

## Communication 1 Syllabus : Designed by Consensus

著者	Kurzweil Joshua, Hellman Christopher John, Russ Robin, Cowen Christopher, Calman Rebecca, Doodigian John R.
雑誌名	関西大学外国語教育フォーラム
巻	1
ページ	31-46
発行年	2002-03-31
その他のタイトル	コンセンサスに基づくシラバス・デザイン
URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/10112/1231">http://hdl.handle.net/10112/1231</a>

# Communication 1 Syllabus: Designed by Consensus

コンセンサスに基づくシラバス・デザイン

Joshua Kurzweil

Chris Hellman

Robin Russ

Chris Cowen

Rebecca Calman

John Doodigian

この論文は関西大学の1年生のための英語授業、「英語 I コミュニケーション」のコース・デザインを紹介している。この授業は3年契約で雇われている11人の特任外国語講師が担当しており、11人中の約3分の1が毎年入れ替わっている。コミュニケーション授業は学生のオーラル・コミュニケーション・スキルの向上を目指すものとなっているが、その目標を達成する具体的方法は今まで定められておらず、教材、クラス・アクティビティー等は各先生に任せられていた。そのため、学生のコミュニケーション・スキルの向上をめざした統一シラバスを作ることにした。特任外国語講師のメンバーは全員英語教育の経歴をもっているが、その経験は多様で、教育概念も必ずしも一致していない。そのため、シラバス・デザインは教育概念を統一することから始めるのではなく、すでにある各先生の教材を見ることから始め、ボトム・アップ・アプローチで進めるのがよいと考えられた。まず各先生から教材を集め、それを目標別に分類した。次に、各教材の目標がコース全体の目標にどれだけ貢献するかを検討し、教材のランク付けを行った。この際、それぞれの先生の意見を尊重し、コンセンサスを得るという方法がとられた。この論文ではコース・デザインに使用した英語教育理論、コンセンサスを得る過程、そして英語 I コミュニケーション授業の将来の発展について論じている。

## Introduction

The Communication I program was established in 1993 and is under the auspices of the Institute of Foreign Language Education and Research. At present, the staff consists of 11 instructors each with the responsibility of teaching ten classes per week across the various faculties at Kansai University. Class admission is limited to first year students with a ceiling of 30 students per class. The course is offered as an option for English I in the language curriculum, and placement is awarded by lottery.

In general, the first year students possess a basic understanding of English and are typical false beginners with 6 years of English study in secondary school. They have a great deal of

passive knowledge but have difficulty articulating their ideas when communicating. To address this, the program has two primary objectives. The first is to actively develop students' ability to communicate in a socially appropriate manner. Secondly, there is a determined effort to build learner confidence and to motivate them to assume personal responsibility for their further progress after completion of the course.

To achieve these objectives, the teachers are responsible for creating a set of materials that specifically meet the varying needs of Communication I students. As much as possible, the language used in these materials is to be authentic and requires students to engage in genuine communication. By developing a shared set of materials and working towards specific objectives, we hope to provide the students with a common learning experience which meets the program's objectives.

In looking at the program historically, the communicative approach to language learning has consistently been applied to attain these two objectives. However, the syllabus that articulated the methodology for doing this went through several drastic changes over a short period time. This was due in no small part to teacher turnover, an inherent feature of our program, since the teachers who compose the team are limited to three years. As there had been no system in place for organizing materials incoming teachers were constantly faced with the task of defining their own syllabus. The consequence was a cyclical redefining of how to go about the business of educating our students which confounded any attempts to establish a core content from which to expand. It was this lack of institutional memory that led to the team proposing a new model of materials organization. It is hoped that this plan will retain the valuable contributions of previous teachers by providing a living artifact in the form of easily accessible materials. Moreover, it was felt that by analyzing materials for classification, teachers would go beyond the obvious categorization of what they teach and look at the deeper questions of how and why they teach, thus providing valuable information for further refinement of course objectives.

As with any plan, many unpredictable challenges and unanticipated benefits lay in its execution. An account of this process of syllabus design will follow. Although what works for one program does not necessarily work for another, contemplating this process could prove useful as a starting point for the potential course designer. In organizing the materials and identifying the objectives of the activities, the communication team dealt with many aspects of course design.

### **Theoretical Background**

According to standard definitions (Graves 1996; Richards 1990; White 1988; Yalden 1987a b), a

syllabus elucidates the content of a particular course and suggests plans for implementation. It is one aspect of a broader framework of processes in course design. Other considerations include:

1. Needs assessment
2. Course goals
3. Content and methodology
4. Selection of activities and materials (syllabus)
5. Organization of content and activities
6. Evaluation

While the framework appears linear, beginning with needs analysis and ending with evaluation, in reality the decision making process does not follow any particular sequence. It is common for teachers or course designers to use as a starting point the factors that they perceive as having the greatest impact on planning and implementation (Yalden 1987a b; Graves 1996). Our main task was concerned with the second and fourth factors, focusing on activities, materials and objectives. The materials were then used to identify student centered objectives for the course without dictating a specific order, thus maintaining teacher autonomy and flexibility.

Although our task, as assigned, was to organize and clarify the course syllabus, in fact the process also necessitated reviewing course objectives. In our case, curriculum directives, which had been established at the program's inception, determined the overarching objectives. Our task was not to define them, but to clarify them in terms readily understandable to teachers newly appointed to the team.

The Communication I Team, while not doing a formal needs analysis during the first classes, adopted several strategies to take students' needs in to account. Since the students in the program are mostly false beginners and have a common educational background, we judged there to be a certain uniformity in their needs. This judgement was based on the team's collective experience with Japanese university students as well as information gleaned from student evaluations conducted previously by the program's team members.

Finally, the Communication I teachers apply weekly ongoing assessment of needs, both as perceived by the teacher and as perceived by the students themselves, through the use of Learning Journals. Entries provide feedback and information which assist teachers in analyzing the needs, interests and progress of students.

Syllabus planning can be approached in various ways. In our case we elected to use a bottom-up approach in which teachers submitted materials which they had used towards achieving the general course objectives. The materials were then used to suggest course content and how the syllabus would be organized. Such a bottom-up approach is often employed by teachers in planning and designing their courses. Graves (1996, 26) notes that many teachers involved in course design begin with ideas about the activities, materials and the techniques they will use, rather than with concepts about content and objectives. Grass roots teacher involvement has also been credited with creating an environment of easy implementation and acceptance (Yalden 1987a, White 1988) as teachers have a greater commitment to a syllabus which represents their views of student ability and the reality of the conditions in the classroom.

### **Rationale**

In describing the task of creating a syllabus it must be realized that the actual form the project took was, to a large degree dictated by the experience of the members of the team. The theoretical underpinnings were perhaps secondary to the practical exigencies of the situation, and the subsequent evolution into a bottom-up approach was a result of practical considerations. This is not to say that theoretical concerns did not inform the project, but rather, these concerns were already part and parcel of the participating members' teaching experience, and had been absorbed and internalized over years of teaching, and thus their impact was not felt overtly during the project.

The mission statement as originally presented to the team members was open-ended: no strict parameters were given concerning time-scale, for instance, or indeed, the desired nature of the final product. Additionally, the use to which the syllabus would be put, and how strictly it would be enforced were not made explicit. This allowed a variety of interpretations. The collective experience of those involved suggested that everyone had well-developed approaches to teaching. Any attempt to organize a curriculum without first understanding the range and compatibility of these approaches seemed unlikely to be of much value, and in addition, this kind of prescriptive, top-down approach was expected to encounter a degree of resistance that the fledgling project could ill-afford. A bottom-up approach, it was felt, was necessary to assess what was already being taught in the program, and so allow this to be used as the basis upon which decisions would be made. This also seemed less likely to provoke teacher resistance, as it offered little threat to individuals' independence in the classroom.

The data (in the shape of lesson plans) that was collected could be organized according to principles suggested by the nature of that data itself, which gave the project the additional advantage of being easy to initiate and sustain, despite the lack of definition of the end product.

### **Designing the Syllabus**

The present Communication I Team first met in April 2001 at which time we were given the mission statement and the assignment of producing a practical teaching syllabus for the program. Our method for developing the syllabus was to begin with teachers contributing materials on a lesson by lesson basis which, over the course of several weeks, provided a pattern of content and objectives. An analysis of the materials indicated linguistic and discourse priorities common among the teaching team and suggested performance and discourse objectives. Indeed, our process in many ways follows that expounded by Richards (2001).

“Rough initial ideas are noted down as a basis for further planning and added to through group brainstorming. A list of possible topics, units, skills and other units of course organization is then generated. One person suggests something that should go into the course, others add their ideas...Throughout this process the statements of objectives and objectives are continually referred to and both course content suggestions and the objectives and objectives themselves are revised and fine-tuned as the course content is planned.” (Richards 2001, 148).

As previously stated, the materials are the determining feature of the Communication I course. We differed from Richards’ model in that instead of relying on one individual to contribute an idea we all simultaneously contributed materials and then looked for commonalities in our lesson objectives. In addition, as opposed to starting with “rough” ideas the Communication I Team had to take into account the fact that team members would often be contributing polished materials that were the culmination of several years of their own work both inside and outside of the program. We needed to find a way to respect our differences and yet also agree upon what we had in common.

The team went through a number of stages so as to insure that the goal of creating a syllabus was met and that the process of achieving it would be rewarding to all participating. The steps we took were as follows:

1. Clarify the assignment

2. Draft individual lists of objectives we had for the first semester
3. Create a Weekly Materials File for worksheets and activities
4. Create a Recipe Note Sheet to outline the objectives and procedures of the materials
5. Discuss each other's materials
6. List all of the objectives from the Recipe Note Sheets and divide them into three categories: Must Do, Should Do, and Could Do.
7. Create individual files for each of the "Must" objectives and put copies from the Weekly Materials File into the Objectives Files
8. Introduce the syllabus to incoming teachers and guests

### **1. Clarify the assignment**

The first thing that the team needed to do was clarify the exact nature of our assignment, specifically what was going to be done with the syllabus we created and who it was for. There was considerable concern among the team that the syllabus was to be submitted to an administrator and judged. This possibility caused worry among the team members and would greatly affect how we went about our task. Essentially, we needed to know who our audience was. The coordinator established that it was only to be used by the team. The administration was quite satisfied with the general description of the course as outlined in the mission statement and simply wanted the team to continue its teaching efforts. We realized though that we did have a target audience which was the following year's incoming teachers. This clarification freed us by allowing us to describe what we do in the classroom as teachers and for teachers.

### **2. Draft individual lists of objectives we had for the first semester**

After reading over the mission statement of the course and discussing the committee assignment we agreed to begin by writing out a list of class objectives. Specifically, we brainstormed lists of things that we wanted our students to be able to do by the end of the first semester. These lists were used as an initial stimulus to discuss how different teachers envisioned the semester. The semester objectives also served the function of moving from the abstract course objectives to more concrete student-centered objectives. For example, instead of saying that students will study communication strategies we might say that students will be able to start, sustain, and conclude a five-minute conversation. Although these objectives were useful to begin our exchange of ideas, we found that they were still removed from the actual classroom activities.

### **3. Create a Weekly Materials File for worksheets and activities**

As stated earlier, we adopted a bottom-up approach in the design of our syllabus. We agreed to contribute weekly to a materials file which was kept in the teachers' room. The contributions could be of two types. The first was student worksheets created by the individual teachers. The second was that for those activities that did not use a worksheet we agreed to write up notes of the board work and instructions that came up as the teacher did the activity in class. In this way, all of the teachers put their descriptions of their actual classroom activities in the weekly folders and were able to peruse the files at their leisure.

### **4. Create a Recipe Note Sheet to outline the objectives and procedures of the materials**

Although we were wary of making the process of contributing to the Weekly Materials File a burden, we found that the worksheets and board work notes alone did not clearly indicate how the activity worked in the classroom. The committee then worked on a Recipe Note Sheet that could accompany the materials. The purpose of these recipes was to make it so that one teacher could easily use the materials of another teacher. Over the course of several weeks we discussed the form of the Recipe Note Sheet with particular attention to finding a balance between something that was useful but not too time consuming. (See Appendix 1.) One of the earlier drafts had many more check boxes for what area the activity worked on, but we found that the sheet became too long and unwieldy. We decided to hand out a Supplementary Page (see Appendix 2) which listed many of the different areas speaking classes might focus on. In this way, the teachers could refer to the Supplementary Page as they divided the objectives of the activity into language areas, speaking skills, and learning skills. In many ways, the discussion of the Recipe Note Sheet and the Supplementary Page and our subsequent use of them helped us find a common language with which we could compare and discuss our often very different approaches toward achieving our semester objectives. For example, we found it effective to separate the language area from the speaking skill when thinking about activities. While a language area might include different vocabulary, grammar, or areas of pronunciation, the speaking skills concentrated on the actual student task. For example, we all agreed that it was important for students to become adept at the skill of asking follow up questions, but realized that while doing follow up question activities different teachers might want to teach different aspects of language, such as question formation, intonation, sentence stress, or the meanings of the question words themselves. By filling out the Recipe Note Sheet, teachers were able to talk about and compare their activities in a specific way which focused on what the students were



learning.

### **5. Discuss Materials**

Each week the Communication I Team met to share and discuss the materials that had been contributed. The procedure we adopted was one in which teachers would examine and present the materials of other teachers. Teachers would select randomly from weekly folders and spend some time reading over the materials and Recipe Note sheets. We then presented each other's activities and worksheets to the group who could then ask specific questions about procedure or objectives. We often found that this process not only introduced teachers to new materials, but also encouraged creative expansion as members would come up with new ideas and variations on the activities that had been presented. During these sharing periods we began to see common objectives emerging from the team. That is, we found things that we were all working on with our students albeit sometimes in very different ways.

### **6. List all of the objectives from the Recipe Note Sheets and divide them into three categories: Must do, Should do, and Could do**

Toward the end of the first semester we compiled a list on the white board of all of the different objectives we had worked on during the semester. We went through all of the Recipe Note Sheets calling out the objectives and adding them to the list. If an objective was repeated it simply got a tick next to it. In this way we were able to see what the majority of us were doing. We then compiled the following three lists:

**Must do:** These are objectives that all the teachers on the team agreed that the Communication I Class must include. Teachers are free to choose the order in which they work toward these objectives as well as the activities they do to help students achieve these objectives.

*For example: Students will be able keep a conversation going by asking follow up questions.*

**Should do:** These are objectives/areas that most of the teachers on the course have included in their syllabi.

*For example: Students will learn about the culture (s) of English speaking countries.*

**Could do:** These are objectives/areas that some teachers find interesting and useful for students.

*For example: Students will learn to be more creative and apply that creativity to their learning habits.*

It should be stressed here that, while we agreed that the “must do” list be a part of each teacher’s syllabus, we in no way wanted to limit teachers to working only on these objectives. The syllabus objectives are purposefully incomplete. (See Appendix 3.) It is expected that teachers will add their own objectives and activities to the existing set according to their interests and ideas. In addition, the required syllabus does not need to be done in any particular order. Each teacher can consider what he or she thinks a logical order would be to achieve these objectives.

### **7. Create individual Objectives Files for each of the “must do” objectives**

At the beginning of the second semester we then created a new set of files which corresponded to the objectives on the “must do” list. Each objective on the syllabus had one corresponding Objective File that contained activities and worksheets that had been used to help students achieve that particular objective. An incoming teacher would then be able to get the list of “must do” objectives and immediately get a sense of the kinds of activities that could be used. This process involved photocopying the materials and worksheets in the weekly files and then working together to decide the Objective File (or files) into which it should be placed. Engaging in this filing proved to be useful as a review of the first semester and helped us start planning for the second semester.

### **8. Introduce the syllabus to incoming teachers and visiting scholars**

During the second semester we continued to add to the weekly files. We also needed to create a way of making the files approachable to the incoming teachers. To this end we discussed what the new teacher would need to know and drafted a letter explaining the syllabus and the procedure for being a contributing member of the team. Once again, the process of discussing what we had done acted as an overall review and helped us tighten up vague areas in the syllabus.

## Problems

For a project of this type it was inevitable that a number of problems would occur. Often different problems were closely related, but for the purposes of examining how we dealt with them, they may be divided into five main categories: - friction between members of the project team - inertia - procedure - common language - intellectual property rights

### Friction

It was anticipated that friction could develop from asking a group of experienced, self-reliant teachers, with varied teaching styles and approaches to work together to construct a syllabus. We needed something that was both useful and at the same time would not prove to be an undesirable constraint. Thus throughout the project, attempts were made to facilitate a process that was acceptable to all those involved. The early decision to employ a bottom-up process was especially helpful in creating an atmosphere that encouraged this, and it was because of the continued awareness and sensitivity that all members of the project team displayed, that no problems of this type actually occurred.

### Inertia

Secondary to this were problems of inertia, both in terms of starting the project and then keeping it going. As related above, previous attempts at curriculum coordination had ultimately proved unsuccessful: though materials were gathered and, to some extent, organized, these initial moves were not followed up and the project languished. It was feared that memories of these prior attempts might be the cause of some reluctance but, in fact, the hesitancy of those previously involved in the program was balanced by the enthusiasm of new blood.

As the project continued, a degree of inertia was also manifested as resistance to performing the work involved in running the project. Although this work was minimal, it was nonetheless necessary for the smooth running of the project, and a certain 'critical mass' of contributing members was seen as necessary to make the project not only worthwhile, but actually representative of the range of teaching present on the program. This problem was dealt with chiefly by introducing an element of accountability into the project. Each week, meetings were held at which the progress of the project was reviewed, and various of the materials that had been contributed were examined by the team. Although not its primary function, this served to remind teachers of the importance of continuing to contribute to the materials file and to increase interest through the examination of materials that had been contributed. Although contributions were not received equally from all members of the team, that 'critical mass' was

achieved so that the materials were judged to be comprehensive and representative enough to be used as the basis for the syllabus.

### Procedure

As the bottom-up nature of the project became apparent, it was clear that the continuing contribution of materials was vital, and that any problems that might interrupt this flow should be dealt with promptly. Initial discussions as to the form of the submissions were particularly important - decisions were taken on the submission of materials and lesson plans and the way in which they should be filed. This initial decision was particularly important as it enabled the project to continue with moderate input from members before decisions had been taken about the final organization of the materials and the form of the final project. It did, in fact, require some insistence that simply collecting materials and delaying the labeling of files was sufficient to begin the project.. As our experience showed, the initial labeling was not necessary, and later organizational systems were applied once the nature of the contributions was known. The Recipe Note Sheets which accompanied the lesson plans were the subject of considerable discussion, and several meetings were given over to their refinement and testing. Despite a degree of uncertainty, it proved its usability, and the prompt settlement of any disagreements over language and form allowed the project to continue smoothly.

### Common Language

The discussions connected with the Recipe Note Sheets had an unexpected benefit, which proved to be of major importance to the project. Given the diverse group of teachers involved in the project, there was not, in fact, a completely shared technical language. In making a Recipe Note Sheets, there was clearly the need to carefully examine the language used. It had to be revised and tested several times before agreement was reached. This had the effect of creating a shared language for team members, which greatly eased communication and had obvious benefits for the team as a whole.

### Intellectual Property Rights

So far, the problems discussed were purely internal to the team. However an issue that posed the possibility of more serious repercussions, was that of intellectual property rights. Given the inevitable borrowing, adaptation, and recycling that attends the creation of teaching materials, worries were expressed about future uses of materials. This was of particular concern to some members of the team who were involved in publishing on a professional basis, as it raised issues

of copyright and attribution of sources. While willing to share their materials, they were worried about possible use outside the team. Other members also had reservations about the crediting or miscrediting of materials. It was recognized, given the cooperative nature of the course and material use, that absolute accuracy in crediting materials was probably not realistic but that materials should be credited to the source as far as possible, and that this was to be noted on the materials themselves or on the accompanying explanation with which they were filed. It was also agreed that though every care would be taken to ensure accuracy, those who were particularly worried should not submit those materials they would rather not see used beyond the course. A notice to this effect was attached to the materials submission box, and all team members seemed satisfied.

The problems mentioned above were general ones that occurred during the project, but none of them proved to be serious. They were dealt with in a timely fashion before becoming overly problematic. The group approach that was taken in overcoming them proved to be effective, both as a means of solving the immediate problems, and also in uniting the members of the team through the creation of a shared language and the knowledge of each others' materials and interests in teaching. Most of the problems we encountered arose from differences in teaching philosophy and experience, but we found that it was the discussion of those differences that ultimately made the project worthwhile.

### **Applications of the Syllabus**

The end product of this project to create a syllabus has had two primary applications. Firstly, new teachers joining the team in 2002 have received the list of objectives as part of a package introducing them to the program. During the first meeting of the new academic year the new teachers will be shown the materials files which are linked to each objective. They also will receive information about the procedure for contributing to the materials file as a member of the team. The second application was in revising the course description that the students read. The team was able to rewrite the course description so that it accurately reflected what students could expect from the course irrespective of their teacher. While students can expect a variety of different types of lessons which relate to each teacher's individual style and approach, the overall course has reached a degree of standardisation.

### **Suggestions for Future Research**

Now that the activities have been gathered and organized in topical fashion, further research might include testing the final product by both its authors and teachers new to the program.

Communication I Syllabus: Desigend by Consensus (Kurzweil, Hellman, Russ, Cowen, Calman, Doodigian)

Having created a resource, how accessible and useful will the activities be? Will teachers be readily able to draw activities from the resource files for the next academic year? In the coming academic year, four teachers who were not directly active in creating the resource file will be teaching on Kansai University's Communication I Team, others will have completed their term of employment and a group of four new teachers will be entering the program. It will be interesting to see how the newcomers use the files compared with the teachers who were active in creating it. The result could provide an interesting measure of the resource file's usefulness.

The original objectives were selected based on sessions in which teachers examined individual activities after which they were classified into similar categories. During the coming year (s) it will be of interest to see how the list of objectives changes. We anticipate that it will, and the underlying reasons for those changes would no doubt provide valuable information about the evolution of a program and reflect emerging tendencies in the field of ESL syllabus design.

#### REFERENCES

- Breen, M. 1987. Contemporary paradigms in syllabus design Part II. In *Language Teaching* Vol. 2-3, 157-174.
- Graves, K. (ed). 1996. *Teachers as Curriculum Developers*. CUP.
- Richards, J.C. 2001. *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. CUP.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1990. *The Language Teaching Matrix*. CUP.
- White, V.W. 1988. *The ELT Curriculum*. Blackwell.
- Yalden, J. 1987 (a). *Principles of Course Design for Language Teaching* CUP
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1987 (b). *The Communicative Syllabus, evolution, design and implementation*. Prentice Hall.

Appendix 1: Recipe note sheet

<b>Creator(s):</b> _____	<b>Date:</b> _____
<b>Activity/Worksheet:</b> _____	
<b>Student interaction</b> : _____	<b>Week #:</b> _____
<i>ex. groups of four, mingling, pairwork, plenary, etc.</i>	
<b>Stage in Lesson:</b> _____	<b>Time estimate:</b> _____
<i>ex warmup, main activity, closing activity</i>	
<b>Activity Type/Rationale</b> : _____	
<i>ex schema activation, awareness, elicitation, practice, use, etc.)</i>	

*What were you working on?*

*What did you want students to know or be able to do?*

**Language area(s):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Speaking skills(s):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Learning skills(s)**  
**Classroom Dynamics:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Procedure notes:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments/Variations:** \_\_\_\_\_

Appendix 2: Supplementary Page given out to help fill out the recipe note sheet.

SIT TESOL Certificate Course:  
Speaking module Appendix

**When planning a speaking lesson you can use the following abridged lists to help you focus on what you would like to work on with your students. Once you choose an area and/or topic, you can then think about what the students will need. (i.e. vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, cultural knowledge, skills, etc.)**

## Functions/Notions

- Introducing oneself
- Greeting people
- Saying goodbye
- Requesting someone to do something
- Offering to do something
- Telling time
- Saying numbers
- Complaining
- Apologizing
- Talking about money
- Asking for and giving directions
- Talking on the phone
- Inviting
- Suggesting
- Ordering in a restaurant
- Making a reservation
- Giving and Receiving permission
- Asking for and Giving advice

## Speech Acts in conversations

- Starting a conversation
- Finishing a conversation
- Asking follow up questions
- Using Rejoinders
- Echoing
- Using Fillers
- Controlling the topic
- Finding things in common
- Expressing likes and preferences
- Describing people, places, things
- Giving and Asking for Opinions
- Narrating a story
- Persuading
- Convincing
- Speculating
- Predicting
- Summarizing

## Topics (concrete)

- Homes
- Friends
- Family
- Personal History
- School
- Learning
- Daily Routines
- Free time/Weekend activities
- Future Plans
- Travel
- Work
- Music
- Television
- Movies
- Money
- Shopping
- Celebrities/Famous People
- Accidents
- Food
- Sports/Exercise
- Health: being sick
- Future Plans

## Topics (abstract)

- Urban/Rural living
- Friendship values
- Familial relationships
- Marriage
- Life changes/regrets
- Education
- Customs
- Lifestyles
- Current events
- Hopes/Dreams/Goals
- Tourism/Travel problems
- Fears
- Embarrassment
- Thinking/Creativity
- Advertising
- Media
- Humor
- Culture
- Romance
- Religion
- Art
- Literature
- Health: symptoms/treatments
- Discrimination
- Crime
- Conflict
- Politics
- Communication

## Repair skills

- Asking for repetition
- Asking for meaning
- Clarifying
- Circumlocution
- Restating
- Confirming

## Paralinguistic aspects

- facial expressions
- gestures
- body language
- personal space
- eye contact

Kurzweil & Long, Kyoto



Appendix 3: Communication 1: Spring semester objectives

## SPEAKING SKILLS

### **(Must do): Students will be able to/will learn**

- how to keep a conversation going by asking of follow up questions.
- keep a conversation going by giving "Answer Plus "
- use classroom language (ex. requests, introducing themselves, teacher instructions, etc.)
- use repair skills such as asking for meaning, spelling, pronunciation, etc.
- the basic structure of a conversation (i.e. how to start, continue, and finish a conversation)
- how to give basic opinions
- how to use non-verbal communication (ex. gestures, body language, para-language)

### **(Should do) Students should be able to/should learn**

- think of and ask questions to get specific information indirectly
- discuss a topic or question (ex. turn-taking, follow up questions, etc)

## LANGUAGE AREAS

### **(Must do): Students will be able to/will learn**

- topical vocabulary (ex. friends, personality, free time, food, etc.
- how to form questions (i.e. basic patterns)

### **(Should do) Students should be able to/should learn**

- improve pronunciation skills  
(ex. word stress, connected speech patterns, non-kana English, minimal pairs).
- learn about the culture of English speaking countries  
(ex. appropriateness, why we use language the way we do, etc.)

## LEARNER SKILLS

### **(Must do): Students will be able to/will learn**

- notice, analyze, and evaluate their own learning and ability to use English
- organize their course materials
- participate in a communicative classroom (ex. cooperation, working with groups, meeting people, etc.)