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In Taiwan, English is the most important foreign language and being proficient in English is crucial when it comes to college application as well as job hunting and career promotion. While English is learned as a foreign language in Taiwan, students are exposed to English insufficiently and it is hard for them to develop proficiency in English, especially listening and speaking skills. Although it is claimed that communicative language teaching is the major principle that the English curriculum of Taiwan adopted, there is a disconnect between what is claimed to be achieved and the outcomes of students' performance in terms of English speaking or listening proficiency.

The purposes of this project are to promote students' communicative competence and involve real language use through communicative activities. A Curriculum to Enhance Listening and Speaking Skills for 4th Graders in Taiwan is aimed to provide teachers who wish to enhance students' English listening and speaking skills with communicative lesson plans. Topics such as school life, English songs, answering the phone, ordering meals, English stories, shopping and sports are included in the lesson plans, and these topics mirror the authentic language use in the real world. The focus of
the lessons is intended to give students meaningful, contextualized and communicative language practice.
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Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

Background

In Taiwan, English is learned as a foreign language. Chinese and English belong to different language families. There are significant differences between these two languages in terms of alphabets, phonology, syntax and vocabulary. Besides, English does not appear in Taiwanese people's daily life in high frequency and there are only a few channels and programs in English on TV or in other forms of media. English newspapers and magazines are only sold in specific bookstores in big cities. Therefore, it is not easy for learners to master English. Gunderson (2009) pointed out that English as a Foreign Language (EFL) is learned in environments where the language of the community and the school was not English. EFL teachers in Taiwan found it difficult providing access and English models for their students.

In the past years, English education in Taiwan lays more emphases on the teaching and learning of formal language knowledge of English. However, there is less focus on the use of the English language for communication. From this kind of teaching model, English learners tend to have some basic knowledge of grammar, acquire some vocabulary and their reading and writing skills are at the average level. However, their oral and listening skills are not proficient and improvement needs to be made.
For years, English had been taught from grade 7 in Taiwan. It was not until 2001 that English was first introduced to the Grade 5 curriculum when the Ministry of Education in Taiwan decided to implement The Grades 1-9 Curriculum for young learners while trying to avoid a structure-based language teaching approach used to teach teenage students in the past. The emphasis of English instruction at an elementary level focuses on developing students' speaking and listening abilities in the first two years (i.e., 1st and 2nd grades). At this level, instruction on listening and speaking skills are at the rate of 80% and those on reading and writing skills are at the rate of 20%. When students are in the 3rd and 4th grades, the instruction on listening and speaking skills are at the rate of 60% and those on reading and writing skills are at the rate of 40%. As for the 5th and 6th graders, 50% of the instruction is focused on listening and speaking skills and 50% of the instruction is for reading and writing skills. There are two class sessions of English each week and each session lasts 40 minutes (Ministry of Education, 2008). Beginning in September, 2011, the Department of Education of Taipei City, which is the capital city of Taiwan, added one more English class each week for the third to sixth graders.

After students receive two years of English instruction, they are expected to recognize and write the 26 alphabet letters which include capital and lower case letters. They are also expected to recognize 35 oral production words, be able to say 22 sentences of daily life conversations and 3 simple sentence patterns. When students finish the curriculum of the 4th grade, they are expected to write 110 written production words, 55 oral production words, be able to say 45 sentences of daily life conversations and 18 simple sentence patterns. When students finish the curriculum of the 6th grade, they are
expected to write 250 written production words, 70 oral production words, be able to say 69 sentences of daily life conversations and 30 simple sentence patterns (Ministry of Education 2008).

According to the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) website, there are five levels of language proficiency in the Pre-K - 12 English Language Proficiency Standards Framework. Level 1 to Level 3 corresponds to what the guidelines of English curriculum in Taiwan expect students to achieve at the elementary level. Level 1 is the starting stage in which students primarily have limited or no understanding of English. They hardly use English for communication and as their oral comprehension increases, they begin to imitate the verbalization of others by using simple words or phrases. After that they begin to use English instinctively. Level 2 is the emerging stage in which students can understand phrases and short sentences and communicate limited information in simple everyday and routine situations by using memorized phrases and words. There are still some basic errors and they begin to use general academic vocabulary and everyday expressions. Level 3 is the developing stage in which students understand more sophisticated speech but still may need some repetition. They use English instinctively but may have difficulty expressing all their ideas because of lack of vocabulary. Students at this level speak in simple sentences, which are comprehensible and appropriate but with grammatical errors (TESOL, 2006).

There are differences between the goals of Taiwan's English curriculum and those in the Pre-K-12 English Language Proficiency Standards Framework. First of all, the goals in Taiwan's curriculum guidelines are formulaic and there is no precise description
about the expectations of students' proficiency at each level. Besides, students' proficiency of English and capability to communicate in English cannot be assessed accurately by the numbers of words and sentences they acquire.

Some problems emerged after the implementation of English instruction at the elementary level in Taiwan. One of the problems is that there is a shortage of qualified English teachers (Chang, 2007). A majority of qualified teachers teach in the urban areas while children in most of the remote areas are taught by substitute English teachers. There has been a bimodal distribution of test scores on the test of English of the Basic Competence Test for Junior High School Students, which the graduates of junior high schools take since it was implemented in 2001. Students from the urban schools outperformed those from the suburban schools (Chang et al., 2003). The average test mean scores of the students from the three major cities, Taipei, Tainan and Kaohsiung, were 36.07, 30.34 and 30.03 while the national average score was 29.94 in the academic school year of 2001-2002. However, students from three suburban counties, Taitung, Hualien and Penghu, scored 22.74, 24.51 and 25.3. Therefore, there is a gap of English proficiency between students of urban areas and those from the suburban areas.

Another major issue concerning elementary English education in Taiwan is the larger class size which is 30-35 students in one class. Many parents from better socioeconomic backgrounds eagerly send their children to after-school English language school (Chang et al., 2003). This has widened the gap between the higher achievers and the lower ones. According to a study done by Taiwan Assessment of Student Achievement (TASA) in 2010, students from better SES families did get higher scores in
English proficiency test than those from lower SES ones. The data from Pearson Correlation was 0.473 for the sixth graders and 0.482 for the eighth graders (p <.001). The results showed that there was a significant correlation existing between students' English proficiency test and their SES for the sixth and the eighth graders. This phenomenon has made it increasingly difficult for public school teachers to teach the subject as they face students with vastly different levels of English. A class of 30 students may have some students who do not know the alphabet letters while others can speak, write and read English fairly fluently.

Moreover, another problem is the limited teaching hours (Su, 2006). The two weekly English instruction hours are in fact not sufficient to ensure successful learning of English. It is difficult for teachers to teach a large size class in limited class sessions while they have to deal with classroom management as well as teach English efficiently at the same time. For students who have learned English at school for three years, they only receive 53 hours of English instruction per year. A major finding of the research done by a University of Calgary team discovered that students who take foreign language classes at school are not likely to achieve deep fluency unless they receive sufficient exposure. They also pointed out that functional bilingualism and fluency will not be achieved when students learn a second language for 95 hours per year for six years and we must have realistic expectations (Archibald et al., 2006). Therefore, it is not possible for students in Taiwan to achieve English fluency in such a limited learning time frame.

Another issue that has caused enormous concern is that the authority of Education in many cities in Taiwan have started to administer English proficiency tests at the
elementary level to make sure students obtain basic English ability in the last few years. The purposes of the tests are aimed to assess the effectiveness of English instruction and to identify students that are in need of remedial teaching (Chang, 2006). Many students are encouraged to take them to prove they are learning well (Chang, 2006). However, the tests have put parents, students and teachers under pressure (Chao, 2004). For English teachers, in order to help their students do well on the tests, they focus on teaching to the tests. Students practice tests to gain better grades, and teachers teach students how to get good grades. Under this circumstance, teachers adapt traditional teaching methods and students are asked to memorize vocabulary and grammar for the purpose of taking tests. Teachers emphasize test materials only. Students are tested more on their writing and reading ability than their listening and speaking ability on the proficiency tests. However, speaking and listening ability are important skills to develop at the elementary level (Chang, 2006). Therefore, it is important that students are provided more opportunities to cultivate their listening and speaking of English in the classroom.

Another problem that has emerged is the adaption of communicative language teaching (CLT) in the current curriculum. CLT emphasizes authenticity, interaction between teachers and students, student-centered learning and task-based activities. These essential elements helped learners to establish communicative competence (Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Littlewood, 1981; Nunan, 1991). Communicative competence was an essential concept of CLT proposed by Hymes (1972). He pointed out that language competence involved knowledge of the language as well as the ability to use it. Moreover, students' fluency and capability of communication were focused during the
teaching process and it was expected that they were able to respond to different situations appropriately by using the language while accuracy is less emphasized (Brown, 2001; Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Although communicative language teaching is the main principal that is adopted, it is found in some studies that the textbooks do not provide real communicative activities for students to enhance their English proficiency (Chen 2005; Hung, 2009). According to a study conducted by Huang (2011), the teaching activities included in the elementary English teacher's guides do not correspond to the main goal of communicative language teaching so it does not facilitate learners’ basic communicative proficiency. Furthermore, Kuo (2009) pointed out in her study that in the English textbooks at the elementary level, the proportions of the non-communicative and form-focused tasks are much higher than the communicative and meaning-focused ones. Therefore, it is hard for students to use English to communicate with others in real life.

**Statement of the Problem**

I have been teaching English at a public elementary school in Taiwan for ten years. I did not realize the problem of the disconnect between the goals of English instruction and students' learning achievement in Taiwan until my daughter's first-day school experience in the U.S. My daughter, Mia, attended elementary school as a second grader here in Sacramento after she finished her first year in elementary school in Taiwan. She had “learned” English for three years. Her formal English education at school started when she entered the first grade and before that, she learned some English
from teachers at her preschool and me. On the first day of school of Sacramento, Mia said that she could not understand 80% of what the teacher said and her speaking was not fluent enough for the teacher to understand her. Her teacher found out that her English reading and writing skills were above the second grade level. However, her speaking and listening skills needed a lot of improvement. Because of this, I discovered that there might be a disconnect between what is claimed to be achieved in the English curriculum in Taiwan and what the outcomes of students' performance in terms of English speaking or listening proficiency. This project will research what can be added to the English curriculum of elementary school in Taiwan to improve students' speaking and listening proficiency.

**Significance of the Study**

Although the Communicative Approach is adapted in the English curriculum in Taiwan, there are few authentic real life teaching materials such as video clips in which students are able to hear native speakers talk in English. Since students are not exposed to daily life conversation spoken by native English speakers, it is difficult for them to understand what people are talking about in an all-English environment. Besides, because students do not have a lot of opportunities to talk in English, it is hard for them to talk to people when they are placed in a setting where everyone speaks English. It is critical that more authentic teaching materials, activities and strategies that enhance listening and speaking skills are added in the elementary English curriculum in Taiwan.
Purpose of the Project

The intention of this project is to create teaching materials that English teachers in Taiwan can utilize to help students to develop listening and speaking skills based on the principle of communicative language teaching. The target population of this project will be the fourth grade classes in Taiwan. The purpose of this study is to provide activities for teachers to use in the classrooms as supplementary teaching materials which aim to expose students to authentic English communication situations in daily life.

Theoretical Basis of the Study

Chomsky (1965) introduced the notion of language “competence” to mean the shared knowledge in “an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech community” (p. 3). That was to say, a language's user was able to use such knowledge to understand and produce sentences. On the other hand, according to Chomsky (1965), “performance” is related to the process of applying the knowledge to the actual language use. However, Hymes (1972) suggested that Chomsky's view of competence was too limited and introduced the notion of “communicative competence” to cover the knowledge that a fluent speaker of a language must have for understanding and producing contextually comprehensible and appropriate utterances in a language.

Littlewood (1981) stated that communicative language teaching (CLT) attended to aspects of function and structure of language. Nunan (1991) pointed out five features of CLT: (1) communicating through interaction in second language (L2) was emphasized; (2) authentic texts were introduced into the learning situation; (3) The learning process as
well as the language were to be focused by the learners; (4) learners' own personal experiences were to be enhanced and these helped learning in the classroom; and (5) the importance of connection between in-class activities and real-life experiences was emphasized. The concept of CLT is important for creating this project because the purpose is to enhance students' communicative competence.

Definitions of Terms

*Communicative Activity* = A pair or group work activity that involves the handling of a limited number of structures but which allows for authentic information exchange (Nunan, 2004).

*Communicative Competence* = The ability to manipulate linguistic, interpersonal and sociocultural knowledge efficiently for communicative purposes (Nunan, 2004).

*Communicative Language Teaching* (CLT) = An approach of language teaching which aims on helping learners meaningfully communicate in the target language (Nunan, 2004).

*English as a Foreign Language* (EFL) = A traditional term for the use or study of the English language by non-native speakers in countries where English is generally not a local medium of communication.

*Task-based Language Teaching* = An approach to language teaching organized around tasks rather than language structures.
**Organization of the Project**

This project contains four chapters. Chapter 1 is an introduction to this project and includes background, statement of the problem, significance of the study, purpose of the project, theoretical basis of the study, definition of terms and organization of the project. Chapter 2 is a review of relevant literature on the issue of communicative language teaching and second language acquisition and justify why this research is crucial for this project. Chapter 3 contains the methodology utilized to create the project. Chapter 4 contains discussion of the project, recommendations, limitations and conclusion. The Appendix contains the project. The final section includes references that were used in writing this project.
Chapter 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

The topics in this literature review are focused on studies regarding learning and teaching English as a foreign language (EFL). The intention of this literature review is to give an overview of research how EFL students develop target language proficiency and the appropriate teaching methodology to enhance students' listening and speaking skills. The following topics will be covered: communicative language teaching (CLT) and second language acquisition research, which includes Krashen's input hypothesis, as well as Swain's output hypothesis.

Communicative language teaching

Since the emergence of communicative language teaching (CLT) in the 1970s, it has been popularly applied in English teaching because it is viewed as a diversion from more structure-based methodologies (Hadley, 2001; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Richards and Rodgers (1988) defined CLT as “a theory of language teaching that starts from a communicative model of language and language use, and that seeks to translate this into a design for an instructional system, for materials, for teacher and learner roles and behaviors, and for classroom activities and techniques” (p. 69). Lightbown and Spada (1999) also pointed out that CLT is based on the hypothesis that successful language learning requires knowledge of structures and forms of a language as well as the functions and purposes that a language works in different communicative settings. That is to say, language is a tool for communication rather than a subject of knowledge that is
learned only in the classroom, and should be related to contexts outside the classroom. Furthermore, Brown (2007) offered his definition of CLT as “an approach to language teaching methodology that emphasizes authenticity, interaction, student-centered learning, task based activities, and communication for the real world, meaningful purposes” (p. 378).

There were a strong and a weak version of CLT and distinctions were made between these two. Halliday (1994) pointed out that the differences between weak and strong CLT were distinguished in terms of the focus and lesson input. In weak CLT, learners learned to use English. In addition, the focus was on the practice of language use along with lesson input. The language model was presented under a situation and learners were asked to practice the language item in a communicative activity. Littlewood (1984) also suggested that weak CLT was based on a skill-learning model. In this model, practicing, which served as a way to establish learners' communicative skills, was highly emphasized. Besides, the teaching procedure, PPP (Present-Practice-Procedure), was applied in this model. In the presentation stage of PPP, teachers presented new language items for learners to understand and perceive them. Then, the items were practiced and learners were expected to pick them up in the practicing stage. Finally, learners were given a chance to produce the new item in real situations. Willis (1996) claimed that “PPP provides discrete language items in a vacuum and then looks for some activity to practice them” (p. 137).

In contrast, according to Halliday (1994), in strong CLT, the target language was acquired through communication and the focus was on learning how a language works in
a discourse which was considered as input. The language data in the text was the input in the lesson. In addition, Ellis (2003) claimed that in strong CLT, instead of first acquiring language as a structural system and then learning how to use the system in communication, learners actually discovered the system itself during the process of learning. Learners were provided with opportunities in which they experienced how language was used in communication. He also proposed that task-based language teaching was one of the teaching methods that constituted a strong version of CLT. Tasks functioned as a useful tool for “planning a communicative curriculum, particularly in context where there are few opportunities for more authentic communicative experiences, for example, many FL situations” (p. 30).

Moreover, Brown (2007) also provided four interconnected characteristics of CLT:

1. Classroom goals are focused on all the components of communicative competence (CC) and not restricted to grammatical or linguistic competence.

2. Language techniques are designed to engage learners in the pragmatic, authentic, functional use of language for meaningful purposes. Organizational language forms are not the central focus but rather aspects of language that enable the learner to accomplish those purposes.

3. Fluency and accuracy are seen as complimentary principles underlying communicative techniques. At times fluency may have to take on more importance than accuracy in order to keep learners meaningfully engaged in language use.
4. In the communicative classrooms, students ultimately have to use the language, productively and receptively, in unrehearsed contexts (Brown, 2007, p. 241).

While immersion as a method incorporates a CLT approach, research indicates that caution must be used in its implementation. McMillan and Rivers (2011) conducted a study in which an attitudinal survey of 29 native-English speaker teachers at a Japanese university was documented. In this university, the target language being used exclusively was the official policy in order to promote the best foreign language learning environment. However, results suggested that many teachers believed that using students' L1 selectively could promote L2 learning in various ways within a communicative framework. For novice students whose English proficiency was not high enough to understand teachers' lectures or carry out tasks in class, students could benefit from using L1 in judicious ways.

McMillan and Rivers (2011) pointed out that it would be best for teachers and students to determine what made up optimal use of the target language and the L1 based on the immediate context of the classroom. In other words, when students' proficiency levels and difficulty of the task were taken into account, teachers could decide when students were allowed to use L1 selectively. The participants in this study were only 29 teachers and the survey only asked three questions, which included their attitudes toward teacher L1 use and student L1 use and their beliefs about speaking English only was required when communicative approach was adapted in an EFL classroom. More participants, a more detailed survey, interviews with teachers and classroom observation
were needed to provide more profound ideas about what teachers and students actually did in the classroom and how the use of L1 helped them with L2 learning.

Carless (2004) also conducted a study on immersion research which investigated the implementation of a task-based innovation in three primary school classrooms in Hong Kong. For English curriculum, task-based approach was a significant component. Classroom observation and interview data were analyzed and showed how the case study teachers reinterpreted a new curriculum with their own beliefs and the practical challenges occurring in their school contexts. Three problematic issues were highlighted when the tasks were implemented: use of the mother tongue, classroom management, and the quantity of target language produced.

First, Carless categorized the teachers' views on the reasons why ESL/EFL students used L1 as follows: limited English proficiency, to facilitate the activity when it was too complicated, to express their feelings, to argue or complain, and laziness. In terms of classroom management, teachers had a hard time maintaining a quiet and orderly classroom which was Asian's school culture while they tried to carry out oral English tasks in which students were in need of more freedom to talk. Moreover, regarding the production of the target language, some tasks only enabled a few students to use the target language. There were also some tasks which were irrelevant to language production such as coloring or making arts and crafts. Carless' study only focused on teachers' perspectives about the problems occurring in the classroom. Learners' age and proficiency levels were not taken into account.
Similarly, Li and Baldauf (2011) conducted a study investigating the relationship between the national English education policy and its implementation at primary and secondary school classrooms in China by analyzing the data from interviews with 73 English teachers. The 2001 national English language curriculum of China focused on promoting the quality of students' competence through task-based, learner-centered and CLT. The results of this study showed that changing the curriculum to a more communicative one does not provide a solution to effective language problems and there was a gap between the curriculum policy and practical teaching situations. First of all, teachers found that the new textbooks were too difficult for students to learn from and for teachers to use. Second, training for implementing the new curriculum was reported ineffective and some teachers were not confident in carrying out CLT with limited knowledge of CLT and English proficiency. Third, although the new English curriculum emphasized on improving students' communicative competence, the educational system still remained examination-oriented. The results indicated that empowering in-service teachers in policy making may hold them accountable and help the national language curriculum be more implementable.

Li and Baldauf's study also suggested that the new curriculum was doomed to fail because there were no changes for the examination-oriented educational systems and effective teacher training on CLT. However, the perspective from the authority and policy makers was not included in the study. It would be a more complete study if it included the survey from the members of the educational authority.
One type of CLT that had become popular was content-based instruction (CBI) in which the target language was a tool for learning subject matter that learners were interested in. Besides, CBI supported contextualized learning in which learners were taught useful language that was embedded within relevant discourse contexts. Spada and Lightbown (2008) did a review on form-focused instruction (FFI) and identified two types of FFI, isolated and integrated. Isolated FFI was provided in activities that were taken out from the communicative use of language, but were still carried out in CBI and CLT. Isolated FFI may be taught for preparing for a communicative activity or after an activity in which students had difficulty with a particular language form. On the other hand, in integrated FFI, the learners' attention to language forms was carried out during CBI or CLT. Spada and Lightbown examined the role of both kinds of FFI based on characteristics of the learners, learning environments, and language items.

It was suggested that isolated FFI was useful under these conditions: L1 had a strong influence on L2 form; to help learners to notice some frequent occurring language forms that were hard to sense in oral input; and to assist students to learn language forms that were rare in the language they were exposed. As for integrated FFI, it might be more suitable for these language forms: language features that were more complicated and the rules were harder to explain; language features that errors were more possibly to lead to communication failure; and to promote improvement of comprehension and production.

In conclusion, Spada and Lightbown (2008) suggested that both integrated and isolated FFI played a role in CLT and CBI in different ways. Integrated FFI helped learners to acquire abundant language features when they were engaged in meaningful learning
during CLT and CBI while isolated FFI was useful in helping to acquire some language features which were difficult to perceive in communicative activities.

This study helped teachers to think more deeply about what was the better way to introduce certain language forms and students might benefit from different ways of learning language when it is presented in meaningful and communicative activities.

Second language acquisition research

The Acquisition-learning Hypothesis

Krashen (1982) claimed in his acquisition-learning hypothesis that there were two means for adult second language learners to develop competence; one was acquisition and the other was learning. Acquisition referred to a natural and unconscious process of acquiring the target language which was like children developing their first language. Learners developed proficiency when they understood the target language and used it for meaningful communication. By contrast, learning was defined as a conscious process in which learners were attentive to forms and rules of the target language. According to Krashen, learning could not make acquisition happen. It was suggested that in order to achieve communicative competence, learners should acquire as much as they could. Krashen's acquisition-learning hypothesis corresponded to his comprehensible input hypothesis which suggested that language acquisition only occurred when the input of the target language was understood by the learners.
The Monitor Model

The monitor hypothesis asserted that when learners communicated in the target language, their acquired linguistic system acted as a monitor. In other words, learners depended on their learned knowledge to check and correct their output. However, the learned system only functioned as a monitor and Krashen (1982) claimed that there were three conditions to be met in order to use the monitor successfully.

a. Time: Acquirers were given sufficient time to use the monitor to pick up a learned rule and apply it when producing output.

b. Focus: Acquirers were supposed to focus on the form of the output.

c. Knowledge: Acquirers needed to have the knowledge of rules first and then they were able to use the monitor.

The Natural Order Hypothesis

The natural order hypothesis suggested that second language learners acquired grammatical structures in a predictable or natural order. Brown (1973) claimed that in first language acquisition of English, some particular grammatical rules or morphemes were acquired before others, and such a natural order was found in second language acquisition as well (de Villiers & de Villiers, 1973). Second language learners produced similar errors during the process no matter what their first language was.
The Input (Comprehension) Hypothesis

Krashen (1982) proposed the input hypothesis which defined the relationship between the input that learners were exposed to and language acquisition. He claimed that “comprehending messages is the only way language is acquired” (Krashen, 2003, p. 333). He suggested that comprehensible input was the key to successful second language acquisition and acquirers were able to progress from stage i, their current level of competence, to stage i+1, the higher stage right after stage i, when receiving input of stage i+1. In other words, by understanding input that was slightly beyond their level, learners acquired language best. Moreover, he claimed that by using “context,” which included learners' “previously acquired linguistic competence” and “extra-linguistic knowledge”, learners were able to achieve understanding input that was beyond their current level. Furthermore, according to Krashen, when learners were exposed to enough comprehensible input, speaking came along as a result of language acquisition. That is to say, speaking fluently was not able to be taught directly. Only after learners built up linguistic competence by comprehending input were they able to speak fluently.

The Affective Filter Hypothesis

The affective filter hypothesis claimed that language acquisition occurred when learners had low anxiety, self-confidence and motivation. Firstly, low individual anxiety and low classroom anxiety is better to ensure the success of second language acquisition. Secondly, learners with self-confidence had a better chance to succeed in second language acquisition. Lastly, learners who had high motivation usually did better in
language acquisition. Krashen (1982) argued that comprehensible input alone did not promise language acquisition. Learners with low affective filters were more likely to be receptive to the input they get and interacted confidently at the same time. Only when learners were receptive to the input were they able to acquire the target language. For the purpose of lowering the affective filter and creating a low-anxiety classroom, it was important that instead of focusing on form, meaningful communicative activities and interesting input were presented in the classrooms.

There has been some research that focused on Krashen’s second language hypothesis. For example, Trottier (2008) did research on English Villages (EVs) to reply to criticism of Krashen (2006), who opposed the establishment of these EVs. Trottier pointed out that due to the increasing number of Korean school-aged children migration, which was related to English education, educational policy makers were prompted to develop alternative sources of EFL instruction in Korea. In response, the development of some EVs served as an alternative to overseas English immersion. But reaction to the English village phenomenon has been mixed, with some questioning the efficiency of such programs to help students with their English proficiency. Krashen (2006) criticized English villages, saying they were nothing but artificial learning environments and the resident teachers were not able to provide authentic real life conditions. Besides, Krashen argued that it was not appropriate to develop EVs while no formal evaluations had been done to assess their viability. Trottier argued that Krashen's arguments contradicted his own theories and disregarded EVs' attempts to reconstruct Korean's EFL theories to meet the challenges of increasing globalization. Trottier argued that the instructional text used
in EVs had topics such as weather forecasts, news reports, as well as multicultural recipes that were authentic and communicative and in fact, there were few studies being conducted but mostly were aimed at instructional perspectives and visitor satisfaction. Trottier also claimed that EVs provided not only an immersion program for students of Korea to increase English proficiency but also a multicultural experience to improve their understanding of the world.

This study provided some valuable insights about how EVs created near authentic environments where students could increase their English proficiency. However, there were only a few studies done about EVs and most of them only focused on the visitor satisfactory surveys. No empirical studies have been done regarding the issue of the viability of the EVs which was originally designed as an alternative to overseas immersion programs.

LeLoup and Ponterio (2005) examined two websites in their research in which comprehensible input was provided for English learners, with follow-up activities given for learners to practice their oral output. Oral language proficiency was the skill that language learners would use most frequently so it must be focused and developed along with the other language skills which include reading, writing, and listening. National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project (2006) supported the idea that within the goal of communication that the four skills should be developed. Oral language skills will be able to be developed when comprehensible input (CI) and social interaction were involved (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005). The first website examined in this study was *Randall’s ESL Cyber Listening Lab* which provided many audio files on various topics.
and these files were divided into three levels which include “easy,” “medium,” and “difficult” for teachers or self-learners to choose from. Each audio file included pre-listening activities to help learners to get to know the topic and post-listening to check comprehension. Besides, expansion speaking activities were provided for learners such as paired discussion. The other website was *Breaking News English* which provided breaking news audio files for learners to listen to and discuss information with others.

Some of the topics at the easy level in the website of *Randall's ESL Cyber Listening Lab* are age appropriate for the fourth graders in Taiwan. It provides comprehensible input and follow up activities which request students to discuss and express their ideas or feelings which correspond to the first standard in the goal of communication of the Standards for Foreign Language Learning in The 21st Century, which suggests that “students engage in conversations, provide and obtain information, express feelings and emotions, and exchange opinions” (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, 2006, p. 9). The pre-listening and post-listening activities are really helpful for improving learners' listening and speaking skills.

This website did provide some meaningful and interesting comprehensible input which give students access to the tools on the internet and helps them to develop their language skills. However, what is lacking in this article is empirical research to show how the activities on this website help to increase L2 acquisition.
Swain's Output Hypothesis

Krashen's comprehensible input hypothesis may not be sufficient to ensure second language acquisition and that it was not possible to acquire a language when learners kept silent (Macaro, 2003). Thus, Swain (1985, 1993, 1995, 1998, 2000, 2007) proposed the output hypothesis in which she emphasized the important role that output played in second language learning, and she suggested that producing language gave learners the opportunity for “meaningful practice” by using their language knowledge. Fluency was gained when learners used the language frequently and teachers were supposed to provide as many opportunities as possible for students to speak in class. There were three functions of output in second language learning: (a) noticing, (b) hypothesis formulation and testing, and (c) metalinguistic function and syntactic processing.

First of all, output was assumed to stimulate three types of noticing which included noticing a new form, a gap and a hole (Swain, 1995, 1998). As for noticing a new form, learners just noticed it in second language (L2) acquisition because of the frequent occurrence or significance of the language features. When noticing a gap, learners noticed that the form of the target language was different from their mother tongue. Swain (1993) pointed out three responses that learners might have when they recognized a gap: (a) neglect it; (b) look for their existing linguistic knowledge to narrow the gap; (c) recognize the gap and take notice of related input (p. 159).

As for noticing a hole, it referred to the point that learners noticed that there was something that they cannot say accurately in the target language. When noticing holes in their knowledge of linguistics, it was found that learners tried to fill them by looking up a
dictionary or book of grammar; by asking questions of their teachers or peers; or by reminding themselves to be attentive to similar input in the future. Moreover, when learners noticed a hole or a gap, these actions helped learners to recognize their linguistic problems and their attention were led to language forms they were not familiar with or they did not understand well enough (Swain, 2000).

Second, hypothesis formulation and testing referred to the process in which learners tried out new language forms and structures, which were hypotheses, by using their outputs to express their intended message. When producing language, the opportunity for trying out various expressions was provided. Output was used to test what worked and what did not work. When feedback from an external resource was not available, learners could only test their hypotheses by using their own internal knowledge. It was pointed out that feedback might be valuable some of the time when students tested out their hypotheses. However, when feedback was available, learners would modify their output by different ways such as confirmation check or clarification request (Swain, 1998). During this process, construction of linguistic knowledge was completed and learners were “engaged in knowledge building” (Swain, 2000, p. 102).

Finally, Swain (1998) identified metalinguistic as the third function of output in which she suggested that “learners used language to reflect on language use” (p. 68). Swain argued that in an extremely context-sensitive situation, this metatalk helped deepen learners’ awareness of forms and linguistic rules and assist them to realize the relationship between meanings forms and functions. Besides, it must occur in context where “making meaning” was emphasized (p. 69).
In order to support the position of language that served as a communicative as well as a cognitive tool, Swain and Lapkin (1998) conducted a larger study involving four grade 8 French immersion classes and each received a different task. The data analyzed in this article was from one of the classes of 35 students. This class was assigned a jigsaw task. The research lasted 5 weeks. In week 1, students were given a pretest. In week 2, students were familiarized with the jigsaw task. In week 3, students were given a mini lesson about what they were supposed to do when given the task. After that, students were paired up and each got half of a set of pictures that were numbered. They were asked to develop a story together according to the pictures they had and to write it out. Students were recorded while they were doing the task. In week 4, the tapes were transcripted and in week 5, a posttest was administered.

Dialogue between the student pairs for working out the task suggested that using dialogue helped them to “co-construct the language they need to express the meaning they want and to construct knowledge about language” (Swain & Lapkin, 1998, p. 333). It was evident that dialogue served as a way for the students to communicate with each other as well as “a cognitive tool” (p. 320) to enhance their L2 learning. It was found that output played a role in language learning because it initiated responses from others and these responses helped learners to modify their output (1998). She claimed that just speaking and writing was not enough for language proficiency. Learners were to be pushed to “perform their competence” (p. 161) and that was to say that they needed to go over their output and figure out ways to modify it to improve accuracy and suitability. This can be achieved by “teacher-led and collaboratively structured sessions” (p. 161).
However, the participants in this study were grade 8 students from an immersion program whose L2 level were much higher than the participants in this project who are 4th graders and will learn English as a foreign language. Nevertheless this kind of collaborative activity was still valuable in L2 learning because the pair learned from each other and completed the task in which one might not have been able to figure out by oneself.

Aiming to clarify the possible roles of output practice in L2 acquisition, Muranoi (2007) wrote an article reviewing studies on L2 output and suggested the importance of giving learners opportunities to produce the target language as a way to facilitate communication in L2. In the first part of the research, she examined cognitive processes of L2 production based on psycholinguistic models which included Levelt's language production model; Swain's output hypothesis and Anderson's skill acquisition theory. In the second half of the article, she reviewed four bodies of research of the effects of output: studies comparing comprehension and production practice, studies of output practice through text recognition and writing, studies of output practice through interaction, and studies of output practice through communication tasks. Muranoi claimed that by understanding the cognitive processes which occurred in L2 production allowed a better construction of output practice. Besides, empirical studies were reviewed which showed the effects of output practice. In the conclusion, it was suggested that output practice was crucial for establishing L2 learners' communicative competence.

Out of the various empirical studies of the effects of output practice, output practice through text reconstruction and of communication tasks helped with planning this project. Kowal and Swain (1994) conducted a study which presented data of 13 and
14 year-old intermediate and advanced French learners completing a text reconstruction task collaboratively. This process was called “dictogloss” which gave learners opportunities to produce in L2. In the process of “dictogloss,” learners listened to a short but condensed text and had to write down words and phrases that they identified. Then they worked in small groups to restore the text by sharing information with one another. The findings suggested that learners were given opportunities to contemplate the sentence and looked for a solution by trying out possibilities and using their prior linguistic knowledge to work out the story. This activity could possibly give students the opportunity to improve their listening and speaking skills. However, though the important role of output practice have been identified, little was known about how much practice learners of L2 need in order to acquire a specific form.

Besides, tasked-based instruction has been recognized as a greater way to provide opportunities for learners to negotiate meaning than traditional teaching. DeKeyser (2001) suggested that by being given communication tasks, learners were exposed to meaningful practice and their accuracy in production will be well developed. In Taiwan, it was claimed that a communicative language teaching approach was the main focus for English education and textbooks were designed to develop students' communicative competence. However, according to a study conducted by Lee and Chang (2011), it was found that learning activities geared toward authentic communication were lacking in the textbook. Lee and Chang's study explored the designs of speaking activities used in English textbooks of junior high schools in Taiwan and China. The study was carried out by using content analysis with three raters' participation and two textbook series that were
selected to be analyzed. Two of the raters were qualified junior high school English teachers with more than three years of teaching experience, and the last rater was one of the researchers. A total of 463 speaking activities were analyzed in the textbooks of Taiwan and 513 were examined in the textbooks of China. It was found that most of the speaking activities from the textbooks of Taiwan were drills that were usually mechanical exercises and helped students to master some basic forms of the target language. It was indicated that most of the emphases were laid on helping students learn the basic forms of knowledge without providing communicative activities for students to develop communicative competence. Lee and Chang suggested that teachers were supposed to take advantage of their positions to provide more communication-orientated speaking activities when the textbooks failed to do so.

Mackey (2007) conducted a study which described in detail the development of the Interaction Hypothesis and four interaction processes which included negotiation for meaning, the provision of feedback, the production of modified output and cognitive factors. She also pointed out that interaction had a huge impact on L2 learning and indicated how this research can be applied to the classroom. The findings from Mackey's interaction research showed that when learners were provided with opportunities to “negotiate for comprehensible input, receive feedback, and modify their outputs” (p. 100), the outcomes were tremendous. Besides, the role of instructors was important in task-based interaction.

In order to indicate the importance of comprehensible input and output, Carrier (2006) identified Multiple Modes of Input and Output (MMIO) as an effective approach
that teachers needed to use teaching techniques that are less dependent on oral and written English in order to make content comprehensible and assessment possible for their English Language Learners (ELLs), particularly for junior and senior high school students who were learning concepts more abstract and language more academic. Carrier suggested techniques that were less language reliant including real life objects, pictures, demonstrations, movement, gestures, graphic organizers, multimedia, and physical activities. Presenting information through these multiple modes of input provided more opportunities for ELLs to comprehend the input, and also to make connections between English vocabulary, sentence structures, and the concepts being presented.

The first step in using MMIO is to select the key concepts for the lesson. The next step is to ensure that these key concepts are presented during classroom instruction in various and illustrative ways. The final step in using the MMIO approach is to create assessment opportunities that allow ELLs to demonstrate what they have learned. In conclusion, Carrier suggested that using the MMIO approach to demonstrate key concepts in multiple ways that were less language dependent helped teachers make instruction more accessible for their ELLs, providing opportunities to assess students’ progress, and promote English language development.

Although Carrier's study was aiming on helping ELLs in the United States, some characteristics from MMIO will be suitable to implement in the EFL classroom. For example, using real objects and other visual aids help learners to understand the concepts of the target language.
Summary

In this chapter, there were two areas that were discussed and examined. The two areas were communicative language teaching, and second language acquisition which focused on Kranshen's input hypothesis and Swain's output hypothesis. The key findings from this literature review show that selective use of L1 helps to promote L2 learning in a communicative framework and it is important to use communicative tasks that are encouraging more L2 production. Other major findings are that oral language skills will be improved when comprehensible input and social interaction are involved. It is also important to note that learning activities that promote authentic communication are not sufficient in Taiwan's textbooks and it is critical for teachers to provide more opportunities for students to engage in communication-orientated activities.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This project is designed for teachers who wish to enhance students' English listening and speaking skills in Taiwan, which is a non-English-speaking country. The target students for this project are fourth graders who have received formal education of English as a foreign language at school for three years. They received 254 hours of English instruction in the three years and they are at the beginning level. The lesson units that will be presented in this project are aimed at improving students' listening and speaking competence through communicative activities.

The purpose of adopting CLT in the lesson units is because it emphasizes learning to communicate through interaction in the target language and authentic activities are introduced in the learning environment. Students' L1 is Mandarin Chinese and it will be used selectively based on the immediate context of the classroom. CLT attempts to link classroom language learning with language activities outside the classroom, which is exactly what is lacking in the current English curriculum in Taiwan.

Settings and Participants

The project was created for teachers who intend to help their 4th graders to enhance their English listening and speaking skills. In Taiwan, English is learned as a foreign language and learners do not have many opportunities to hear English or practice speaking English in daily life. In elementary school, students have three English class sessions each week and each class is 40 minutes. With limited class hours and insufficient
exposure to English, it is hard for students to develop proficiency in English, especially listening and speaking skills. Besides, though it is claimed that communicative language teaching is the major principle that the English curriculum of Taiwan adopted, students are still not able to communicate fluently in English. This project will help teachers to enhance students' communicative competence in the aspects of listening and speaking.

**Steps Taken to Design the Project**

The project was designed to increase elementary students' communicative competence in Taiwan. My seven-year-old daughter's first-day school experience in California motivated the production of this project. Before coming to California, she had learned English for three years. However, she came home and felt frustrated after the first day of school because she did not understand most of the lectures and had a hard time communicating with the teacher and classmates. The problem was that what she learned at school in Taiwan did not help her to communicate and interact with other people in real life. That was the first time I realized that the current English curriculum in Taiwan failed to prepare students to engage in real communication. Therefore, this project will be created to fill the gap of the current English curriculum in Taiwan and its goal is to enhance students' listening and speaking competence.

After reviewing the research on CLT, Krashen's input hypothesis and Swain's output hypothesis, it became evident the curriculum would be created specifically for promoting learning through real communication activities. It was found that the
guidelines of the English Curriculum for elementary schools in Taiwan were not helping to promote students' communicative competence. After looking up Taiwan's elementary school English curriculum framework, I came up with this chart that critiqued the Taiwanese curriculum framework from a CLT perspective.

Table 1. Critique of Taiwan's Elementary School English Curriculum Framework from CLT Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taiwan's Elementary School English Curriculum Framework: Competence Indicators of Listening and Speaking from Department of Education of Taipei City (2010)</th>
<th>Critique from CLT Perspective, Focusing on Listening &amp; Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differentiate the phonetics differences</td>
<td>Learning is only focused on the forms of language, and the forms are learned under de-contextualized conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be able to know the stress in phrases and sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be able to know the different intonation between a question and a sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say simple sentence with correct intonation and stress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the meanings of the vocabulary for the 3rd and 4th grade (See table 2)</td>
<td>Language is practiced by being attentive to partial meaning. The guidelines showed that students are asked to memorize vocabulary and sentence patterns solely without learning them in context. Besides, there is complete control of learners' responses and students might be able to ask and answer questions accurately without understanding the meaning. Students do not communicate with others by using new messages. Students are not put in real life scenarios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be able to produce the vocabulary for the 3rd and 4th grade correctly (See table 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand daily life conversation and basic sentences and patterns (See table 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use daily life conversation in real life (See table 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be able to ask and answer questions by using basic sentences and patterns (See table 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand easy chants and songs</td>
<td>By learning songs and chants or listening to stories as well as watching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be able to sing songs and chants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan's Elementary School English Curriculum Framework: Competence Indicators of Listening and Speaking from Department of Education of Taipei City (2010)</td>
<td>Critique from CLT Perspective, Focusing on Listening &amp; Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand stories and plays accompanying with visual aids</td>
<td>plays may promote students' listening and speaking competence. However, some follow-up activities should be added to provide opportunities for students to use the language forms they learned in the songs and plays to communicate with others in real life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be able to introduce oneself</td>
<td>It will be a more communicative activity if there are follow-up activities such as students talk to or about their classmates after self-introduction, or an information-gap activity to make sure there is comprehensible input and output production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice English in life when there is a chance</td>
<td>Lightbown and Spada (1999) pointed out that CLT is based on the hypothesis that by achieving successful language learning, knowledge of structures and forms of a language as well as the functions and purposes that a language works are required in different communicative settings. In other words, language is not a subject of knowledge that is learned only in the classroom, but a tool for communication, and should be related to contexts outside the classroom. In the communicative classrooms, students ultimately have to use the language, productively and receptively, in unrehearsed contexts. However, English is learned as a foreign language in Taiwan, and there are not many chances for students to use English in real life. Students should be provided more opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 1, we can see that although it is claimed in the guidelines of elementary English curriculum that communicative language teaching is the main teaching methodology, it fails to engage students in authentic use of English for meaningful purpose.

Table 2 is the chart of vocabulary which the Department of Education of Taipei City (2010) requires the fourth graders to memorize. However, memorizing vocabulary does not help them to achieve communicative competence. Being able to spell the vocabulary does not get them ready to use English competently for authentic communication. Therefore, classroom tasks that prepare students with the skills for communication in real-life context are what need to be included in this project.

### Table 2. Vocabulary for the 4th graders
From Department of Education of Taipei City (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Words that are underlined are written production words which students have to know how to spell.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>boy, girl, kid (3) student, teacher, doctor, friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>dad, father, mom, mother, brother, sister (6) grandma, grandpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Drinks</td>
<td>egg, apple, cake, banana, milk, rice, tea, water, cook (9) orange, juice, hamburger, ice cream, pizza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colors</td>
<td>blue, green, red, yellow, color (5) black, white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>ball, bag, book, box, pencil, desk, door, marker, pen, table (10) chair, eraser, ruler, window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>bird, cat, cow, dog, fish, pig (6) bear, monkey, lion, rabbit, tiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places &amp; Locations</td>
<td>zoo, home, park, school (4) bookstore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>cup, fan, key (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten (10) eleven, twelve, many, much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts of the Body</td>
<td>head, eye, nose, ear, hand, arm, leg, foot, face (9) mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics</td>
<td>old, short, tall (3) thin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather &amp; Nature</td>
<td>cold, cool, hot, warm (4) cloudy, rainy, sunny, windy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, time, day, week, year, now, today (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td>I, it, my, you, he, she, they, we (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH-words</td>
<td>what, how, who, where (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be &amp; Auxiliaries</td>
<td>be(am, are, is), do(does), can (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles &amp; Determiners</td>
<td>a(an), this, that, the (4) these, those</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>cry, dance, jump, like, read, sing (6) draw, sleep, swim, want, write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepositions</td>
<td>at, in, on, under (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Nouns</td>
<td>yo-yo, kite, name (3) o’clock, weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Adverbs</td>
<td>no, not, yes (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>big, small, long (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 is the chart of daily conversation and basic sentences and patterns from Curriculum Guidelines of Elementary English Language Teaching and Learning (2010) which fourth graders are expected to learn. For students, English is learned as a subject and discrete linguistic items are practiced, memorized and repeated. Intensive drills for memorizing and repeating sentence patterns are emphasized and students do not learn to use English appropriately for real communication.

Table 3. Daily Life Conversation & Basic Sentences and Patterns for the 4th Graders from Department of Education of Taipei City (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily life conversation</th>
<th>Basic sentences and patterns (Word that are bold face can be replaced according to what students have learned or the context)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are you ready? (Yes/No)</td>
<td>1. This is my <em>book</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Circle the word “<em>fish.</em>”</td>
<td>3. What’s this?/What’s that?/What is it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Go back to your seat, (please).</td>
<td>4. a. I am <em>tall.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Good job/very good.</td>
<td>b. He/She is <em>tall.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Good morning, <em>Ms. Wang.</em></td>
<td>5. a. What are these/those? They are tigers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Good afternoon, <em>Mr. Lee.</em></td>
<td>b. Are these/those <em>bears</em>? Yes, they are./No, they aren’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Goodbye/Bye.</td>
<td>6. a. Are you a <em>teacher</em>? Yes, I am./No, I’m not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hi!/Hello!</td>
<td>b. Is he/she a <em>doctor</em>? Yes, he/she is./No, he/she isn’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How are you?</td>
<td>7. a. Is it/this/that a <em>banana/an apple</em>? Yes, it is./No, it isn’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I’m fine/I’m (not) O.K.</td>
<td>8. a. Can you <em>dance</em>? Yes, I can. / No, I can’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Listen!/Listen to me!/Listen carefully!</td>
<td>b. Can he/she <em>dance</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Look!/Look here!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Point to the word “<em>fish.</em>”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Raise your hand (, please).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Put your hand down (, please).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Repeat./Repeat after me (, please).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Sit down (, please).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Stand up (, please).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Take out/Put away your book./</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily life conversation</td>
<td>Basic sentences and patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Take it out./Put it away.</td>
<td>Yes, he/she can./No, he/she can’t.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 24. Thank you. | 9. a. What are you doing (now)?
| 26. Any questions? | b. What is he/she doing? He/She is singing. |
| 27. Come in (please). | 10. Who’s he/she? He/She is my teacher. |
| 28. Don’t talk/run/shout. | 11. a. How old are you? I am eight year(s) old. |
| 29. Excuse me. | b. How old is he/she? He/She is ten year(s) old. |
| Good idea. | 12. a. Where is the pen? It’s in/on/under the box. |
| 30. (I’m O.K.) How about you? | b. Where are the books? They’re in/on/under the desk. |
| 31. It’s your turn. | 13. a. Where are you? I’m in the park/at school. |
| 32. I’m sorry. | b. Where is he/she? He/She is in the park/ at school. |
| 33. Let’s go. | 14. a. What time is it? It’s one (o’clock). |
| 34. Let’s read/count (together). | b. Is it four (o’clock)? Yes, it is./No, it isn’t. |
| 35. Line up (please). | 15. a. What day is today? It’s Sunday. |
| 36. May I go to the bathroom/restroom? | b. Is it Monday today? Yes, it is./No, it isn’t. |
| 37. Please turn to page 12. | 16. How’s the weather? It’s sunny. |
| 38. Put down/Pick up your pencil./ | 17. a. How many pencils (are there)? (There are) three. |
| 40. See you./See you later. | 18. How much is it? It’s five dollars. |
| 41. Show me your homework (please). | 42. Sorry, I don’t know. |
| 43. Spell the word “book.” | 43. Spell the word “book.” |
| 44. Time’s up. | 44. Time’s up. |
| 45. Turn on/off the light (please). | 45. Turn on/off the light (please). |
| 46. Which one (do you like)? | 46. Which one (do you like)? |
| 47. Who’s next? | 47. Who’s next? |
| 48. Write down the word/sentence (please). | 48. Write down the word/sentence (please). |
In tables 1, 2 and 3, it is found that communicative competence is not able to be developed when students are only asked to memorize vocabulary and sentence patterns. It is crucial that students are given communicative tasks which involve them to use English actively for communication purpose and this is the main goal of this project.

Besides, McMillan and Rivers (2011) indicated that using L1 in judicious ways promoted L2 learning especially for the beginners and it gave this project the idea that using L1 selectively was permissible when carrying out tasks in pairs and groups. Carless (2004) also suggested that beginning learners might not have sufficient English ability to carry out tasks when the language forms were not pre-taught. Therefore, limited use of L1 is to be allowed in the classroom which engages learners to communicate in L2 and this is taken into account in this project.

Furthermore, Trottier (2008) research on English Villages which provided authentic environments for students to increase English proficiency in Korea. There were some English Villages in Taipei city where I worked as an English teacher. These EVs are to facilitate English learning and students are provided with opportunities to be placed into simulations of everyday situations. These EVs are usually furnished with several simulation rooms that replicate real-life situations, such as an airplane flight cabin, a train station, a clinic, a supermarket and a restaurant and a number of foreign teachers are in charge of the language program. There is usually one field trip to these EVs each semester for elementary school students of Taipei.

Although EVs are not real, it is still a great opportunity for those underprivileged students whose families could not afford overseas trips or immersion programs to have a
multicultural experience and be comfortable with using English in a relaxing environment. However, before visiting these EVs, students are supposed to be prepared with some lessons that help them to be able to respond to the situation they are in. A lesson plan that focuses on one of the situations such as a supermarket lesson plan, prepares students with some English they can use for authentic communication. When students are prepared before they visit EVs, they will learn more when they go there.

**Description of the Project**

*A Curriculum to Enhance Listening and Speaking Skills for 4th Graders in Taiwan* is composed of eight lesson plans. It is located in the appendix. The first lesson is about guiding students to describe a day at school. The second lesson is designed for students to learn a pop song of English which provides an opportunity to improve listening skills and learn new vocabulary through context. The third lesson is aimed to instruct students what to say when answering the phone which is practical for communication in real life. The fourth lesson is ordering meals at McDonald's which familiarizes students with vocabulary and phrases that are commonly used in a fast food restaurant. Eating at a restaurant is the fifth lesson that helps students to learn how to order meals in a restaurant. The sixth lesson is about offering trip stories to students and they need to work in a group to figure out their stories. This activity presents opportunities for practicing speech acts to transitions. The seventh lesson is about shopping in a supermarket. Students learn about items sold in the supermarket, their categories, shopping under
certain budget. The eighth lesson is about sports in which students learn about different names of sports and do a survey with other classmates.

**Conclusion**

This project is intended for promoting students' communicative competence and involving real language use through communicative activities. Based upon the research I have done, communicative activities in which meaning is the primary focus are critical in helping students to acquire communicative competence. Topics such as school life, English songs, answering the phone, ordering meals, English stories, shopping and sports are included in the lesson plans, and these topics mirror the authentic language use in the real world. The focus of the lessons is aim to give students meaningful, contextualized and communicative language practice.
Chapter 4

DISCUSSION, LIMITATIONS and CONCLUSION

Discussion

Although it is stated in the Curriculum Guidelines of Elementary English Language Teaching and Learning (2010) that one of the goals is to help students develop basic communication skills in English, it appears that there is a gap between what is claimed and students' learning outcomes. Since CLT is the main teaching methodology that is adopted in the English Curriculum in Taiwan, it is expected that students are provided with more opportunities to use English properly in daily life situations. Activities of CLT are aimed to engage learners in conversation, information sharing and other meaningful communication. However, the reality of the Elementary English Curriculum in Taiwan is that students' English abilities are evaluated and assessed according to the amount of vocabulary and sentence patterns they are able to memorize. It is evident that there is a mismatch between a CLT curriculum and an exam-oriented education environment. English is learned as a foreign language in Taiwan and classroom hours are primarily the only part of the day when students are exposed to English. Therefore, it is crucial that teachers provide students with learning activities in which language use it in meaningful context. Only through authentic communicative activities can students involve in real language use and achieve communicative competence.
Limitations

One of the limitations of this project is that the lesson plans are developed solely for enhancing the fourth grader's listening and speaking skills in Taiwan and lessons for other grade levels are not included. However, with alteration of task complexity, the lesson plans can be used for teaching higher grade level students.

The second limitation is that topics included in the lesson plans are limited. The topics included in the lesson plans are school life, telephone dialogue, a pop song, ordering meals, poems, shopping and sports. There are still a variety of topics that students need to learn to get ready for real-life communication in English.

The third limitation is regarding English teachers' level of English proficiency and their knowledge of CLT for carrying out CLT. Non-native EFL teachers in Taiwan are at various level of English proficiency. Some teachers might not have sufficient English proficiency to instruct their students effectively. In a study conducted by Butler (2004), she indicated that most of the teachers of elementary schools in Korea, Taiwan, and Japan considered their English proficiency levels lower than the level necessary to teach English and they addressed the need to improve their English proficiency. Support programs from the authority of education are to be implemented to meet teachers' need specifically for improving their English speaking ability. Besides, professional development workshops that equip teachers with knowledge of CLT and teaching techniques about how to put the premises of CLT into practice are urgent. Teachers without proper training of CLT will not be capable of using the lesson plan to increase students' communicative competence.
The fourth limitation is that this project will be more completed if the lesson plans are reviewed by Taiwanese English teachers and carried out in fourth graders' English class and the feasibility can be evaluated. However, due to time constraint, the lesson plans have not been implemented yet. In addition, teachers' knowledge of CLT and capability to carry out CLT activities also determine the feasibility of the lesson plans.

The last limitation is the lack of effective assessment instruments of students’ language proficiency. That is to say, means of assessing students’ communicative competence should be developed to replace traditional testing system. In 2002, California Department of Education developed the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) and uses it to identify students who have limited English proficiency and to determine students' level of English language proficiency in the domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing. There are five levels of proficiency which includes Beginning, Early Intermediate, Intermediate, Early Advanced and Advanced level. The listening and speaking standards for English learners in CELDT can be modified according to the EFL learning setting of Taiwan and used as a reference to assess students’ development of listening and speaking abilities.

Conclusion

The purpose of this project is to create lesson plans for teachers who hope to help to enhance fourth graders' English listening and speaking abilities in Taiwan. The communicative activities in the lesson plans are aimed to expose students to rich and comprehensible input and the authentic teaching materials are added to foster their
interests in learning English. It is expected that students will be equipped with better communicative skills through the learning activities in the lesson plans.
Lesson Plans

A Curriculum to Enhance Listening and Speaking Skills for 4th Graders in Taiwan

Language of instruction: Mostly English with selective use of Mandarin Chinese

Students' English level: Beginners

| Lesson 1 | A Day at School |
| Lesson 2 | Singing Along |
| Lesson 3 | Answering the Phone |
| Lesson 4 | Order Meals at McDonald's |
| Lesson 5 | Eat at a Restaurant |
| Lesson 6 | Strip Poems and Stories |
| Lesson 7 | My Shopping Cart |
| Lesson 8 | Sports! Sports! Sports! |
# Lesson 1

**Lesson Title/Subject:** A Day at School  
**Grade:** 4  
**Purpose** To describe a day at school  
**Vocabulary** Language arts, math, recess, after school club  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Objectives: BTEOTL, SWBAT:</th>
<th>Assessment and Criteria</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● demonstrate listening comprehension by orally answering questions in complete sentences.</td>
<td>● In complete sentences, students will orally answer comprehension questions about the listening vignette.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● orally discuss a day at school.</td>
<td>● In pairs, each student will ask their partner what they love or hate about school in a complete sentence. Partners will orally respond and describe things they love and hate about school in a complete sentence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● describe what they like or hate about their school life by writing down sentences or draw pictures</td>
<td>● Students will draw a picture and write a complete sentence that describes what they love or hate about school life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Materials and Safety Precautions**  
Audio file (http://www.esl-lab.com/elemelemrd1.htm), computer,  

**Focus Lesson (Teacher does): Direct instruction**  
1. Teacher asks students questions and leads them to describe a normal school day including hours, class subjects, meals, rules, dress, and extra-curricular activities. Teacher tells students that when answering questions, they have to answer in full sentences.  
   Discussion questions:  
   - What time do you go to school? Teacher models the answer by saying “I go to school at 7:40.”  
   - What subjects do you learn at school? What is your favorite subject? I learn Chinese, math, English, Social Studies and Science at school.
| **Guided Instruction (Teacher and Students do together):** | 1. Listening activity- Teacher explains: “We will listen to a dialogue between an adult and a Japanese elementary school student talking about his day of school. Listen carefully and try to catch the main ideas. You will be asked a few questions after listening.” The conversation is 1 minute and 35 seconds.  
2. After listening to the conversation, Teacher asks some comprehension questions regarding the conversation. Teacher asks students to answer the questions in complete sentences.  
- Does Joshua get home from school between 3:00 pm-4:00 pm? Yes, he gets home from school between 3:00 pm-4:00 pm.  
- How does the boy, Joshua, in the conversation go to school? Take a school bus, the subway or walk? He walks to school.  
- Which item did Joshua NOT mention when talking about the things he takes to school? A backpack, gym clothes or a school hat? He didn't mention a school hat.  
- What is the first thing Joshua does when he arrives at school? The first thing he does is stand up and bow when he arrives at school.  
- Where does Joshua eat lunch at school? He eats in his classroom.  
Teacher will check for students' understanding of the dialogue according to their answers and involve the whole class to answer the questions by calling different students. |
| **Collaborative Learning (Students do it together):** | 1. Pair students up and assign them to talk about what things they enjoy and hate about their school life and write a sentence or two or draw pictures on a piece of paper Teacher gives them.  
. Teacher models how to express likes/dislikes about school life.  
- I enjoy playing with my friends during recess.  
- I hate PE class because I am bad at sports.  
2. Students take turns and share their ideas with the whole class.  
3. TPS: Using sentence frames, Ss practice asking and
| answering questions |

Source: Randall’s ESL Cyber Listening Lab [http://www.esl-lab.com/]
Rubric 1 for writing a sentence and drawing a picture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Accuracy</td>
<td>The sentence makes sense and is understandable. The sentence has a high degree of accuracy. Student begins and ends the sentence correctly.</td>
<td>Sentence strip displays a sentence that fairly makes sense and is understandable. The sentence has good degree of accuracy. Student begins and ends most sentences correctly.</td>
<td>Sentence strip displays a sentence that somewhat makes sense and is understandable. The sentence has low degree of accuracy. Student begins and ends a few sentences correctly.</td>
<td>Sentence strip does not display a sentence that makes sense nor is understandable. The sentence has low degree of accuracy. Student rarely or never begins or ends sentences correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures</td>
<td>Pictures are detailed and relate to the sentence.</td>
<td>Pictures are somewhat detailed and relate to the sentence.</td>
<td>Pictures do not have enough details and only partly relate to the sentence.</td>
<td>Pictures are not detailed and relate to the sentence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesson 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title/Subject:</th>
<th>Singing Along</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To practice speaking English in an enjoyable setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Verbs: need, push, show, stop, tell, play, touch, hope, think, feel, beat, shine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Objectives: BTEOTL, SWBAT:</th>
<th>Assessment and Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• demonstrate comprehension of the song by orally translating the lyric into Mandarin Chinese</td>
<td>• Students will orally explain the lyric in English or Mandarin Chinese or explain it in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• demonstrate their understanding of the words: beat, need, push, show, stop, shine, tell, play, touch, hope, think, feel by making sentences with each of the words</td>
<td>• Students will orally create complete sentences in English using the verbs they learn in the song.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Materials and Safety Precautions | Song audio file ([http://www.tumblr.com/tagged/ellie%20goulding%20lights](http://www.tumblr.com/tagged/ellie%20goulding%20lights)), computer, cloze passages with lyrics, a photo of home that is related to the theme of the song |

| Focus Lesson (Teacher does): Direct instruction | 1. Warm-up activity- Teacher presents the photo to the whole class and asks students what they see. Students are asked to answer questions in complete sentences. T writes down relevant contributions from students on the blackboard. Discussion questions: - What do you see in the picture? I see a house. - How do you feel when you think of home? How do you describe your home? I feel safe when I think of home. My home is cozy and comfortable. |

| Guided Instruction (Teacher and Students do together): | 1. Teacher plays the song “Lights” by Ellie Goulding one time and asks students questions. Discussion questions: - What is the word that you hear many times in the song? Lights. - Do you know what a verb is? A verb is a word that describes an action. “Open” is a verb. “Sit” is a verb, too. Do you hear any verbs in the song? |
2. Distribute the cloze passage. (Worksheet 1). All the missing words in the cloze are verbs. This activity is an exercise to help them to review these verbs they have learned.
3. Play the song 1-2 times and students can fill in the missing words in the cloze.
4. Teacher asks student volunteers to read the sentences that have missing words.
5. Ask students about the content of the song to check their understanding and students may explain the lyric in English or translate it in Mandarin Chinese. After explaining the whole song, Teacher asks students what the song is about. Students express their ideas. Teacher concludes that the lyric implies that home is a safe place like lights.
6. Ask students to point out the verbs appeared in the song: beat, need, push, show, stop, shine, tell, play, touch, hope, think, and feel. Teacher checks students’ comprehension of the meanings of the verbs and explains words that they don't understand for them.

Collaborative Learning (Students do it together):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | Students take turns making sentences orally by using the verbs learned in this song. Teacher models a few sentences for students.  
- I need your help.  
- Show me how to do it.  
- I want to tell you a story.  
2. | Students sing the song together. |

Source: UCLA Language Materials Project
**Rubric 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>4 - Excellent</th>
<th>3 - Good</th>
<th>2 - Satisfactory</th>
<th>1 – Needs Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand the meanings of the vocabulary and make a complete sentence.</td>
<td>11-12 sentences are written with verb usage correct and no grammatical errors.</td>
<td>9-10 sentences are written with verb usage correct and no grammatical errors.</td>
<td>7-8 sentences are written with verb usage correct and no grammatical errors.</td>
<td>6 or less sentences written with verb usage correct and no grammatical errors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Words Bank
need push show stop tell play touch hope think feel beat shine

**Lights** by Ellie Goulding

I had a way then losing it all on my own
I had a heart then but the queen has been overthrown
And I'm not sleeping now; the dark is too hard to
And I'm not keeping now, the strength I ________ to ________ me

* You ________ the lights that ________ me turn to stone
  You ________ it when I'm alone
* And so I ________ myself that I'll be strong
And dreaming when they're gone
  'Cause they're calling, calling, calling me home
Calling, calling, calling home
Repeat *

Home

Noises, I ________ within my head
________ my own skin and _________ that I'm still breathing
And I ________ back to when my brother and my sister slept
In an unlocked place the only time I ________ safe
Repeat * *

'Cause they're calling, calling, calling me home
Calling, calling, calling home
Repeat *

Home

Lights, lights, lights, lights lights, lights, lights, lights(Home, home)Lights, lights, lights, lights lights, lights, lights, lights
Repeat * *

'Cause they're calling, calling, calling me home
Calling, calling, calling home
Repeat *

Home
(Home, home )Lights, lights, lights, lights
Lights, lights, lights (Home, home)Lights, lights, lights, lights
Lights, lights, lights, lights
**Lesson 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title/Subject:</th>
<th>Answering the phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To talk on the phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence frames</td>
<td>Hold on, May I speak to..?, Take a message</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurable Objectives:**

**BTEOTL, SWBAT:**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● demonstrate listening comprehension by orally answering questions in complete sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● demonstrate his/her listening and speaking competence by answering and talking on the phone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment and Criteria**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● In complete sentences, students will orally answer comprehension questions about the listening vignette.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● In pairs, according to the topics they are given, students will create a telephone conversation by writing 8 lines of dialogue by both participants and then orally role play the dialogue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Materials and Safety Precautions**

Worksheets, pictures, audio ([http://www.esl-lab.com/meet/meetrd1.htm](http://www.esl-lab.com/meet/meetrd1.htm))

**Focus Lesson (Teacher does): Direct instruction**

1. Warm-up activity: Pair students up. Ask them to sit back to back. Student A has a pencil and a piece of paper. Student B has a picture. Student B describes the picture and student A draws a picture according to the description. Students compare pictures with their partner after they are done with the drawing. Explain to students that this activity helps them to understand the differences between talking to someone in person by seeing their gestures and faces and without seeing their gestures and faces. Students will know the differences between contextualized and decontextualized. Students are allowed to use Mandarin when doing this exercise. For advanced students, they are encouraged to use English to complete this task.

**Guided Instruction (Teacher and Students do together):**

1. Ask students to write down their home telephone numbers and ask each other what their telephone number is.
2. Talking on the phone. Ask students when they would use the telephone. Ask students what they should say when answering the telephone.
3. Teacher explains: “We will listen to a dialogue between a man and a girl talking on the phone. Listen carefully and try to catch the main ideas. You will be asked a few questions
after listening.” The conversation is 56 seconds. Teacher asks students some questions from the conversation and requests them to answer the questions in complete sentences.
- Does the man tell the girl that he will call again sometime after 7:00 pm? Yes, he does.
- According to the girl, why can't the caller talk to her dad? Is he not home, on another line or just can't come to the phone?
  He can't come to the phone.
- What does the girl refuse to tell the caller? Her age, her name or her address?
  She refuses to tell the caller her name.
- What is the caller's name? His name is Nick Johnson.
- What is Nick's telephone number? His telephone number is 589-7248.

4. Distribute the dialogue (Worksheet 2) for answering the phone. Teacher models the dialogue with one of the more advanced students first. Teacher practices the dialogue with the whole class.

Collaborative Learning (Students do it together):

1. Pair students up. One student in each pair takes one role and the pair practices talking to each other according to the telephone conversation. Teacher circulates around the classroom, observes students' practice and provides help when there is a need.

2. In pairs, students will be given topics for writing a telephone conversation that will include 8 lines of dialogue by both participants. The topics are:
   - plans for the weekend
   - ask for help about homework assignment
   - talk about school life

Students are allowed to use Mandarin and English orally when discussing and creating telephone dialogues. Teacher circulates around the classroom and gives guidance and translates sentences from Mandarin to English for students when there is a need.

3. Ask each pair to role play the dialogue they created in front of the whole class.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category &amp; Fluency</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td>Students are completely prepared and speech is completely fluid and natural.</td>
<td>Students seem pretty prepared and speech is mostly fluid and natural.</td>
<td>Students are somewhat prepared and speech is somewhat fluid and natural.</td>
<td>Needed quite a bit more practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Clearly</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly all (100-95%) the time, and mispronounces no words.</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly all (100-95%) the time, and mispronounces less than 2 words.</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly most (94-85%) of the time, and mispronounces less than 4 words.</td>
<td>Often mumbles or cannot be understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses complete sentences</td>
<td>Always (99-100% of time) speaks in complete sentences.</td>
<td>Mostly (80-98%) speaks in complete sentences.</td>
<td>Sometimes (70-80%) speaks in complete sentences.</td>
<td>Rarely speaks in complete sentences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Worksheet 2**

**Conversation 1**

A: Hello, this is __________ speaking. May I speak to Jane, please?

B: Hold on, please.

**Conversation 2**

A: Hello, I’d like to speak to James, please.

B: I’m sorry. He can't come to the phone at this moment. Would you like to leave a message?

A: This is ______. My telephone number is _________. Please tell him to call me back.

Thanks.

B: O.K.
Lesson 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title/Subject:</th>
<th>Order Meals at McDonald's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To order a meal at fast food restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>combo meal, hamburger, French fries, soda, milkshake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence frames</td>
<td>I would like....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measurable Objectives:
BTEOTL, SWBAT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assessment and Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● demonstrate listening comprehension by orally answering questions in complete sentences</td>
<td>● In complete sentences, students will orally answer comprehension questions about the listening vignette.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● demonstrate his/her competence of orally ordering meals in a fast food restaurant</td>
<td>● In pairs, based on the conversation teacher provides, students will order a meal ordering conversation by filling the blanks according to the food items they would like to order and then orally role play the dialogue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Materials and Safety Precautions

Worksheet, flash cards of the food items, audio file ([http://www.esl-lab.com/fastfood/fastfoodrd1.htm](http://www.esl-lab.com/fastfood/fastfoodrd1.htm))

### Focus Lesson (Teacher does): Direct instruction

1. Teacher asks students what their favorite food is and writes the vocabulary on the board. Teacher requests students to express their likes by saying it in a complete sentence and models how to say it.
   - My favorite food are French fries.
2. Distribute the menu from McDonald’s and allow time for students to practice the names of the food on the menu and ordering food.

### Guided Instruction (Teacher and Students do together):

1. Listening activity- Teacher explains: “We will listen to a man ordering a meal from a fast food restaurant and find out what to say when ordering meals. Listen carefully and try to catch the main ideas. You will be asked a few questions after listening.” The conversation is 1 minute and 59 seconds.
2. Teacher asks students some questions from the conversation and requests them to answer the questions in complete sentences.
   - Did the customer order something else from the restaurant menu or look for another place to eat at the end?
He ordered something else from the menu.
- What is not included in the combo meal? An order of fries, a dessert or a sandwich?
A dessert is not included in the combo meal.
- Was the man surprised by the price of his meal? Why?
Yes, he was surprised by the price of his meal. Because it is too expensive.
3. Teacher presents the flashcards of combo meal, hamburger, French fries, soda, and milkshake. Students practice the vocabulary with Teacher.
4. Teacher distributes Worksheet 3 to students and points out the use of sentence frame- I would like for making requests. Teacher models how to make requests.
- I would like (a hamburger).
5. Teacher asks each student to practice saying the sentence: "I would like ________.”
6. Teacher models the dialogue with one of the more advanced students first. Teacher practices the dialogue with the whole class.

**Collaborative Learning (Students do it together):**
1. Pair students up and ask them to use the menu to role play through ordering a meal. Both students would switch roles a number of times. Teacher circulates around the classroom, observes students practice and provides help when there is a need.
2. In pairs, based on the conversation on worksheet 3 (Part I), students will create a meal ordering conversation by filling the blanks according to the food items they would like to order (Part II) and then orally role play the dialogue.
3. Ask student pairs to role play the dialogue in front of the whole class.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness &amp; fluency</td>
<td>Students are completely prepared and speech is completely fluid and natural.</td>
<td>Students seem pretty prepared and speech is mostly fluid and natural.</td>
<td>Students are somewhat prepared and speech is somewhat fluid and natural.</td>
<td>Needed quite a bit more practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Clearly</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly all (100-95%) the time, and mispronounces no words.</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly all (100-95%) the time, and mispronounces less than 2 words.</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly most (94-85%) of the time, and mispronounces less than 4 words.</td>
<td>Often mumbles or cannot be understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses complete sentences</td>
<td>Always (99-100% of time) speaks in complete sentences.</td>
<td>Mostly (80-98%) speaks in complete sentences.</td>
<td>Sometimes (70-80%) speaks in complete sentences.</td>
<td>Rarely speaks in complete sentences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worksheet 3
Part I

Conversation I

Waiter: "Welcome to McDonald's. May I take your order?"

Customer: "I would like to a Big Mac and a small coke."

Waiter: "One Big Mac and one small coke. Will that be all?"

Customer:"Yes."

Waiter: "Will that be for here or to go?"

Customer:"For here, please."

Waiter: "The total comes to $4.87."

Conversation II

Waiter: "Welcome to McDonald's. May I take your order?"

Customer: "I would like to have combo number 2."

Waiter: "What's in your combo number 2?"

Customer: "A cheese burger, small French fried and soda."

Waiter: "What would you like to drink?"

Customer: "Coke, please."

Waiter: "Will that be all?"

Customer: "Yes, thanks."
Part II

Waiter: "Welcome to McDonald's. May I take your order?"

Customer: "I would like to have ________________.

Waiter: "What's in your ________________?"

Customer: "__________, ____________ and ____________.

Waiter: "What would you like to drink?"

Customer: "____________, please."

Waiter: "Will that be all?"

Customer: "Yes, thanks."
### Lesson 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title/Subject:</th>
<th>Eat at a Restaurant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To order meals in a restaurant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vocabulary (you have steak in the LP, but not here; will there be a pix of it?)**
- menu
- knife
- spoon
- fork
- table
- cup
- napkin
- tray
- soup, garden vegetable soup
- clam chowder
- salads, Cesar salad
- chicken salad
- Hawaiian pizza, pepperoni pizza
- drinks, water, orange juice, lemonade
- dessert, ice cream, apple pie, cheesecake

### Measurable Objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BTEOTL, SWBAT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● comprehend all vocabulary words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● demonstrate his/her understanding of vocabulary words by saying it when shown pictures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● demonstrate his/her ability to read the menu and order meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● In groups of 3 students will order a meal by filling the blanks according to the food items they would like to order. Students will use at least 6 vocabulary words that are taught in the dialogue and then orally role play the dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● demonstrate his/her competence of orally ordering meals in a restaurant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Materials and Safety Precautions
- Flashcards of food, menus, food items, menus, utensils.

### Focus Lesson (Teacher does): Direct instruction

1. Teacher asks students to brainstorm their favorite restaurant and asks them to think of their favorite dish to order there.
   - What is your favorite restaurant? Sizzler? Pizza Hut? Outback?
   - What do you like to order when you go to a restaurant? Pizza? Salad? Ice cream? Steak?
   (Teacher shows the pictures of the food items when asking questions.)
2. Teacher randomly chooses students to tell the class what their favorite restaurant is and dishes there.

### Guided Instruction (Teacher and Students do together):

1. Present the flashcards and ask students if they know how to say the items.
2. Orally practice the food items with students by showing them the pictures. Practice until they are familiar with the words. Ask students randomly and see if they are able to say the words.
3. Distribute menus to students and model how to use them appropriately. Teacher reads through the menu while the class follows along and goes over key vocabulary and pronunciation by saying the words and has students repeat.

4. Discuss what food items are on the menu and how items are categorized.

5. Teacher asks if any student can pretend to order something from the menu and go over some sentence frames- “Can I have the …..,” and “I'd like the …..”

6. Practice the dialogue with students (Worksheet 5). Teacher models the dialogue with one of the more advanced students first. Teacher practices the dialogue with the whole class

**Collaborative Learning (Students do it together):**

1. Divide students into groups of three. Based on the conversation (Part I) teacher provides, students will create a meal ordering conversation by filling the blanks according to the food items they would like to order (Part II), and use at least 6 vocabulary words that are taught. Teacher circulates around the classroom, observes students practice and provides help when there is a need.

2. Ask students to role play the dialogue in front of the whole class.
## Rubric 5 Ordering meals at a restaurant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness &amp; fluency</td>
<td>Students are completely prepared and speech is completely fluid and natural.</td>
<td>Students seem pretty prepared and speech is mostly fluid and natural.</td>
<td>Students are somewhat prepared and speech is somewhat fluid and natural.</td>
<td>Needed quite a bit more practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Clearly</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly all (100-95%) the time, and mispronounces no words.</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly all (100-95%) the time, and mispronounces less than 2 words.</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly most (94-85%) of the time, and mispronounces less than 4 words.</td>
<td>Often mumbles or cannot be understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying vocabulary words</td>
<td>Identify and say all the vocabulary words correctly</td>
<td>Identify and say 4/5 of the vocabulary words correctly</td>
<td>Identify and say ½ of the vocabulary words correctly</td>
<td>Identify and say less than ½ of the vocabulary words correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses complete sentences and vocabulary words</td>
<td>Always (99-100% of time) speaks in complete sentences and uses at least 6 vocabulary words.</td>
<td>Mostly (80-98%) speaks in complete sentences and uses at least 6 vocabulary words.</td>
<td>Sometimes (70-80%) speaks in complete sentences and uses less than 6 vocabulary words.</td>
<td>Rarely speaks in complete sentences and uses vocabulary words.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SOUP:**

- Garden vegetable soup $3
- Clam chowder $4

**SALADS:**

- Cesar salad $5
- Chicken Salad $6

**PIZZA:**

- Hawaiian Pizza  
  - small $8  
  - large $12
- Pepperoni Pizza  
  - small $9  
  - large $13

**DRINKS:**

- Orange juice $3.5
- Lemonade $3.5

**DESSERTS:**

- Ice cream $4.5
- Apple pie $4
- Cheesecake $5
Worksheet 5

Part 1

Waiter: Welcome. Here are your menus.

I’ll be back to take your order in a minute.

Waiter: Are you ready to order?

Customer 1: Yes. May I have a small Hawaiian pizza, please?

Waiter: And for you?

Customer 2: I'll have a large Pepperoni pizza, please.

Waiter: Would you like something to drink?

Customer 1: Orange juice, please.

Waiter: And for you?

Customer 2: Just water, please.

Waiter: So, that’s a small Hawaiian pizza,

a large Pepperoni Pizza, orange juice and water.

Let me take your menus. (Come back in 5 minutes.)

Waiter: Here is your food. Enjoy your meal!

Customer 1 & 2: Thank you.
Waiter: Welcome. Here are your menus.

I’ll be back to take your order in a minute.

Waiter: Are you ready to order?

Customer 1: Yes. May I have _________________ and _______________, please?

Waiter: And for you?

Customer 2: I’ll have _________________ and _______________, please.

Waiter: Would you like something to drink?

Customer 1: _________________, please.

Waiter: And for you?

Customer 2: _________________, please.

Waiter: So, that’s _________________,

_____________________, _______________ and _______________.

Let me take your menus. (Come back in 5 minutes.)

Waiter: Here is your food. Enjoy your meal!

Customer 1 & 2: Thank you.
# Lesson 6

**Lesson Title/Subject:** Strip Poems and Stories  
**Grade:** 4  
**Purpose** To practice speaking  
**Vocabulary** **Adjectives:** bright, dumb, busy, special, great, big

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Objectives: BTEOTL, SWBAT:</th>
<th>Assessment and Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● comprehend and figure out the sequence of a poem/story and read it to the whole class</td>
<td>● Students will orally present their poem/story to the whole class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● work cooperatively in a small group</td>
<td>● Teacher walks around the classroom assesses students’ performance during the activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Materials and Safety Precautions**  
Story/ poem strips  
(A strip story is a short dialogue or story with each line typed onto a separate strip of paper. Each student gets one strip and works out the sequence of the story with others.)

**Focus Lesson (Teacher does): Direct instruction**  
1. Prepare 7 sets of strips of different poems or stories. (Each poem or story has 4 sentences.) (Worksheet 4)  
2. Pass out the strips randomly and tell students to write his or her line down, practice saying the sentence orally to themselves and to each other. Students have to memorize his or her own line.

**Guided Instruction (Teacher and Students do together):**  
1. Tell students that they have to go find three people to complete their story. (Teacher has to collect the strips to keep students from showing them to others.)

**Collaborative Learning (Students do it together):**  
1. Students walk around the class and find partners to work in a story in a group. Teacher circulates around the classroom, observes students practice and provides help when there is a need.  
2. When finding their group, students should write the story/poem down and get ready to present.  
3. Teacher asks each group to present their poem/story in front of the class.  
4. The whole class reads the 7 stories together out loud.  
5. **Extension Activity:** Teacher asks students to make sentences with the adjectives they have learned today.
### Rubric 6 Strip Poems and Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness &amp; fluency</td>
<td>Students are completely prepared and speech is completely fluid and natural.</td>
<td>Students seem pretty prepared and speech is mostly fluid and natural.</td>
<td>Students are somewhat prepared and speech is somewhat fluid and natural.</td>
<td>Needed quite a bit more practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Clearly</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly all (100-95%) the time, and mispronounces no words.</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly all (100-95%) the time, and mispronounces less than 2 words.</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly most (94-85%) of the time, and mispronounces less than 4 words.</td>
<td>Often mumbles or cannot be understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses complete sentences (do the sentences have to have the adjectives?)</td>
<td>Always (99-100% of time) speaks in complete sentences.</td>
<td>Mostly (80-98%) speaks in complete sentences.</td>
<td>Sometimes (70-80%) speaks in complete sentences.</td>
<td>Rarely speaks in complete sentences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worksheet 6

Story 1:
Anna gets up at 7 in the morning.
She brushes her teeth and eats breakfast.
Her mother drives her to school.
She has math and English lessons in the morning.
(Retrieved from www.esl-galaxy.com/speaking.html)

Story 2:
Leo the Lion had a bright boat.
He likes to row.
On some days, Leo would bring food to eat,
He took a lot of lion snacks.

Story 3:
I have to write a poem
but I really don't know how.
So maybe I'll just make a rhyme
with something dumb, like a "cow."

Story 4:
There are ants in my grandmother's yard.
The ant colony is by the tree roots.
I like to watch the ants.
They are so busy.

Story 5:
My mother is a special part
Of all that's cherished in my heart,
She is my pearl, my soul, my mate;
She is the one to make life great.
(Retrieved from http://www.familyfriendpoems.com/poem/)

Story 6:
The earthworm is your garden's helper.
Earthworms crawl around underground.
They dig tunnels by eating, digging and squeezing.
Once they mix up all the dirt, their roots of plants can grow.

Story 7:
The science fair is a big event.
This year Evelyn worked on a special project.
She made a volcano.
She spoke with pride when she told the judges about her volcano.
**Lesson 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title/Subject:</th>
<th>My Shopping Cart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To go shopping in a supermarket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Produce, deli, home and family care, beverages and snacks, meals and ingredients, breakfast, refrigerated and frozen, mango, chip, cheese, body lotion, detergent, pudding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurable Objectives:** BTEOTL, SWBAT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment and Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● categorize items sold in a supermarket and name the items orally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● demonstrate their ability to choose items for each category and express what they buy for $40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Materials and Safety Precautions**

- Worksheet, pictures of the items sold in the supermarket, newspaper ads

**Focus Lesson (Teacher does): Direct instruction**

1. Teacher asks students about their experience of going to a supermarket and what they usually buy. Teacher tells students that when answering questions, they have to answer in full sentences.
   - Do you go to a supermarket with your family? Yes, I go to a supermarket with my family.
   - What do you usually buy in a supermarket? I buy milk, vegetables, meat and snacks.

**Guided Instruction (Teacher and Students do together):**

1. Teachers tells students that there are seven categories of products and they are produce, deli, home & family care, beverage & snacks, meals & ingredients, breakfast and refrigerated & frozen. Teacher asks students to name some items for each category.
   - Can you name different items in each category?
2. Practice the vocabulary with students. Teacher models pronunciation of each item and students repeat after Teacher.

**Collaborative Learning (Students do it together):**

1. Divide students into groups of five. Each group gets an envelope with product pictures and they have to paste the pictures on the right column (worksheet 7). Teacher circulates around the classroom, observes students’ practice and provides help.
2. Each student gets worksheet 8 and he or she has to decide
what to buy with $40. Teacher explains: You have $ 40 and you need to buy at least one item from each category. What would you buy? Write down the items in each category and its price. Complete the sentence and practice saying it.
- I bought __________, __________, __________, __________, __________, __________, __________, and __________. I spent ___________ dollars.
3. Students take turns and share what they buy with with $ 40 buy saying the complete sentence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness &amp; fluency</td>
<td>Students are completely prepared and speech is completely fluid and natural.</td>
<td>Students seem pretty prepared and speech is mostly fluid and natural.</td>
<td>Students are somewhat prepared and speech is somewhat fluid and natural.</td>
<td>Needed quite a bit more practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Clearly</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly all (100-95%) the time, and mispronounces no words.</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly all (100-95%) the time, and mispronounces less than 2 words.</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly most (94-85%) of the time, and mispronounces less than 4 words.</td>
<td>Often mumbles or cannot be understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses complete sentences and vocabulary words</td>
<td>Always (99-100% of time) speaks in complete sentences and uses 7 vocabulary words.</td>
<td>Mostly (80-98%) speaks in complete sentences and uses 7 vocabulary words.</td>
<td>Sometimes (70-80%) speaks in complete sentences and uses less than 7 vocabulary words.</td>
<td>Rarely speaks in complete sentences and uses vocabulary words.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worksheet 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Produce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home &amp; Family Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverages &amp; Snacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals &amp; Ingredients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerated &amp; Frozen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LOW PRICES ON PRODUCE
- Fresh from the Fields
- **$5** per pound for Organic Tomatoes (Club Price: $10)
- **$99c** per pound for Organic California Broccoli (Club Price: $1.99)
- **$99c** per pound for Organic California Grown Oranges (Club Price: $1.99)
- **$1.99** per pound for Red Ripe Tomatoes (Club Price: $1.99)
- **$7.99** per pound for Signature Farms Fresh Picked Turkey (Club Price: $7.99)
- **$7.99** per pound for Signature Farms Fresh Picked Turkey (Club Price: $7.99)

### DELI
- **$7.99** per pound for Signature Cafe® Signature Turkey (Club Price: $7.99)
- **$5.99** per pound for Signature Cafe® Signature Ham (Club Price: $5.99)
- **$6.99** per pound for Signature Cafe® Signature Baked Ham (Club Price: $6.99)
- **$3.49** per pound for Signature Cafe® Signature Turkey (Club Price: $3.49)

### HOME AND FAMILY CARE
- **$18.99** per 24 Hour Allergy & Congestion Relief Formula (Club Price: $18.99)
- **$9.99** per pack for Sunwarmer® Sunscreen Lotion, SPF 30 (Club Price: $9.99)
- **$4.99** per pack for Garnier® Fructis® Damage Eraser Shampoo (Club Price: $4.99)
- **$4.99** per pack for Garnier® Fructis® Damage Eraser Conditioner (Club Price: $4.99)
- **$10.99** per pack for Duracell® Batteries, AAA (Club Price: $10.99)
- **$6.99** per pack for Friskies® Cat Food, Canned (Club Price: $6.99)
- **$16.99** per pack for Simba® Dry Dog Food, Bag (Club Price: $16.99)
**My Shopping Cart**

You have $40 and you need to buy at least one item from each category. What would you buy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>item</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home &amp; Family Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverages &amp; Snacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals &amp; Ingredients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerated &amp; Frozen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

**Practice saying this sentence:**

I bought __________, __________, __________, __________, __________, __________, __________, and __________. I spent __________ dollars.
# Lesson 8

**Lesson Title/Subject:** Sports! Sports! Sports!

**Grade:** 4

**Purpose**
To learn about sports

**Vocabulary**
Baseball, basketball, football, soccer, badminton, tennis, table tennis, golf, play, ski,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Objectives: BTEOTL, SWBAT:</th>
<th>Assessment and Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● demonstrate their understanding of the vocabulary by saying the names of each sport</td>
<td>● Students will say the names of each sport when shown the flashcards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● orally describe what their favorite sport is</td>
<td>● In complete sentences, students will ask and answer what their favorite sport is.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Materials and Safety Precautions**
Flashcards of sports

**Focus Lesson (Teacher does): Direct instruction**
1. Teacher asks students questions and lead them to discuss about sports that like. Teacher tells students that when answering questions, they have to answer in full sentences.
   - Do you watch sports on TV?
     Yes, I do.
   - What sports do you watch?
     I watch basketball.
   - Name some sports that you know.
     Basketball, baseball, dodge ball, soccer and table tennis.
   - What kind of sports do you like?
     I like soccer.
   - Which sport do you think is dangerous?
     I think football is dangerous.
2. Teacher tells students that we are going to play a mime game. Teacher asks some student volunteers to come to the front and mime their favorite sports and other students guess what the sport is.

**Guided Instruction (Teacher and Students do together):**
1. Present the flashcards of sports and practice with students
2. Present the sentence: “What sport do you like? I like __________,” and practice with students. Teacher models the dialogue with one of the more advanced students first. Teacher practices the dialogue with the whole class.

**Collaborative Learning**
1. Distribute worksheet 9 to each student. Students have to
(Students do it together):

| walk around the classroom and ask their classmates what sports do they like and sign their name on the right column. Teacher explains that when asking and answering questions, students have to use complete sentence. Teacher circulates around the room and sees if students are answering and asking questions in complete sentences. After they find one person for each sport, they can go back to their seats. 2. Teacher asks each student to express orally what their favorite sport is by saying it in a complete sentence. |
## Rubric 8 Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speak Clearly</strong></td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly all (100-95%) the time, and mispronounces no words.</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly all (100-95%) the time, and mispronounces less than 2 words.</td>
<td>Speaks clearly and distinctly most (94-85%) of the time, and mispronounces less than 4 words.</td>
<td>Often mumbles or cannot be understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses complete sentences</strong></td>
<td>Always (99-100% of time) speaks in complete sentences.</td>
<td>Mostly (80-98%) speaks in complete sentences.</td>
<td>Sometimes (70-80%) speaks in complete sentences.</td>
<td>Rarely speaks in complete sentences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worksheet 9

**Survey**
What sports do you like?
I like ______________.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>People who love this sport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basketball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>football</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soccer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>badminton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tennis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>table tennis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>golf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dodge ball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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