Stronger CLT: Getting Students to Speak in English in Class

Martin J. Murphy
Sapporo Gakuin University

Reference Data:
Murphy, M. J. (2013). Stronger CLT: Getting students to speak in English, in class. In N. Sonda & A. Krause (Eds.), *JALT2012 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

It is well known that pretertiary English education in Japan fails to foster basic conversational ability in many students. In order to prepare students for entrance examinations, a focus on reading, writing, and translation comes at the expense of communication practice. Many students enter university without the ability to engage in basic English conversation. It has also been observed that some students are reluctant to participate in communicative tasks, even when given the opportunity. This reticence can be vexing for instructors of lower proficiency students in mandatory English classrooms. Drawing on Howatt's (1984) "strong" version of Communicative Language Teaching, I outline a discussion and debate classroom method that fosters small group conversation even among students of mixed proficiency and confidence levels. The results of a pilot survey asking what students thought of these activities showed that students are willing, given the right conditions, to speak English in class.

日本の高等学校における英語教育は、大学入試対策のための、読み、書き、和訳が中心であり、そのため英会話の練習時間が取れなくなるため英会話力を養うことができないことでよく知られている。そのため基礎レベルの英会話さえできない多くの学生が大学に入学することになる。また大学において英会話の機会を与えられても、積極的に参加しようとしない学生も少なくない。特に習熟度が低い学生に対して必修英語を教える教員にとって、どうやってこのような学生の積極性を引き出すか悩ましい問題であろう。本論文はHowatt （1984）による「コミュニケーション」言語の教授法の「強い」バージョンを土台とし、大学生の英会話習熟度を問わず、また少人数グループでの英会話練習法を提案するものである。この教授法について予備調査を行ったところ、この方法を通じて習熟度の低い学習者でさえも積極的に英会話に参加するといった、目覚ましい結果が表れた。

After a minimum of 6 years of compulsory English study, many students entering university cannot engage in basic English conversation. As Mulligan (2005) observed,

> Japanese students study English 3 to 5 hours a week or more, anywhere from 6 to 10 years, yet Japan has one of the lowest levels of English language proficiency of any developed country in the world. This is further reflected in their international TOEFL scores, which languish at the bottom. (p. 33)

Many university EFL teachers attempt to address this proficiency deficit by trying to develop communicative competence. Their students' study for entrance examinations finished, teachers are free to focus on communicative classroom tasks, to adopt a learner-centered approach, and—ideally—to get their students to speak to each other in English. These efforts

may be well received among groups of motivated or proficient students. However, often teachers face the reality that their students *won't* talk to each other in English. It may appear that they can't, or that they do not want to. Indeed, getting students to speak in English in the classroom can be a formidable challenge (Boston, 2005; Fellner, 2005). Speaking tasks may be met with mumbling or dead silence.

Nunan (1998) stressed the importance of using classroom time for activities that practice real conversation (p. 27). Many university EFL instructors choose from an array of textbooks advertised to include communicative approaches and activities. However, for lower proficiency, lower confidence groups, some instructors find themselves starting all over again, reteaching a limited set of basic language forms embedded in a notional-functional syllabus. These students become so-called false beginners. "The students just can't speak," "Japanese students are shy," "They have no opinions," "They do not know what to say," are not uncommon complaints among instructors who encounter resistance to speaking activities.

In this research, I examined whether classroom materials orientated towards discussion—real conversation—and a stronger communicative approach are indeed effective. A previous study (Murphy, 2013) challenged the presumption among many instructors that Japanese learners cannot or will not speak English in the classroom. The small case study showed more language production with a student-centered discussion style lesson as detailed below. Spontaneous adlibbing in L2 was remarkable. The amount and quality of language produced in class and oral testing are one gauge of effectiveness. The present study of academic year 2012 went further and looked at effectiveness from the learner's perspective. This study relied on the learners' experiences as reported in an end-of-year survey. It is one thing for the instructor to look at test data and to surmise the efficacy of the lesson, but another for the students to report whether they felt their language ability improved and whether the teaching material and class style were beneficial.

Students' Pre-University EFL Classroom Experience

Two methods commonly used in junior high school and high school English classrooms are (a) *yakudoku*, whereby instructors mainly use the learners' L1, students learn English through analysis of grammar forms, and translation between English and Japanese is the main method of language learning (Hino, 1988; Gorsuch, 1998, 2001); and (b) adaptations of the Audiolingual Method, in which the learners are led by the instructor to practice grammar forms in oral repetition. This method focuses on engraining form-correct statements, questions, and responses as habit. Language forms are explained in L1, practiced in isolation, and later applied in possible communication situations through a variety of drills.

The dearth of communicative activities can be attributed to teachers' attitudes that they should use classroom time to prepare students for entrance tests (Law, 1994; Gorsuch, 1998). However, in her 1998 study of two Japanese teachers using the *yakudoku* method, Gorsuch (2001) observed that the teachers "reported that they did not ask the students to produce their own original spoken or written English utterances or sentences, because it would be too 'difficult' for students" (p. 4). Although it is arguable which methods are actually in use and which are the most beneficial to language learning (Saito, 2012), it is clear that many English language classrooms in Japan remain very teacher centered and focused on language forms (Nishino, 2008).

Less frequently, a learner might encounter one of the more current Communicative Approaches. Such lessons are more student oriented rather than using the traditional teacher-as-the-center-of-instruction approach. In addition, students break from

the typical method of grammar and pattern practice and use English in order to learn English (Finocchiaro & Brumfit, 1983).

Toward a Learner-Centered, Discussion-Based Lesson Format

Strong CLT, Weak CLT Case Study—Academic Year 2011

Howatt (1984) identified *strong* and *weak* versions of communicative language teaching (CLT). He posited that the weak version is found in standard four skills textbooks and lessons focusing on the functional-notional approach. This weak version generally results in structure-based dialogs aiming at linguistic competence. Most of the speaking tasks are, as Littlewood (1981) observed, designed "to equip the learner with some of the skills required for communication without actually performing communicative acts" (p. 8).

Howatt (1984) further made a distinction between "learning to use" English, and the stronger version of CLT which results in "using English to learn it" (p. 279). He saw it as gaining knowledge of the language and acquisition through learning to use it to communicate and developing a deeper understanding of the complexity of language through experimentation in genuinely unrehearsed conversation. Communicative competence becomes the driving force of language learning and not a far-off end result. In this sense the discussion-based lesson format described herein can be considered to be a strong version of CLT in which learners generate their own language. They draw on receptive knowledge of English from previous years of study. More noteworthy is that students put together phrases and useful arguments on the spot by struggling to communicate a particular point of view.

Prior to the end of the 2010 academic year, I used what I considered to be a communicative, learner-centered lesson style only in classes with higher proficiency learners. In these lessons speaking activities focused on small-group discussions with no drills, very little explicit grammar–form instruction, and almost no controlled practice of language forms. Like the teachers in the Gorsuch (1998) study, I thought that lower proficiency students could not handle open-ended speaking tasks. Therefore, for groups of students who scored low on the placement test, I chose a typical textbook that focused on language forms.

Because my small-group discussion lessons at the higher levels tended to be successful and, in fact, more enjoyable for both the learners and me, I began to test them out on other classes. The students liked the change: the classes transformed. Particularly surprising was that students in all classes were able to handle this stronger version of CLT, were willing to engage, and were able to produce their own free conversations. After a while, the remaining textbook-based classes seemed tedious and frustrating. So, I instituted the same discussion-based lesson format in my lowest level classes.

In Murphy (2013), I described my classes in the 2011 academic year, which I started with Howatt's weak CLT version and then switched to a strong approach. Teaching with two different sets of materials and teaching styles was revealing. In that study, oral testing revealed that the fairly predictable end result of standard textbook model dialogues was the memorization of grammar forms and established phrases. Students dared not deviate from textbook models for fear of making a grammatical mistake. They seemed to feel that *less was better*. On the other hand, the discussion style led to significantly longer conversations and linguistic variation. *More was better*. Transcripts showed students overcoming the struggle to be understood. In conversation that is unpredictable, more concise explanation of ideas is needed; more language and more varied language are necessary to communicate with clarity.

Furthermore, the study (Murphy, 2011) showed that even the lowest proficiency students generated arguments impromptu, their *own* arguments—not the ones provided by teaching materials. On a given topic, each group of students created their own mainline reasoning, their own memes. Many ideas were completely original, beyond the boundaries of the possible debate arguments I had imagined as I made my teaching materials. Some students used their own anecdotes and stories to support their thinking. The study documented one student group that began an oral test discussing fast food. The conversation soon segued to a discussion of Japanese traditional food, Japanese culture, and Western culture, fashion, and music. It finally made its way to a discussion of how young Japanese find hip-hop and popular American trends more appealing. This is what the students *really* wanted to talk about. The freedom to produce their own language provided a sense of personal investment and ownership in the discussion. Such original and hard to explain concepts required negotiation of meaning and rephrasing or repetition. This discussion took place in a so-called *low* class. Without L1 to help, learners by necessity demonstrated a deeper understanding of English. This also occurred in much of the extensive classroom practice in which students picked up or passed on newly gained understandings of language and its usage as well as general knowledge. That language acquisition had taken place became apparent when such usage and knowledge showed up in unrehearsed and unrelated topics many weeks later.

Discussion-Debate Lesson Format and Evaluation—Academic Year 2012

The lesson materials I have been developing are built around a number of debatable topics. Nearly all class activities involve semi-structured conversation leading to a final discussion. Each lesson opens with a "find someone who" activity. Learners become familiar with a topic by asking questions, eliciting opinions and actual experiences from their classmates. To the limit of their ability, students are asked to make follow-up questions. Some carry out the task more successfully than others; however, the learner-centered nature of the task leaves students free to mine the depths of a topic. Compared with a textbook-based lesson format, language forms are not rehearsed. Practice questions and answers are not read verbatim from a book. Rather, students generate the questions themselves. In low proficiency classes, the teacher acts mainly as a facilitator and provides hints and corrects grammar only as needed. For example, in a lesson in which the topic is education problems, the handout reads: "Find someone who . . . sleeps in class." Students may generate questions like *Do you sleep in class? Do you fall asleep in class?* or *Do you see others fall asleep in class?* Follow-up questions might be *Why?* or *Why not?* Possible answers are up to the imagination, for example: *I didn't sleep last night, The classroom is hot,* or *The teacher is boring*. Students are instructed that there is no set answer and that they are free to talk as much as they can with whatever English they can manage. This activity serves two purposes: moving beyond mere automatic yes or no answers to probing for more information and practicing a wider variety of English. The process of this activity allows the students to be creative and talk to many other classmates at their own level of competence.

The next exercise is a role-play in pairs or groups of three. It is another chance for the learners to generate questions, understand answers, and use arguments in a setting that does not expose what they might really think about a given topic. For example, a role-play might be a conversation between two parents and a teenager. In this scenario, one parent thinks that children should study more and never stay out late; the other parent thinks that more socializing with friends is a good thing. The third role-play member is a teenager who wants to stay out with friends. The exercise varies each time, but the goal is

for students to enact a conversation that is close to real life. The role-play moves the topic from the abstract to students producing their own dramas, making the issue a real-world problem to be considered.

The final task is a discussion in groups of three in which not everyone agrees. In one example topic, education problems, students hone their arguments about education problems in schools. Possible approaches are the "bad" students: they lack motivation or willpower, or they lack study skills. Or is it the teachers and schools that are not up to task? Or is it the parents' responsibility? The three students engage in debate. The main rule is simple: *All students cannot agree*. Having gone through the previous activities, students should understand both sides of the issue well enough to take a position on either side of the debate. After a set amount of time, the group members change. All students A move clockwise to another group, and students B move counter-clockwise, making completely new conversation practice groups. Students C do not move.

Students start again with completely different groups. With each change of group members, learners have a chance to experiment with what worked in the previous group. They pick up new ideas from classmates. These become tools or ammunition for the next discussion. This changing of partners and restarting the discussion was found to be highly effective in practicing the material several times without drilling or rote memorization.

In addition to the *not everyone can agree* rule, another key rule in this discussion activity is: *no non sequiturs allowed*. Arguments must follow logically from another partners' previous statements. Meaning is paramount, so if they do not understand they must seek clarification by asking, *What do you mean?* or *I don't understand*. Once the point is made the conversation can be skillfully shifted to another aspect of the topic, using expressions like *That's true but . . .* or *On the other hand*. Previously, the textbook-based lessons focused on a particular set list of phrases and learners generally sought and passed on predictable information. With that, the conversation ended. In contrast, the discussion-based lessons are much more open-ended. Learners are free to expand on a dialogue for as long as they want or are able.

Evaluation, in brief, entails written essays plus written and oral tests. In the speaking tests, to prevent coordination and memorization, three students are chosen lottery style and must be prepared to take either side of the debate. Based on standards set and explained by me, students are tested on communication fluency, strength of arguments, and logic. The grading criteria are transparent and reflect the in-class discussion practice. Oral test feedback is given on the spot immediately afterwards. This makes the test a part of the learning process. I have observed that during following tests many flaws are corrected. Relative improvement of each student is noted and can play a part in final grades.

The Learners' Experience—A Survey

At the end of the second semester of the 2012 school year, I surveyed all classes with a brief questionnaire at a time when students had had ample experience with the classroom routine. The survey consisted of 11 Likert-style statements (see Appendix). There was space at the end for free comments or reflections. Of the 11 statements, a detailed treatment of the first three is not included in this paper. With those statements, I sought to determine the amount of English the students' high school teachers had used in class, the percentage of English speaking activities in their high school classes, and the degree to which the students think they will use English in the future. My intention was to find out if there was a connection to the other survey items. For example, if a student was comfortable with the class style, might the student have already had a similar conversational lesson in high school? However, the results of statements

1 and 2 were uniform and showed little high school English practice. I was not able to make any correlation with later items that specifically evaluated the current class style. Also outside the scope of this study are several factors beyond approach and materials that undoubtedly influence class outcomes: class size, group chemistry, and motivation.

The responses to statement 4, among both higher and lower proficiency learners, were weighted towards being challenged by the class (agree or strongly agree, 88%). It is possible that many students saw the class as a double-edged sword. The class material was difficult and challenged them to think, but it did not necessarily overwhelm or demotivate them. Generally, challenge was not seen as negative, but rather as positive in terms of being more academically rigorous. The following comments were similar to others:

- It was interesting. But sometimes the topic is difficult for me even in Japanese!
- This class is good for me because I can speak English smoothly in class. But teaching materials (sic) is difficult for me.

In statement 5 about nervousness, I attempted to determine whether students felt pressure from participating in the class activities. The activities were less form focused and instead put a premium on understandable communication. Mistakes were forgiven and learners had the chance to correct their own English. The neutral response (neither agree nor disagree, 33%) suggests that most students were comfortable with the class style. However, there were a few strong comments about nervousness, such as: "自分はすごく緊張してしまうけど、まあまあ楽しくやれているとは思う [I was extremely nervous, but I managed to do it fairly enjoyably, I think]." It is hard to generalize, but I often observe nervousness at the start of a discussion as students try to come to grips with a topic they have never previously thought about seriously. In particular at the beginning of the course and occasionally thereafter, there were uncomfortable silences. For some, this experience may have left a memory of having been nervous.

As a way to motivate students to engage in the classroom tasks, often I explained the pedagogical approach. Thus, it is no surprise in statement 6 that the learner-centered approach was preferred by 47% over a more teacher-centered class (preferred by 15%). Clearly, the active participation was popular. On the other hand, when I examined the comments, there was no explanation why some students favored the teacher-centered approach. Perhaps it can be chalked up to low motivation to engage in communication with classmates or a desire for a more passive classroom. Most wrote positively about the free nature of the class conversations with friends. A small number noted that it was difficult for shy people. Comments included the following:

- I like this class style . . . I like speaking English more.
- This class style is good. Speaking is very important I think. But sometimes it is difficult for me. I make effort.

One student directly compared the lessons with other styles: "I think active class is much better than traditional class."

Over two-thirds agreed to statement 7 that the discussion style helped foster thinking ability. Many students commented on having to think:

- I could think many topics what I didn't care until now.
- This is a little difficult for me, but my thinking ability maybe rise.
- 自分の興味のtopicないも話せて考えの幅が広がる。考える力がつく [I talked about topics outside of my interest, my range of thinking widened. I accrued thinking ability].

Many students perceived this challenge to think as a positive—as *helping* them. A small number merely wrote one word: "difficult." However, as in the comments above, almost all other such comments were qualified with a positive silver lining.

In terms of improving confidence and explaining ideas (statements 8 and 9), the results were not clear; the responses spread evenly. To *improving confidence*, nearly half (48%) agreed or strongly agreed. But it was not preponderance; many had no strong feelings either way (34%), and 15% did not get a feeling of confidence. The classes were heavily focused on speaking activities and discussion practice, and I had expected the responses to show more agreement. After all, from a teacher's perspective, on quite difficult subject matter nearly all students improved and were able to get their opinions across in the end. A possible explanation from a learner's perspective could be that in a discussion, one party carries the day with his or her arguments. Although I try to encourage friendly and mutual exploration of the topic, competition does occur. Further, I am certain there are those who felt disappointed by their discussion test results. However I found no such specific comment to this effect. Most comments were positive, such as:

- I can speak English a little. I like speaking English more. I thank this class.
- Speaking English connects with confidence.

To statement 9, the responses were evenly distributed, with most answers in the neutral zone. *Explain my ideas* goes hand-in-hand with *challenge* and *degree of difficulty*, as expressed in the comments above. The students in the lower level classes had some difficulties getting their thinking across:

- できる人とできない人の差がすごいきがいした [I felt there was a big gap between the people who could do it and couldn't do it].

This comment likely reflects the same sentiment as those who did not get a boost in confidence. It is likely that they judged their performance in terms of relative success against stronger classmates. Again however, from the teacher's perspective, it seemed most were able to communicate their ideas. Nobody was mute, and all expressed a logical and understandable point of view. If not, real conversation would have been impossible.

One more positive comment summed that up:

- 毎回、必ず、英語でコミュニケーションをすれる機会があって良かった [Every time—without fail—there was a chance to communicate in English, which was good].

There were more positive comments about the class style (statement 10) than about any other item. Most were to the point: "I enjoyed this class!" While this was encouraging, it could be an indication of a good relationship with the teacher. However, it could also be a marker of success. If the students liked the teacher but hated the activity, this should have shown up elsewhere in the questionnaire.

Overall effectiveness (statement 11) was rated highly, nearly 90% agreed or strongly agreed. An incomplete version of the survey without this question was mistakenly photocopied for half the classes. However, given that it was more highly motivated classes that did not respond to this statement, I feel that if all classes had taken the full survey, the average results would still remain high. Indeed, in the advanced classes several students marked 110% or 120%. There were many variations on the following kinds of comments:

- このクラスでspeaking abilityが上がった [My speaking ability got better in this class].
- I can get many skills.

With the large amount of time spent on unguided real conversation, it is not surprising that almost all students wrote a positive reflection on the class and materials. Further, it is encouraging that the class played a part in improving some aspect of their English or education in general: speaking, communicating, thinking, gaining insights, and increasing knowledge. Most heartening were the responses from an advanced-level English class at Otaru University of Commerce, a high-ranking national university, as well as from English majors at Sapporo Gakuin University:

- I've never taken such an interesting class. I hope I will be able to take same style next year.

This kind of approval appeared several times, indicating that the degree of challenge to think and express ideas was particularly well suited to those with high proficiency in English, those who are more academically inclined, and those with a real interest in improving their English.

Finally, as noted earlier, testing and test feedback was observed to have facilitated language learning. However, this is beyond the scope of this study, and it is indeed impossible to argue that compared to other methods and approaches this class set-up is more or less effective. Lacking empirical evidence, I cannot say definitively how the method described above fares in terms of language acquisition. If the student self-evaluations are any measure, the stronger communicative approach is effective for many students. Among the free comments, second only to *like class style* (35.2%) was a broad category of *improvement in skills, ability, thinking* and *usefulness in learning* (30%). The latter comments were the longest in length, the most thoughtfully written, and particularly introspective regarding the learning process:

- I think discussion is important. It is useful for the future.
- 中学や高校でも文法についてばかりでまったく会話や議論をすることがなかったのでこのクラスを通して、はじめはすごくむずかしくて大変だとおもたけど英語が上達したと実感できたのでもっとディスカッションはするべきだと感じました [Junior and senior high school were only about grammar and there was no conversation nor discussion . . . taking this class at first I thought was extremely difficult and hard. But I feel my English improved and feel we should do more discussion].

Conclusion

Literature on CLT with respect to the Japanese university context deserves further examination. There is a view that the strong version of CLT I have outlined would not be universally appropriate to all university English classrooms in Japan. The strong version of CLT has been criticized as a situation where students are flung into a conversation "as a prelude to any instruction: all subsequent teaching is based on whether they sink or swim" (Harmer, 1982, pp. 164-165). Others have argued that CLT may not be appropriate to the Japanese educational context (Li, 1998; Samimy & Kobayashi, 2004; Tanaka cited in Kavanagh, 2012). Further development and wider implementation of the method I have outlined above should take these criticisms into account.

As the final student quote reveals, many learners had never previously experienced a class built around discussion. Like others in the survey, this student was properly challenged and improved his speaking skills. I found ample evidence in the test transcripts that almost all students struggling to convey their ideas could successfully accomplished the task with the help of their partners. The survey data in this report suggests that cobuilding spontaneous dialogue with classmates helped students improve ability and left them with a higher sense of accomplishment and positive attitude toward their ability to communicate in English. Considering the nature of the language produced (Murphy 2013), it seems evident that lower proficiency students don't fail, but rather they thrive with a strong version of CLT. Many students will swim, if given the right incentive to do so, and not only because they will sink if they don't. When the focus of speaking activities and tests is on certain language structures, learners will place value on what they can memorize and recite smoothly. When they perform poorly, "I couldn't remember" is a common refrain. On the other hand, in a discussion-based activity format, there is little sense

of regret among students that anything was missed or left out. Most students follow the basic rules of making a dialogue in which statements and counter-statements are linked logically. They succeed with what they have. Particularly in the Japanese university EFL context, where getting students to speak English in the English classroom is an unending challenge, development of this method deserves further attention.

Bio Data

Martin J. Murphy is a full-time teacher at Sapporo Gakuin University. His research interests include communicative language teaching, student and teacher motivation, and Japanese history. He can be contacted at <murphsafari@yahoo.com>.

References

Boston, J. (2005). The grey zone and task-based learning. *The Language Teacher, 29*(5), 21-23.

Fellner, T. (2006). Diamond rankings: A communicative activity that involves all students. *The Language Teacher, 29*(9), 23-26.

Finocchiaro, M., & Brumfit, C. (1983). *The functional-notional approach.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gorsuch, G. (1998). *Yakudoku* EFL instruction in two Japanese high school classrooms: An exploratory study. *JALT Journal, 20*, 6-32.

Gorsuch, G. (2001). Japanese EFL teachers' perceptions of communicative, audiolingual and y*akudoku* activities: The plan versus the reality. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 9*(10), 1-27. Accessed from: http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/339

Harmer, J. (1982). What is communicative? *ELT Journal 36,* 164-168.

Hino, H. (1988). *Yakudoku:* Japan's dominant tradition in foreign language learning. *JALT Journal, 10*, 45-55.

Howatt, A. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kavanagh, B. (2012). The theory and practice of communicative language teaching in Japan. *Academic Research Journal, 2*, 730-737. Accessed from: http://www.savap.org.pk/journals/ARInt./Vol.2(2)/2012(2.2-80).pdf

Law, G. (1994). College entrance exams and team teaching in high school English classrooms. In M. Wada & T. Cominos (Eds.), *Studies in team teaching* (pp. 90-102). Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

Li, D. (1998). It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine: Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 677-703.

Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mulligan, C. (2005). No English educational reforms will be effective unless Japanese English teachers can speak and will speak English in the classroom. *The Language Teacher, 29*(5), 33-35.

Murphy, M. (2013). A stronger communicative language teaching design in university classrooms. *Otaru University of Commerce Review of Liberal Arts, 21*, 83-96.

Nishino, T. (2008). Japanese secondary school teachers' beliefs and practices regarding communicative language teaching: An exploratory survey. *JALT Journal, 30*, 27-51.

Nunan, D. (1998). *The learner-centered curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saito, Y. (2012). Translation in English language teaching in Japan. *Komaba Journal of English Education, 3*, 27-36.

Samimy, K., & Kobayashi, C. (2004). Toward the development of intercultural communicative competence: Theoretical and pedagogical implications for Japanese English teachers. *JALT Journal, 26*, 245-261.

Appendix

End of the Year 2012 Survey Results

Statement	Student responses					*n*
	5	4	3	2	1	
4. This class challenged me more than other English classes.	36.0%	52.0%	1.5%	8.6%	0.7%	
5. Speaking in class made me nervous.	6.5%	28.2%	33.3%	18.1%	13.8%	
6. I prefer the traditional teacher-centered classroom.*	2.9%	12.3%	37.7%	26.8%	20.2%	
7. This class style helped my thinking ability.	29.0%	47.1%	17.4%	5.8%	0.7%	138
8. This class style improved my confidence speaking English.	14.5%	34.1%	34.1%	15.2%	2.2%	
9. I was able to explain my ideas in English.	8.0%	24.6%	37.7%	23.9%	5.8%	
10. I enjoyed this class style.	39.9%	31.9%	21.0%	6.5%	0.7%	
11. This class style was effective.	56.1%	33.3%	5.3%	5.2%	0%	57

Note. 5 = Strongly agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly disagree; * 5 = Teacher-centered 100%; 4 = More teacher; 3 = Neutral; 2 = More student; 1 = Student / learner centered 100%