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INTRODUCTION

Within the field of second language research (SLA), an increasing number of studies are focusing on corrective feedback. The term corrective feedback refers to a response by a teacher or other interlocutor that attempts to signal to a non-native speaker (NNS) the incorrectness/ ungrammaticality of the NNS’s utterance. (Williams, 2001) summarized the importance of research on corrective feedback by saying that its central goal is to ascertain whether corrective feedback promotes L2 learning, and if so, what features or types of feedback lead to the greatest gains in L2 learning.

Thus, while, some studies have examined a wide range of types of corrective feedback ( eg. Loewen, 2005; Lyster&Ranta, 1997; Panova&Lyster,2002), others have
focused their attention on one or two types of corrective feedback. (eg. Ammar & Spada, 2006; Carpenter, Leon, Macgregor, Mackey 2006, Iwashita, 2003; Lyster, 2004, Loewen & Philp, 2006).

One area of particular interest to researchers and practitioners is the use that the learners make of corrective feedback such as recasts in oral interaction. Recasts which provide an immediate correct reformulation of a learner’s erroneous utterance, can direct the learner attention to nontarget components of their speech at moments when they are focusing on meaning. This can be a very effective way to help learners make form-meaning connections that will help them acquire the L2. Nevertheless, sometimes a learner does not notice or misinterprets the intended focus of the recast. The learner may misunderstand because of his or
her proficiency level of metalinguistic skills, or because of the qualities of the recast, such as the length of the recast or the number or lexical or syntactic changes in the recast to the original utterance.

There are several reasons why recasts have received so much attention from researchers. First, they have been found to occur more often than any other type of corrective feedback in natural classrooms (Lyster, 1997). Second, there are several theoretical reasons for assuming that recasts provide positive and negative evidence, increase the saliency of target forms and promote interaction.
JUSTIFICATION

Over the last decades, a great deal of researchers have set their eyes on the way how feedback is used to develop learning in the acquisition of a second language in students, that is why most of them strongly affirm that it is of great importance the fact that interaction between teacher – students, and students – students flows in an appropriate way in order to encourage the presence of feedback.

One of the main interferences in the learning process through feedback is concerned to the error correction, which has been a controversial topic in the history on Second Language Education.

Whether and how to correct errors usually depends upon the methodological perspective to which a teacher
describes. Historically, the behaviorist teaching models that were practiced in the 1950’s such as the Audiolingual Method stressed error correction at all cost. Behaviorists viewed errors as inevitable, but strove to avoid and overcome them by providing speedy examples of correct responses.

In the 1970’s and 1980’s, some scholars claimed that error correction was not only unnecessary, but also harmful to Second Language acquisition.

In recent years, to correct errors has caused controversial issues, some linguists support the idea that corrective feedback can have negative effects in a student’s natural communicative flow; the corrective feedback is defined as practice in the learning process where learners receive feedback from their teacher as
well as their mates, showing evidence from the error and encouraging accuracy in the production.

It is well known that students do not like to be corrected at any learning level nor high school neither university because they may get different levels of anxiety when being done that.

Some types of corrective feedback may finish the motivation in a student to learn a new language; when teachers teach at a university level, it is very relevant to be careful when correcting since students may have different reactions in the teaching-learning process. Some may feel frustrated, others may try to avoid the correction and the others simply decide not to continue in the learning process.

One of the most used ways to correct students ‘errors is by means of the use of recasts or
reformulations; recasts may draw the learners’ attention to the inconsistency between their utterance and the target language, since students when being corrected neither feel threats nor a means of obstruction to provide correction, besides recasts do not disrupt the flow of interaction because they function both to confirm the meaning of the student’s utterance and to correct the form, that is why they have been seen as an important way to create corrective feedback.

Another reason for wanting to apply recasts as a way to provide corrective feedback is that they frequently occur naturally in L2 classrooms. Early observation classroom studies on corrective feedback were carried out with the purpose of describing what types of corrective feedback are being provided. It quickly became apparent that corrective feedback types were not
all equal in terms of how often there were provided by teachers. Specifically, these studies found that recast occurred much more often than any other type of corrective feedback.
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CHAPTER I

1 OBJECTIVES

1.1 GENERAL OBJECTIVE

- To use the recast strategy in the students of the second level of the Instituto de Idiomas from the Universidad Tecnológica Equinoccial (UTE).

1.2 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

- To apply the strategy recast in the oral production in the students of the second level of the Instituto de Idiomas from the Universidad Tecnológica Equinoccial.
- To verify if the strategy influenced in the development of the oral production in the students of the second level of the Instituto de Idiomas at UTE.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Over the last few years, the role played by corrective feedback in language acquisition has become a highly controversial issue. In the field of First Language Acquisition (FLA), researchers express strong reservations concerning the effect that negative evidence (information about what is not acceptable in the target language) has on FLA, if there is any at all. In the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), however, there appear to be a growing consensus among the majority of researches concerning the significance of the role played by negative evidence in the process of SLA.
Feedback on errors has been a traditional pedagogical practice in EFL/ESL classroom; feedback provision allows Second Language Learners to make progress in their ability to use the target Language appropriately.

Feedback is either positive or negative. Positive feedback is usually presented in the form of examples of acceptable or target-like utterances, while negative feedback includes information about what is not acceptable in the target language. Negative feedback may be explicit or implicit.

One widely used implicit negative feedback technique in SLA is the recast, in which the target-like form is provided no elicited.

Recasts are target language reformulations by
the interlocutor of a learner’s nontarget-like utterance that retain the central meaning while changing the form of the utterance (Long, 1996), as shown in the following example, the recasts function both to confirm the meaning of the student’s utterance and to correct the form.

Recasts may draw the learner’s attention to the inconsistency between their utterance and the target language. (Long& Robinson, 1998). In instructional contexts, recasts are usually incidental to the discourse; that is, they are not preplanned by the
teacher, but arise in response to the language the student produces.

In many meaning-oriented language classrooms, recasts comprise a large percentage of the types of corrective feedback offered by teachers. (Donato, 1994; Doughty, 1994; Ellis et al., 2001; Loewen, 2002, 2004, Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

**Characteristics of Recast**

Although recasts provide implicit negative feedback, they may range in degree of explicitness and salience. The number of feedback moves, prosodic cues, repetitions, length of recasts, number of changes, and segmentation are all the features that can affect the degree of implicitness in a recast.

1. Number of Feedback Moves
One way that recasts become more salient is through the number of feedback moves (also referred to as “response moves” (Loewen, 2002). Following a learner’s nontarget-like utterance, a teacher may provide more than one kind of feedback move, for example, an elicitation followed by a recast, as shown in example 2.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T; You have to tell this story to S okay (. ) not your story (. ) you’re the story</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“girl had bullet in her scalp”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S; The title if the story is girl had <strong>blood</strong> in her scalp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>T; <strong>blood?</strong> Elicitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S; B<strong>loot</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>T; bullet bullet = recast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S; = bullet bullet in her scalp is about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Elaborated by Andrea Rosero*
In this case, the student first heard the correct word *bullet* in the preceding turn (1.2), yet produced *blood* (1.3). The teacher elicits self-repair from the student, who unsuccessfully modifies his original pronunciation. (1.5) After the student fails to self-repair, the student’s attempt is recast by the teacher, the student then repeats it in the following turn. (1.7). Clearly, the student is led through a series of moves to notice the recast *bullet*, and he successfully uptakes or incorporates into his production the correct linguistic form.

Recasts arise within an entire body of discourse, and it is important to consider them within the organization of the classroom.
2. Prosodic Emphasis

Another way in which the recaster may cue the learner to the particular problem is by means of prosodic emphasis, whereby a particular word is morpheme is stressed, as in example 5. This technique is used particularly for phonological problems, but as this example shows, it can also be used for morph syntactic items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>some people have racism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>some people ARE racist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Intonation

Recasts provided in the context of conversation are often part of negotiation sequences and function as confirmation checks, with interrogative intonation
(i.e. “Is this what you mean?”), as in example 4. In such cases, it may be unclear whether the interlocutor fails to understand the speaker or is simply correcting the form of the utterance. An interrogative recast is ambiguous as corrective feedback because the learner may interpret it either as corrective or as a request to confirm the intended meaning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T;</th>
<th>Okay, S do you know this story?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S;</td>
<td>Finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T;</td>
<td><em>Finished?</em> Interrogative recast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S;</td>
<td>Finish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The didactic force of a recast is, thus, signaled by intonation, with declarative recasts being arguably more explicit as corrective feedback than interrogative recasts because they do not suggest a choice for the learner to accept or refuse.
Alternatively, declarative recasts may be interpreted in the same way as a teacher’s repetition or learners ‘target language forms.

4. Segmentation

Another feature of recasts in classrooms is segmentation, also known as partial recast or recast with reduction. Segmentation may also reduce the ambiguity of a recast, as in example 5 in which the teacher segments the problematic form (*racist*) and recasts in isolation (*racism*).

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1;</td>
<td>Yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2;</td>
<td>No racist not like uh racist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T;</td>
<td>Racism [\textbf{segmented recast}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1;</td>
<td>Racis this country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Number of Changes and Length of Recast

Other factors that appear to affect learners’ noticing and responses to recasts center on the relationship of the recast to the original utterance, including such factors as number of changes (i.e. the degree of difference between the recast and the original utterance) and length of the recast. Previous experimental research has suggested that the fewer the changes and the shorter the recast, the more likely one is to notice it (Egi, 2004; Phip, 2003)

The distinction between length of recast and segmentation is an important one because segmentation potentially pinpoints the problems for the learner. Although segmented recasts are always short, not all short recasts are necessarily segmented.
Types of recasts:

According to (Sheen, 2011), recasts can be partial (part of the incorrect learner’s idea is corrected) or total (the complete idea of the learner is modified). At the same time, recasts can be classified in didactics or conversational (2011:62).

a. Didactic Recast

A didactic recast is a partial or total reformulation or the incorrect utterance. Students focus their attention to in de error. The objective of a didactic recasts is led to a pedagogical aim more than communicative.

Example:

A: Women are kind than men. (grammar error)

P: kinder. (didactic-partial reformulation)
b. **Conversational Recasts**

A conversational recast may take place in a context where teacher do not understand de learner’s utterance and reformulate to try to understand what the student is trying to express, that is why this kind of recast has a communicative aim.

A: *How much weight?* (grammar error)

P: What?

A: How weight are you?

P: How much do I weigh

(conversational feedback-reformulation)

Nevertheless, Long established that giving conversational or didactic recast in the classroom is not enough evidence (1991; 148–69) so he supported the idea that conversational recasts help students acquire other languages more effectively.

26
Potential benefits of recasts

In both first language (L1) and L2 acquisition, two characteristics common to recasts. Juxtaposition and contingency, ostensibly facilitate noticing problematic forms in the learner’s production (Long, 1996; Nicholas et al., 2001; Philp, 2003, Saxon, 1997).

1. First, recasts serve to juxtapose the incorrect forms with the correct forms, which provides both model and a contrast with the learner’s nontarget-like utterance because they immediately follow the learner’s ill-formed utterance (Saxton, 1997).

2. Recasts are contingent on what the learner produces and, for this reason, are congruent with the learner’s production and are not just the teacher’s own pedagogic focus.
3. The timing of recasts is important because it is while focused on meaning and use that the learner receives feedback on how to communicate that meaning. (Doughty, 2001). Thus the potential the potential interaction to facilitate acquisition lies both in timing and context.

4. It has been hypothesized that such feedback allows the learner to map form to meaning, rather than focusing on form as a discrete element.

5. Doughty observed that, because explicit correction breaks into learner’s encoding of an utterance, it is intrusive to learning, whereas implicit correction allows the learner to integrate new linguistic information as he or she continues to speak.
It is important to point out that recasts may be of benefit only if they are noticed by the learner. (Philp, 2003), noted that the selective attention of the learner is of fundamental importance in the connection between conversational interaction and acquisition.

Although recasts can be ambiguous as corrective feedback, the likelihood of their effectiveness depends on various factors: the classroom context (including both the age of the participants and the extent to which language is a focus of study) and, the context of the recast within the discourse.

**Ambiguity of recasts**

The claim about ambiguity of recast initially emerged from descriptive analysis of communicative classroom, where the primary focus was on meaning. For example, Lyster (1998a) suggested that recasts
might have been ambiguous to L2 learners in French immersion classrooms in which teachers provided both corrective repetitions (i.e., recasts) and non-corrective repetition at similar frequencies. These two utterance types shared the same pragmatic functions: providing and seeking confirmation or additional information. These similarities might have obscured the corrective force of recasts, leading to Lyster (1998b) claim that “recasts of grammatical errors probably do not provide young learners with negative evidence, in that they fail to convey what is unacceptable in the L2” (p.207). As evidence, he reported that learners rarely responded to recasts (i.e., uptake) or corrected their problematic utterance. (i.e., repair).
However the didactic nature of recasts might be more perceptible in contexts in which the instructional focus disambiguates the purpose of the teacher’s repetitions. For instance, Lyster (1998b) found that during a reading-loud activity, French immersion students often modify phonological errors target by recast. Recast provided during such an activity, according to Lyster “would be perceptually salient as well as unequivocal in terms of purpose” (p.205) Oliver and Mackey (2003) also found that when lessons explicitly focused on language, learners in English as a second language (ESL) classrooms produced modified output in response to feedback, whereas when the primary focus was on classroom management issues, they produced no modified output. Oliver and Mackey stated, “in the explicit
language-focused contexts there was an abundance of teacher feedback and thus teachers’ expectations for the learners were quite transparent” (pp.529-530).

**Learner´s perceptions of recast**

In her 2003 study, Philp investigated the factors that mediated learners´ noticing of recasts in native-speaker (NS) and nonnative speakers (NNS) interactions. She found that higher and intermediate level learners were significantly more accurate when recalling recasts than the lower level learners. Recasts of five or fewer morphemes were recalled with greater accuracy than recasts of six or more morphemes. Phil found that the recalls of recasts were significantly less accurate for all learners (high, intermediate, or low) when there were more than three changes within the recast.
CHAPTER III

2 METHODOLOGY

The research was carried out to students of the second level of El Instituto de Idiomas from la Universidad Tecnológica Equinoccial during the semester September- November 2015.

The teaching program at the university is divided by semesters which are subdivided into two bimesters receiving English in a Monday to Thursday 2 hour schedule.

The current book students are using is Touchstone 2 from Cambridge, corresponding to second level units 1 to 6. The book has as its main characteristic to be friendly with productive skills, which is significantly helpful in terms of facilitating students to develop their
oral production, but it has been seen that students tend to make lots of mistakes, first, due to the fact that they are in a low English level, and most relevant because they are afraid of being corrected in unexpected ways.

One of the mayor obstacles learners have to overcome in learning to speak is the anxiety generated over the risk of blurting things out that are wrong, stupid or incomprehensible. Because of the language ego that informs people that “you are what you speak” learners are reluctant to be judged by hearers. Language learners can put a new twist on Mark Twain’s quip that “it is better to keep your mouth closed and have others think you are ignorant than to open it and remove all about”,

Our job as teachers is to provide the kind of warm, embracing climate that encourages students to speak, however halting or broken their attempts may be.
One of the main characteristics of the use of the recast strategy as corrective feedback is the fact that the ways teachers correct their students’ errors is less threatening to their confidence, and less disruptive of the flow of interaction than other corrective feedback strategies.

Speaking is fundamental to human communication just think of all the different conversations people have in one day and compare that with how much written communication you do in a day. Which does a person do more of? In our daily lives most of us speak more than we write.

The parameters which students were evaluated are five and correspond to the rubrics established by the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). The analysis had these results.
Experimental group:

The coherence (coherence) in the students of the experimental group, before applying the strategy of 50% and after applying the strategy was 53%, evidencing an improvement of 3%, in the logical relation of the different parts of affirmation or statement of the conversation or dialogue developed by the students, as well as evidence of the relationship that the students achieved a question with their respective response.
Figure 1.1: Results in Coherence – Experimental

Group:

The consistency (coherence) in the students of the control group, before applying the strategy was 48.5% and after applying the strategy was 46.5%, showing a relatively low decrease of 2%, in the logical relationship of the different parts of an affirmation or statement of the conversation or dialogue developed by the students.
2. Fluency

Experimental Group:

Regarding the measurement of the fluency of the experimental group before and after having been applied the respective pretest and post test, an improvement of 6% was evidenced, which indicates that the ability to express correctly of the students optimized the facility
and spontaneity in students regarding their capacity to reproduce ideas, produce them and give meaning to their thoughts in a fluid way.

![Fluency Results - Experimental group](image)

**Figure 2.1: Fluency Results – Experimental group**
Control Grupo:

With regard to the measurement of the fluency of the control group before and after having applied the respective pretest and post test, a relatively small decrease of 1% was shown, which indicates that the students' ability to express themselves correctly did not improve significantly.

![Fluency Results - Control Group](image)

**Figure 2.2: Fluency results – control group**
3. Pronunciation

Experimental group:

Regarding pronunciation, we see that there was a 9% improvement in the students of the A1 level of the Language Institute, demonstrating that the use of the Recast strategy or implicit reformulations, significantly helps to correct the articulation and emission of sounds at the moment of speaking and producing a statement.

![Figure 3.1: Results in pronunciation – Experimental group](image-url)
Control Grupo :
Regarding the pronunciation we see that there was a decrease of 2.5% demonstrating that with the use and application of recast strategy, students could have improved the pronunciation.

![Graph: Results in Pronunciation – Control Grupo](image)

**Figura 3.2: Results in Pronunciation – Control Grupo**
4.Range

Experimental group:

Regarding the range, that is to say the way in which the second level students use the grammar according to the corresponding units, an 8% increase in the assimilation of their knowledge is evidenced, which means that the frequent use of reformulations, motivates students to improve their lexical level.
Figura 4.1: Results in range – Experimental Grupo

Grupo Control:

Regarding the rank, which refers to the use of grammar in second-level students, there was a minimum of 1% decrease in the assimilation of their knowledge, which indicates that if the strategy had been applied throughout the 4 weeks that the process lasted the second level students would have improved their lexical level, by
using vocabulary that goes according to the level that corresponds to them.

![Bar chart showing results in range – control group]

**Figure 4.2: Results in range – control group**

5. Content

**Experimental group:**

It can be seen that with a percentage of 6.5, the students showed an improvement in the use and accuracy of the
content used and related to conversations or dialogues focusing on the central theme of each unit.

**Figure 5.1: Results in content – Experimental Group**

**Control group:**

You can see a minimum percentage of 1.5% in the decrease obtained by students after applying the post test
in the same way the accuracy in the use of the content did not vary between the different units.

Figure 5.2: Results in content – Experimental group
Taking into account these results, it has been seen the need to develop 6 lesson plans focused on different ways for students to feel more comfortable and confident when being corrected as well as techniques to improve their oral productions in different topics related to the units students have to cover in a bimester.
Unit 1. MAKING FRIENDS

Objective: Use simple present with vocabulary related to family and hobbies.

Technique: Interaction effect

Interaction effect: The greatest difficulty that learners encounter in attempts to speak is not the multiplicity of sounds, words, phrases, and discourse form that characterize any language, but rather the interactive nature of most communication.

Conversations are collaborative as participants engage in a process of negotiation of meaning. So for the learner, the matter of what to say – a tremendous task to be sure – is often eclipsed by conventions of how to say things, when to speak, and other discourses constraints.
For example, among the many possible grammatical sentences that a learner could produce in response to a comment, how does that learner make a choice?

Activity: inverse role play

Procedure: Give a couple of students a piece of paper with the end of a story.

Students have to make up a conversation from the very beginning and include the end to the paper they have been given, the rest of the class has to copy silently their mates’ mistakes, then in couples, students have to try to correct their partners errors.
Didactic Resources: pieces of short incomplete end stories, markers

**Conclusion:** After the students’ presentation the teacher spoke aloud relating the mistake each student had made and letting students first have the chance to correct themselves if not the teacher proceeds to help.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OBJECTIVE</strong></th>
<th><strong>ACTIVITY</strong></th>
<th><strong>PROCEDURE</strong></th>
<th><strong>DIDACTIC RESOURCES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>use simple present with vocabulary related to family and hobbies.</td>
<td><strong>Inverse role play</strong></td>
<td><strong>Here the rules:</strong> 1. Choose a partner different from the one you usually work with. 2. Pick up a paper from the teacher’s bag 3. Read it silently with your partner and give yourself 2 minutes to create a dialogue based on that piece of paper. 4. After you have performed, ask your classmates whether they understood the message or not 5. Act out again 6. If classmates neither teacher did not get what you try to express, say the answer loudly</td>
<td>Paper Markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difficulty:</strong> Easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Required:</strong> 20-30 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapted by: Andrea Rosero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EVALUATION:**  

**Rubric for Role Play**

Student’s name: __________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exceptional 4</th>
<th>Admirable 3</th>
<th>Acceptable 2</th>
<th>Attempted 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Understanding of Topic** | □ Factual information is accurate  
□ Indicates a clear understanding of topic | □ Factual information is mostly accurate  
□ Good understanding of topic | □ Factual information is somewhat accurate  
□ Fair understanding of topic | □ Information is inaccurate  
□ Presentation is off topic |
| **Cooperation**     | □ Accepts ideas of others; able to compromise  
□ All members contribute | □ Accepts most ideas without negative comments; able to compromise  
□ Some members contribute | □ Unwilling to compromise  
□ Few members contribute | □ Group does not work together  
□ One person does all the work |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>□ Shows confidence</th>
<th>□ Shows some confidence</th>
<th>□ Unsure of responsibility</th>
<th>□ Portrayal stalls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Informative</td>
<td>□ Presents some information</td>
<td>□ Somewhat informative</td>
<td>□ Lacks information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Entertaining; engages audience</td>
<td>□ Engages audience</td>
<td>□ Engages audience intermittently</td>
<td>□ Audience bored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Speaks loudly and clearly</td>
<td>□ Can be heard</td>
<td>□ Can be heard</td>
<td>□ Mumbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appropriate use of body language</td>
<td>□ Some use of body language</td>
<td>□ Some use of body language</td>
<td>□ Body language is lacking; inappropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assignment Score _____________ + Beyonder/Bonus _____________ = Final Score
_________ 36 14 50

cte.sfasu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Skit.doc Adapted by: Andrea Rosero
2.1  Unit 2. INTERESTS

Objective: Use different verb forms to express interests

Technique: Affective filter in the classroom

Affective filter in the classroom: In his hypotheses, Krashen strongly distinguishes between language learning and language acquisition, explaining that language learning is a conscious process that allows production of a language over time with less focus on rules. Krashen shows that the effective filter hypothesis is more effective when we are dealing with students who are acquiring language rather than memorizing rules.

Krashen goes on to explain that although a low affective filter is crucial to acquiring language, by itself it is not enough. The learner must also be provided with “comprehensible input.” This means that the information...
coming in (vocabulary and content knowledge) must be understandable to the student. When the input is understandable, but slightly outside of the student’s current level of ability to spontaneously produce it, this is when the most language is acquired.

Activity: **Lowering stress in students**

Procedure: Allow students to submit answers anonymously. They can write them on 3x5 cards or use whiteboard markers (or chalk) to put answers on the board. When this technique is used, incorrect answers can be corrected without embarrassing the student who made the error. This allows each student to see that he/she is "normal" - each person in the class is growing and developing and still makes mistakes, just like they do. This strategy also helps give students a feeling of
success because they can also be praised for the originality and content of their submissions.

Didactic Material: cards, whiteboard, markers, cd

relaxation music.

Conclusion: The Affective Filter Hypothesis provides a good starting place for teachers who are looking to refine their teaching techniques and make the classroom experience more enjoyable and productive for their students. Knowledge of the affective filter can assist teachers in heightening their students’ self-confidence and motivation, thereby increasing language development, and leading to a consistently positive classroom experience for English language learners.
### Affective filter technique in the classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PROCEDURE</th>
<th>DIDACTIC RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Use different verb forms to express interests | Lowering stress in students | • Prepare a topic related to the unit.  
• When students make oral mistakes allow them to submit answers anonymously.  
• They can write them on 3x5 cards or use whiteboard markers (or chalk) to put answers on the board.  
• After having collected all the mistakes, the teacher reads them aloud and make students notice each error then,  
• Everybody has the chance to give his or her feedback according to what they think. | cards, whiteboard, markers, cd relaxation music |

Prepared by Andrea Rosero

---

Speaker’s name: _______________________

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Rating Excellent</th>
<th>Rating Good</th>
<th>Rating Satisfactory</th>
<th>Rating Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Points 10-9</td>
<td>Points 9-8</td>
<td>Points 8-7</td>
<td>Points 7-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>(1) Gets attention</td>
<td>Meets any three of the four criteria</td>
<td>Meets any two of the four criteria</td>
<td>Meets only one of the four criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Clearly identifies topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Establishes credibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Previews the main points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Body</strong></td>
<td>Main points are clear, well supported, and sources are documented</td>
<td>Main points are somewhat clear, some support, and some documentation</td>
<td>Main points need clarity and support lack of sources and documentation</td>
<td>Main points are not clear and have no support and no sources or documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>(1) Reviews main points</td>
<td>Reviews main points, brings</td>
<td>Brings closure</td>
<td>Does not bring closure; the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Brings closure</td>
<td>closure</td>
<td>audience is left hanging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Memorable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eye Contact**

- Eye contact with audience virtually all the time (except for brief glances at notes)
- Eye contact with audience less than 80% of the time
- Eye contact with audience less than 75% of the time
- Little or no eye contact

**Use of Language**

- Use of language contributes to effectiveness of the speech, and vocalized pauses (um uh er etc.) not distracting
- Use of language does not have negative impact, and vocalized pauses (um uh er etc.) not distracting
- Use of language causes potential confusion, and/or vocalized pauses (um uh er etc.) are distracting
- Use of language is inappropriate

**Body Language**

- Body language, gestures, and facial expressions adds greatly to the message
- Body language, gestures, and facial expressions compliment message
- Body language, facial expressions and gestures lack variety and spontaneity
- Body language, gestures, and facial expressions are lacking or inappropriate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Clarity</strong></th>
<th>Speaks clearly and distinctly all the time with no mispronounced words</th>
<th>Speaks clearly and distinctly nearly all the time with no more than one mispronounced word</th>
<th>Speaks clearly and distinctly most of the time with no more than two mispronounced words</th>
<th>Often mumbles or can not be understood with more than three mispronounced words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic is specific,</strong></td>
<td>Topic is specific, appropriate and adapted</td>
<td>Topic is clear appropriate and somewhat adapted</td>
<td>Topic lacks clarity and focus needs adapting to audience</td>
<td>No specific purpose-- inappropriate for audience or occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>follows assignment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adapted to audience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Aids</strong></td>
<td>Visual aids well chosen and presented</td>
<td>Minor problems with visual aids</td>
<td>Significant problems with visual aids</td>
<td>No visual aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td>Within allotted time</td>
<td>Within 10% of allotted time</td>
<td>Within 20% of allotted time</td>
<td>Not within 20% of allotted time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Unit 3. HEALTH

Objective: Use simple present and present continuous

Technique: Use of Interaction hypothesis

The Interaction Hypothesis is a type of theory proposing that one of most effective methods of learning a new language is through personal and direct interaction. This theory is applied specifically to the acquisition of a foreign or a second language. It is usually attributed to Professor Michael Long, when he wrote a paper entitled “The Role of the Linguistic Environment in Second Language Acquisition in 1996.
Through the Interaction Hypothesis, Professor Long integrated and reconciled two hypotheses on second language acquisition (SLA): the input and the output hypotheses. The Input Hypothesis states that a language learner only needs to be supplied with “input” through the forms of reading, listening to conversations, and lessons on grammar and vocabulary. The Output Hypothesis, on the other hand, stresses the importance of practicing and speaking to retain and remember the language. The Interaction Hypothesis combines both the “input” and “output” by stating that interaction is not only a means for a learner to study the language, but also a way for the learner to practice what he has learned.

Activity: Chain story
Procedure: Divide the class into two groups, tell each group to think about a famous person they like in common. The teacher begins the story using simple present, then students continue it giving ideas in present progressive from time to time. The student, who pronounces incorrectly or makes a mistake in the corresponding time, has to say a tongue twister based on the word he or she made the mispronunciation. The group which has the least number or corrections is the winner.

Didactic material: Board, projector, computer, bone paper.

**Conclusion:** As this theory is applied specifically to the acquisition of a foreign language, the interaction provided between teacher and student and, students among students is essential to be part of the learning process.
## OBJECTIVE
To use simple present contrasted with present continuous

## ACTIVITY
Chain Story

Suggested topics:
Famous people’s activities at the moment of speaking.

**Time Required:** 15-20 minutes

http://presentationsoft.about.com/od/classrooms/tp/student_tips.htm
Adapted by: Andrea Rosero

## PROCEDURE
1. Divide the class into two groups.
2. Tell each group to think about a famous person they like in common.
3. The teacher begins the story using simple present, then students continue it giving ideas in present progressive from time to time related to food and health habits.
4. The student who pronounces incorrectly or makes a mistake in the corresponding time, has to say a tongue twister based on the word he or she made the mispronunciation.
5. The group which has the least number or corrections is the winner.

## DIDACTIC RESOURCES
- Board
- Projector
- Computer
- Bone paper
# EVALUATION: Partner Interaction Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1 – Unacceptable</th>
<th>2 – Minimally Acceptable</th>
<th>3- Acceptable</th>
<th>4 – Pretty acceptable</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content of Questions</strong></td>
<td>Inappropriate questions asked to illicit responses. Lacked variety in type and form of questions.</td>
<td>Few substantive/pertinent questions asked. Very little variety in type and form of questions.</td>
<td>Some substantive/pertinent questions. Some variety in type and form of questions.</td>
<td>Mostly substantive/pertinent questions. A lot of variety in type and form of questions.</td>
<td>Score: ___ (out of 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization of the activity in group</strong></td>
<td>Little or no structure present. Presentation is confusing to the audience; no logical sequence of ideas; frequently off topic. Interview falls well outside set time parameters.</td>
<td>Identifiable structure is present but inconsistently executed; may contain several statements out of place and occasionally deviate from topic. Presentation falls slightly outside set time parameters.</td>
<td>Identifiable structure is present and consistently executed with few statements out of place. Presentation meets set time parameters.</td>
<td>Identifiable structure is presented in a purposeful, interesting, and effective sequence and remains focused. Presentation makes full, effective use of time and stays within time parameters.</td>
<td>Score: ___ (out of 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>Grammar, pronunciation, and/or word choice are severely deficient. Interviewer does not use professional language.</td>
<td>Isolated errors in grammar, pronunciation, and/or word choice reduce clarity and credibility.</td>
<td>Presentation is free of serious errors in grammar, pronunciation, and/or word usage. Interviewer sounds mostly professional.</td>
<td>Presentation is free of errors in grammar and pronunciation; word choice aids clarity and vividness. Professional language.</td>
<td>Score: ___ (out of 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Delivery is distracting or awkward and not commanding for an interview. Long silences or too much talking on the part of the interviewer.</td>
<td>Delivery neither enhances nor hinders performance. Appropriate gestures are communicated and some distracting mannerisms are visible.</td>
<td>Delivery is clear and commands the interview. Voice and body are evenly matched and appropriately managed for the situation.</td>
<td>Vocal and non-verbal delivery are well developed and enhance the interview experience.</td>
<td>Score: ___ (out of 15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student’s Name:**

www.nvcc.edu/annandale/lrc/...interaction_rubric.do
2.3 Unit 4. CELEBRATIONS

Objective: Use going to and present continuous to talk about future

Technique: Use of the negotiation of meaning

Negotiation of meaning: Negotiation of meaning is triggered when a breakdown in communication occurs in conversation leading to a modified utterance either from the L2 learner or their interlocutor. Either the learner needs to change what is said (i.e., modified output) in order to be understood by the native speaker or the NS needs to simplify speech (i.e., modified input) in order to be understood by the NNS. The negotiation of meaning is able to help the input process of information because by becoming consciously aware of one’s own production, output can serve the metalinguistic function of helping to
Researchers have found strong empirical evidence to support the hypothesis that oral communication is beneficial to learner language development because it fosters negotiation of meaning (e.g., Gass & Mackey, 2007). Corrective feedback, including that arising from negotiation of meaning, provides opportunities for language learners to focus on specific linguistic forms and thus may lead to incidental, implicit language learning, which has been shown to be effective in increasing communicative competence (Long, 1996).

Activity: **sequence role play** (at the dentist)

Procedure: In pairs, act out a conversation between a dentist and a patient, another pair acts out a conversation between husband and wife. The husband has toothache, another couple at the same time acts out a conversation in
the dentist’s waiting room, and finally the rest of students try to create a complete scene based on the different sceneries and taking into account one another’s opinion to negotiate what the topic is about and decide which part was used with the grammar given, in this case, going to and present continuous for future intentions.

Didactic Resources: Different topics and vocabulary related to the unit.

**Conclusion:** The negotiation of meaning, works as a positive strategy for interaction, according to Gass (2003), negotiation between native speakers and second language speakers and between two or more second language students is very important in developing second language skills. That is to say “conversation is not a medium of practice, but also the means by which learning takes place”( p234).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PROCEDURE</th>
<th>DIDACTIC RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To use going to and present</td>
<td>Sequence role play (at the dentist)</td>
<td>1. In pairs, act out a conversation between a dentist and a patient, another pair acts out a conversation between husband and wife. The husband has toothache, another couple at the same time acts out a conversation in the dentist’s waiting room.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous for future ideas</td>
<td>Suggested topics:</td>
<td>2. The rest of students in the classroom try to create a complete scene based on the different sceneries and taking into account one another’s opinion to negotiate what the topic is about and decide which part was used with the grammar given, in this case, going to and present continuous for future intentions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topics related to the use of future ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Time Required: 15-20 minutes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of negotiation of meaning Technique
### Rubric for Role Play

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exceptional 4</th>
<th>Admirable 3</th>
<th>Acceptable 2</th>
<th>Attempted 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Understanding of Topic** | □ Factual information is accurate  
□ Indicates a clear understanding of topic | □ Factual information is mostly accurate  
□ Good understanding of topic | □ Factual information is somewhat accurate  
□ Fair understanding of topic | □ Information is inaccurate  
□ Presentation is off topic |
| **Cooperation**           | □ Accepts ideas of others; able to compromise  
□ All members contribute | □ Accepts most ideas without negative comments; able to compromise  
□ Some members | □ Unwilling to compromise  
□ Few members contribute | □ Group does not work together  
□ One person does all the work |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>contribute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shows confidence</td>
<td>Shows some confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>Presents some information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertaining; engages</td>
<td>Engages audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audience</td>
<td>Can be heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks loudly and</td>
<td>Some use of body language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clearly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate use of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure of responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat informative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intermittently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be heard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to hear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrayal stalls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacks information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience bored</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumbles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body language is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacking; inappropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assignment Score ______ + Beyonder/Bonus ______ = Final Score ______

36 14

50

Adapted by: Andrea Rosero
2.4 Unit 5: GROWING UP

Objective: To use simple past of the verb be and action verbs in the correct form.

Technique: Use of the noticing hypothesis

Noticing hypothesis: In Schmidt’s (1995, 2001) noticing hypothesis, noticing is characterized as a catalyst in the internalization of L2 input into learners’ IL (interaction) system. Interaction researchers have also viewed noticing as an essential liaison that connects interactional input and learners output (Long, 1996). A number of researchers have taken learners ‘responses as evidence that they have noticed feedback. Researches have argued that uptake implies that learners have noticed the corrective function of recasts (Lyster R. &., 2006) and that a “reformulated utterance from the learner gives
some reason to believe that the mismatch has been noticed”.

As (Mackey, 2006) and Egi (2007b) suggested, learners’ accuracy identification of corrective feedback, particularly noticing the gap between IL and L2 forms, may facilitate the integration of L2 input contained in the feedback into learners ‘knowledge system. Gass (1997) stated “an initial step in grammar change is the learner’s noticing (at some level) a mismatch between the input and his or her own organization of the target language” (p. 28). In addition, noticing the gap may represent a higher mental activity than the simple noticing of L2 exemplars.

Activity: **Picture story**

Procedure: students are given randomly some pictures related to a man’s night, then they have to put the
pictures into the correct order to tell his or her partner the complete story using verbs in past either regular or irregular. The student who gets to have the most logical story with the appropriate verbs and with most of the verbs pronunciation correct is the winner.

Didactic Resources: photocopy papers, scissors, and irregular and regular verbs list.

**Conclusion:** When students notice the gap between one language and another, they are willing to interact making the act of speech more accurate, understandable and definitely more likable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PROCEDURE</th>
<th>DIDACTIC RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To use simple past of the verb be and action verbs in the correct form.</td>
<td>Picture story</td>
<td>1. Students are given randomly some pictures related to a man’s night.</td>
<td>Photocopy papers, scissors, and irregular and regular verbs list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulty: A little bit difficult</td>
<td>2. Then they have to put the pictures into the correct order to tell his or her partner the complete story using verbs in past either regular o irregular.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Required: 20-30 minutes</td>
<td>3. The student who gets to have the most logical story with the appropriate verbs and with most of the verbs pronunciation correct is the winner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.eslflow.com/speaking">http://www.eslflow.com/speaking</a> andcommunicativeicebreakeractivities.html</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted by: Andrea Rosero
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Audience cannot understand conversation because there is no sequence of information.</td>
<td>Audience has difficulty following conversation because student jumps around.</td>
<td>Students’ conversation presents information in logical sequence which audience can follow.</td>
<td>Students’ conversation presents information in logical, interesting sequence which audience can follow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>Students’ conversation does not provide relevant information on the topic.</td>
<td>Students’ conversation is somewhat relevant to the topic and provides some related information.</td>
<td>Students’ conversation provides relevant content on the topic but without additional details.</td>
<td>Students’ conversation provides detailed relevant content (more than required) with explanation and elaboration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mannerism</strong></td>
<td>Student is very nervous and talks in a stilted manner.</td>
<td>Student is a little nervous but is able to converse coherently.</td>
<td>Student is comfortable conversing with partner and converses in a natural manner.</td>
<td>Student is totally at ease with conversing with partner and converses articulately and confidently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eye Contact</strong></td>
<td>Student reads out conversation with no eye contact.</td>
<td>Student occasionally uses eye contact, but still reads mostly from notes.</td>
<td>Student maintains eye contact most of the time but frequently returns to notes.</td>
<td>Student maintains eye contact with partner and seldom returns to notes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elocution</td>
<td>Student mumbles, incorrectly pronounces terms, and speaks too quietly for students in the back of class to hear.</td>
<td>Student's voice is low. Student incorrectly pronounces terms. Audience members have difficulty hearing the conversation.</td>
<td>Student's voice is clear. Student pronounces most words correctly. Most audience members can hear conversation.</td>
<td>Student uses a clear voice with correct, precise pronunciation of terms so that all audience members can hear conversation.</td>
<td>Total Points:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.ncsu.edu/midlink/rub.pres.html
by: Andrea Rosero
2.5 Unit 6: AROUND TOWN

Objective: To learn how to ask about places in town with the use of *is there* and *are there*

Technique: Simulation

**Simulation:** It is a technique that plays aspects of reality, with the use of various resources that want to be studied and learned to get the most success at the moment it takes place. This strategy, which emphasizes process over content, is very interesting for training in techniques for solving social problems and for training in social interaction techniques (interviewing, conducting meetings). (Mendoza Fillola, 2003). This technique is based on the Jigsaw principle which establishes that the coherence of discourse is built from information brought
from different partners. Each member of the group has a different part of the information, either orally or in writing is provided; then they put together what everyone knows and together rebuild the total information from the fragments that each possesses to have a logical coherent dialogue.

Activity: Summer fun

Procedure: This is a pair work activity, Student A reads the brochure about Seasons Resort, and student B has a brochure about Breezes Resort. Students begin asking each other what kind of attractions each resort has, the rest of the class is writing silently students’ mispronunciation and trying to decide which place is the best for a summer vacation. When the conversation finishes participants are given feedback and choose another couple to continue with the activity.
Conclusion: The simulation technique helps a lot students who are afraid of talking in groups, since there must be interaction all the time among students in conversations, and this way students feel self-confidence because they are using the *Natural approach* to speak in front of their partners, since the *Natural approach* catches the interest adapting students’ needs to the required activity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PROCEDURE</th>
<th>DIDACTIC RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To learn how to ask about places in town with the use of <em>is there</em> and <em>are there</em></td>
<td>Summer fun: role play</td>
<td>This is a pair work activity. Student A reads the brochure about Seasons Resort, and student B has a brochure about Breezes Resort. Students begin asking each other what kind of attractions each resort has, the rest of the class is writing silently students’ mispronunciation and trying to decide which place is the best for a summer vacation. When the conversation finishes participants are given feedback and choose another couple to continue with the activity.</td>
<td>pieces of brochures related to different locations in a town</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VALUATION:

Teacher’s name: ______________

Student’s name: ______________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exceptional 4</th>
<th>Admirable 3</th>
<th>Acceptable 2</th>
<th>Attempted 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Understanding of Topic** | □ Factual information is accurate  
□ Indicates a clear understanding of topic | □ Factual information is mostly accurate  
□ Good understanding of topic | □ Factual information is somewhat accurate  
□ Fair understanding of topic | □ Information is inaccurate  
□ Presentation is off topic |
| **Cooperation** | □ Accepts ideas of others; able to compromise  
□ All members contribute | □ Accepts most ideas without negative comments; able to compromise  
□ Some members contribute | □ Unwilling to compromise  
□ Few members contribute | □ Group does not work together  
□ One person does all the work |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Shows confidence</th>
<th>Shows some confidence</th>
<th>Unsure of responsibility</th>
<th>Portrayal stalls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>Presents some information</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lacks information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entertaining;</td>
<td>Engages audience</td>
<td></td>
<td>Audience bored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>engages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mumbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body language is lacking; inappropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaks loudly</td>
<td>Can be heard</td>
<td>Hard to hear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and clearly</td>
<td>Some use of body language</td>
<td>Some movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate use of body language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assignment Score ____________ + Beyonder/Bonus ____________ = Final Score ______
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