

Product placement in a process syllabus: Designing a university course in Current Affairs English

Tim Marchand
Aston University

Reference data:

Marchand, T. L., (2011). Product placement in a process syllabus: Designing a university course in Current Affairs English. In A. Stewart (Ed.), *JALT2010 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

This paper looks at the steps taken in the design of a university course in "Current Affairs English." Following a framework proposed by Graves (2000), the paper examines some of the personal choices made by the teacher in terms of *defining the context*, *conceptualizing content*, *assessing needs*, and *developing materials*, among other things. The paper describes how these choices led to the design of a course that combined elements of a process-based syllabus with those of a product-based one. It also makes reference to the teacher's research diary and argues that such a diary can be a useful tool for course design.

この論考では、大学の「時事英語」コースを設計するにあたって取った対策について考察する。グレイブズの提唱する枠組み(2000年)に従い、本論考では、特に「文脈を定義すること」、「内容を概念化すること」、「教材を開発すること」そして「ニーズ・アセスメント」という点で教師がした選択のいくつかを吟味する。本論考では、これらの選択によって、プロダクト・ベースのシラバスの要素とプロセス・ベースのシラバスの要素を組み合わせたコースの設計にどうやって至ったのかについて述べる。また、教師の研究日誌を照会し、このような研究日誌がコース設計において有用なツールになり得ることについても論ずる。

FROM APRIL 2009 I was asked to teach three English classes at a large, private university located in Tokyo, Japan. The three classes were for second-year undergraduate students from the university's Faculty of Computer and Information Sciences, who were to be taught this compulsory course under the title of "Current Affairs English."

In my initial discussions with faculty members, I found I would be given a broad license to teach the course as I saw fit and was therefore able to decide the actual content of the course myself, from material selection all the way to student assessment. I was however given some suggestions and caveats:

- focus on building the students' vocabulary so they may be able understand basic news in English
- include some speaking activities and pair work as these had proved popular with this cohort in their first year English classes
- do not worry about developing writing skills, as the students will also be taking a separate technical writing class
- anticipate fairly low levels of proficiency and motivation



With these points in mind, I set about researching the best way to develop this new course, turning to Graves (2000) as my starting point for the process. According to Graves (2000), designing a course has several components that can be drawn together as a framework and visualized as a flow chart (p. 3). The components include:

1. Defining the context
2. Articulating beliefs
3. Formulating goals and objectives
4. Conceptualizing content
5. Assessing needs
6. Organizing the course
7. Developing materials
8. Designing an assessment plan

Although I have numbered the components here in a linear list, Graves (2000) is keen to stress that the framework should be seen as a system with no particular hierarchy in the processes or sequence in their accomplishment. Each component is interrelated as each of the processes influences, and is influenced by, others.

The second tool I used was a research diary, which allowed me to document and reflect on the processes outlined in this framework in an organized way. Some of the insight derived from the research diary became integral to the eventual shape of the course; therefore this paper will briefly look at some of the components listed above with reference to selected research diary entries.

Defining the context

The course was to run for a 14-week semester, with a single 90-minute class once a week. My three classes had about 25

students in each class, including a few third-year students who had failed the equivalent compulsory course in the year before. One class was comprised of Computer Science majors, while the other two classes included mainly Digital Media majors. I was repeatedly warned that none of the classes would be particularly advanced, that they would find authentic news material difficult to handle, and also to expect quiet classes.

This reticence on the part of students to speak out in class is well documented in Japan (Anderson, 1993; Williams, 1994; Doyon, 2000), and something I had personally encountered in other university settings. Given that the students on this compulsory course had not selected English as their major, I was not anticipating an enthusiastic group of students.

Thus one of the key concerns for me when designing the course was getting the students engaged in the material and keeping them motivated for the duration of the semester. These concerns touch upon some of my beliefs as to what roles should be played by the teacher and the learners and how they should interact with the subject matter (Hawkins, 1967, cited by Graves, 2000). I will examine this in more detail in the next section.

Articulating beliefs

According to Graves (2000), a teacher's beliefs often arise from one's work experience and by what have been seen to be a "success" (p. 26) in a particular setting. Although I had never taught a class focusing on Current Affairs English before, I had been involved in another university course with a primary focus on vocabulary development. In that case the syllabus was very much defined by the textbook series *Totally True* (Huizenga and Huizenga, 2004), which introduces new vocabulary within the context of "amazing" true stories. It then recycles the key words in subsequent units, in line with Sokmen (1997), who suggests a teacher should try "to consciously cue reactivation of vocabulary"



(p. 242). The learning of the new words was also actively encouraged by weekly quizzes, an approach which O'Dell (1997) recommends as regular testing “forces most learners to revise their work and to make a conscious effort at recall” (p. 276).

Although I had seen some success with this approach in the past, I also held some reservations. For one thing *Totally True* does not organize the vocabulary into topics, which many have noted as being important for vocabulary learning (O'Dell, 1997). Another concern was whether such material would engage the interest of the learners, especially if the readings presented were not particularly relevant to the students' lives, and lack of motivation may affect the students' intention to commit something to memory (Baddeley, 1990).

More fundamentally, however, the *Totally True* approach to presenting vocabulary would indicate a belief in a product-based, or Type A, syllabus (Nunan, 1988; White, 1988), whereby the role of teacher was of someone who selects and sequences discreet lexical items for the students to internalize in a deductive process (Graves, 2000). As befits the “system” (Graves, 2000, p. 30) theory of course design Graves espouses, the implication of such an approach would have profound consequences for the development of materials and the way the students would be assessed. This is because the content of the course would be predetermined and set out in advance (by me) for the learners and assessed, on the whole, by use of external achievement tests (O'Dell, 1997). While this would make the course easy to manage, I did have some reservations about this approach, expressed in my research diary:

If I go down the road of *Totally True*, how much interaction would I get in the class? I can imagine a lot of students working by themselves in isolation which probably won't be very motivating. The last thing I want this course to be is another exercise in passive reading and translation. [Research Diary (RD) 23/01/09]

Placing an importance on *interaction* in the classroom would suggest following a communicative or *task-based* approach to syllabus design more in line with Type B, or process-based syllabi (O'Dell, 1997). Willis and Willis (2007) suggest that well-crafted tasks can encourage—in a structured way—the “spontaneous exchange of meanings” (p. 8) that are often regarded as “golden moments” (p. 8) in successful language learning activities. Moreover Doyon (2000) recommends overcoming student reticence in the Japanese classroom by fostering an “intimate interactional” (p.10) atmosphere where open communication and displays of spontaneity are likely to prevail. This was closer to my own belief as to what would succeed in the context of these classes, but it did lead to questions about the best way to develop and assess vocabulary learning.

So it seemed that a task-based process syllabus would be more suitable to promote student participation in the classroom, whereas a predetermined, product-based syllabus would be easier to manage in terms of controlling the lexical input and assessing learner achievement. Therefore I decided to adopt a hybrid solution, one which encouraged student interaction through communicative tasks while retaining at its core a series of texts that could form the basis for vocabulary learning.

Conceptualizing content

Although McGrath (2002) offers quite a detailed overview of the different methods that a teacher may employ to choose a course book, by this stage I was quite clear of what I was looking for, so in the end I did not get much further than a “first-glance evaluation” (p. 29). The resulting determination was that none of the books I examined would make an ideal fit, and so I decided to make the materials myself. In my research diary I wrote:

Now I've decided against using a textbook, I have a chance of using some really up-to-date news each week



which might keep the students engaged. Maybe I could adapt some recent news articles each week that fit around a topic—Drop the Dead Donkey-style? [RD 15/02/09]

Drop the Dead Donkey-style refers to a British situation comedy popular in the nineties which was set in a newsroom and inserted dialogues about topical news stories and events into an otherwise predetermined script. My idea was to introduce topic-based vocabulary through recent news items that the university students may have an interest in, or at least a familiarity with. I broadly sketched out what topic areas should be covered (politics, economics, sports, entertainment, technology, etc.) based on a preliminary needs assessment of the students’ interests undertaken in the first class.

With an authentic, or semi-authentic looking news article set at the core of the lesson, I envisaged a lesson cycle with some kind of communicative task serving as a warm-up prior to the reading and analysis of the language used in the article after reading. This somewhat mirrors the task-cycle advocated by Willis and Willis (2007) where a *focus on meaning* is followed by a *focus on language* (Table 1).

Adopting this sequence would mean that a communicative task would “prime” the learners for the reading by engaging their own knowledge and opinion on a subject, while offering an opportunity to introduce some of the vocabulary associated with the topic (Willis & Willis, 2007, p. 21). These tasks would be largely determined by the content of the news article, but I imagined using a mix of pair work and group activities that would include ranking, rating, and discussing certain topics.

Willis and Willis (2007) also provide numerous examples of tasks that can be used with written texts to focus on language, which could be adapted for the news article at the core of each lesson; tasks where students reorder paragraphs, predict texts, or fill in gaps based on general knowledge or lexical content.

However, I was keen to keep the main article as authentic in appearance as possible, so I decided I would present it in an orthodox format, albeit with certain words highlighted in bold or underlined. These highlighted words would form the basis of subsequent quizzes, and also be the ones I would recycle in future materials. I chose to highlight two types of vocabulary: topic words and common words. While I share the view that it is a good idea to organize vocabulary by topic, a focus on “only topic-based vocabulary can lead to the exclusion of many important items” (O’Dell, 1997, p. 270) especially verbs which do not “fit neatly into a single topic category” (O’Dell, 1997, p. 270). The students were expected to annotate the highlighted vocabulary as they saw fit.

Following each article, I decided to check comprehension by getting the students to ask and answer questions in pairs. These questions would resemble an information-split activity (like those suggested by Willis and Willis, 2007) in that each student in the pair would be given a different set of questions to ask their partner, whose job it was to then find the answer in the article. By splitting the questions this way, I was hoping to encourage plenty of speaking opportunities as well as chances to improve listening skills.

Table 1. Lesson cycle

Focus on meaning	Warm up:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce vocabulary • Prime schemata • Add communicative element
Focus on language	News article:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current news topic • Highlight vocabulary
and on form	Comprehension check:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions focus on comprehension and on particular grammar / lexical patterns
Review	Vocabulary quiz:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quiz on topic words and common words • Reinforce grammatical/lexical patterns



Next we come to the part of the cycle where Willis and Willis (2007) suggest *focusing on form*. A focus on form at this stage would allow the students to make sense of the language they have experienced, with the highlighted language likely to become more salient and noticed in future encounters (Willis & Willis, 2007). I decided that it would be difficult to select *a priori* the particular lexical or grammatical patterns to focus on, as it would depend on not only each week's article, but also the needs of the students.

Finally, the lesson cycle was completed in the following week by reviewing the highlighted vocabulary in a quiz. Again, the nature of the quiz would be largely dependent on the previous week's article and the observed needs of each class.

Assessing needs

To assess the level of each class I did an initial needs assessment using an "Ask the teacher" activity which allowed me to evaluate language ability and the sociability of the class (do they work well in groups, use L1 or L2 when working together, etc.) (Graves, 2000). From this I gathered it would be difficult to use authentic news articles as the basis for the core texts but that at least students might respond well to a task-based approach.

The second needs assessment involved gathering information into the interests of the students. This was important as I was teaching in an EFL setting with no clear-cut needs for using English outside of the classroom (Graves, 2000), and in a compulsory course where some students might not be very motivated (Dorneyei, 2001). This assessment confirmed what I was told to expect—classes where the majority of students did not have much interest in studying English. However it did yield a list of topic areas of interest the students, including news about technology, sport, and Japanese society.

Finally, I was keen to integrate an ongoing needs assessment into the course materials. The first way I tried to achieve this was through the *comprehension check* stage of each class, which often included questions such as "Did you enjoy reading this article?", "Did you see this story on the news?" to see whether I was achieving the course objectives of making the material of interest to or relevant to students' lives. I also always included the question "Was this news too difficult/okay/too easy for you?" to keep track of the appropriateness of the material each week (see Appendix 4). At the end of each class I would ask for a show of hands for the answers to these questions, and kept a tally of how the students responded in my research diary.

The second way I integrated ongoing needs assessment into the course was by noting linguistic difficulties arising through the students doing the tasks in groups or pairs. This sometimes led to the deliberate overlap of language exposed during one week's class and then recycled into the materials developed for the next. For example in week two I noted many students were making errors talking about time phrases in the future ("he will resign 2 weeks after*"), so in week four I included a task requiring students to repeatedly use the time phrase "*in ___ years time,*" which was also reproduced in the core text that week and in the subsequent quiz. Similarly, in week eight, problems with talking about money were exposed, so the following week the class materials focused on various verbal phrases to talk about money

Developing materials

This section will examine the process behind the writing of the materials by looking at one particular "unit" which straddled two weeks of the course.

One of the major news stories of around week ten of the course was the release from prison of a man who had been



jailed for 17 years after new DNA results suggested he had been wrongly convicted. At the same time, there had been a lot of background news stories over the previous weeks about Japan adopting a new jury system, which would mean lay jurors would start being selected for jury service for the first time. As some students had previously expressed an interest in studying about Japanese society, it seemed appropriate to do a lesson on *crime and the justice system*.

Such a subject area naturally contains quite a lot of specialist vocabulary, so I felt I needed to pay a lot of attention to this before looking at the main article (see Appendix 2). Warm-up 1 introduces a lot of this specialist lexis and also checks whether the students are aware of the criminal justice process. With this schemata established, Warm-up 2 asks students to rank *crimes, punishments, and evidence* in terms of *seriousness, severity, and reliability* respectively, thereby introducing some of the themes the article touches upon. The students' task was to compare their rankings in pairs before discussing the questions that follow. Each pair then joined another to compare their answers to the questions before selecting a spokesperson to report back a summary of their discussion to me.

Having primed the students in this way, the lesson moves on to the main text (Appendix 3), which exposes the students to the vocabulary covered in the previous task in the context and format of an article. The core text was based on a variety of pieces found online, including one from the Japan Today website (www.japantoday.com), which became a useful starting point for a number of lessons.

Table 2. Vocabulary focus of the unit

Recycled words	apologise	(from week 2 / 3 rd time)
	however	(from week 3 / 4 th time)
	denied	(from week 2 / 4 th time)
	according to	(from week 3 / 5 th time)
	rather than	(from week 4 / 2 nd time)
	decision	(from week 9 / 2 nd time)
	in order to	(from week 2 / 5 th time)
	prevent	(from week 3 / 4 th time)
Topic words	spent (from week 9 / 3 rd time)	
Common words	justice / crime / commit / sentenced / prison / guilty / murder / evidence / trial / DNA samples / confession / crime scene / case / jury / innocent / guilty / judge / suspect /	
Common words	error / former / included / fairly / obtained / violence / raises some important questions / / terrified / influence / relied / forced / chiefs / certain	

When writing the article I recycled words from previous weeks as naturally as possible, since, according to Sokmen (1997), retention is advanced by the number of times vocabulary is recalled. I also highlighted “topic” words and “common” words, the latter being ones I deemed salient enough to be worthy of attention (see Table 2). This process was largely intuitive rather than systematic, as I wrote in my research diary:

Which words should I be highlighting as common? If I had more time, I would like to find a more principled way of selecting vocab—perhaps based on some corpus frequency lists?. [RD 05/05/09]

However I also reflected upon my interest in the process:



Writing the articles each week is an interesting challenge: Finding something topical and of interest on the one hand, recycling past vocabulary on the other, and all the while trying to crow-bar in language that their past task performances indicate they need. [RD 12/05/09]

So the research diary revealed at quite an early stage the emergent blend that was to make up the core of the course materials: recycled “common” words from previous classes, language-items exposed in tasks as needing attention, and “topic” words based on a recent news item; all linguistic products placed within a shell of communicative tasks.

The second side of this “shell” comes next: the comprehension check stage (Appendix 4), which ended up incorporating a lot of *focus on form* questions. In fact to some extent this stage came to encapsulate the essence of what the course set out to achieve. For example, questions 1a and 1b seek to determine whether the selected news item is relevant to the students’ lives, while the last questions 10a and 10b give me a way of gauging whether the material is the appropriate level. Meanwhile questions 2b, 5a, and 6b require the students to notice the cohesive structure of the text, as does question 8a/b by asking what each pronoun “they” refers to. Question 6a reviews the lexical pattern *in order to* which was repeated a number of times during the course, while question 7b asks them to think about the synonym of a common phrasal verb. Finally questions 9a and 9b ask the students more personal questions in order to generate a deeper affective impression of the material (Stevick, 1996).

What satisfied me most about this stage, though, was how well the students stuck to the task of asking and answering each other the questions in English, and often ended up working together to find the answers. In my research diary I wrote:

I’m really pleased with how well the students are doing the questions in pairs—almost uniformly sticking to the

task in English. I wonder if they notice how much of the text they are successfully parsing to answer these questions? [RD 20/05/09]

The final stage of this “unit” was the review quiz given the class of week 11 (Appendix 5). As with the comprehension check stage, I stuck to a regular format for the quizzes, with 6 questions checking that the students could match English words with their Japanese meanings, 10 cloze questions in another theme related news article, and four comprehension questions, some of which would again test an understanding of the text on a structural level. In a similar vein to the main article of the previous week, I would try to make the quiz article about a recent news story as well as recycle words covered previously in the course.

By the end of the semester, the course had covered eight units similar in format to the one outlined above, and included as their core texts articles about such things as the outbreak of swine flu, the singer Susan Boyle’s sensational worldwide fame and the death of Michael Jackson. The majority of these stories were very up-to-date, which seemed to be appreciated by the students. In my research diary I noted some students’ surprise in week 11 when the warm-up task worksheets were handed out, and they realized there was no mention of Michael Jackson’s death, followed by a chorus of “*yappari*” (“as I thought”) when the article about his death was finally presented.

Conclusion

A simple assessment of the Current Affairs English course itself may be obtained through the course evaluation forms completed by the majority of students at the end of the semester (Table 3). Broadly speaking, the majority of students had a positive feeling towards the course, with 73% saying that the course was good and only 3% indicating they felt the course was bad. This



was despite the universal belief that this compulsory course was in fact unrelated to their major and therefore their main interest of study. A more qualitative feedback of the course can be found in some of the students' comments in Appendix 1.

Overall I felt that creating materials based on very recent news events provided a suitable medium of discourse for this class. It exposed the students to semi-authentic news texts relevant to their lives. Moreover the combination of a process-based syllabus with the deliberate insertion of salient and recycled lexical and grammatical *products* seemed to satisfy the competing demands of maintaining learner interest while developing their news-based reading skills.

The discussion above introduced one example of a course design using the framework devised by Graves (2000), and the concurrent keeping of a research diary as a tool for helping to resolve some of the complex considerations course designers and teachers need to make. It is hoped that describing some of the framework's components in detail for this university course demonstrates the value of such an approach and that others in different contexts may find the system explained here useful.

Table 3. Course evaluation questionnaire results

This course was good	73%
This course was okay	24%
This course was not good	3%
I gained knowledge in this course	78%
I had an interest in a related field to the subject of this course	0%

Note: All questions translated from the original Japanese

Bio data

Tim Marchand is a graduate of the Aston MSc TESOL programme. He currently teaches at a number of universities in Tokyo. <timmarchand@gmail.com>

References

- Anderson, F. (1993). The enigma of the college classroom: Nails that don't stick up. In P. Wadden (Ed.), *A handbook for teaching English at Japanese colleges and universities* (pp. 101-110). New York: Oxford.
- Baddeley, A. (1990). *Human memory: Theory and practice*. Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.
- Dorneyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Doyon, P. (2000). Shyness in the Japanese EFL class. *The Language Teacher*, 24 (1), 10-11.
- Graves, K. (2000). *Designing language courses: A guide for teachers* Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Huizenga, J., & Huizenga, L. (2004). *Totally true*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *Syllabus design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O'Dell, F. (1997). Incorporating vocabulary into the syllabus. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition, and pedagogy* (pp. 258-278). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Omaggio Hadley, A. (1993). *Teaching language in context*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Sokmen, A. (1997). Current trends in teaching second language vocabulary. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition, and pedagogy* (pp. 237-258). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stevick, E. (1996). *Memory, meaning and method*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.



- White, R. (1988). *The ELT curriculum*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Williams, C. (1994). Situational behavior and the EFL classroom in Japan. *The Language Teacher*, 18 (5), 10-11.
- Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix I

Positive feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The lessons were interesting and I liked the topics because they happened recently.</i> • <i>The course was run in an enthusiastic way.</i> • <i>Because I was able to study a lot of news in the world, I could deepen my thought, and I could study about some news which I did not know.</i> • <i>I was able to study English happily.</i> • <i>It was fun.</i> • <i>I could know so many new thing, and I could acquire the English thinking ability!</i> • <i>It was an enjoyable class.</i> • <i>The teacher was kind and the lecture was fun.</i> • <i>It was enjoyable.</i> • <i>My English ability might have improved a bit.</i> • <i>My conversational skills improved.</i> • <i>I could discuss various topics.</i> • <i>The form of the quizzes was enjoyable.</i> • <i>It was interesting.</i> • <i>I improved my English ability.</i> • <i>The class was made up of different topics every week, so it seemed well devised.</i>
Negative feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>There was no answer sheet</i> • <i>Let's give up English!</i>



Appendix 2

Current Affairs English: Crime news



Warm Up 1: The justice system

1.1 Look at the table below. Complete the table with words from the box on the right.

Vocab notes		
:	a criminal commits a crime	victim
:	a _____ sees the crime	police
:	the _____ reports the crime to the police	police
:	the police gather	innocent
:	the _____ arrest a suspect	criminal
:	the police question the _____	witness
:	the _____ charge the suspect with the crime	suspect
:	the _____ listens to the evidence	suspect
:	the judge / jury finds the _____ innocent or guilty	evidence
:	the _____ suspect is released	judge
:	the _____ sentences the guilty suspect	guilty
:	the _____ suspect is punished	judge / jury

Warm Up 2: You are the jury

2.1 Look at the table below. Rank each group from 1-6 in terms of the phrase in grey:

the most serious crime	the toughest punishment	the most reliable evidence
murder	a fine	fingerprints
speeding	a life sentence in prison	DNA samples
assault	capital punishment	confessions
kidnapping	a suspended sentence	witness reports
robbery	10 years in prison	video recordings
shoplifting	2 years in prison	a motive

2.2 Ask and answer these questions to your partner:

- 1) What is a suitable punishment for each crime listed in 2.1?
- 2) What evidence would you need before deciding if someone is guilty of each crime?
- 3) In Japan 98% of suspects are found guilty. In UK 76% of suspects are found guilty. Which system is better? Why?
- 4) Would you like to go on a jury? Why? Why not?

Appendix 3

Japan murder case shows justice errors

It looks almost certain that Toshikazu Sugaya spent 17 years in **prison** for a **crime** he did not **commit**. The former bus driver was **sentenced** to life in **prison** after being found **guilty** of the **murder** of a four year old girl in 1990. The **evidence** that was used at the time of his **trial** included **DNA samples** and a **confession**. However, new tests showed that his DNA did not match the samples from the **crime scene**, and Mr Sugaya later denied his **confession** was fairly obtained. According to the 62-year old, the police used violence against him: "They were pulling my hair and kicking me, saying, 'You did it! You did it!' . . . It went on all day. I was terrified."



Toshikazu Sugaya before his release from prison

This **case** raises some important questions at a time when the Japanese **justice** system is changing. First, would a **jury** have found Mr Sugaya **innocent** rather than **guilty**? Mr Sugaya does not think so because he believes the **judges** will still strongly influence the **jury's** decision. Secondly, can **confessions** be relied upon? Some people want video cameras to record anytime the police question **suspects** in order to prevent forced confessions. Most police chiefs are against this idea, but if they are introduced then perhaps the police will not have to apologise again for another error in **justice**.

Vocabulary notes

Common words:	Topic words:

Appendix 4

Comprehension Check

STUDENT A's QUESTIONS (Do not show these to student B)

- 1a) Did you remember hearing about this story?
- 2a) How long did Mr Sugaya spend in prison?
- 3a) Why was Mr Sugaya sentenced to life in prison?
- 4a) Why was the evidence bad?
- 5a) What does *this case* mean?
- 6a) Why do some people want video cameras to be used?
- 7a) With B, find a phrase which means *continued*.
- 8a) With B, count each time *they* is used in the article. What does *they* mean in each sentence?
- 9a) Do you think video cameras should be introduced?
- 10a) Was this news: too difficult / okay / too easy for you?

STUDENT B's QUESTIONS (Do not show these to student A)

- 1b) Did you see this story on the news?
- 2b) What was Mr Sugaya's job in 1990?
- 3b) What evidence was used at his trial?
- 4b) What was kind of violence did the police use against him?
- 5b) Does Mr Sugaya believe a jury would have also found him guilty?
- 6b) What does *this idea* mean?
- 7b) With A, , find a phrase which means *continued*.
- 8b) With A, count each time *they* is used in the article. What does *they* mean in each sentence?
- 9b) If you were innocent and spent 17 years in jail, what would you do after being released?
- 10b) Was this news: too difficult / okay / too easy for you?

Appendix 5

Current Affairs English: Quiz 7

Name:

Student number:

A) Match the English words 1-6 with the Japanese meanings a-f:

1) fairly	a) 証拠
2) chief	b) 陪審
3) influence	c) 公平に
4) evidence	d) 署長
5) jury	e) 影響する
6) replace	f) 取り代える

- 1) 2) 3) 4) 5) 6)

B) Fill the blanks in the story with suitable words from the box below:



Protesters against the new jury system

According to a recent article, 79.2% of the people asked said they did not want to serve on a jury. The big change to the Japanese 1) _____ system will happen later this year, after which ordinary people, if selected, will have to look at all the 2) _____ and decide if the 3) _____ is innocent or 4) _____. The trials with these new juries will only be for serious 5) _____ such as murder and

assault, but some people are worried about the 6) _____ that members of the jury might face. They think that the three real 7) _____ may unfairly influence the jury's final decision. This is especially true when it comes to 8) _____, in other words when the appropriate punishment is decided. For example if only you believe that someone is innocent, you will still have to decide how long he or she should remain in 9) _____. In that case can you be 10) _____ upon to make the difficult decision?

- | | | | | |
|------------|-------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| a) prison | b) evidence | c) guilty | d) judges | e) relied |
| f) suspect | g) crime | h) sentencing | i) justice | j) pressure |

C) Read the article again and answer these questions:

- 1) When will the big change happen? _____
- 2) What are two examples of serious crimes? _____
- 3) When might judges especially influence the jury's decision? _____
- 4) What is an example of a difficult decision? _____

