1. Title
Developing communicative competence in low-level students with conversation strategies and a communicative language teaching approach.

Theme of this semester’s AR:
How can we encourage lower-level students to use English with greater confidence in class? How can we encourage negotiation for meaning in preparation and improve attitudes to and results in productive tasks? How can we keep better track of these results?

2. Teaching Context
Semester 2:
1) Level: 1st Year University Students, low-level English majors
2) Class size: 14
3) Time: 90 minutes, once weekly
4) Nationalities: 13 Japanese, 1 Chinese (6 boys/8 girls)
5) Levels: 4 beginners, 10 upper beginners
6) Ages: 19-20

Problems:
i. Students unwilling/unable to speak English in class.
ii. Students unable to hold longer pair conversations.

Possible causes:
i. Lack of knowledge of a range of CSs.
ii. Poor questions/homework preparation.
iii. Complex teacher talk.
iv. Lack of confidence when speaking English.
v. Closed conversation questions in textbook.

3. Principal Course Goals and Objectives:
1) To encourage students to hold at least a 4-minute timed conversation.
2) To introduce students to the use of conversation strategies with a view to developing fluency and communicative competence.

4. What I did
Spring semester 2016

During the spring semester, I was continually searching for the best way to increase student fluency and length of spoken output. I held recursive pair conversations on the unit topic but students tended to get confused and begin doing the wrong task. As a result of this recurring issue, I decided to target, reduce and simplify my teacher
talk and to encourage students to focus on flash writing exercises. Initial results showed that most of the 14 students could produce a piece of flash writing of over 60 words in 6 minutes by the end of the spring semester. They were able to extend their written output. However, at the same time students weren’t making similar progress with their spoken English. I found that the written exercises consumed valuable class speaking time and that it was hard to find any conclusive evidence that their improved writing ability drove their improvements in speaking length. This led me to structure written homework tasks for students in preparation for each class. In doing this, I was able to focus in the second semester upon communicative competence and fluency in class. These improvements are shown in the students’ ability to increase their spoken output and structure more successful and interesting conversations using the conversation strategy sets. I decided to refocus both myself and the students on conversation strategies in order to help them structure longer pair conversations and to practice these with recursive dialogues on the same topic. Thus began my search to find the best way to present the strategies in class time and to engage the students in personalizing their strategy sets.

Fall semester 2016

i. I ran this fall university semester as detailed in Table 1 below and was observed and advised by Professor Sato.

ii. I made recursive, face-to-face pair conversations the focus in class.

iii. I video recorded, transcribed and analysed each of their four speaking tests with a view to comparing fluency and strategy use. I collected survey data.

iv. I introduced sequenced conversational strategies in sets such as opening a conversation, ending a conversation, passing turn and summarizing. I provided students with a written copy of Sets 1,2,3,4,5 and 6 conversation strategies in review, described and modeled their appropriate use, effects and context. I required students to record their personalized strategies from set 2 through 6.

v. I developed simple homework sheets to feed forward into new topics.

vi. I provided students with the speaking test rubric at the start of the semester, referred back to it and reminded students of it in class.

vii. I allowed students to read aloud a model dialogue with their partner, prior to redoing it whilst inserting conversational strategies. The intention was to have students notice the change in flow when the speaker includes strategies. I drew students’ attention to the changes resulting from their conversation use, quality, flow and length.

viii. I used a variety of materials such as audiovisual, printed hand-outs and changed the classroom layout in order to raise student involvement.

ix. I developed a positive learning environment, encouraging students to share personal experiences with each other and challenge them to offer and share contrasting interests and points of view.
Table 1 - Fall Semester 2016-2017 timetable of unit, topic, conversation questions and communication strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Questions for timed conversations/durations</th>
<th>Conversation strategies sets introduced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep 23</td>
<td>1/15</td>
<td>Unit 7 Vacations</td>
<td>1. How was your summer vacation? 2. What did you do? Timed Conversation 1 – 2.5 minutes</td>
<td>Set 1: (i) Opening (ii) Ending (iii) Sharing (iv) Asking to Repeat (v) Fillers (vi) Showing Interest (vii) Summarizing Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep30</td>
<td>2/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 7</td>
<td>3/15</td>
<td>Unit 8 Leisure time plans</td>
<td>1. What are you going to do this weekend? 2. Where will you do it? Timed Conversation 2 – 3 minutes</td>
<td>Set 2: (i) Shadowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 14</td>
<td>4/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Test 1 – 3 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 4</td>
<td>6/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 11</td>
<td>7/15</td>
<td>Unit 10 Cooking</td>
<td>1. What can you cook? 2. How do you make it? Timed Conversation 4 – 3.5 minutes</td>
<td>Set 4: (i) Shadowing/ Summarizing (ii) Other ways to summarize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov18</td>
<td>8/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Test 2 – 3.5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov25</td>
<td>9/15</td>
<td>Unit 11 Marriage</td>
<td>1. What is your dream wedding? 2. Where would you hold it? Timed Conversation 5 – 3.5 minutes</td>
<td>Set 5: (i) Asking for an explanation (ii) Seeing if your partner understands (iii) Showing you do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2</td>
<td>10/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Timed Conversation 5 – 3.5 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 9</td>
<td>11/15</td>
<td>Unit 12 The Weather</td>
<td>1. In future, how rich will you be? 2. What job will you do? Timed Conversation 6 – 4 minutes</td>
<td>Set 6: (i) Asking your partner to explain (ii) Explaining what you mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec16</td>
<td>12/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Timed Conversation 6 – 4 minutes</td>
<td>Speaking Test 3 – 4 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec23</td>
<td>13/15</td>
<td>Review of units 7-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 6</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>Final speaking Test</td>
<td>Timed Conversation 7 – 4 minutes</td>
<td>Final Speaking Test 4 – 4 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 13</td>
<td>15/15</td>
<td>Course review/ Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Speaking test analysis and results

*+ve:* With each successive speaking test, students developed their fluency as illustrated in Table 2 below. The students became increasingly comfortable holding pair conversations on a given topic and spoke with greater fluency in the speaking tests. This was also reflected in the survey results (see Student Survey data analysis). The excerpts presented and analysed in this results section will demonstrate how students learned to avoid or overcome conversation breakdown and hold longer pair dialogues over the course of the semester.

*-ve:* Some students did require their sheets for the final Speaking Test as they had been on vacation for the two week winter vacation. **In future, I will be sure to clarify for students that sheets are not allowed during Speaking Tests.**

**(a) Speaking test conditions**

The first speaking test (2016.10.14) was held and video recorded in the regular classroom with all students present. Professor Sato, my advisor, observed it. On his advice, speaking tests two, three and four were held in a separate room. The data in Table 2 below seeks to highlight the fluency development of deep data students through four speaking tests conducted in semester two. Table 2 shows the progression of students in holding longer conversations containing fewer and shorter pauses in the course of the semester.

**Table 2.** Pauses within each conversation, number of turns and duration of conversations (n=6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date / Participants</th>
<th>Total Duration of Pauses (as a percentage of the conversation)</th>
<th>Number of Pauses</th>
<th>Number of Turns</th>
<th>Duration of Conversation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 14th October (2016)</td>
<td>24.5 (seconds)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK and TA</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 18th November</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA and AM</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 16th December</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM and HA</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 13th January (2017)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YT and CK</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Conversation Strategy use by deep data students (semester 2 Speaking Tests)

(i) **Speaking Test number/date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student code</th>
<th>No. of times each strategy was used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Test 1 2016.10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Test 2 2016.11.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Test 3 2016.12.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Test 4 2017.1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) **Speaking Test number/date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student code</th>
<th>No. of times each strategy was used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Test 1 2016.10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Test 2 2016.11.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Test 3 2016.12.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Test 4 2017.1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) **Speaking Test number/date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student code</th>
<th>No. of times each strategy was used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Test 1 2016.10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Test 2 2016.11.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Test 3 2016.12.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Test 4 2017.1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Speaking tests conducted in October, November, December 2016 and January 2017.
(b) Data analysis of Tables 2 and 3

Table 2 follows the fluency development of the deep data group through the four speaking tests. The students showed that they could not only hold longer conversations on a given topic but could also detail these conversations with more turns and fewer and shorter pauses. Given these indications of progression, I sought to find out how they students were achieving these more successful conversations with relation to the tuition of conversation strategies.

Table 3 follows the students’ development in conversation strategy with data drawn from the same four speaking tests analysed in Table 2. This time, I sought to follow each student’s use and disuse of the CSs taught. I found the most notable changes to be the decrease in use of strategy 5 and the increase in use of strategies 8 and 9 in their pair conversations. Strategy 5 related to Fillers which were used early on by students to generate space and thinking time in the conversations. They often preceded or followed long pauses. In time, the Medium Level student CK decreased the use of Fillers from three to zero over the four speaking tests. So, what did the students use their speaking time for instead? All four deep data students increasingly used CS set 8 Shadowing and CS set 9 Follow-up questions in order to develop and improve their speaking test dialogues. In the case of the Low Level student YT, the use of shadowing developed from zero instances to eight, nine and four in the course of the semester’s explicit CS teaching. The use of set 9 Follow-up questions also showed great progression from three to later six and five instances per dialogue.

(c) Transcription analysis and excerpts

This section seeks to analyse pertinent dialogues for fluency development through strategy use. The aim is to exemplify how students learn to use CSs in order to avoid communication breakdown. The transcription excerpts are presented in chronological order with the timings and length of pauses indicated (rounded to the nearest half-second). The dialogues sampled took place in the same four speaking tests presented in tables one to three above. The transcription method is a basic CA version, selected because (1) CSs are used, (2) pauses are recorded to the nearest second. Initials are used to identify each student.

Excerpt A: Speaking Test 1, 14th October 2016, MI and SO

1. [0:05] MI: (1) how ‘bout you
2. [0:08] SO: me too not bad (2) what are you going to do this weekend
3. [0:12] MI: (1) oh, this weekend I’m going to go to (1) play tennis
4. [0:14] SO: play tennis sounds good who do you go with
5. [0:16] MI: (1) near my house..in the park (3)

The turns are shown to the left of the transcription, with MI speaking the odd turns and SO speaking the even turns. The students had been exposed to conversation strategy sets 1 and 2 before this speaking test with the aim of improving fluency,
negotiating for meaning and avoiding conversation breakdown. The students were also provided with the rubric shown on page 11 in order to encourage them to be aware of the value of strategy use as reflected in their grading. It is notable that the number of strategies and turn taking may have in this case been skewed by two main factors relating to context. First, this was the first time that students encountered the speaking test situation. Second, testing was done in front of the full class group with the resulting pressures of performing in front of peers, even in the second semester. The point would only be received by the student if the CS was used appropriately.

This short excerpt from the first pair in the first speaking test shows that neither student was comfortable with openers at this point. I had only recently taught the set CSs 1-9 in class and students were new to the speaking test format. This is exemplified in lines one and two with MI’s opener “how ‘bout you”. SO did show interest in line four with “sounds good” but MI misunderstood the follow-up question “who do you go with”, responding instead with the location for the tennis game. I believe that MI had anticipated the wrong follow-up question and would require some assistance from SO in order to repair the conversation for meaning. This led to a long pause as SO couldn’t follow his response and MI tried to work out why not.

Excerpt B: Speaking Test 3, 16th December 2016, MI and KI

1. [0:08] MI: how are you
2. [0:09] KI: (1) im fine thank you and you
3. [0:11] MI: im sleepy
4. [0:12] KI: sleepy
5. [0:13] MI: yes because i go to bed five oclock in the morning(1)five in this morning
6. [0:16] KI: what time did you get up this morning
7. [0:18] MI: (1) I got up at 7 7 30 actually I stayed at my friends house in this to complete my assignment for studying abroad do you want to go to go to abroad
8. [0:20] KI: oh yes I will go to the Philippines in spring so I don’t do

Excerpt B shows both MI and KI using follow-up questions. In this conversation, the dialogue is both more successful and the content more detailed as they discuss both their activities of the night before and their plans for the coming year. There are far fewer and much shorter pauses and no conversation breakdowns indicating greater comfort in speaking and involvement in the discussion topic backed by fluency. MI pauses only once for a single second as does KI. Even with his grammatical error of tense use in line five, MI, KI still responds with a pertinent follow-up question and the conversation continues. The synthesis of the content is that they both realize that they will study abroad in the following year but under slightly different conditions.

Excerpt C: Speaking Test 4, 13th January 2017, YT and CK
1. [0:45] CK: with vegetables finally i simmer it
2. [0:46] YT: (1) simmer
3. [0:48] CK: simmer meaning boiled a long time
4. [0:49] YT: aah maybe maybe ok
5. [0:50] CK: ah(1)do you like curry
6. [0:52] YT: yeah but
7. [0:53] CK: what kind of curry do you like
8. [0:54] YT: I like vegetable curry
9. [0:55] CK: vegetable curry
10. [0:56] YT: yah
11. [0:57] CK: (1) buuh what do you what kind of vegetables do you like
12. [0:59] YT: for example egg plant egg plant
13. [1:00] CK: what does that mean

Excerpt C shows the synthesis of the semester’s CS training as the medium level CK is helping the lower level YT who is requesting the explanations and help by using both follow-up questions and intonation. Later CK uses CS 17 in this case “what does that mean” allowing YT the opportunity to provide the explanation for the unknown term and the conversation both continues and develops in depth without long pauses on either side. Shadowing is also effectively used and students demonstrate their ability to successfully paraphrase and converse around unknown terms. They just keep on talking. It is gratifying to observe how both the lower and the medium level student were able to share the turn and check and learn new terms from each other.

Excerpt D: Speaking Test 4, 13th January 2017, MI and TA

1. [4:01] MI: ten minutes
2. [4:02] TA: oh short
3. [4:03] MI: because its too easy to cook
4. [4:05] TA: do you like(1)what do you like ingredients miso soup
5. [4:08] MI: I like tofu
6. [4:10] TA: oh really me too
7. [4:11] MI: I like tofu tofu is really good im glad to hear that you like miso soup (1) have you made miso soup before
9. [4:14] MI: could you do it
10. [4:15] TA: yes, yes, yes nice talking with you
11. [4:16] MI: nice talking with you

Excerpt D again is a mixed level conversation between the high level MI and the beginner TA. TA’s line 2 interjection “oh short” is a fine example of natural language and contributes to the level of engagement of both students in the conversation. The students are able to share both a common taste in their type of miso soup and also their particular style of cooking it. They are both happy to find common tastes which comes through, particularly in MI’s line 7 “I’m glad to hear that you like miso soup”. This ability to hold and continue a successful dialogue in English through increased communicative competence, using CSs to structure their conversation was the goal.
of the second semester course. It’s satisfying to show students not only successfully conversing but engaging in and enjoying the process.

(d) Student survey
(i) Context
This survey was conducted anonymously during class time on December 23rd 2016. One student was absent.

Figure 1: The communication strategies help me to communicate better than before.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: I know how to start and end a conversation better than before.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: I can ask more questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: I enjoy speaking in English more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: How motivated are you to participate in class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Analysis
Interestingly, with reference to Figure 3 in the survey analysis, most students responded that they only agreed that they could ask more questions than before. The data showed that follow-up questions showed one of the greater increases in use as shown in the Table 2 data above. This would tend to indicate that students had learned to use the strategy and were using it without being aware of its use. The responses to sample questions four and five as represented in Figures 4 and 5 would tend to indicate that students were aware of improvement in their communicative competence as they at least agreed that they enjoyed speaking in English more and were more motivated to participate in class. This would imply that as their range of skills of conversation had both grown and improved, they felt more comfortable in the English conversation class with its base in recursive conversation practice. What is more, the survey was conducted one week after the third speaking test and prior to the winter vacation so they had already been required to perform and be assessed under test conditions.
The full survey is attached in appendix.

6. What I learned, what I might do differently next time

I need to/should:

1. Include a warm-up and lead-in, before the main class activities. This should ideally lead straight into CS review or introduction, before the topic.
2. Provide students with thinking time when introducing a new topic or new material. Then go into pair discussions.
3. Match the timing of CSs introduction to the topic being studied.
4. Simplify the rubric for students understanding.
5. Develop the mind map into a model conversation which I would write out on the board. Have students provide one part including strategies detailed.
6. Demonstrate the model conversation more thoroughly.
7. Provide the beginner students with extra conversation strategies in the model conversation in order to negotiate for meaning.
8. Give students more time to practice speaking with more conversation partners before the speaking tests.
9. Develop better materials in order to challenge students to think deeper and have more of a view to express to their speaking partners. I think that some of the textbook topics need more supporting materials.
10. I will need to reissue the rubric prior to each speaking test. Then, it would be better to have students work in groups of 3 in order to practice speaking and assessing those they are listening to in an informal way. They can exchange roles in order to get the most practice on each topic and using each set of strategies.
11. The students had much more communicative interactions when sitting face to face. The general levels of interest and energy on show was far higher in this format.
(12) Leave students alone more in order for them to develop more autonomy and demonstrate greater agency particularly when completing speaking tasks.

(13) Continue to point out to students the difference between a successful conversation and conversation breakdown, preferably with selected video-excerpts of their own or near-peers performances.

(14) Encourage students to speak without the conversation strategy or homework sheets when undertaking speaking tests in order for them to interact more with their partner/s and become more fluid speakers.

(15) In future, I need to improve my planning for effective data analysis and presentation.

7. Future Issues

(1) I need to encourage students to speak without the conversation strategy or homework sheets when undertaking speaking tests in order for them to interact more with their partner/s and become more fluid speakers.

(2) In future, I need to improve my planning for effective data analysis and presentation.

(3) I need to offer more of a challenge to students within the scope of each topic.

(4) I would like to include a free conversation where students can choose the topic themselves using the CSs learned.

(5) I need to simplify the rubric to enable student understanding and confidence.

(i) Homework Sheet for Week 1

(ii) Speaking Test 1 rubric: 2016.10.14
LEVEL: 1st year of University, English majors (some repeating students)

CLASS SIZE: 14 students

TEXTBOOK: EVERYDAY ENGLISH – Gerry McLellan 2010, 1 unit: 2 weeks.

TOPIC: Vacations.

GOAL: Students will hold a small talk conversation for 2.5 minutes on vacations. Students will revise set 1 conversation strategies and use 4 of them in context in small talk.

OBJECTIVES: 1. Students will learn to use the past tense in the context of vacation activities. 2. Students will become familiar with unit vocabulary relating to vacations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Aims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Housekeeping. T brings Ss back together after summer break/allows late Ss to arrive.</td>
<td>Ss settle back into class after summer vacation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ss have short conversation game in pairs (topic relates to vacation, free-time activities).</td>
<td>Speaking warm-up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>T gives Ss 3 questions to talk about in pairs (topic: vacations). T introduces new questions, checks vocab. understanding, gives Ss time to think about possible responses. S have conversations with 2 different partners. T times each pair conversation (2.5 mins goal). T introduces Set 1 CSs and sheets.</td>
<td>Allow Ss to personalize topic/introduce own ideas. Recursive speaking practice on topic: vacation. Monitoring/OCFB – T writes up S topics/ideas in mind-map form. CSs enable students to speak more comfortably.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>T introduces model conversation. T reads convo with volunteer student, introduces new vocabulary. Ss practices convo if nec.</td>
<td>Introduce new vocabulary and practice pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CONVERSATION STRATEGIES Ss highlight conversation strategies in model conversation. (Hmm/let me see, shadowing) Noticing</td>
<td>Ss notice and understand conversation strategies and their use in context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>T guides Ss through first half of the textbook unit, selecting and adapting exercises to the communicative language teaching approach and the Ss level. T’s goal is to provide a purpose to clarify and have Ss use the past tense forms with a communicative purpose. Group classroom set-up.</td>
<td>Ss work through the textbook unit with listening and short pair conversations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Closing convos. Ss return to S have conversations with 2 new partners. T times each pair conversation (3 mins goal).</td>
<td>Ss practice conversation on unit topic. Ss use convo. strategies in context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Closing. T gives out short essay homework sheet. Chance for Ss to begin short essay ≥60 words on the topic of travel and free-time activities/ ask questions.</td>
<td>Ss start writing their short essay on the topic of travel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix – Student Survey NGU 2016.12.23

Section 1 Communication strategies and you
This section explores what you have learned so far in this class and whether you enjoy speaking more now than in March. The last questions in this section are about how to improve the class.

Speaking
Have you been taught communication strategies before you took this class? (please circle)
Yes  No
If yes, where? (-please circle)
Junior high school  high school  here at NGU  other

Please circle what is true for you now.
a) The communication strategies help me to communicate better than before.
   strongly agree  agree  disagree  strongly disagree
b) I know how to start and end a conversation better.
   strongly agree  agree  disagree  strongly disagree
c) I can speak longer with my partner than in September.
   strongly agree  agree  disagree  strongly disagree
d) I can ask more questions.
   strongly agree  agree  disagree  strongly disagree
e) I have more confidence speaking English.
   strongly agree  agree  disagree  strongly disagree
f) I enjoy speaking in English more.
   strongly agree  agree  disagree  strongly disagree
g) If you have another idea, you may write here:

Section 2 About your teacher and motivation
1. I understand the teacher’s explanations. (please circle)
   always  usually  sometimes  never

2. How satisfied are you with the following?
a) Teachers explanations
   very satisfied  satisfied  somewhat satisfied  not satisfied
b) The amount of help you receive from the teacher.
   very satisfied  satisfied  somewhat satisfied  not satisfied
c) The amount of Japanese the teacher uses.
   very satisfied  satisfied  somewhat satisfied  not satisfied
d) The clarity of the lesson goals. ー授業の目的は明確であったか
   very satisfied  satisfied  somewhat satisfied  not satisfied

3. How motivated are you to participate in this class? (please circle)
   very motivated  motivated  unmotivated  very unmotivated

Thank you for answering these questions.

Seth