Shanghai Dianji University by analyzing the pedagogy of three English teachers. The study examines what happens to the three teachers’ pedagogy when the Shanghai Municipal Educational Commission promotes new methodologies, that is, task-based learning and content-based instruction which seem to be in conflict with their traditional pedagogy. This research adopted quantitative methods (questionnaire) combined with qualitative methods (interviews and classroom observation) and demonstrated how they reconcile their pedagogy with the promoted methodology in a situated context constrained by college culture, college authorities’ expectations, students’ expectations and the availability of resources. The study reveals the dynamic nature of pedagogy under the effect of teachers’ beliefs as well as the interplay of teachers’ beliefs and classroom practice, which is in contrast with the image of teachers of English as pure disseminators of grammatical knowledge, bounded by textbooks.
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1. Introduction

ESP (English for Special Purpose) in contrast to EGP (English for General Purpose), a comparatively new concept in China, originated from the Western countries in the 1960s with the purpose of encouraging and helping students to be both functionally and academically literate and be able to use English to access, gather, synthesize, and critically evaluate information of content areas. ESP can be subdivided into EAP (English for Academic Purpose) and EOP (English for Occupational Purpose). The reason why EAP has gained increasing popularity in China is that-as a result of the overemphasis on EGP, most students have succeeded in college English exams, and quite a number even had high scores on College English Test (CET) Band 4 or 6, yet have both linguistic and academic problems in their bilingual courses at their junior and senior academic years. On the other hand, encouraged by the relevant Document issued by the Ministry of Education in 2004, more and more colleges and universities have designed bilingual courses for their students. However, according to the questionnaire conducted at Shanghai Dianji University in 2010 concerning college English teaching, the teachers of bilingual courses claimed that, although students’ proficiency in general English was adequate, their proficiency in academic English was not. Many Chinese language researchers and educators (e.g., Zhang 2002; Cheng 2002; Zhang 2003; Cai 2004a, 2004b, 2012) have already realized both the severity of the problems originated from the overemphasis on general English. They have strongly suggested that the focus of college English education should be shifted from teaching English for general purposes (EGP) to teaching English for specific purposes (ESP).

In the context of deepening EAP-oriented teaching reform, administrators and teachers themselves are aware that it is well-trained teachers who hold the key to the outcome of high-quality ELT education (Xu & Liu, 2009; Wen, 2012). To which extent they accept the reform and why to reform will definitely affect the classroom practice. Therefore, it is of great importance to conduct a deep and elaborate research.

Advocated by the Shanghai Municipal Educational Commission, and motivated by the above analysis, a two-year EAP teaching experiment was conducted at Shanghai Dianji University from September 2013 and will continue till July 2015, with the aims of developing undergraduates’ literacy and critical thinking skills. A review of the research literature shows that pedagogical innovation in colleges, especially in non-key universities, is neither widely practiced nor well studied at the micro-level, even when new teaching approaches, such as collaborative learning, task-based learning and content-based instruction are being widely advocated by the Educational Commission. (See Table 1 in Appendix I)

In order to make a close examination of the nature of implemented pedagogy in universities, especially in non-key universities, and reflect how teachers think and act in their classrooms in the undergoing EAP-oriented reform, this research attempts to explore the dynamic nature of the pedagogy of teachers of English by examining the beliefs of teaching and learning, curriculum design, and classroom practices by three teachers of English. For the purpose of research study, this research is not so concerned with the effectiveness of the three teachers’ implementation, nor what methods would enhance their teaching effectiveness. Instead, it will examine the effects of the newly implemented English curriculum on English language teaching, in particular how the three teachers approach
the implementation of the curriculum, how they make decision about what and how to teach. In other words, this research focuses on how the promoted methods and pedagogy interact with each other and affect each other in the situated Chinese context.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Study on Teacher’s Beliefs and Classroom Practices

The concept of teachers’ belief has been a common feature of research papers in ELT for the past decades. Studies on the relationship between teachers’ beliefs and classroom practices can be traced back to the early 1990s and enjoyed increasing popularity in the late 1990s (from Tan, 2007). Freeman (2002) defined the decade from 1990 to 2000 as a flourishing period of the research on the teachers’ beliefs and classroom practices. Despite its popularity, there is yet no consensus on meaning. Clark and Yinger (1979:251) called it “implicit theories”. Teachers’ beliefs are composed of diverse factors, including teacher’s learning and life experiences, teaching experiences, educational experiences, pedagogical knowledge and self-reflection on the basis of the peer interaction experiences (Freeman 2002; Woods 1996). The areas most commonly explored are teachers’ beliefs about teaching, learning, and learners; subject matter (i.e. EFL or language); self as a teacher, or the role of a teacher (Calderhead 1995).

The role and importance of beliefs have been studied in several key areas of interest to ELT professionals: the influence of teachers’ pedagogic beliefs on their classroom behaviors, for example, Woods’ (1996) study of ESL teachers in North America, and Borg’s (1998) case study of a practicing EFL teacher’s beliefs about, and knowledge of, grammar teaching. Although overseas researchers generally believe the interaction between teachers’ beliefs and classroom practices, they cannot reach agreement on whether teachers’ beliefs are consistent with classroom practices. For example, Burns (1992) maintained the consistency of beliefs with classroom practices, believing that the beliefs guide teachers’ ideology and behaviors. While Richards (1996), after conducting a research on sixteen English teachers in Britain, held different opinion that teacher’s choice of teaching methodologies and devices could be constrained by diverse objective factors of the classroom practices so that teachers couldn’t teach in accordance with their beliefs. Duffy & Anderson found that only four of eight teachers teaching reading course implemented their classroom practice according to their beliefs (from Zhang, 2006:12).

Compared with the fruitful achievements in Western countries, domestic research on this issue is relatively neither wide, nor well studied. Liu (2004: 93); Yu(2005: 16); Xie (2007: 102) and Su (2006: 42) presented theoretical research and description on the construct and characteristics of teachers’ beliefs. Generally, they believe that teachers’ beliefs and their teaching behavioral are closely related, but the former and latter are not all along consistent. Zheng (2004, 2006) made a further step to prove the inconsistence between teachers’ beliefs and classroom practices by conducting case study on secondary school teachers of English.

2.2 Research Question

Since the literature review reveals the close correlation between teachers’ beliefs and classroom practices, it is well worth to do further research by investigation and analysis. Based on the literature review and college English teaching in the context of the EAP-oriented teaching reform in a non-key
university, this research is to address the following three research questions:

1) What kind of belief the teachers of English in non-key universities hold toward the new round of reform and teaching experiment;

2) How the beliefs affect their opinions of the new curriculum and the top-down EAP-oriented teaching reform and

3) How the beliefs prompt them to make changes in their teaching strategies in the situated Chinese context.

2.3 Significance of this Research

The aim of this study is to investigate how the beliefs, the three teachers held toward the newly implemented curriculum, affect their teaching pedagogy with practices in the situated Chinese context by analyzing questionnaire surveys, teacher interviews and classroom observations. It is anticipated that it can provide teachers with insight into the students’ pressing needs of EAP on the basis of EGP and impending requirements for English teachers to update their teaching conception and innovate their teaching pedagogy during the implementation of the new curriculum.

As the research also examines whether teachers further strengthen or diminish their role as knowledge disseminators in the classroom practice, it can help the EFL teachers in university to have a better understanding of the need for the cooperative learning method and the task-based learning techniques in order to help students shoulder their responsibility of learning on their own. Furthermore, it can have practical implications for the on-going EAP-oriented teaching reform in university in China and also provides empirical findings for teacher’s in-service training projects.

3. Methodology

The study adopted quantitative methods (questionnaire) combined with qualitative methods (interviews and classroom observation). Firstly, the three participating teachers were selected from 38 teachers of total 65 classes in the university. Secondly, the sampled students were chosen from the 9 classes the three teachers were teaching. With the aim of achieving the study goals, information related to the teachers’ teaching styles and pedagogy was obtained through students’ interviews by audio recordings as well as teacher interviews by filming videotapes. Then, the teacher interviews and student interviews were transcribed and then coded. In the midst of classroom observations, the researcher took notes, wrote analytic memos and summaries after watching each class video clip for each teacher and each student.

3.1. Selection of Three Participating Teachers

In this research, the three participating teachers were chosen based on the two criteria: one was high ratings by students, proposed by Hativa, Barak, & Simhi (2001) and the other was complete concurrence by the supervising administrator, proposed by Strong, Gargani, & Hacifazlioglu (2011). The evaluation resulted from the scores of the Student-Evaluated Teaching Survey (SET), administered by Foreign Language School, Shanghai Dianji University. The three teachers in this study topped the scores in the past three consecutive years. Three teachers, Teacher A, 36, associate professor; Teacher B, 43, associate professor and Teacher C, 32, lecturer, were selected for 9 classes of students with mixed English proficiency levels at the outset of the first semester in September 2013. They have been teaching English for at least 7 years in college and gone through two periods of English teaching reform. With their consent, a semi-structured interview with the three teachers respectively was conducted to collect more detailed information on their beliefs and teaching practice for analysis.
3.2. Selection of Participating Students

Three hundred sixty one undergraduate students majoring in Electrical Engineering were enrolled across 9 parallel level-mixed classes (about 40 in each class) the three teachers were teaching. 140 sampled students were classified into high-scoring, average-scoring and low-scoring students based on their final grades of the first semester of the College English course for the 9 classes taught by the three teachers. 6 high-scoring students, 9 average-scoring students, and 7 low-scoring students were randomly selected and were composed as the sampled 140 students. The selected 22 students were interviewed based on their responses to the questionnaire survey.

3.3. Research Procedures
3.3.1. Teacher Interviews

Each teacher was interviewed by the end of the first and second semester respectively and all the interviews were transcribed. The interview questions were largely about their life story, learning experiences, professional development, pedagogic ideas, classroom practices and beliefs, such as: How do you see new curriculum and the proposed teaching method? What will be the challenges for you in the upcoming reform? The questions helped reveal the pedagogical theories that the teachers used. The interviews were filmed in a very relaxing atmosphere.

3.3.2 Student Interviews

Six students from each teacher (total of 18 students) were invited to participate in the audio-taped face-to-face interview for 20-25 minutes respectively. The interview questions were largely about the new curriculum, the teachers’ method, the interactions in the classroom, such as: What does the teacher do to help you learn? Is the lecture based on collaboration in the form of team? What are the differences between your previous English and the present ongoing English learning in the classroom? These questions prompted the students to recall what and how they had learned in the class. As suggested earlier, however, as this research is not so concerned with the effectiveness of the three teachers’ implementation, nor what methods would enhance their teaching effectiveness, the student interviews were employed only to help gain knowledge of whether the three teachers’ beliefs are consistent with their teaching practices.

3.3.3 Classroom Observation

Throughout the second semester, the researcher attended each teacher’s class twice and had three 90-minute spans of each teacher teaching their class videotaped to record exactly what method was used by the teacher and students participation in the classroom. The videotape was later transcribed. The observations facilitated the researcher to see and understand the impacts of the new curriculum and proposed method occurring in the classrooms.

4. Data Analysis, Findings and Discussion

This section involves the analytic results of the collected data, including a description of three teachers’ beliefs based on questionnaires, the teaching practice on the basis of the associated pedagogy from the teacher’s course syllabi, classroom observations, teacher interviews as well as students’ learning experiences in practices decrypted from the interview transcriptions.

4.1 Description of Three Teachers’ Beliefs

Prior to the EAP-oriented teaching experiment, a questionnaire was presented to the three teachers. Based on Teachers’ Beliefs Questionnaires proposed by Lv (2004), the quantitative questionnaire was readjusted to investigate teachers’ beliefs from two aspects: teachers’ evaluation on
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students’ learning as well as their views on the new curriculum in terms of the disciplinary features of English teaching.

The questionnaire was composed of 20 questions, including the teachers’ beliefs on their evaluation on students learning (from No 1 to No 7) and teachers’ view on the curriculum (from No 8 to No 20. The 6-point Linker-scale was employed to investigate the characteristics of the three teachers’ beliefs, with choices ranging from “strongly disagree”, “disagree”, “somehow disagree”, “somehow agree”, “agree” and “strongly agree”.

Among the 20 questions, teachers’ beliefs on evaluation on students learning are made up of 7 questions with full scores as 42(mean=21); teachers’ view on the curriculum comprises 13 questions with full scores as 78 (mean=39).

Figure 1: Teachers’ Evaluation of Students Learning (see Questionnaire 1 in Appendix II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation on</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somehow disagree</th>
<th>Somehow agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student learning</td>
<td>(% )</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the 7 questions surveyed from Figure 1, 5 were responded with over 50% “agree”, which indicates that they had the knowledge of the aims and objectives and criteria of the new curriculum and hoped to adopt a multiple modes of assessment on students’ learning instead of relying on heavily on their final examinations. A unanimously “disagree” among the three teachers was revealed in the survey question No.12, which proves their assumption of English teachers’ domination over the teaching content and assessment criteria without students involved in the process. They were not assured of students’ autonomy in learning. In addition, the three teachers “agree” 100% to the survey question No.12, showing their tendency to the emphasis on the nation-wide standardized tests, which has been shaped by the several-decade history of English education and required by the college administrative departments as an indicator of rule makers in the class. Meanwhile, the survey question No. 6 shows they were not sure of students’ autonomy in English learning, nor did they recognize the better effect of students’ knowledge exploration on their own than that of lecturing by teachers during the process of English learning.

Figure 2: Teachers’ view on the New Curriculum (see Questionnaire 2 in Appendix III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The new curriculum</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somehow disagree</th>
<th>Somehow agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the 13 questions surveyed from Figure 2, 12 were responded with over 50% “agree”, which indicates that they had the knowledge of the aims and objectives and criteria of the new curriculum and hoped to adopt a multiple modes of assessment on students’ learning instead of relying on heavily on their final examinations. A unanimously “disagree” among the three teachers was revealed in the survey question No.12, which proves their assumption of English teachers’ domination over the teaching content and assessment criteria without students involved in the process. They were not assured of students’ autonomy in learning. In addition, the three teachers “agree” 100% to the survey question No.12, showing their tendency to the emphasis on the nation-wide standardized tests, which has been shaped by the several-decade history of English education and required by the college administrative departments as an indicator of
assessing college students' English proficiency levels.

4.2. Description of the Semi-structured Interviews

Based on the questionnaire, the semi-structured interviews were employed to probe into the following three main questions: what challenges and difficulties were you confronted with during the EAP-oriented teaching experiment? Compared with the present teaching practice, are there any changes in your beliefs when recalling the pedagogy used at the beginning of the teaching reform? If yes, what prompted the changes in your beliefs?

The results of the interviews on the Question 1 reveal that the common challenges confronting them were the teaching conception transition from teacher-centered classroom to student-centered classroom. Not only the teachers, but the students felt intimidated in the new teaching mode. Instead of continuing with the traditional grammar-translation method bounded by the textbook as it was practiced before, the three teachers had to come up with innovative tasks to engage the students in class activities and facilitated students’ completion of those tasks with proper direction. As for the students, they were required to learn to collaborate with different group members in different tasks in order to gain a favorable assessment result after each task rather than sitting passively in the class as they used to. In addition, overcrowded classes are also a major challenge that causes many problems for instructors and learners. The main difficulties facing the teachers varied individually, but included in common the longer time-and-energy-consuming class preparation process, the frequent motivation of students to learn, the students’ lack of cooperation even resistance to participation in group activities, the mixture of students’ English proficiency levels, regular design of quizzes or tests and the following grading and assessments, etc.

The results of the interview Question 2 & 3 showed that all of them experienced changes in their beliefs. As for what prompted the changes, they attributed it to the following factors: the advocated task-based instruction method with an increase of students’ participation in the classroom, the understanding of the students’ cognition and perceptions based on feedbacks from their students, their own reflection on their class teaching practice, collective preparation for class lectures among the three teachers on a regular basis, seminars on academic English teaching and demo classes presented by model teachers from other universities. It is these stimulants that enabled them to interact and exchange ideas to timely update their teaching conception and improve teaching method by collaborating with team members.

4.3. Description of the Three Teachers’ Teaching Practice

Based upon the classroom observation and review of videotaped teaching sessions, the three teachers’ teaching practice is described as follows. (See Appendix V) Table 2 summarizes the practices with the advocated pedagogy and categorizes teaching methods from classroom observation and teacher interviews. The three teachers all made use of GT combined with CLT or CL methods, with the mixture of students' English proficiency levels taken into consideration. As they expected that students would find themselves in situations which were totally new experiences for them and were required to engage in activities that called for higher level of participation – both physically and mentally, the three teachers still dedicated significant time to the improvement of vocabulary, reading and speaking, giving detailed explanations of the
target language, but tried to switch most of students’ attention from paperwork to more communicative activities by constantly encouraging them to be open-minded and interact with the teacher and their peers. More specifically, compared with their previous teacher-centered instruction, they spent 55%, 60%, and 60% of their class time in lecturing, that is to say, their students used up about 45%, 40%, and 40% of the class time, respectively, a relatively considerable increase of time for student participation. The teacher interviews further indicate that the teachers began to feel much more assured and at ease when entrusting more class time to the students.

In addition, the three teachers paid an increasing attention to the formative assessment by assigning students regular quizzes based on the unit just learnt, and presentations or projects, a fundamental shift from the previous summative assessment by one single final examination.

4.4. Discussion of the Findings

For the mentioned question 1 and 2, through the newly adopted curriculum and the advocacy by relevant educational authorities, the three EFL teachers gained an understanding of both the practical needs of the society and students’ academic needs. They hold a positive and supportive attitude toward the new round of reform and are open-minded to experiment the newly advocated teaching methodology. It is also clear from questionnaire 1 and 2 that they consider English teachers’ main task is to encourage students to learn in accordance with their capabilities and interests instead of disseminating grammatical knowledge and helping them with the standardized exams although they are not sure of students’ autonomy in English learning.

For the mentioned question 3, guided by their beliefs and new teaching concept, they tried to reconcile their pedagogy usually practiced in the past with the promoted methodology and made use of the cooperative learning method by engaging students in class activities rather than clinging to the traditional lecture-centered teaching.

Though the three instructors find it somehow overwhelmed by the oversized class and difficult to manage their class communicatively, the classroom observations show they consciously or unconsciously diminished their role gradually from the sole knowledge transmitters to the facilitators and knowledge co-constructors with students in the classroom although a considerable amount of time was still invested in grammar, exercises and translation skills constrained by the present educational system and pressed by the upcoming College English Test Band 4 and Band 6.

5. Conclusion

Based on the EAP-oriented teaching reform, the study investigates how the beliefs the three teachers held toward the newly implemented curriculum affect their teaching pedagogy with practices in the situated Chinese context by analyzing questionnaire surveys, teacher interviews and classroom observations. The results show they were ready to experiment newly advocated teaching methodology guided by new concept and made use of cooperative learning based on tasks to reconcile their traditionally teacher-centered pedagogy.

A multitude of other challenges still exist in the context of EAP-oriented teaching reform which may not be addressed by teachers only and need to be identified and considered by educational authorities seriously, such as shortage of time, high expectations from relevant authorities at a short period of time, insufficient knowledge of EFL instructors in EAP, lack of clearly articulated instructional objectives in the
specific EAP context, the mixture of students language proficiency, teacher’s training.

The result of this investigation into the teachers’ beliefs and their teaching practice in the context of EAP-oriented teaching reform may not be expected to have universal applicability, but may provide implication for further research on how to promote teachers’ beliefs and their career development so as to affect their teaching behavior and effectiveness favorably. Besides, it is also a potential research direction on how to construct knowledge together between teachers and students rather than deliver knowledge only through teachers by means of strengthening the cooperation among teachers as well as between teachers and students.
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Appendix: I
Table 1: the Newly Adopted Curriculum Framework of College English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Transitional courses</th>
<th>Core courses</th>
<th>Optional courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EG (Optional)</td>
<td>EGAP (Compulsory)</td>
<td>ESAP (Optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit ratio</td>
<td>3-10%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Listening &amp; Speaking</td>
<td>Academic English</td>
<td>Financial English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Academic Listening &amp; Speaking</td>
<td>Business English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>English Writing</td>
<td>Academic Reading</td>
<td>Engineering English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Academic Report and Presentation</td>
<td>Academic English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated English</td>
<td>Academic Writing</td>
<td>EOP (English for Occupational Purpose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>British and American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Society &amp; Culture</td>
<td>Intercultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Public Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Philology</td>
<td>Critical Thinking &amp; Debate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix: II
Questionnaire: 1
Teachers’ Evaluation of Students Learning
Based on the Linker 6 Scale, please write the number at the bracket according to ① “strongly disagree”, ② “disagree”, ③ “somehow disagree”, ④ “somehow agree”, ⑤ “agree” and ⑥ “strongly agree”.
1. Students are collaborators of English teaching instead of passive knowledge receivers. ( )
2. English teaching should promote students’ intrinsic motivation. ( )
3. English teachers should encourage students to use different approaches to learn in terms of their individual abilities and interests. ( )
4. Rather than rely merely on teachers, students can take the initiatives to learn on their own. ( )
5. Students are allowed to disagree with teachers, but should obey the rules made by teachers. ( )
6. It is better to allow students to explore during the process of learning than to teach them via lecturing. ( )
7. It is more important for students to know how to learn than how to teach by teachers. ( )

Appendix: III
Questionnaire: 2
Teachers’ View on the New Curriculum
Based on the Linker 6 Scale, please write the number at the bracket according to ① “strongly disagree”, ② “disagree”, ③ “somehow disagree”, ④ “somehow agree”, ⑤ “agree” and ⑥ “strongly agree”.
8. English teachers should grasp a solid understanding of the newly adopted curriculum standards, such as the objectives and the content. ( )
9. The main objective of the curriculum and teaching is supposed to cultivate students’ self-esteem and the sense of achievement as well as ignite their initiatives. ( )
10. English teachers should focus more on the dynamic process of the class during their preparation for the lectures. ( )
11. English teachers should not organize the teaching activities by rigidly following the curriculum scheduled. ( )
12. Students can also be allowed together with English teachers to determine the teaching content and the criteria of assessment. ( )
13. The new teaching pedagogy should be student-centered, with the role of the teacher shifted from the knowledge disseminator in the classroom to the facilitator and organizer. ( )
14. The new reform should be imperative ranging from changing the teaching content to pedagogy. ( )
15. Instruction on systematic grammar rules should not be ignored during the new teaching reform. ( )
16. English teachers should both help students prepare for and pass the College English Test Band-4 and Band-6. ( )
17. English teachers are allowed to differentiate students of the same classroom and teach them accordingly. ( )
18. Multiple modes of assessments should be employed evaluate students performance instead of relying merely on one single examination result. ( )
19. In addition to knowledge assessment, students’ emotion and language competency should be included in the evaluation. ( )
20. It is more sensible to have a comprehensive knowledge of students’ performance by using regular quizzes and tests than one single summative examination. ( )

Appendix: IV
Interviews Questions for the Students
1) What do you learn English for?
2) What is the biggest difference between your present English teaching and your past one?
3) Is the cooperative learning challenging for you? What difficulties do you encounter in this new mode of English learning? Do the methods help you learn?
4) What does the teacher do to help you learn?
5) What kinds of activities does the teacher organize in the class?
6) Do you like to learn based on group work or based on teacher’s lecture?
7) What skills have you learned benefit you the most to enhance your learning?

8) Which one is better, to sit for one final exam to determine your grade or to have more tests on a regular basis? Do quizzes on a regular basis help to learn? Do you care about your grading of quizzes and group presentation?

Appendix: V
Classroom Observation

Table 2 Teaching method observed from classroom observation (GT for grammar-translation; CL for cooperative learning; CLT for communicative Language teaching)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Associated pedagogy/method</th>
<th>Teaching activities</th>
<th>Teaching practice</th>
<th>Time distribution per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>CLT method: designing student-centered activities for them to work in teams; instructing them on reading strategies such as finding key words, main ideas, topic sentences.</td>
<td>Team presentation; Work together to read the topic sentences and main idea of the text, work in teams to translate some designated paragraphs.</td>
<td>Students’ presentation: 10%; English vues 10%; Teaching vocabulary and grammar 20%; Structure analysis 15%; Task-based Interaction Among students 25%.</td>
<td>Student-teacher interaction on test and homework 20%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>CLT combined with GT method: designing student-centered activities to encourage students to work by themselves or with others. Discussing, checking the homework answers in class; asking students to discuss the group presentation content with the teacher via e-mail before they present their group work in class.</td>
<td>Task-based discussion and presentation; role play activities, essay assignment and analysis; reading aloud.</td>
<td>Students’ presentation: 10%; Teaching vocabulary and grammar 20%; Background and Structure analysis 15%; Task-based Interaction Among students 25%.</td>
<td>Student-teacher interaction on test and homework 15%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher C</td>
<td>GT method: increasing vocabulary knowledge and phrase knowledge. CL combined with GT method: using interactive activities with students working in teams and the teacher inspecting and directing individually. Chinese is allowed during the translation in class; regular unit quizzes.</td>
<td>Work together to translate designated paragraphs; role play, essay writing assignment and collective correction and analysis; read text paragraphs aloud.</td>
<td>Students’ presentation: 10%; Teaching vocabulary and grammar 35%; Structure analysis 15%; Task-based Interaction Among students 20%.</td>
<td>Student-teacher interaction on test and homework 15%; Read aloud and story retelling 10%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>