

Classroom Research: The Key To More Effective Material Use and Design For the Language Classroom

Alan Bossaer

Abstract

Reflecting on what is going on in the classroom is one way a teacher can improve his or her teaching. It is also an effective means to evaluate teaching materials. By performing a micro-analysis of material used in a classroom task or activity teachers can systematically evaluate the materials' effectiveness and worth, particularly in terms of the aims and objectives of the course. This paper presents a retrospective micro-evaluation on a specific set of materials adapted for the classroom, and assesses its effectiveness or ineffectiveness. The paper also discusses the original material and sheds light on the authors' rationale for its intended use.

Introduction

The term 'classroom research' (or 'action research' as it is sometimes called) refers to a small-scale investigation undertaken by a teacher (Field, 1997, p.192). The purpose of the investigation is to give a detailed account of actual classroom behavior, most often through the method of observation (Allwright, 1988, xvi). Classroom research allows teachers to reflect on what is going on in the classroom and often draws on theoretical insights

provided by SLA studies (Ellis, 1990, p.90). Classroom research also enables teachers to evaluate materials used in the classroom. As Ellis points out, there are numerous instruments used in the evaluation of language teaching materials, many of them tailored to 'predictive evaluation' (i.e. checklists designed to help teachers make a decision prior to implementation of material) (1997, p.37).

It is common for a teacher already in the process of working with a course book or his or her own material to want to evaluate the materials' effectiveness; to measure its worth, particularly in terms of the aims and objectives of the course. The idea of retrospective evaluation whereby teachers carry out empirical evaluations of material in use is an invaluable tool in the field of language teaching (Ellis, 1997, p.36). To help teachers conduct systematic evaluations of the teaching materials Ellis recommends doing a micro-evaluation on one specific aspect of the material (i.e. a task) since an assessment of a complete set of materials (a macro-evaluation) can be time consuming. He also concludes that a micro-evaluation can be just as effective as a macro-evaluation (p.37).

Most teachers would agree that few, if any, course books exist which satisfy the requirements of the second, or foreign language classroom: there just always seems to be something missing. This is due no doubt to the various notions teachers have on the nature and acquisition of knowledge, on the nature of language learning itself, and on the rules of the participants (to name just a few reasons). One area of learner development, which material writers often fail to incorporate into their course books, is learner training, in particular, activities which enhance learner autonomy, even though they claim to adhere to communicative language teaching principles. This is rather surprising since as Thompson points out "a constant theme of communicative language teaching is that learners need to be given some

degree of control over their learning” (1996, page 13). Through learner training students can be helped to understand the different strategies available to them and be encouraged to give more input into their own language development (Nunan, 1988, p.53). Strategy practice can become a part of their daily language study, gradually helping students overcome weak areas by providing feedback through self-discovery and allowing them to see and monitor their progress (Holec, 1981).

The purpose of this paper is to present a retrospective micro-evaluation on a specific set of materials I adapted for the classroom from the dialogue section of the course book I was using and to assess its effectiveness or ineffectiveness. The paper will also discuss the original material and shed light on the authors’ rationale for its intended use. Finally, the paper will discuss the rationale behind the adapted material.

Background to the study

Students. The study involved 20 Japanese male and female university students taking an English conversation course (in Japan) once a week. All the students were characterized as high-beginner to low-intermediate level, having proficiency in rudimentary reading and writing skills and limited proficiency in basic conversational skills. The students were English majors, presupposing some level of intrinsic motivation, although to what degree is unknown.

Material. The course centered on a course book entitled *Speak Up*, chosen by myself. Each student had a book and they were told in advance which units they would be covering over the course of the year. I was able to adapt the material in any way I saw fit although I tried to cover many of

the sections in the textbook.

Course Goals and Objectives. The course could be described as being process-based with a focus on what the students do with the language and not on the language itself, thus it was not product-based (for a detailed description of process and product-based courses see White, 1988). I adhere to the general belief held that students are more apt to acquire English when it is used communicatively (i.e. for some real purpose). Throughout the course the students were expected to perform role plays, skits, presentations, and short reading exercises (to check pronunciation). I graded all of these activities and all of these activities were graded according to criteria decided on *a priori* by myself [see Appendix A].

The Study

Micro-evaluation of the task

As mentioned in the introduction, a micro-evaluation of one particular teaching task can be an effective means of conducting a detailed empirical evaluation of teaching materials. Ellis (1990, p.38) provides a series of steps needed to evaluate a task. The steps are:

Step 1: Choosing a task to evaluate

Step 2: Describing the task

Step 3: Planning the evaluation

Step 4: Collecting the information for the evaluation

Step 5: Analyzing the information

Step 6: Reaching conclusions and making recommendations

Step 7: Writing the report

I have used this framework to analyze a task adapted for the classroom. Note: I have combined steps 5 and 6 and renamed them *analysis and discussion* under the heading Step 5.. Step 7 will be replaced with a section entitled *future considerations* (labeled Step 6), as the paper itself constitutes the report.

Step 1: Choosing a task to evaluate (reasons for evaluating the task)

The task I chose to evaluate was an adaptation of the dialogue section of the course book (see appendix B-original task). My basic reason for choosing the adapted task to evaluate was simple: I had been using the dialogue section in the course book previously in a way the authors intended and I was not satisfied with the way the students reacted to the material (activity) based on first-hand observation. I wanted to make some changes in the way the task was carried out and to learn the outcomes of the new task.

Step 2: Describing the adapted task

The process syllabus centers around the notion that many activities are negotiable between teacher and student and includes activities that “teach the learner to learn” (Holec, 1985, p.264). In order for the learner to understand the learning process better, it has been suggested that conscious attention to the language process be carried out via learner training (Wendon and Rubin, 1987, p.16; Lake, 1997, p.170).

The task I designed involved two processes. First, it required students to communicate with each other with whatever language skills they could produce without the aid of the teacher or the textbook (the students were however given the topic which they developed any way they saw fit). Secondly, it involved getting the students to pay attention to language processes through evaluation procedures. This coincides with the process view of language teaching where students and teachers work together to devise a system of evaluating successful learning (White, 1988, p.100).

As was mentioned previously part of the course involved evaluating students as they performed role plays. The dialogue section of the course book had been a springboard for the role play activity and up until the time of the experiment evaluation was the sole responsibility of the teacher. The new task was designed to get students actively involved in evaluating the learning outcomes by having the students decide the criteria for evaluating the role plays. The new task is described as follows:

1. Introduce the topic (i.e. What you did the previous weekend). I put these two questions on the blackboard: How was your weekend? and What did you do?
2. Students were put into pairs, since I wanted students to learn from each other, and asked to have conversations initiated by the topic questions stated in 1 above. They were asked to tape the conversations using audio equipment (two tape recorders were placed in the hallway).
3. After taping, the students were given a sheet of paper and asked to write down individually, criteria they deemed necessary for successful communication (through the medium of role playing). I elicited all the

criteria from the class and put the entire list on the blackboard (see appendix C).

4. Next, the students were put into groups of four and asked collectively to come up with what they thought were the six most important criteria for evaluating role plays (see Appendix D).
5. Each group was asked to give their list of six criteria and the results were written on the blackboard. From this list we were able to come up with the classroom list of the six most important criteria (Appendix E).
6. As a class we discussed the criteria in detail making sure the students understood what they entailed.
7. The students were put back into their original pairs and told to listen to their original taped conversations. They were all asked to refer to the list of six criteria while they listened to their conversations. The pairs were then asked to re-record their conversations using the same topic as before (i.e. What they did the previous weekend). Again they were asked to use the list of six criteria as a guide. The students could then listen to the tape recording to judge whether or not their conversations had improved (they were given five minutes to do this).
8. The following week the students were put into new pairs and asked to perform conversations based on the previous week's topic in front of the class. The entire class as well as myself graded the conversations based on the six criteria decided on by the class the previous week (see Appendix E).

Step 3: Planning the evaluation

Ellis presents a list of choices involved in planning the past evaluation (see Appendix F for a complete description). Essentially, the focus of the evaluation dealt with the content (what was to be evaluated), and attempted to identify the students' attitudes to the adapted task (was the task enjoyable and/or useful?) as well as examine the actual outcomes. In other words, it sought an answer to the question-Did the students improve the role plays through conscious thought to planning, monitoring and evaluation (what is commonly referred to in the literature of learner training as meta-cognitive and cognitive strategies (Wenden, 1991, p.34))? Part of the evaluation also sought to discover students' attitudes to the original task.

Step 4: Collecting the information

To determine whether or not the adapted task was successful or not as well as elicit information about the original task, I conducted the evaluation myself through anthropological methods (i.e. participant observation) (Ellis, 1990, p. 69) and through self-report measures (a questionnaire to be listed the students' attitudes) (see appendix G). The evaluations took place both formatively (during the task-through observation) and summatively (after the task was completed- via the questionnaire).

Step 5: Analysis and discussion

What I discovered from the observation of the task was a focused approach to the task itself. The students seemed determined to communi-

cate with whatever skills they had. Carried out in the usual way (using the methods suggested originally by the authors of the course book) the role play appeared lifeless and not much fun. The students often gave up trying to communicate even when I tried to make it as realistic as possible. Students matched my perception of the task as many of them wrote on the questionnaire that they liked the new task better because it was more fun. What I also discovered from observation was that students at times would provide feedback to their partners on some of the criteria decided upon earlier by the class. The partner would then try to make adjustments with the language. Because negotiation between learners was one of the goals of the task, I judged the activity to be successful on this fact alone, especially since negotiation was something I had not observed when we did the role plays before the experiment. I should add that none of the students wrote down on the questionnaire that they had a negative feeling about being corrected by their peers. In fact, six of the twenty students reported that they found it important to have someone else check their English (it wasn't clear if this someone meant the teacher or student, though I took it to mean either since the students didn't qualify this).

In the area of evaluation only one student made mention of the cooperative evaluation (between both teacher and students) of the task. The student in question reported that she didn't care how the role play activity was done as long as the teacher evaluated the activity. She didn't mention anything about being evaluated by her classmates. Perhaps the reason more students did not mention the peer evaluation process was because the questionnaire did not specifically ask the students to report on it. I chose instead to ask students about their preferred changes to the way we did the role plays in the future and what they liked or did not like about the role plays. I assumed the students would consider the peer evaluations under

one or the other. My reason for using umbrella (all-encompassing) questions on the questionnaire was to avoid “the interviewer effect”, a term Weir and Roberts use referring to the tendency among respondents to answer questions from teachers favorably (1994, page 141). I was hoping the students would comment on the peer evaluations on their own. In the future however, it would serve the evaluation better to include a few more precise questions. The overall impression students had concerning the collective decision making process (with the six criteria used for grading the role plays) was favorable. Five students reported that coming up with criteria together made them more aware of what was involved when having a conversation in English. Three students said they understood the grading of the role plays better because the new activity gave them more time to fully understand the criteria. This information is valuable since one of my criticisms of the course I designed lay with the criteria themselves for evaluating the role plays. I found the criteria covered too much ground and found it difficult myself to evaluate students based on it (see Appendix A). I feel the new criteria provided sufficient coverage as it listed the items the students and I deemed important for effective communication.

One of the questions on the questionnaire centered around the students’ view of role playing in general: Did they think role playing was the useful activity for helping them learn English? I had hoped this question would reveal to students something about the learning process itself. In other words, a language awareness exercise aimed at making the students think about how languages are learned. The reports from students were somewhat disappointing as many of the students (ten) wrote that they didn’t know if role plays were useful. One student wrote, “I’m not sure. I’ve never been in that situation in real life. It’s doubtful I will ever be in that situation outside the classroom.” Another student added that she would

like to choose the topics for conversation herself as they would center around themes she was interested in. The idea that the learner is capable of nominating and controlling the topic of conversation and that this facilitates language acquisition has been studied by some researchers and is known as the topicalization hypothesis, and has direct applications to the processed-based view of language learning (Ellis, 1990, p.124).

The final comment I would like to make concerning the task relates to the use of audio-taping. While it appeared the students enjoyed making the tapes and listening to themselves, in reality many of them were not comfortable listening to their own voices (six students said they were embarrassed at hearing themselves on tape). Oddly enough, no mention was made about being embarrassed as a result of having their contributions heard by classmates. This discrepancy between what was observed and what the students reported bears witness to the suggestion by classroom researchers of the importance of combining data collection methods to corroborate data (Weir and Roberts, 1994, p.137).

Step 6: Future considerations

1. To make the transition to learner training strategies smoother I would recommend strategy workshops after each unit (about once every six weeks). During these workshops students could evaluate strategies they have been using or introduce new strategies they may want to try.
2. Let the students have a say in the choice of units we cover during the course. Though the choices are limited it still gives the students a feeling that they have some control over what is covered in class.

3. Provide training in self-assessment. Perhaps more structured and/or illustrated examples of how to grade the role plays using the criteria. Short workshops where students and the teacher can compare notes on self-assessment might help.
4. A long-term study is needed to evaluate the effects of learner training in the EFL classroom (which are highly subject to problems in motivation). Also, designing material which incorporates learning strategies in other areas (presentations and skits) would need to be done and evaluated for effectiveness.
5. Increase the opportunities for students to develop their own topics.

Rationale behind the material-original and adapted

The original task

“Materials carry with them strong suggestions about the roles of the learners and teachers and roles of learners vis a vis each other. They also carry expectations about how learners should interact with texts within the materials and with the materials as a text” (Wharton, 1997, p. 3). This statement about teacher and student roles cannot be understated since the type of activity and its intended use reflects the views the authors hold in the area of SLA, and no evaluation of materials can take place without first understanding these views. The following outlines the authors’ (of the textbook) assumptions about language teaching and learning:

1. General theoretical assumptions or learning principles on which the

book is based.

The following is an excerpt from the introduction section of the textbook:

Speak Up is based on the principles of a learner-centered curriculum and communicative language learning (p.6).

2. Theoretical assumptions or learning principles on which the dialogue section of the textbook (Appendix B) is based:

The following is from the teacher's manual concerning the dialogue conversation section in the textbook:

This section consists of dialogs designed to provide an interesting and useful social function. The dialogues provide substitution practice based on a sample and give students the opportunity to create their own conversations. In the model dialogue, the expressions to be substituted are highlighted to help the students do the exercise smoothly. In the conversation that follows, students create new exchanges by placing alternate words or phrases into the highlighted slots. The model conversation and substitutions are recorded on the *Speak Up* cassettes so that students can hear clear examples of natural interaction. The students they use these models for repetition and compare their own conversations with the taped versions they have practiced (p.7).

What I find troublesome about the dialogue section of the textbook is the perception it gives the students about how a language is learned. The basic formula presented is a stimulus-response mechanism with substitution/

repetition practice. This appears to follow the PPP (presentations/practice/production) cycle and not a process-based approach. The textbook allows for some variation of the dialogues and encourages expansion but this is not enough. It does not consider seriously the rules of the students (Richards and Rodgers, 1986 p.23). The dialogue section is still too teacher-centered which doesn't sit well with the aims of the course, which boasts a process/learner-centered classroom. The biggest problem with the PPP approach is it tells students that they are in need of information, which must be provided first by a teacher thus, the role of the learner is very limited. In his book, *Teaching Oral English*, Byrne refers to the teacher as an informant and suggests that the teacher's main task at the presentation stage of the lesson is to present the information in a "clear and memorable" way (1986, p.2). In the dialogue section of the *Speak Up* course book this is done through the use of audio cassettes. At the practice stage Byrne states that the students do most of the talking, while the teacher "devises and provides the maximum amount" of practice (p.2). At this stage the teacher monitors the student's performance to "see that it is satisfactory" (p.2). Again, it would seem that the teacher is controlling a lot of the learning process. In the final stage, the production stage, the learners are provided with activities for free expression and are discreetly monitored as they carry out the activities (to find out if they are really making progress). Even though the PPP cycle can be reversed (i.e. setting tasks which require students to communicate as best they can first and then using the outcomes as a way of deciding what new language needs to be presented and perhaps further practiced (Byrne, p.3)), it still requires a huge presence of the teacher to carry out the learning processes. Students still get an image of the teacher as provider of knowledge and see themselves as "vessels to be filled".

The dialogue section as I mentioned earlier allowed for expansion but students seemed to find it lacking a real purpose. I think the problem lies in the fact that the students were not doing anything with the language they generated. Yes, they were conversing with each other but only because they had been directed to do so by the teacher and by the text itself. It was still too “formulaic” (i.e. “Use these patterns to start the conversation and then add your own words, and patterns.”). I think the dialogue section could be improved greatly if the focus of the activity was task-based. One could argue that expanding or building a dialogue in itself is a task but I would argue that an activity is only a task if it is perceived by the learner to lead to the accomplishing of some goal agreed to by the learner in advance. This is the biggest drawback to using a single textbook in a language class. No textbook can possibly cover the goals and objectives set in advance and no single textbook can cover goals and objectives that develop as the course unfolds. The dialogue section, in particular with its reoccurring structure is ‘static’ rather than ‘dynamic’. This lends itself to problems with motivation since it forces students to focus on areas they may find unimportant.

The adapted task

The idea of incorporating learner training into the classroom to influence second language acquisition has been gaining acceptance more and more in the language teaching profession (Stevick, 1996, p.199; Wendon, 1991, p.4). Providing an explicit definition and the goals of learner training would be an arduous task, to say the least, although it is generally agreed that learner training encompasses these three components: 1) learning strategies 2) meta-cognitive knowledge 3) attitudes (Wendon, 1991, p.18).

Learner strategies refer to language learning behaviors learners engage in to learn and regulate the learning of a second language. These strategies are referred to as cognitive strategies (p.6). Meta-cognitive strategies are also included in the description of learning strategies and are strategies “used to oversee, regulate or self-direct language learning” (Rubin, 1987, p. 25). Meta-cognitive knowledge includes “the beliefs, insights and concepts that [students] have acquired about language and the language learning process” (Wendon as cited in Lake, 1997, p.170). The last component deals with the learner’s attitude toward his or role in the learning process and how he or she accepts and manages additional responsibility. Encompassing the definition and goals of learner training is the underlying goal or objective, namely, the development of the self-directed or autonomous language learner (Lake, 1997, p.171).

Although teachers would be hard-pressed to find a textbook these days that does not claim to stimulate real communication through communicative processes what we actually find are textbooks which fail to live up to their claims of communicative activities based on sound, up-to-date, theoretical principles. As Lugutke and Thomas point out “in spite of trendy jargon in textbooks and teacher’s manuals, very little is actually communicated in the classroom” (1991, p.x). They go on to say, “there seems to be a striking lack of learner autonomy or self-direction. Democratic principles appear alien to L2 classrooms. Learners do not participate in the management of their learning and teaching as actively and as comprehensively as they could” (p.8). One can see truth in these words as the attempt to teach dialogues in the manner described earlier (through the PPP method) robs students of the democratic process as described above.

The learner training activity adapted for this study was designed to a) involve the students in the learning process as much as possible, b) create a

more symmetrical relationship in the classroom between students and teacher, c) show students firsthand how they can monitor and evaluate their learning. What I found most appealing about using learner training as a way to practice the role plays was it encouraged some students to help their fellow classmates without stressing the need to do so. It was an option they could take without any pressure from the teacher. This tactic is just one of the goals of an individualized approach to language learning, where learners can learn from other students (Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p. 23).

Changing the roles of the learner and teacher, a key element of the process-based and learner-centered classroom, is not without its problems. As White points out “the abdication of certain areas of authority by the teacher may be very unwillingly undertaken” (1988, p.101). This point cannot be taken lightly and must be heeded with caution for as one student so aptly wrote on the questionnaire, “I don’t care how I learn a role play it as long as it is checked by the teacher”. The lesson to be learned from this is to tread cautiously and to introduce learner training gradually. In the area of error treatment it is important to remember that students often demand feedback regarding the correctness or appropriateness of their responses (Ellis, 1990, p.70). Because of this it may become very difficult to convince students to work with each other and not rely solely on the teacher’s help for their communicative needs. They should understand that they can turn to each other for advice and pinpoint strengths and weaknesses in their speech on their own before asking for help. Perhaps what is needed at the beginning of the course is a workshop where the teacher can impart to students the importance of using a “criteria of acceptability rather than criteria of correctness” (p.72).

Conclusion

From Ellis's micro-evaluation model teachers can make informed assumptions about the task under analysis. This analysis can then be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the task in question, and reveal its strengths and weaknesses. Some teachers may question the value of doing a micro-analysis since it is impossible to show if the interaction that results from application of the task will lead to L2 learning (Ellis, 1990, p.91; Van Lier, 1988, p.91). However, I would argue that micro-analysis is not only a mechanism whereby tasks are evaluated, kept (perhaps adapted) or discarded. The true value of micro-analysis is as Ellis suggests, in the form of "professional empowerment" (1990, p.41). As a type of action research teachers can conduct their own personal experiments and discover for themselves what is actually working or not working in the classroom. As a result, teachers can make the necessary adjustments to ensure that the communicative opportunities they envision and develop for the classroom are indeed activities the learners themselves find enjoyable and useful.

Finally, it is hoped that through the micro-evaluation itself I have made a case for the inclusion of learner training in the classroom while pointing out at the same time the pitfalls of the teacher-fronted lesson. Over-reliance of the PPP method or any method which encourages conditioning models of practice and repetition and places the teacher in a position of passer of knowledge can only meet with very limited success and perhaps failure. Instead, we should remember Roger's position towards teaching and learning when he says "the goal of education is the facilitation of change and learning. Learning how to learn is more important than being taught something from the superior vantage point of the teacher who

unilaterally decides what shall be taught” (cited in Brown, 1987, p.71).

References

- Allwright, R. (1984). *Observation in the Language Classroom*. London: Longman.
- Brown, H.D. (1987). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Byrne, D. (1986). *Teaching Oral English*. Essex, UK: Longman.
- Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: UK. Blackwell Publishers.
- Ellis, R. (1997). The Empirical Evaluation of Language Teaching Materials. *ELT Journal*. 51/1:36-42.
- Field, J. (1997). Key Concepts in ELT. *ELT Journal*. 51/2: 192-193.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Holec, H. (1985). *Discourse and Learning: Taking learners' needs into account in self-directed learning*. P. Riley (ed.). London: Longman.
- Kusuya, B. and Ozeki, N. (1993). *Speak Up: Conversation for cross-cultural communication*. Hong Kong: Longman.
- Lake, N. (1997). Survey review: learner training in EFL coursebooks. *ELT Journal*. 51/2: 169-182.
- Legutke, M. and Thomas, H. (1991). *Process and Experience in the Language Classroom*. Essex: UK. Longman.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *The Learner-Centred Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. and Rodgers, T. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language*

Teaching: A description and analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner Strategies: theoretical assumptions, research history and typology in learner strategies in Language learning.* A. L. Wendon and J. Rubin (eds.) Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
- Stevick, E. (1986). *Memory, Meaning and Method: A view of language teaching.* Boston, USA: Henle and Henle Publishers.
- Thompson, G. (1996). Some misconceptions about communicative language teaching. *ELT Journal* 50/1: 9-14.
- Van Lier, L. (1988). *The Classroom and the Language Learner.* Essex, UK: Longman.
- Weir, C. and Roberts, J. (1994). *Evaluation in ELT.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Wendon, A. and Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner Strategies in Language Learning.* Hertfordshire: UK. Prentice Hall.
- Wendon, A. (1991). *Learner Strategies for Learner Autonomy.* Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
- Wharton, S. (1997). *Materials Analysis and Production.* Birmingham: Aston University.
- White, R. (1988). *The ELT Curriculum: Design, Innovation and Management.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Appendix A Role Play Criteria (As specified in the course description).

Body language

Is the student using gestures to communicate with their partner?

Is the student looking at his or her partner when they speak and when they listen?

Is he or she receptive to communication?

Is the student using gestures to help their partner understand?

Is the student using facial expression?

Confidence

Is the student speaking loud enough to be heard?

Is the student speaking at a natural speed?

Is the student willing to take a chance in communication?

Linguistic content

Is the student trying to do his or her best?

Is performance impaired by clear signs of nervousness?

Is the student able to communicate without too much repetition?

Is the student able to stick to the topic?

Is the conversation reasonably polite?

Are the ideas clear?

Is the student able to use vocabulary, which explains his or her ideas clearly?

Does the student give reasons for his or her ideas?

Is the student able to communicate ideas verbally, without resorting to gesture instead of language?

Is there enough follow-through to explain why students hold the opinions they do?

Are they able to explore one facet of the discussion in a little depth before jumping on to another topic or question?

Responsiveness

Is the student listening to his or her partner and following up with appropri-

ate comments and questions?

Does the student ask relevant questions when the conversation lags?

Is the student trying to help his or her partner succeed?

Does the student indicate when he or she doesn't understand?

Appendix B Dialogue From the textbook *Speak Up* (p.45).

Model Conversations:

A: What's *Phuket* like?

B: It's *beautiful*.

A: What can you do there?

B: You can *lie on the beach, or go snorkeling, or watch the sunsets*.

A: That sounds great. Maybe I'll go someday.

B: You'd love it.

Practice:

1. Tokyo

exciting

visit shrines, or ride the bullet train, or see a Kabuki play

2. Rio de Janeiro

wild at Carnival time enjoy the parades, or sing, or dance in the street

Appendix C List of student-generated criteria deemed important (when role playing) (decided on individually with collective list to be put on the blackboard)

List of things students should think about when role playing

1. clear pronunciation

2. naturalness
3. creativity
4. loud voice
5. communicative ability (clear message)
6. intonation and rhythm
7. speaking speed
8. confidence
9. responsiveness
10. cooperation
11. was it interesting?
12. proper eye contact
13. use of props
14. friendliness
15. use of vocabulary
16. conversation length
17. grammar
18. attitude
19. acting ability
20. body language

Appendix D List of six most important criteria (when role playing).
(Decided on in groups of four)

Please choose six items from the list on the blackboard. (see appendix C above).

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

CULTURE AND LANGUAGE, No. 60

4. _____
 5. _____
 6. _____

Appendix E List of six most important criteria for evaluating role plays as determined by the entire class (generated from the blackboard list above).

Role Play Evaluation Sheet

English Conversation

Student being evaluated

Name _____

Class _____ No. _____

Pts	Key Points →	Natural Speaking	Pronunciation	Body Language	Voice Level	Communication	Rhythm & Intonation
6	Great!						
5	Very Good!						
4	Good!						
3	Okay						
2	A little weak						
1	Needs to improve						
	TOTAL						
GRAND TOTAL:							

Appendix F Choices involved in planning the past evaluation (Ellis, 1997, p.39)

Questions

Choices

- | | |
|------------------------|--|
| 1. Purpose(Why?) | a. the task is evaluated to determine whether it has met its objectives |
| | b. the task is evaluated with a view to discovering how it can be improved |
| 2. Audience (Who for?) | a. the teacher conducts the evaluation for him/herself |
| | b. the teacher conducts the evaluation with a view to sharing the results with other teachers |
| 3. Evaluator (Who?) | a. the teacher teaching the task |
| | b. an outsider (i.e. another teacher). |
| 4. Content (What?) | a. student-based evaluation (i.e. students attitudes towards and opinions about the task are investigated). |
| | b. response-based (i.e. the outcomes-products and processes-of the task are investigated). |
| | c. the learning-based evaluation (i.e. the extent to which any learning or skill-strategy development has occurred) is investigated. |
| 5. Method (How?) | a. using documentary information (e.g. a written product of the task). |
| | b. using tests. |
| | c. using observation |
| | d. self-report (e.g. a questionnaire listing the students' attitudes). |

6. Timing (When?)
- a. before the task is taught
 - b. during the task (formative).
 - c. after the task has been completed (summative).
 - d. immediately after
 - e. after a period of time

Appendix G Student questionnaire concerning the adapted task in the regional task (role playing).

Please answer the questions. You can write in English or Japanese.

1. Do you think role plays are good for helping you learn English? Why or why not?
2. Did you like the new way we did the role play? (i.e. With the tape recorder and deciding the six points as a group. For example, speaking naturally; body language; big voice, etc.). Was the new way better than the old way or was it the old way better? Why it was the old way better? Why was the new way better?
3. Would you like to make more changes to the way we practice role plays? What changes would you like to add or take out?