Designing a "Workable" English Language Course: Some Thoughts in Language Course Development

Alan Bossaer

Abstract

This article reports on an earlier unpublished study of an English language course designed for Japanese high school students. Though the course analysis was originally carried out in a high school setting the analysis has been expanded to include course design recommendations for any English language program that follows sound pedagogical principals. In fact, the original study, which was, in reality, a critique of an existing course design, was the springboard from which the forthcoming discussion and list of recommendations for designing a future English language course was set forth. Regarding the list of recommendations, it is by no means a prescription that must be followed precisely. In fact, I hope that those teachers who read it, do so with the intention of adapting or improving the list, as it is really just one more step we take towards culminating a better understanding of our own view of a "workable" English language course. If there is anything to be learned from a study of course design and syllabus types it is that they should be treated as living and breathing entities and not as recipes which when followed to the letter result in predetermined or desired outcomes.

Introduction

Motivating high school and university English language students in Japan can be a struggle. It is not an easy task at times as many students suffer from a lack of intrinsic motivation. One way teachers can increase motivation is by focusing on communicative rather than linguistic competence in the classroom. To accomplish this task many language teachers design or adapt materials that conform to their ideas of communicative language teaching and learning. Pedagogically speaking, the materials and methods should center around goals and objectives derived from the wants, needs, and desires of the students. In the private sector, namely, conversation schools, a needs analysis is a key element of the courses. Although it is important to collect information about students' backgrounds, profession, age, education, and current English language ability, in other words, their objective needs (Brindley as cited in Graves, p.13), it is equally if not more important to assess their subjective needs. Subjective needs, or affective needs as Brindley refers to them include the students' attitudes toward the target language and culture, what the students' expectations are, and their purpose for studying English (Graves, p.13). In addition, because language schools are a business it is necessary to measure the effectiveness of the programs as well as the level of instruction using both summative (end of the course) and formative (during the course) evaluation methods (Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p.17; Weir and Roberts, 1994, p.5). Even though the needs analysis and perhaps the evaluations are not always strictly pedagogical by design (see Bossaer, 2004, for a discussion on the business side of language schools) it is easy to see the importance of relating content and methodology to the needs of each student and the importance of modifica-

tion and revision in course design.

In the area of course and syllabus design there are various models available for planners to choose from. One of the most popular models teachers subscribe to is a cyclical model of modification and revision, though not all language teachers adhere to this model. Some course planners adopt a more linear approach (the term linear is used to mean that planning, implementation, and evaluation occur in sequential order) (White, 1988, p.33). The linear approach is most often seen as being synonymous with the traditional means-ends model which focuses on the product or end result (Nunan, 1988, p.20). The fact that some planners adopt the traditional means-end model is not surprising, as it is the easiest to plan ("This is what we will do and we will assess its effectiveness at the end of the course."). What is surprising is that many planners envision their courses to be processed-based, when in fact, they focus on the end product.

The purpose of this paper is to report on an earlier study critiquing a Japanese high school English conversation course. The paper will describe the initial critique focusing on the course's planning, implementation, and evaluation processes from the viewpoint of active participant (teacher) in order to determine which of the labels "product-based" or "process-based" applied to the course design. Particular attention is paid to the goals and objectives of the course and their relationship to planning (specific needs analysis), to implementation, and to evaluation. Finally, the paper will expand the study to include recommendations and suggestions which hopefully serve, not as criticisms, but as contributions to the ongoing process of developing a future "workable" English language course.

Situation and Background Information

Students. The students in this study were comprised of second year English majors at a private high school in Sapporo. All the students were female and between the ages of 16 and 17. There were 125 students in total, divided into six classes.

Teaching staff. The English department consists of three full-time foreign teachers and one part-time foreign teacher, all North Americans, as well as ten full and part-time Japanese teachers. As far as the roles the Japanese teachers played in the development of the current curriculum, it was run through committee (consisting of all English department members), and approved without much, if any thought to the actual content suggesting the designers of the curriculum (two of the full-time teachers) had total control over decisions concerning the curriculum. At this time I would like to define the terms curriculum, syllabus, and course as used in this paper. Using the British distinction of the terms, syllabus refers to the content or subject matter of an individual subject (its selection an organization), course refers to an individual subject, and curriculum refers to the entire learning program within one school or educational system (White, p.4).

Course Planners. The entire English language course was designed by two full-time foreign teachers.

Administrative context. Since the school is a private high school, student enrollment is a priority. This means the top officials are constantly worrying about cost-cutting and maintaining an image of high quality

education. The school's English language program enjoys a fairly good reputation in terms of its quality.

The Conversation Course Model

It seems logical that any discussion of a course model should begin with an identification of the educational ideologies of the planners, since most decisions about developing a language course reflect the assumptions and beliefs of the curriculum planners (White, p.24). However, trying to encapsulate the entire teaching-learning rationale of the course planners is a task ill suited for our purposes here, and quite possibly an impossible one. Nevertheless, it is important to find out what the planners had in mind when they designed the course. I have based my description and subsequent discussion of the course on information obtained during a two hour orientation session with the planners as well as on firsthand experience rather than on data collected from informal interviews with the planners since as studies have shown, there is often a disparity between the planned curriculum ... and the implemented curriculum (Nunan, p.138; White, p.97).

Upon arrival at the high school I partook in an orientation session with the two foreign teachers (the course planners). The orientation began with a brief discussion of the students, the teaching staff and the administration (see the *situation* section for a description of the teaching staff and administration). It was quickly understood that the students, while choosing to take the English conversation class as an elective, simply did not have the time to pursue English seriously since their priorities centered on passing the university entrance exams. This fact, together with the view that most of the students lacked any intrinsic motivation (they just do not see the need outside of the classroom) set the parameters of the course. A large part of

the discussion focused on students' backgrounds (objective needs, Graves, p. 13), particularly on their abilities to use the English language.

Next, I was then given a list of goals and objectives (see appendix 2) although we did not discuss any of them in detail. The third phase of the orientation centered around the course book from which the learning experiences were to be derived. Although the issue of methodology did not come up in the orientation the importance of using the textbook was apparent (all the students had the same text and much time had been devoted to choosing a text the students would find stimulating). The textbook (see appendix 1), as was explained to me, was topic-oriented, clearly designed to spark discussion on topics ranging from *international food* to *dating and marriage.* Each unit in the textbook focused on a topic and each topic had a cultural twist (e.g. dating customs in foreign countries). It was pointed out that I was to specify which units I wanted to cover before the course began (the coverage objectives, Graves, P.18). The fourth phase of the orientation concerned the activities to be assessed, namely, pronunciation checks, skits, roll plays, and presentations (see appendix 3). I have chosen to use Skilbeck's definition of assessment which he refers to as "a process of [judging] students learning potential and performance" as opposed to evaluation which he sees as a means of "... making judgments about the curriculum including the ... planning, designing and (implementation)", (1984, p.238).

I learned that there were no formal formative evaluations from students (i.e. questionnaires, regular oral feedback sessions (Graves, p.32), or written journals. In fact, there was no mention of formative feedback evaluations of any kind during the orientation. I was however, given a copy of the previous year's summative course evaluation (see appendix 4). Though I did not receive any written documents outlining the methodology

to be used during the orientation, a rapid-fire question and answer session quickly indicated to the two course designers that we carried similar beliefs about language learning; that language was to be put to purposeful use, that only the target language was to be used in the classroom if possible, that a relaxed policy toward correction of minor errors would stress meaning over accuracy, that learners need to become more self-reliant in their approach to language study, and that the process was more important than the product. Finally, we all agreed that the learner-centered environment would benefit the students rather than a teacher-centered one, although we did not get into any discussion of what the learner-centered classroom involved except to acknowledge the importance of pair work and group work (necessary to negotiate and interact with the target language). This concluded the orientation.

Discussion

It is generally agreed that standard curriculum (and subsequently course) models consist of the following framework components: needs analysis, goals and objectives, implementation (selection and organization of content; selection and organization of learning experiences), and evaluation (Richards, 1990, p.8; Graves, p.13; White, p.26). I have chosen to discuss the framework components using the goals and objectives component as the nucleus not forgetting that the components, though appearing as separate elements of the curriculum model, are in reality parts of a whole.

Goals, Objectives and Needs Analysis

As mentioned earlier the goals of the course were decided *a priori*. To

borrow a term from Graves, the two course planners "problematized" their situation, that is, they identified the givens of their situation in order to shape their decisions concerning what kind of course they wanted. As Graves points out, "Where a teacher starts in the process of course design depends on the constraints and resources of her situation and how she perceives them" (p.5). The goals then (appendix 2) were a direct result of the needs analysis, a crucial step in the curriculum process (Graves, p.12; Richards, 1990, p.1). I will come back to needs analysis in my discussion of the goals and objectives below.

Goals statements refer to elements of the program that are actually going to be addressed by instruction. Richards gives this example of a goal statement; "Students will develop favorable attitudes toward the program". He then adds a warning "while this goal might represent a sincere wish on the part of the teachers, it should appear as a program goal only if it is to be addressed concretely in the program (1990, p.3). This highlights one of the problems I had with the course design. Nowhere was it stated clearly, how the goals were to be achieved (the objectives usually do this), (Richards, 1990, p.3). The teacher is left to assume that the textbook and the teaching methods will take care of this part. This puts a lot of pressure on the teacher to try to match unrealistic program goals with teaching methods (Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p.158), a point made by the part-time native speaker teaching the course and who had just embarked on a teaching career. I say unrealistic because some of the goals seemed to be too broad, too encompassing, to be included in a course that provided only 45 contact hours with the target language. For example, one of the goals was to learn to communicate ideas, thought, and opinions to others (see appendix 2). This would be a serious challenge for a motivated ESL student in an immersion program let alone a high school student in

Japan with little intrinsic motivation. Another problem I had concerning the goals was in terms of what they actually represented. Looking at the list (appendix 2) we see that the planners had different types of program goals. Many of them seemed to be skill-based, (i.e. "Students will speak slowly and clearly while maintaining a natural rhythm" and "use expression (vocal, facial, etc.)") while others seemed knowledge-based (i.e. "…learn to form a clear opinion; learn to communicate ideas, thoughts, and opinions to others"). Still, some goals seemed to be promoting awareness (i.e. "Students will think about using pauses appropriately") or awareness and attitude (i.e. "Students will increase awareness of Japanese culture and of self as Japanese"). Again, without stating specific objectives on how the students will achieve these goals, the teacher is left wondering if indeed the goals represented wishful thinking on the part of the planners. My last concern dealt with the goal setting itself. Rather than set a myriad of general and specific aims based on their ideas of what the course should entail the planners might have thought about including the students in the goal setting, especially since the planners advocated a learner-centered course. By tapping into the affective needs of the learners (rather than concentrating on objective needs, as they had admitted doing) it would have been easier to see how the goals and objectives related directly to students needs (see 1. on the list of recommendations to follow).

Goals, Objectives, and Implementation (selection and organization of content and the learning experiences)

As mentioned earlier the course centered around one particular textbook. Though the textbook was just a tool to guide learning and the teacher was able to supplement were needed, it should have been imperative

that the activities drawn from the textbook reflected closely the course goals and objectives (Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p.158). However, if we look at the breakdown of activities covered in the textbook (appendix 1) and compare them to the goals statement (appendix 2) we find some problems. We see that the goals cover a lot of ground pedagogically speaking, and the textbook chosen for the task, while strong in some areas, fails to meet many of them. In fact, I have doubts as to the validity of textbooks that claim to be based on communicative language teaching yet include activities such as that found in the dialogue section of each unit in the textbook (appendix 6). Here we find prescribed patterns and slot-substitution exercises suspiciously similar to those found in many audio-lingual-type textbooks, which stress mimicry and memorization (Stevick, 1989, p.23). Though the course design allowed the teacher to supplement existing materials it did not mention how the modifications were to be addressed in terms of the goals and objectives.

Another problem I had concerned the textbook and its focus on "interesting and stimulating" topics. The following was an off-the-cuff remark made by a student taking the course to a Japanese teacher and later relayed to me: "I don't have a boyfriend and I never think about marriage because I'm only 17 and I have to study". The student was referring to one of the units we covered highlighting *marriage and dating*. The teacher who taught the same unit the previous year appeared surprised by the remarks. She claimed to find that particular unit very "enriching" and "stimulating". I was not sure how to take this comment. I was somewhat suspicious of how she determined the unit was stimulating since the students were not surveyed on the particular unit. Nunan talks about studies that show what teachers perceive exciting and interesting may in fact be anything but in the learner's eyes (p.77). This comment sums up what I

believed to be a serious flaw in the planning of the course, that is, an over-reliance of teacher input for the selection of the units to be covered. Though it is not always feasible for teachers to incorporate many of the elements Nunan prescribes in the learner-centered curriculum (e.g. to give students equal say in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the course, or to base much of the syllabus around students' needs (p.44)), it would not be difficult to include the students in decisions concerning the units they would prefer to cover. Though there were some constraints (Students had to choose units from the textbook) the fact that teachers are offering them a choice of which units they would like to cover would suggest to students that their input is valuable, and thus a bridge of mutual trust could be built.

Goals, Objectives, and Evaluation

The term evaluation can refer to evaluation within the course as well as evaluation of the course itself (Graves, p.30). In this section I will discuss both, though length constraints limit the discussion to just a few comments. Close examination of the activities for assessment (description of criteria: appendix 3) revealed a direct link to many of the goals (i.e. one of the goals was for students to make eye contact with a partner and in front of the class. Under the criteria of features to be assessed for role plays we find the following: is she looking at her partner when she speaks?). As mentioned earlier the linking of activities to goals and objectives is a crucial step in the course design. Problems arise however, when criteria subject to evaluation are not being addressed in the implementation stage of the course. The breadth of the criteria subject to evaluation (appendix 3) was vast given the length of the course. In fact, I found this to be the case

with the presentations and role plays. Many of the criteria suggested skill-training was necessary but this was not mentioned anywhere in the course design nor was it feasible to cover many of the skills specified in the criteria within the course time. I saw the problem as one where the planners felt the need to be specific with criteria but failed to realize the importance of validity, a crucial element of the testing process (Heaton, 1990, p.7).

In regards to the effectiveness of the course itself, what students did in the class was observable, and thus, subject to reflection on the part of the teacher. However, observation does not give any indication of how students perceive the material or the instruction. This can only be obtained through self-report methods (Weir and Roberts, p.141). The planners failed to include any formal formative evaluations in the course design, again, effectively eliminating the students from taking an active role in what was covered in class as well as how it was to be covered. To fill this gap in the course design I proposed including formative evaluations (see recommendation #2 below).

Recommendations

The following is a list of recommendations that draw attention to what I see were flaws in the course design. It is by no means a prescription that must be followed precisely, but a list of recommendations that can serve as a base for an expanded list of considerations when designing an English language course.

1. Write up the goals and objectives prior to the start of the course with the intention of adding to the list as the course progresses (thus it is

important to make a list of general aims, and not to be so specific there is no room for adaptation or addition). Make sure the students are given a copy of the goals and objectives. Next, hand out a questionnaire and elicit their ideas of what they think the course should entail. I believe it is very important to let the students know right away that they have a say in the way the course is planned and implemented. A teacher in Japan reading this may point to difficulties with eliciting reliable information since there is a tendency among Japanese to provide information they think is wanted of them and indeed as Weir and Roberts explain citing Coleman, "in some cultures it is impolite not to do so" (p.141). It should not however, be taken to mean that unbiased data cannot be collected from students. Instead of asking students directly about what they want to learn and how they want to learn it, it may be better to phrase the questions in such a way that students feel they are able to answer without feeling uneasy or guilty. Gorsuch suggests starting with general questions and working towards more specific questions. For example, she explains that if the student responds to the general question, "What do you want to learn?" with "I want to be able to speak to foreigners", the teachers should follow up the response with something like, "If you were a foreigner, what would you like to be able to do?" (Wordell and Gorsuch, 1992, p.164). Weir and Roberts supply a thorough list of criteria for designing the layout for questionnaires (p.156).

2. Perhaps a self-evaluation system whereby the teachers and learners evaluate the materials, learning activities, and their own achievement of objectives during the course could be promoted. In other words, evaluation is built into the teaching process (Nunan, p.7). This would fit better with the planners desire to produce a learner-centered environment. An evalua-

tion could be done after each unit. An example of such an evaluation is shown below:

Unit ______ Please write any comments concerning Unit ______. (For example, what you did not like, what you would like more of, what you would like less of, or whether or not you felt the unit helped you achieve your language learning goals).

____

____

____

3. Though a summative evaluation was part of the course design (see appendix 4), it had some design flaws. Question 3, for example, seemed presumptuous (e.g. "In what ways has your English improved in this class?"). Also, asking students to circle language features which presumably helped them improve their English did not supply teachers with much information (it may not have even been accurate since students may have circled features just because they felt they had to). To get the most out of the evaluation I propose restructuring the question in a way that focuses more on the needs of the students and on student input (see appendix 5).

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to look at one particular English conversation course in terms of its planning, implementation, and evaluation processes in order to determine which of the labels "product-based" or "process-based" applied to the course design. It was also the purpose of this paper to measure the effectiveness of the course and to make any

recommendations that may help further the development future course designs. Though the course planners did have "a plan" when they designed the program, I experienced some problems with the design of the course. The biggest flaw I saw was the lack of direct student participation. Having no say with decisions of the course objectives made it impossible for students to assess their progress, an integral part of learner-management strategies (Holec as cited in Wenden and Rubin, p.151). Also, because there were no formal formative evaluations from students assessing the course as it developed, teachers had to base their modifications solely on observation or on proficiency (i.e. role plays). This strategy failed to include students' perceptions of the materials and instruction. I also felt the choice of using only one textbook was a risky venture especially since student input was missing. On a positive note, the planners' educational ideologies seemed to follow sound principles of current SLA research. An all-English environment, the promotion of individual autonomy, a relaxed view towards errors, and a focus on the process rather than the product meant the planners were thinking in the right direction. Because the course included elements of both the process-and objectives (product)-based models of course design it was difficult to label it is being one or the other. Perhaps it is better to recognize the facts that a course which fails to give due consideration to both process and product will be defective (Nunan, p.20). It is also important to remember, and this applies to all course developers, that there must be high (not partial) degree of fit between the course design and the ideology, and that that ideal course design is one which allows for optimal growth and development within parameters set forth by both teachers and learners whenever possible.

References

Bossaer, A. (2004). *The Power of perceptions: A Look At Professionalism in Private Language Schools in Japan.* JALT Hokkaido Journal, Vol. 7, p.13-23.

Graves, K. (1996). *Teachers as Course Developers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heaton, J. (1990). *Classroom Testing.* New York: Longman.

Kusuya, B. and Ozeki, N. (1993). *Speak Up: Conversation for Cross-Cultural Communication.* Hong Kong: Longman Asia ELT.

Nunan, D. (1988). *The Learner-Centered Curriculum.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. and Rodgers, T. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. (1990). *The Language Teaching Matrix.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Skilbeck, M. (1984). *School-based Curriculum Development.* London: Harper and Row.

Stevick, E. (1989). *Success With Foreign Languages: Seven who achieved it and what worked for them.* Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall International.

Weir, C. and Roberts, J. (1994). *Evaluation in ELT.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

White, R. (1988). *The ELT Curriculum: Design, Innovation and management*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Wordell, C. and Gorsuch, G. (1992). *Teach English in Japan.* Tokyo: Japan Times Ltd.

Appendices

Appendix 1 A brief outline of the textbook "Speak Up" with a basic description of its aims and philosophical underpinnings.

1) Speak Up is a culture and conversation textbook for students of English as a second or foreign language.
2) Assumes the major goal of language learning to be cross-cultural communication and understanding.
3) Focuses on developing students' speaking in interaction skills while raising their awareness of culture.
4) Speak Up is based on the principles of the learner-centered curriculum in communicative language learning.
5) Second Language learning begins with the needs and interests of the learner-to know about the language, culture, interests, and ways of life of other people.
6) Speak Up works to increase students' motivation to learn language.
7) Speak Up helps students become more confident and proficient in an atmosphere of thoughtfulness, openess, interest, humor, and respect for the students' own values, opinions, and ideas.

Breakdown of the activities used in SPEAK UP.

1) Questionnaires - designed to encourage discussion on topics relevant to students (i.e. Growing Up; International menu; Dating and Marriage; Leisure Time; College life, etc.). Students are first encouraged to make short comments on "a series of illustrations that previews some of the topics in the unit" (p.6). Students are then "required to repeat language

models given in a language reference box" (p.6). Students respond to the questionnaire individually, then in pairs, and finally in groups. The students can refer to the language box to help them express their opinions.

2) Dialogues - designed to provide interesting and useful social functions. Provides substitution practice based on a sample and allows students to create their own conversations. Expressions to be substituted are highlighted. Students create new exchanges by placing alternate words or phrases into the highlighted slots.

3) Cultural Input Section - Students first read a brief topical question and provide their own response (i.e. "In high-school did you ever drive a car?"... go on a date? ... have a job? ... smokes cigarettes?"). Then the students listen to a tape to learn new information about the topic. Thus, the Cultural Input Section serves as a selective listing exercise. Students fill in the blank spaces in the textbooks.

4) Speak Up Section - presenting small group problem-solving activities. Students work together and discuss a problem or situation and arrive at solutions. All the situations reflect relevant contemporary issues and are designed to practice" real-world" functional language (e.g. Amy is 15 years old. She's not very sociable. She has trouble making friends and always seems lonely. What should you do to help her? Read the choices and decide on the best advice. Give reasons.).

5) Vocabulary Bank - At the end of the book. A list of words and expressions from each unit. Teachers should spend time at the start of each

section previewing these words and providing explanations for those that are new to the students

(Source: Speak Up: Bev Kusuya and Naoko Ozeki, 1993, pp.6-7)

Appendix 2 List of Goals for 2nd-Year English Conversation Course Hokusei Girls' High School

Goals

Students will:

Pronounce words clearly and confidently

Use a variety of rhythm and intonation in practiced speech

Speak slowly and clearly while maintaining a natural rhythm

Use expression (vocal, facial, etc.) when speaking

Think about using pauses appropriately in conversation

Use gestures sometimes

Make eye contact with a partner during pair work and in front of the class

Speak confidently with a partner and in a group

Maintain study skills

Build passive and active vocabulary

Use words and expressions learned in class when speaking

Learn to communicate ideas, thoughts, and opinions to others

Learn to form a clear opinion

Begin to accept other cultures and other points of view

Increase awareness of Japanese culture and of self as Japanese

Appendix 3 List and Description of Activities Used For Student Assessment Hokusei Girls' High School-2nd-Year English Conver-

sation Course

Presentations

Length

How long did the students speak for? (Not including pauses)

How much information-detail did she give?

How clearly did she explain her ideas?

Rhythm

Is the student attempting to vary the rhythm and intonation?

Are the more important words stronger?

Is she using pauses appropriately?

Is the intonation smooth?

Is the speed natural?

Communication

Is the speaker looking at her classmates?

Is she speaking loudly enough to be heard?

Is she using gestures?

Is she speaking slowly enough to be understood?

Is she helping her classmates to understand what she wants that to say?

Is she using appropriate expression

Vocabulary

Is she using the words she learned in the unit?

It she using appropriate vocabulary?

Is she using a variety of language?

Role play

Body language

Is the student using her body to communicate with her partner?

Is she looking at her partner when she speaks and when she listens?

Is she receptive to communication?

Is she using gestures to help her partner understand?

Is she using facial expression?

Confidence

Is she speaking loud enough to be heard?

Is she speaking at a natural speed?

Is she willing to take a chance in communication?

Is she trying to do her best?

Is her performance impaired by clear signs of nervousness?

Linguistic content

Is she using words and expressions learned in class?

Is she able to communicate without much repetition?

Is she able to stick to the topic?

Is the conversation reasonably polite?

Are the ideas clear?

Is she able to use vocabulary which explains her ideas clearly?

Does she give reasons for her ideas?

Is she able to communicate her 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 she listening to her partner and following up with appropriate comments and questions?
Does she ask relevant questions when the conversation lags?
Is she trying to help her partner succeed?
Does she indicate when she doesn't understand?
Does she try to help her partner when her partner doesn't understand?

Appendix 4 End Of Course Evaluation (English Conversation Course)

Please Circle:

HI TeacherA TeacherB

F Ga Gb Ha Hb Ja Jb

HII (Class) TeacherC TeacherD

1. *Textbook*

What did you think about the textbook? What did you like best about it? And what didn't you like?

2. *Classroom activities*

What kinds of activities did you enjoy most?

What activities did you enjoy least?

What did you think about the graded activities like roll plays, pronunciation checks, and presentations?

Are there any other activities which to think would help us evaluate your speaking ability?

Are there any other activities you would like to do in conversation classes?

3. *Self-evaluation*

How much did you learn in this class?

A lot　　Some　　A little　　Not much　　Nothing

In what ways has year English improved in this class? (Please circle)

pronunciation	listening ability
rhythm-intonation	vocabulary
confidence	speaking speed
eye contact	using expression
speaking loudly	and feeling comfortable speaking
asking questions	using body language
other	

How much effort did you make in the conversation class this year?

A lot of effort　　some effort　　a little effort　　not much effort　　none

4. *Other*

Comments about this class:

Message for the teacher:

Appendix 5 End of the Course Evaluation (Proposal for Self-Evaluation Question 3) Adapted From MATEFL students CALS; University of Reading. Source: Weire and Roberts, 1994, p.157.

3. Self-Evaluation

How much did you learn in this class?

A lot Some A little Not much Nothing

Look at the list of language features below and circle the number to show your answer.

Key: Not Important ………………………… Very Important

0 1 2 3

Not Difficult ……………………………… Very Difficult

0 1 2 3

Example: ***This year you practiced rhythm and intonation in the course. What is your opinion about learning rhythm and intonation?***

Important		Difficult
0 ① 2 3	Rhythm/Intonation	0 1 2 ③