Promoting Supportive Language Learner Communities in a University EAP Program

Martin Balint
Kwansei Gakuin University, School of Policy Studies

Reference Data:
Balint, M. (2005). Promoting Supportive Language Learner Communities in a University EAP Program. In K. Bradford-Watts, C. Ikeguchi, & M. Swanson (Eds.) *JALT2004 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

This paper will describe the benefits of having English language learners engage in various tasks that focus on working collaboratively to support their language learning development. Reasons for incorporating tasks that promote constructive collaboration by students are drawn from the theoretical concepts of Communities of Practice and Sociocultural theory. The successful application of tasks that build supportive communities of language learners at a university in Western Japan will be provided.

この論文は英語学習者が言語学習の発達を促進するために共同作業を通して学習を行う事の有益性を説明するものである。"Communities of Practice" の観点と"Sociocultural theory"が共同作業を要する学習方法の有効性を支持している。学習者が共同で行なう学習方法の例は西日本にある大学で行なわれている事例から提示される。

In the past two decades, there has been increasing attention on the beneficial role of student collaboration in educational contexts. It has been found that having students engage in meaningful small-group activities works to develop strong interdependent groups of learners and builds an awareness of supportive interaction for positive long-term learning. Support for such cooperation has come from research in the field of social psychology and is now making a stronger emphasis in general education. Language learning is particularly well suited for the inclusion of collaborative activities as it focuses on a social practice. While the application of providing small-group activities has been focused primarily at the classroom level, particularly in Cooperative Learning (Johnson & Johnson, 2000; Slavin, 1995) the benefit of developing constructive collaboration of learners should also be viewed at the larger program-wide level. Developing greater collaborative interaction among learners of an academic program can be achieved through careful coordination of multiple courses. University English language programs should make an effort to promote multiple opportunities for learners to engage in small-group activities in various courses in order to foster more supportive learner communities.

The English Language Program (ELP) at Kwansei Gakuin University, School of Policy Studies strives to promote supportive communities of language learners within its program. Through a coordinated program that includes extensive use of small-group activities and peer-feedback sessions within its courses, students gradually develop a supportive interdependence with other students in order to achieve their English language goals. Many of the small-group activities focus on working with

other students toward retrieving research-based information for presentations, discussions, and writing assignments. Also, a number of in-class practice sessions and drafts of written work are checked by classmates in order to receive constructive feedback prior to producing a final product. Therefore, it is believed that students in the ELP develop a greater awareness of the benefits of collaborative efforts.

The Communities of Practice Perspective

The results of Lave and Wenger's (1991) research into the varying social interactions in a business setting, particularly the apprenticeships between old-timers and newcomers, produced what has been termed the *community of practice perspective*. Through their close investigation of the complex interactions of different members within an insurance company, Lave and Wenger identified a process in which newcomers where able to gradually gain access into the old-timers social *communities* through varying levels of engagement with them, or what they termed *legitimate peripheral participation*. This concept thus focuses on learning as being socially situated. Lave and Wenger describe this as "… the social structure of the community of practice, its power relations, and its conditions for legitimacy define possibilities for learning" (p. 98).

The importance of identity formation and identity change is a crucial element of the communities of practice perspective. Lave and Wenger (1991) view identity as coming from the social world one participates in. They explain this as:

> Identity in practice is defined socially not merely because it is reified in a social discourse of the self and of social categories, but also because it is produced as a lived experience of participation in specific communities (p. 151).

This concept is elaborated by Toohey (1996) when she points out, "identities are historically constructed and are variable across time; clearly, also, identities are context-bound..."(p. 566). Toohey goes on to further explain how identity is a factor in terms of one's access to various resources necessary for development, both human and material. A person's identity is ultimately shaped by the relationship of the individual and their social context. This is well stated by Eisenhart (1995) (cited in Toohey, 1996):

> Building or claiming an identity for self in a given context is what motivates an individual to become more expert; that developing a sense of oneself as an actor in a context is what compels a person to desire and pursue increasing mastery of the skills, knowledge and emotions associated with a particular social practice (p.4).

The *communities of practice* concept has also been put into a more general educational framework. Hanks (1991) restates the notion of the importance of social interaction in learning by saying that "Rather than defining learning as the acquisition of propositional knowledge, Lave and Wenger situate learning in certain forms of social coparticipation" (p. 13). This acknowledges a need to conceptualize the learning process not from that of simply being a cognitive process but to that focusing on the context of social engagement.

Incorporating Communities of Practice in General Education

In recent years, some educational researchers have looked into the effects of certain models of education which incorporate the communities of practice concept (Brown and Campione, 1994; Rogoff, Matusov, & White, 1998).

Using a special elementary school program in the United States, Rogoff, Matusov, and White (1998) evaluated three different forms of instruction using the communities of practice concept. One type of instruction was the typical teacher-fronted class in which the *teacher as expert* transmits knowledge to the students. A second form of instruction, termed *children-run*, allowed students to "learn the information as they explore in idiosyncratic ways that are not necessarily connected to the uses to which the information is historically or currently put in the adult world" (p. 390). The third form of instruction was the *community of learners* model in which the parents actively engage with the students in the classroom creating a new dynamic type of collaboration.

While learning was found to occur in all forms of instruction, it was the community of learners format that the researchers concluded made the greatest learning gain. Through follow-up surveys with the parents and students in the community of practice format, the various aspects of interaction within such a system were evaluated. It was shown that although it certainly took some getting used to by the adults, their direct involvement was seen as beneficial.

Other work in favor of a community of practice format within education is that done by Brown and Campione (1994). Brown and Campione use Dewey's concept of *discovery learning* to foster the distribution of expertise necessary within a community of practice format by intentionally designing a *jigsaw* research project in which all members are responsible for additional parts of information in order to successful complete the later presentation and discussion activity. Within a given theme, students are allowed to freely research a topic in which they are interested. This sets up various subcultures of expertise that lead to collaboration of information.

Using various pretest and posttest measures, the researchers compared the achievement of students in the community of practice format classes, the treatment groups, with other students in classes that were taught the same information but did not allow for the same group interactions as the treatment groups. The results showed that the students under the community of practice format were more successful in retaining the necessary information. In addition, analysis of discussion transcripts showed that, over time, the students used greater depth of linguistic repertoire, such as deep analogies, in the discussions of the researched information.

The overall structure of the activity and its benefits mirrors much of what has been described in the Cooperative Learning literature (Johnson & Johnson, 2000; Slavin, 1995). The jigsaw activity format and the emphasis on positive interdependence, or the achievement being successful only as a result of cooperation of all members, has received increasing attention.

Brown and Campione (1994) go on to describe a peer and cross-age tutoring system they use to create a reciprocal teaching effect within the elementary school. One example

of this reciprocal teaching is when the older fifth and sixth grade students are placed as discussion leaders with a group of third grade students. Through the elaborate groupings, younger learners have opportunities to learn directly from their older peers. As they become older, they will also be expected to assume the role of a leader.

Using the Communities of Practice Perspective in SLA

The role of social interactions within the communities of practice concept has been considered within an ESL context. The growing literature over the past decade has shown that there is growing support for a developed conceptual framework of language learning based on the notion of communities of practice.

Using a community of practice perspective, Toohey (1996) examined how the complex interactions of multilingual children effected their integration into in a kindergarten. Through her ethnographic study of the engagement between children in a Canadian kindergarten, including initially non-English speaking children, Toohey provides a description of their identity formations into the English-speaking community, describing the interactions of two Cantonese-speaking children, one being a boy brought up by his Chinese-Singaporean parents using English in the house, with other children in the kindergarten classes.

The particular identities of the two children and the complex relationships they had due to their identities were the focus of the study. Toohey (1996) was able to see how the identities, often based on linguistic ability either in L1 or English, influenced the types of interaction they had, as well as the changes in identity as a result of different situations in which the children interacted with others.

Toohey (1996) points out the similarities between her analysis of the English language learning by the newcomer children in the kindergarten class she studied to the self-described stories given by secondary-level students collected by Kanno and Applebaum (1995) which describe some of their learning coming from the particular types of interactions they had been in. This provides further support to the contention that there needs to be more research on the community of practice perspective in relation to second language learning contexts.

Another study supporting the greater emphasis social interaction has in language learning is Haneda's (1997) study of a group of Japanese language learners at a university in Canada. Through examination of the interactions taking place in group sharing activities within a Japanese reading and writing class and audio-taped student-teacher conferences, Haneda presents evidence of learning due to social interaction with peers and the instructor.

Of importance in the study is the fact that there was a large difference in the students' Japanese linguistic ability, ranging from low-intermediate to advanced. Analysis of various group session transcripts identified how the learners took on different roles of either legitimate peripheral participant or expert, depending on the varying strengths of the members to achieve the goals of the specific task being undertaken. Students were able to develop greater Japanese linguistic abilities as a result of direct interaction with other students and the instructor in either the group sharing activities or teacher-student conferences that were held. According to

Haneda, the relationships of the students were beneficial in the learning outcomes, commenting "Their individual areas of expertise were complementary, and it was this that made their collaboration successful" (p. 23).

Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory

Many of the elements of Lave and Wenger's (1991) communities of practice framework are similar to what is described in the sociocultural theory developed by Russian psychologist Lev Vygotsky. Vygotskian sociocultural theory established a view that learning and cognitive development are from social interactions, rather than the belief that these are attributes or properties of individuals.

One of the main tenets of Vygotskian sociocultural theory is the idea that people learn when they are provided assistance within their zone of proximal development (ZPD) while collaborating with others. The ZPD is the zone between what a person can do on their own and that which they can do with some assistance. The ZPD is activated by "problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers"(Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). This interaction with others is often termed "mediation".

Thus, in the same way of explaining learning within the communities of practice perspective, sociocultural theory is used to explain that learning takes place in a situated format. In a school setting, learning is thus done through social interaction with peers (other students in the school) and teachers. Of particular importance is Vygotsky's notion that teachers or more advanced learners help provide for the development of lower level learners (Vygotsky, 1978).

Group Dynamics and Interaction in ESL

Related to the sociolcultural perspective of learning is that of the effects of interaction and group dynamics. This focuses on the general concepts of group norms and joint hardship within an educational context.

Group norms

One main aspect of group dynamics that relates to the discussion of the communities of practice and sociocultural concepts is that of the power of group norms. This focuses on how individuals are influenced by the perceived need to do what is expected by being a member within a larger group. The importance of recognizing the effects of group norms within education is described by Van Lier (1996) in his book on the role of interaction in second language learning;

> The innate needs of competence, relatedness, and self-regulation are translated or transformed, by the individual and through cultural membership, into goals. This transformation from innate needs into goals is, to my knowledge, not discussed in the intrinsic motivation literature, but is of crucial importance in education (p. 108).

The role of group norms incorporates the previous discussion of the construction of identity within a social context. In general educational terms, this can be applied to the effort students put forth to maintain a certain level of development being done by others in the same group. It could also pertain to the completion of assignments at a certain established standard. In the context of second

language learning, one can conceive the perspective that learners within a class strive to develop at the same linguistic level as others in the class or program.

In their discussion of group norms, Ehrman and Dörnyei (1998) state that;

> …from an educational perspective, group norms —many of them implicit—regarding learning effort, efficiency and quality substantially enhance or decrease the students' academic goal striving, work morale and learning achievement (p. 131).

Developing Supportive Communities of Language Learners in the English Language Program

Taking the above discussion into account, it can be said that learning should be viewed in terms of the various social interactions of learners within an educational institution. The following section will highlight the main elements of curriculum that ascribe to developing interactions supporting learning in the English Language Program (ELP).

The English Language Program at the School of Policy Studies

The ELP in the School of Policy Studies at Kwansei Gakuin University is a two-year EAP program for all students enrolled in the Policy Studies and Information Technology departments. The approximately 1,000 students are required to take four English Communication (EC) courses each semester for two years in preparation for opportunities to take upper-level content courses taught by foreign instructors. All of the courses in the ELP are taught exclusively in English.

A particularly unique feature of the English Language Program is that, while students are streamed into different classes based on the component scores of an institutional TOEFL, all the classes are coordinated. This means that the main tasks and materials are the same for all classes. A full-time instructor, called a *course coordinator*, prepares all the materials and provides teachers with extensive lesson plans which outline the main tasks to be completed, as well as some options for dealing with the variations in levels being taught.

The arrangement of the ELP courses is done in such a way that there is a strong coordination between classes, both horizontally (same semester) and vertically (from one semester to the next) (See Appendix 1). The eight full-time instructors put together the materials for the classes and have various meetings to develop coordinated activities.

Collaborative Pair and Group Work Activities

While many forms of interaction can take place, collaborative efforts by pairs or groups of students should be of notable consideration. How the students engage with one another toward completing various tasks will inevitably influence the learning that takes place. It would seem useful, then, to create multiple opportunities for students to engage with one another. These interactions can be done either in pairs or in larger groups.

Various group tasks are carried out throughout classes in the ELP. An overview of the main tasks which focus on collaborative effects are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Examples of group tasks in the English Language Program

Presentation:	Reading:
Group presentations Peer-feedback (pre- and post)	Group discussions Free-reading share
Speaking / Discussion: Group Survey Assignment Group discussions Internet research activities Peer-feedback	Writing: Group mind-map share Group writing tasks Read and Respond
Listening:	Group discussions

Examples of tasks that require students to work collaboratively for a number of weeks are the group essay writing assignment (Appendix 2), group presentations, and group survey projects. For all group assignments, it is important to point out that the final product is assessed as a group with each member receiving the same grade. Therefore, group members are responsible for helping each other in order to receive the best grade possible. This form of dependence on each other, known as positive interdependence, is a key element of the activities within Co-operative Learning (Johnson & Johnson, 2000).

Another activity that generates interaction involving the pooling of information or ideas is what can be termed *group brainstorming*. In both writing and presentation classes, students are often given time to brainstorm possible topics for their written compositions or presentations. Sharing of ideas in a collective manner is emphasized by first having students make groups to share their personal brainstorming, then to have groups write some of their ideas on the white boards so everyone can see them. Students then can freely choose other topics that they may not have thought of.

A final activity that also brings students together collectively is what is called the *Internet-research activity*. This activity, done multiple times in second-year speaking classes, requires students to find any article of information related to the topic used in a reading-based discussion the previous week. Students come to class with notes of the main information in the article as well as their reaction to the article. In small groups, the students then explain the information to other group members. This form of sharing separate knowledge between members is similar to the well-known *Jigsaw Reading* activity touted by both Communicative Language Teaching practitioners and proponents of Cooperative Learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1987; Littlewood, 1981).

Peer-feedback and Peer-evaluation

In addition to having tasks in which students engage collaboratively, interaction can also be built into the system by students either checking their peers' academic work in the process of producing a final product, or evaluating each others' performance (Appendices 3, 4, and 5). These peer-feedback and evaluation tasks should be carefully developed to ensure that constructive feedback or evaluation is being given. Peer-feedback and evaluation tasks are particularly connected to the communities of practice and sociocultural perspectives. In the ELP, the use of peer-feedback and peer evaluation is done extensively. For example, throughout all writing courses, which focus on a process approach to writing, students continually provide assistance to

their peers in order to make revisions. Peer-feedback is also incorporated within discussion-based courses and presentation courses. In the case of the two presentation courses, the presentations are videotaped and students are required to watch each others' presentations and give constructive feedback.

Final course information sharing activity

The concept of sharing information with others has been expanded into an activity that highlights the sharing of information between different elective content-based courses. At the end of the 14-week semester, students form groups with other students from five different content-based courses. With five content-based courses being taught on the same day and at the same time, the sharing of comprehensive information learned in class with students from other classes can be developed. Students prepare for this sharing of information by writing out five different main concepts or pieces of information that they found most interesting in their content-based course and prepare to tell students from the other classes. This serves not only to ensure that students review what they have learned in their course, but it also motivates students to take further content-based courses that are offered.

Effects of Staff and Faculty Collegiality

One final interesting element related to the success of a program that emphasizes the use of constructive social interaction is the effect of collaboration within the staff of an institution (Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003, p. 174). In their book on group dynamics, Dörnyei and Murphy report on research by Wheelan and Tilian (1999) which found that the level of successful student productivity of elementary schools in the United States was correlated to the collaborative functioning of the staff at the school. It can be seen that as part of the effort to create a positive overall collaborative student environment, it is necessary for the staff and faculty to work together as a model for the students. Positive staff collaborations are described as those in which there are frequent conversations about teaching and learning, observations and feedback of teaching, working collaboratively on the curriculum, and sharing knowledge of teaching, learning, and leading among the staff members.

While no statistical comparisons can be made, negating any empirical proof toward the level of faculty collegiality, there is a highly collaborative relationship between teaching staff members in the ELP. As all the courses are taught using a common syllabus, discussions are continuously held about the curriculum and the materials. This is highlighted by the constant discussions of the courses within the staff offices, often including teachers explaining a particular feature of the lesson that worked well, or any problems they had, to other teachers preparing to teach the class. Many of the part-time teachers have commented favorably on the openness they have in providing suggestive feedback of the courses and that changes are made as a result of the input.

ELP Students' Perceptions of Group Tasks: A Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to investigate the perceptions of second-year ELP students toward the frequent use of group activities and peer-feedback tasks within the program.

Research Question

What are the perceptions of students about the extensive use of group activities and peer-feedback done in the English Language Program?

Participants

133 students in the final semester of the four-semester English Language Program (ELP) participated in the pilot study. All of the students had nearly completed the coursework of the ELP and had experienced the multiple group work activities and peer-feedback tasks. To assure there was no bias due to proficiency level, a wide range of proficiency levels were represented among the students.

Method

Student perceptions of collaborative group tasks were collected through 12 six-point Likert-scale questions on a survey administered at the end of the two year ELP. Instructors of 8 intact classes were asked to have students answer the questionnaire at the end of the class. The survey, in both English and Japanese, could be completed in less than ten minutes. Once all surveys were completed and placed in an envelope, a student representative was asked to bring the envelope to the researcher's office. Answers to the survey were then entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and calculated for descriptive statistics.

Results and Discussion

The means and standard deviations of the twelve questions are shown in Table 2. The results of the pilot study survey indicated that students completing the English language program have an overall moderately positive view of the group activities they had done in the program as seen in the responses to question 1 (4.51) and question 2 (2.15*). Students found the group work activities enjoyable and felt that they were more productive than studying individually. Again, the generally positive response to question 3 (4.49) indicates that students felt that learning in groups was more beneficial than working individually. This helps to justify the extensive use of group work activities within the ELP.

Questions 4,5, and 6 further confirm a favorable perception of group-oriented activities by the ELP students. The reverse-coded results of question 4 (2.85) suggest that there is a beneficial reduction of stress involved in the classroom when using group work activities. The high mean for question 5 (4.60) shows that students are able to help each other understand the activity by working with others. This is not surprising, since it is natural for students to check with each other regarding the activity if they are not sure what to do. The positive response to question 6, which asked students whether or not working in groups has a motivating effect in terms of perceiving a responsibility to do well in the groups, is especially good. While some students may feel more stressful working in groups than individually, as seen by the mean of question 8, there are many students who feel a higher sense of responsibility when having to work with peers to complete the given task.

Table 2. Survey Questions Means and Standard Deviations (N = 133)

Question	Mean (SD)
1. I have enjoyed the group work activities done in the ELP.	4.51 (1.09)
2. Group activities waste time that could be used better studying individually. *	2.15 (1.10)
3. I can learn more information by doing group activities than studying alone.	4.49 (1.09)
4. Working with other students in group activities is more stressful than working individually in class. *	2.85 (1.25)
5. Working with other students helps me understand what to do in the activity.	4.60 (1.02)
6. Knowing that you are going to work with other students in group activities makes you give more effort.	4.44 (1.14)
7. In group activities, some students get lazy and do not get involved as much as they should.	4.16 (1.30)
8. The class atmosphere becomes more relaxed when working in groups rather that listening only to the teacher.	4.28 (1.17)
9. Groups made by the teacher work better than those made by the students' choice.	3.62 (1.22)
10. Working in groups is done too much in the ELP. *	3.05 (1.20)
11. I have talked with students from other classes outside of class about ELP class assignments.	5.07 (1.11)
12. I can easily talk about assignments with other students because all of the ELP classes use the same assignments.	4.74 (1.15)

Note: (*) Reverse-coded items

One weakness of using group work activities, particularly with larger groups, is the possibility of one or more students in the group not being involved as much as they should. Students also found that this was a problem as the result of question 7 (4.16) indicates. This highlights the need for some mechanism in the activities to ensure that all students participate adequately.

The high average responses to questions 11 (5.07) and 12 (4.74) indicate that students within the coordinated program can and do talk with other students about assignments outside of class. While this positive response seems to confirm the emphasis toward the community of practice concept, it should be noted that the results are ambiguous since it is not clear what aspect of the assignments is being discussed between the students.

The results of the pilot study clearly warrant further research to be done in the area of using group work activities to help build a supportive attitude in ESL classrooms.

Future Research

The somewhat beneficial nature of collaboration among the students in the ELP needs to be verified through future research. The pilot study has shown that students exiting the program have favorable opinions of group tasks. A more longitudinal study design, including observation and collection of student perceptions, would help to better validate this claim. A research outline that includes collecting student perceptions of collaborative activities from incoming first-year students and follow-up surveys to discover if any differences exist is now planned. Close

observation of the particular tasks and the reactions of the students will also be involved. If indeed social practices are a key element of learning, what forms of curriculum will bring about favorable conditions? This is similar to the response that Haneda (1997) states at the end of her article:

> As a teacher, my next task will be to empirically test what sort of superordinate activities are most likely to provide these opportunities for helping students learn in their ZPD in a community of practice (p. 25).

Conclusion

The aim of this paper has been to discuss the benefits of collaborative group work and peer-feedback tasks within English as a second language classes. The benefits of group work in educational contexts has been explored within the more recently developed Communities of Practice and Sociocultural theoretical frameworks. By providing students with multiple opportunities to engage in group work activities and to do peer-feedback tasks, students can develop an awareness of how to give constructive support to other members of the program. An example of the coordinated extensive use group work activities and peer-feedback tasks of a university in Western Japan and pilot study investigating the students' perceptions of the program were provided. It is hoped that further research on this subject will help provide evidence to substantiate the initial findings detailed herein.

References

Brown, A., & Campione, J. (1994).Guided Discovery in a Community of Learners. In K. McGilly (Ed.). *Classroom lessons: Integrating cognitive theory and classroom practice*. Pp. 229-270. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dörnyei, Z., & Murphy, T. (2003). *Group Dynamics in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ehrman, M., & Dörnyei, Z. (1998). *Interpersonal dynamics in second language education: The visible and invisible classroom.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Haneda, M. (1997). Second language learning in a 'community of practice': A case study of adult Japanese learners. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 54* (1), 11-27.

Hanks, W. (1991). Foreword. In J. Lave & E. Wenger, *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Pp.13-24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (2000). *Joining Together: Group theory and group skills* (7th Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Kanno, Y., & Applebaum, S.D. (1995). ESL students speak up: Their stories of how we are doing. *TESL Canada Journal, 12* (2), 32-49.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Littlewood W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Slavin, R. (1995). *Cooperative Learning: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd Ed.). Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.

Toohey, K. (1996). Learning English as a second language in kindergarten: A community of practice perspective. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 52* (4), 549-576.

Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the Language Curriculum: Awareness, autonomy, and authenticity*. New York: Longman.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Appendix 1.

The curriculum of the ELP at Kwansei Gakuin University, School of Policy Studies

EC4 Writing *Problem/solution research paper* Social policy topics Internet/library research Increased source req't. Portfolio assessment	**EC4/EC5 Special Topics** *Electives/topic choices* Content-based courses Discussions and presentations Extensive reading / Film viewing Collaborative projects		**EC4 Seminar** *Issues discussions* Social policy topics Discussion management Internet research with critical evaluation
EC3 Writing *Opinion paper with sources* Social policy topics (Education) Integrating outside sources Paraphrasing Citing and referencing	**EC3 Listening** *Films and documentaries* Social policy topics Visual/aural cues Information exchange discussions Interaction listening	**EC3 Presentation** *Panel discussion* Social policy topics Large group project Evaluation groups Project management	**EC3 Seminar** *Issues discussions* Social policy topics Discussion management Internet Research - Discussion
EC2 Writing *Opinion essay & summary* Experiential/ Opinion topics Essay structure Thesis development Compare/Contrast with opinion Writing about statistics	**EC2 Listening** *Film/ Documentary listening Skills* Environmental/social theme Listening strategies Transactional listening	**EC2 Presentation** Skills based presentations Speaking confidence Delivery skills Audio-visual aids Audience involvement Present survey results	**EC2 Seminar** Reading based discussions Personal/social topics Survey project/discussion communication strategies Jigsaw read/discussion
EC1 Writing *Academic Paragraph writing* Descriptive/Opinion writing Paragraph construction and analysis Idea generation techniques Intro to process approach	**EC1 Listening** *Academic lectures* Environmental/social topics Listening strategies Note-taking skills Transactional listening	**EC1 Reading** Reading strategies Environmental/social topics Vocabulary strategies Opinion discussions Extensive reading Dictionary use	**EC1 Seminar** Discussion gambits Personal/social topics Small group skills Discussion member roles Opinion speech Reporting strategies

Appendix 2

Essay 1 (GROUP)—TV: Pro or Con

In groups of three (you and 2 other classmates), write the supporting body paragraphs for one of the television essays, either pro or con.

Step 1

Do some pre-writing activities. Try listing and mapping to find ideas. You can either do this individually, or together as a group.

Step 2

Decide which one of the two essay ideas your group will use. Choose either pro or con, not both.

Step 3

Decide which member will write each of the different body paragraphs.

Step 4 (next class)

Check each other's paragraphs and work together to improve your essay.

Assessment

Your group will receive one grade for your body paragraphs. In other words, your body paragraphs will be treated and graded as one unit. Therefore, it is important that you work together with your group members to get a good grade.

N.B. This activity was developed by David Bodner.

Appendix 3

Presentation Peer evaluation (Form A)

Your name / #: Period

Presenter name: Title:

	NO, not well L				YES, very well J	
Content & overall impression						
§ deep, interesting explanation	1	2	3	4	5	/25
§ used outside sources (articles, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	
§ well organized	1	2	3	4	5	
§ logic & quality of thought	1	2	3	4	5	
§ positive attitude	1	2	3	4	5	
Speaking & nonverbal						
§ volume & speed	1	2	3	4	5	/25
§ pronunciation & intonation	1	2	3	4	5	
§ eye contact & use of note card(s)	1	2	3	4	5	
§ gesture & posture	1	2	3	4	5	
§ confidence	1	2	3	4	5	

comments:

TOTAL = _____ / 5 = _____ / 10

Presentation Peer evaluation (Form B) Your name / #: Period Presenter name: Title:		
	NO, not well L YES, very well J	
Audience Involvement and Q & A § stimulating & energizing § clearly explained AI § Used 3-Step Q & A method § answered questions fully § both speakers answered questions	1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5	/25
PowerPoint (& Audio Visual) § clear design § explained effectively w/ Lang. Tools § supports presentation ideas § interesting content § attractive	1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5	/25
comments:	TOTAL = _____ / 5 =	_____ / 10

Appendix 4

Survey Presentation Peer- & Self-Assessment

Study the self and peer assessment forms for survey presentations (**week 12**). You will complete them immediately after your presentation and turn them in to your teacher.

You will fill out this form for all of the other 4-5 presenters you watch.

PEER ASSESSMENT	No		OK		Yes
1. I understood the content of the presentation.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I could easily follow the presentation (clear organization).	1	2	3	4	5
3. The topic was interesting.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The survey questions were interesting.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The results/discussion/conclusions were interesting.	1	2	3	4	5
6. The presenter's speaking was easy to understand.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Visual aids were easy to read/understand, and attractive.	1	2	3	4	5
8. The presenter made good eye contact with listeners.	1	2	3	4	5
9. The presenter was well-prepared (relaxed, smooth, confident).	1	2	3	4	5
10. I learned something new from this report	1	2	3	4	5

- What is the topic?
- Who were the respondents?
- What did you learn from this report?

SELF ASSESSMENT	No		OK		Yes
1. I rehearsed ____ times / for ____ hours. I was prepared well enough.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I gave a clear introduction and conclusion.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I told the audience the questions and then reported the results.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I made comments about & discussed the meaning of the results.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I spoke clearly (speed, volume, pronunciation).	1	2	3	4	5
6. I used natural intonation and emphasized important words.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I made eye contact with my listeners.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I gave my presentation without reading notes.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I/My group members made attractive and clear visual aids.	1	2	3	4	5
10. My group partners and I shared the work on this project equally.	1	2	3	4	5

- What did you learn from doing this project? (about your topic, about giving a survey, etc.)
- If you did this project again, what would you do differently? Why?

N.B. This activity was developed by Mary Christianson.

Appendix 5

Essay Peer-feedback Form

Step 1

Make the following marks on your partner's paper.

- ♦ Highlight or Underline the thesis statement of the essay
- ♦ Underline the main supporting ideas (Topic sentences of body paragraphs)
- ♦ Put a star(*) next to some of the words or sentences you like best.
- ♦ Write "More" next to sentences you want to know more information about.
- ♦ Put a question mark (?) next to the sentence or part of a sentence you cannot understand.

Step 2

Write general comments for the following questions.

1. What do you like about this essay? Why?
2. What are the most interesting details?
3. What would you like to know more about?
4. Do you think the writer should change the focus of the thesis statement? If 'yes', how?
5. What other main supporting ideas do you think the writer could include?

When you and your partner are both finished, tell each other about your comments

N.B. This activity was developed by Martin Balint.