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When we started the TBL SIG four years ago, we couldn’t have imagined the high calibre of contributors that we would be fortunate enough to have publish in OnTask. Over the last four years we have had extremely high quality contributions from well-respected TBLT practitioners and theorists alike.

Adding to this growing list are the feature article contributors for the present issue, Peter Skehan and William Littlewood. Many of our readers will be familiar with the work of both, Peter as author of an impressive list of articles and books including *Individual Differences in Language Learning* and *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning* and William with an equally impressive teaching and publishing background, including the definitive overview of CLT, *Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction*.

For this issue, we are fortunate to have a great mix of both research based and more practical articles and lesson plans. Peter Skehan’s article looks at two areas of task-based research that have received a lot of attention in recent years; pre-task planning and post-task phases. He reviews the relevant studies concerning both areas of research and then evaluates the pedagogic implications these studies have on teaching procedures. William Littlewood’s article looks at task-based learning in language teacher education. The teaching context involves Chinese learners of English who are training to be teachers. The study shows how TBL can be applied to help prospective teachers learn about language teaching as well as language learning.

Our three lesson plans this issue should again provide TBL practitioners with some good ideas for classes. Oana Cusen’s Language Learner History project is a creative task-based lesson intended to be used at the start of a course in which learners reflect and discuss their language learning experiences. Next, Matthew Turner’s lesson focused on business English in which learners perform a task designed to replicate interactions within multilingual business meetings. Finally, Samuel Crofts provides a fun lesson plan where learners are required to interact in the L2 in order to build a free-standing structure using a set of materials.

If you would like to join our ever-growing list of TBLT experts featuring in OnTask by publishing an article or lesson plan related to task-based learning, please contact our Publications Officer, Colin Thompson at tbltinasia@gmail.com.
Before and After the Task: Potential Research-based Contributions

Peter Skehan
St. Mary's University, Twickenham

The Background

The literature on task-based performance and instruction has grown enormously in recent years, with many, many articles, several books, a book series even, and debates about whether tasks are worthwhile, whether they should be primary or secondary, as well as disagreements about theories of task performance. We have learned a lot about the characteristics of tasks which are important, and how they have an impact on performance. There have also been many research studies into how to implement tasks, such as pre-task choices, post-task choices, and also how to set the task itself up. There have also been developments in how performance is measured. Researchers, if not teachers, now frequently look at general performance in terms of complexity (both structural, with morphosyntax, and lexical, with extent of more difficult words used), accuracy, and fluency. Many of the research studies have explored how varying task characteristics and task conditions impact on these different performance areas.

This is too much to cover here! In any case, there are many places where good material can be found, such as Rod Ellis’ book (2003), as well as the volumes in the John Benjamins series (e.g. Van den Branden et al. 2009). So in this article, I am going to focus only on what happens before a task and what happens afterwards. Circumscribing things like this gives more of a chance that there will be some depth to the discussion. In addition, the before and after phases connect with relatively recent research done with tasks, research which seems to me to have pedagogic implications. Accordingly, I am going to focus mainly on these areas, discussing relevant research, and then trying to evaluate it for relevance to actual teaching procedures.

Pre-task

In some ways, this is the area where research has done most to contribute to pedagogy. The basic concern is what can happen before a task is done that is useful. Of course, many possibilities exist here – pre-task tasks, orientation activities, constructing splash diagrams, hearing native speakers do a similar task, and so on. But what the research literature has most concerned itself with is planning, generally defined as giving learners ten minutes to prepare before they do a task. Many studies have now been conducted and some powerful generalisations were already fairly established some years ago. Basically planning is associated with substantially greater complexity and fluency in the language which is used, and improved accuracy, though this not as much as with the other two performance areas. In addition, it appears that planning is more useful (i.e. has more of an impact on performance) if the task is more demanding or complex. Planning seems to be a bit wasted on simpler tasks. The research basis for these claims is now very well established, and it supports the claim that, pedagogically, giving planning time, pre-task, is a good thing, and boosts performance. (I would also argue that it makes the task a little more natural, paradoxically. It enables the learner to avoid having
to do something ‘cold’, completely new, and because of this, learners can be a little more themselves, and personalise the task).

So if those are the conclusions from, say, 2004, has anything happened since? And here, I think some interesting progress has been made which could be relevant to teachers. There are three areas. First, our understanding of on-line planning has improved. Some years ago, Rod Ellis, looking at the weaker effects of planning on accuracy, argued that we need to distinguish between what he terms strategic planning (i.e. pre-task planning) and on-line planning, i.e. the planning that takes place while someone is speaking, when that speaking takes place under unpressured conditions, with reasonable or even ample amounts of time available. He argues that on-line planning, when it occurs, is what leads to greater accuracy, since participants can exploit the time available to monitor what they are saying in a more effective manner. A student of mine in Hong Kong, Zhan Wang (2014), doubted aspects of Ellis’ research, and designed her own study to explore how on-line planning works. In one condition, ‘pure’ on-line planning (operationalised a little more effectively than in the Ellis and Yuan (2005) studies), she showed that on-line planning alone did not have any effect on accuracy. However, if there was opportunity for pre-task planning and on-line planning together, then there was a strong effect. What seemed to be happening here is that pre-task planning allows learners to organise their thoughts and to have something to say, and then the on-line planning conditions, more relaxed as they are, allow attention to be directed to saying what is said well. It’s not simply more time – it’s time with some purpose attached.

Most of the research with planning has been experimental and quantitative – researchers design studies and then measure performance. What people do during planning is then not the focus – it’s the results of planning which are investigated. The second area for development concerns qualitative studies, in which researchers ask participants what they did during the planning time, to get an idea of how this time is used. One of the first to do this was Lourdes Ortega (2005), who found her participants entirely ready to talk about their planning activities and whose findings are very interesting. What Ortega didn’t do, though, was relate planning behaviours to actual performance and this was something that my colleague Francine Pang and I did, in a study in Macao (Pang and Skehan 2014). We were able to relate what people said they did during planning to how well they performed, in the usual areas, as covered above. What we found, and this surprised us a little, was that planning could be bad as well as good. Doing some things because the planner thought there would be an advantage was actually related to lower performance! We reflected on all the self-reports and the actual performances, and came up with five ‘precepts’ for effective planning which draw upon the positive effects, and minimise the negative. In each case the precept is linked with differences in actual performance, but what we found interesting is that some of these precepts had a two-edged quality – take the wrong perspective and one is planning oneself into trouble! The five precepts are:

• build your own structure
• avoid trouble, and be realistic
• handle trouble when it occurs
• plan small or specific (versus plan general)
• avoid a focus on grammar, and concentrate on ideas

I will cover the precepts one-by-one, in each case trying to bringing out how to make performance better, but also, where appropriate, how to avoid making performance worse. First of all, as with task characteristics, structure is good. In this case, though, some people used planning time to ‘find’ structure in the task, to organise the ideas, and this helped them. Interestingly, some planners anticipated that there would be problems ahead, and used the planning time to think about this, and to
realise how to avoid pitfalls. For example, 'choose to use simple words' figured here. There is also here an important point about realism – think what you can do, and don’t be over-ambitious. Plan to do what is within your capabilities. The same thing goes for handling trouble when it occurs – use planning time to have some recovery or escape strategies. The last two bullet points are a little more positive, at least potentially. It’s good to plan small, and to be as specific as possible, and not to plan with a grand perspective. This brings out clearly one of the key findings – a major issue is not the planning itself, but the learner’s capacity to remember and to transfer the effects of planning into the actual task. Planning small or specific seems to be better as a basis for remembering and transferring material more effectively. Interestingly, this applies clearly to grammar. Focusing on grammar during planning seems to be associated with problems in performance, perhaps because the grammar isn’t remembered when it is important for actual use. In contrast, planning ideas is retained, and is more effective in performance, with accuracy and complexity.

This research doesn’t question the usefulness of planning pedagogically – it still seems to me to be a vital technique to use in the methodology of using tasks. But the research does suggest that there is a ‘use with caution’ element to planning, since there are things one can do during planning time which may be harmful. (And it may be that this accounts, at least in part, for the smaller accuracy effects which have been found with pre-task planning.) From a teacher’s perspective, though, the research is very suggestive. It implies that students need to learn how to plan, or to put this another way, training students to plan more effectively may be a really useful thing to do. And this is something probably best done by teachers. In other words, simply using planning automatically is not the best thing – what is needed is some work between teachers and students which draws attention to how it can best be used.

There is one final area of research which is relevant here, and that is repetition. Asking students to repeat something often provokes a negative reaction from teachers! Repetition? That has to be inauthentic, unnatural, non-communicative! To which I would answer, only up to a point! Much of what we do in life is repetitive, and there are frequent occasions when we catch ourselves thinking that what we are doing or saying is essentially a replay of a previous event. So repetition does occur. And in any case, repetition is usually not of exactly the same thing – we do change, and improvise, and adapt. From personal experience, as a language learner, I would also add that I really loved repetition, not least because I was able to capitalise on the earlier performance. This is a technique where it would be good to ask students what they think. The answer might be surprising and even show a conflict between teachers and students (although I do accept that regular and boring repetition might not be so welcomed.) So for now, I would only ask that the benefit of the doubt should be given.

“ Asking students to repeat something often provokes a negative reaction from teachers! Repetition? That has to be inauthentic, unnatural, non-communicative! To which I would answer, only up to a point.”
Zhan Wang (yes, her again!) also included a repetition condition in her research. The results were spectacular. The repeated performance was massively superior, in complexity, accuracy, and fluency. Her repetition condition was an immediate one, and of course, we don’t know what would have happened if there had been a delay in time (although other research, by Plough and Gass (1993), and by Bygate (2001), as well as classroom based research by Lynch and Maclean (2001), also reports positive effects.) Planning is obvious preparation for a task. But repetition is also preparation – the first performance engages with the task, creates familiarity, and then the second performance reaps the benefit. So dissimilar as the two activities might seem, there are serious resemblances too. But I think there is an important difference. When learners plan, they retrieve things that might be useful for the actual performance, such as words, phrases, sentence frames. Then they hope they will remember these items of planning later. But the planning is usually a little superficial, and with a word, for example, only involves perhaps the general form or meaning of the word. When people repeat, they have already wrestled with actual speech, and if a word was important then, they couldn’t be satisfied simply with the general form. They had to work out which words associate with that word, what sentence frames it fits into, how its phonology is actually handled in speech. There is much greater depth and completeness in the preparation that they do in the first performance which then impacts upon the repeated performance. As a result, it seems, this way of getting ready is much more effective. So, on balance, I think that any worries we have about the inauthenticity of repetition have to be set against the considerable benefits that it can bring. Of course, constant repetition would be a disaster, but encouraging students to use the repeated performance to build, and to do more than they otherwise would can give them a considerable sense of achievement.

The Post-task Phases
There are two parts to this section, corresponding to two sorts of activities (and purposes) that can occur after an actual task. The first is concerned with how teachers can insinuate a concern for form into a task while it is being done, even without being present with the learners doing the task! The method is to get learners to anticipate the post-task phase even while they are doing the task, and in this way, to change how they do the task itself because they will be slightly worried about what will come later. The second type of post-task activity looks at how the task can be a starting point for further work by bringing to attention language which is necessary to create meaning. This language then becomes the starting point for the pedagogic work which follows. The two post-task phases have in common that they highlight the importance that learners do not regard the task as an end in itself, where once the task is completed, nothing more is involved. But the first does, even so, concentrate on the actual task performance, but it assumes that it is anticipation of what happens afterwards that is important. The second, though, views the task as an important starting point for pedagogic activity. Each of these stages, the concern for form and the starting point for pedagogic work, has been strongly influenced by two people whose contributions to understanding tasks is enormous: Tony Lynch and Jane Willis. We will look at the two aspects of post-task work in turn.

Post-task A: Insinuating a concern for form
We now have a few studies which explore the consequences for task-performance of anticipating what is to come later. This work, for me, started with the influence of Jane Willis (1996). The basic worry for a teacher is that asking learners to do tasks will make
them better at doing tasks, but not extend their language competence or skills. In other words, one could try to simply transact a task without focusing on form. In this case something more needs to happen to make it more likely that the learner will devote some attention to form even while engaging in a communicative activity. In Willis’ view of task methodology, a sequence of activities is involved which ‘surround’ the task, and one of these is the possibility that a public performance may follow the ‘private’ task being done in a pair in a classroom, say. My colleague Pauline Foster and I adapted this idea in a study we conducted some time ago (Skehan and Foster 1997). We had predicted that knowing that you might have to re-do a task, in front of the rest of the class and the teacher, would raise the stakes, so to speak, and lead to a greater focus on accuracy, as learners are aware of the rehearsal element of what they are doing in a task, and try to avoid making mistakes (so that they won’t look foolish later). In other words, they would direct more attention than usual in task performance to being correct. In the event, our prediction of greater accuracy, selectively, (not greater complexity or fluency) was fulfilled, but for only one of our tasks, a decision-making task (and not for a personal information exchange task or a narrative). Stubbornly, we decided that the problem was not the idea of pushing attention in a particular direction while a task was being done, but rather that the way we ‘engineered’ this was not very effective, i.e. the public performance. So, following Tony Lynch (2001, 2007), we used a different idea: we required people, after the task, to transcribe some of their performance from actually doing the task (which we had recorded during the actual performance) (Foster and Skehan 2013). We did this with a narrative (the type of task we consider to be the most difficult) and a decision-making task. This time we found clear differences for accuracy on both tasks – those who transcribed some of their performance, compared to a control group who didn’t, produced more accurate language. (In the decision making group they produced more complex language too.) So this condition, post-task transcription, seemed more effective at inducing learners, while doing a task, to direct attention towards form, and to avoid making mistakes. In the more interactive decision-making task, it also seemed to induce them to direct attention towards using more complex language too, which we hadn’t predicted, but which is consistent with our ideas of a greater concern with form. Obviously, as a teacher, you can’t be ‘there’, sitting with learners while a task is running, since then it wouldn’t really be a task. But the condition we used, transcribing, seemed a neat way to us to insinuate pedagogic norms into the task itself without compromising its naturalness (much).

A student of mine in Hong Kong, Christina Li, liked this research, but felt it had even more potential (Li, 2014). So she used transcription as the basis for her Ph.D. What she did that was new was to introduce some additional conditions for the transcription. First, she compared the effects on performance when the transcription was done alone or in pairs. Second, she compared ‘straight’ transcription with a condition where learners produced a (rewritten) version of their performance, correcting their mistakes (where they saw mistakes, that is). In general, she confirmed our broad results: anticipation of transcription is associated with greater accuracy (and also complexity, some of the time). Pair based transcribing had an additional benefit, not huge, but clear, for producing greater syntactic complexity. Producing a revised version had an additional impact, beyond the baseline, on greater accuracy, but this seemed to be at the expense of complexity, which was negatively affected.

It’s my feeling we are at the start of something here. What is clear is that anticipating what will come after a task has an impact on how the actual task is performed, and this is generally beneficial.
This goes some way to countering task critics who claim that people doing tasks run the risk of only transacting the task rather than developing their language. But the research base is rather slender. We need more research, and we also will benefit from learning which sorts of post-task activity, including which sorts of transcription, will have the most beneficial effects.

Post-task B: Building on salience

With task-based approaches, we wrestle with some tensions. Obviously the undisputed advantage of such an approach is that the ability to use language is enhanced, and so communicative ability is reliably developed. However, we also want our learners to develop their general competence and knowledge of the target language system. This might push instruction in a traditional direction, towards units of teaching based on grammar and syllabuses organised accordingly (and which might then compromise what a task-based approach is trying to achieve). But a major problem for such a grammar-oriented approach is that acquisition research tells us that much of development is the result of internal processes of acquisition, and imposing an external structural syllabus is likely to conflict with the learning paths that individuals have.

One response to this set of conundrums is to use the final post-task phase in task-based instruction for actual teaching (Willis, 1996). The task is then seen as the arena which makes salient some aspect of language. In other words, the task may well provoke what has been termed a ‘need to mean’. Crucially, performance during the task needs to be recorded in some way, e.g. with an MP3 player, a mobile phone, a sensitive teacher, or simply notes from a student. The point is that after the task, language which has emerged as important, and which is causing difficulty can then be worked on. In this way, the naturalness of the task is maintained, but it becomes the starting point for focused work on language which has shown itself to be relevant to the development of the students in question (Skehan, 2011, 2013). For example, there may have been difficulty with modality, or relativisation, or choice of tense. If it has been noticed that this is the case, the teacher, at the post-task stage can capitalise on this, and deal with the language in question in a more sustained way. The language may be new, or it may indicate misunderstanding, or it may indicate that some aspect of the emerging language needs reorganisation. But the teacher can choose, out of the many candidate points that are likely to have emerged, those which seem most amenable for timely treatment. In this way, development is led by the students, and the relevance of the language is clear, because it is communication itself that has demonstrated the need. But at this point, the teacher could be licensed to focus on language quite explicitly and even in an organised way, developing teaching strategies which are now focusing on specific language – but the specific language ‘announced’ by the learners themselves. In fact, this post-task phase seems to me the key phase in a task-based approach. It would be very unfortunate if language is made salient through a task, and then this potential is not exploited. This is the moment the teacher has been waiting for when they can use their professional knowledge, and hopefully work on language systematically, and in a manner which is more likely to be retained.

Conclusions

Research, frankly, has not contributed as much as it might to helping teachers select which tasks to use, on the basis of difficulty or complexity. There are some insights, as we have seen, but these are not extensive, and certainly not enough to base a course on. In contrast, task research has a lot to contribute regarding the conditions under which tasks are done, whether this concerns
what happens before the actual task, or what happens afterwards. What I have reviewed seems to me to have already shown that what happens before and what happens after the task are vital for the success of task-based teaching.
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Task-based learning in language teacher education

Bill Littlewood
Hong Kong Baptist University

Introduction

This article considers first how the learning activities which students engage in during teacher education courses may contribute not only to their received knowledge about TBLT but also to their experiential knowledge. Then it looks at how the effectiveness of task-based interaction may be enhanced through collaborative learning techniques. Finally it describes some task-based activities which draw on these techniques and were used in a pre-service teacher education course for L1 Chinese students.

The techniques and activities described are not restricted to teacher education courses but can be transferred to other contexts where a second language is learnt.

Received and experiential knowledge about TBLT

A familiar phenomenon in teacher development is that teachers’ classroom beliefs and actions are often influenced less by the input from their pre-service teacher education courses than by their own previous learning experiences. This is often explained (e.g. by Borg, 2004; Ellis, 2006) with reference to Lortie’s (1975) well known term ‘the apprenticeship of observation’. Students have already sat through several thousand hours of learning and these have provided them with powerful mental models of teaching which are not easily changed by the formal input from courses in pedagogy. When students enter the classroom and are faced with a multitude of unfamiliar situations, these models (which have been deeply internalized over many years) provide them with ‘default options’ for how to think, act and respond.

The ‘apprenticeship of observation’ is often referred to in a negative way, since it may inhibit a new teacher’s attempts to adopt innovations and teach according to newly acquired ideals and methods. However, once we recognize its influence, we can also draw on its positive potential as a blueprint for new learning. Thus, if our teacher education classes can provide models for ways in which the students themselves may later wish to teach, the content and the process of learning can reinforce each other. We may refer here to the distinction between ‘received’ and ‘experiential’ knowledge (Wallace, 1991, cited in Ellis, 2006). Received knowledge is knowledge (here: about TBLT) received from various external sources such as lectures and reading. Experiential knowledge develops from the actual process of learning. One of our aims as teacher educators can be to let the two kinds of knowledge reinforce and illuminate each other – to harness, as Ellis (2006, p. 15) describes it, ‘the subtle interplay of experiential knowledge with received knowledge’.

In the context of task-based learning and teaching, there are many possibilities for this interplay. Task-based learning is a cross-curricular concept and can be applied not only to how people learn a language but also to how people learn about language teaching. In both domains, received knowledge and experiential knowledge can support and reinforce each other.
Thus, through task-based learning (about teaching) students can learn about task-based learning and teaching (of language). Indeed if the students are themselves second language speakers, there is a third level of learning: if the students interact with each other in the second language (which I will here assume to be English – EFL or ESL), they are also developing their own experiential competence in English.

The teacher education context which I write about in this article is an MA in Language Studies programme at the Hong Kong Baptist University. The 33 students involved are either local Hong Kong students or students from Mainland China. All have Chinese as their first language. Some have already had teaching experience but most have recently graduated with English as their major subject. Many (but not all) plan to be teachers in their future career, in Hong Kong or Mainland China. In this context, the three levels of learning just mentioned are present:

• Level 1: The students explore principles that underlie second language learning and teaching. These principles are not exclusive to TBLT but may also apply to other approaches. For example, they discuss motivational strategies, their own experiences of language learning, and ‘postmethod’ principles of language teaching.

• Level 2: In exploring the principles, they are themselves involved in task-based learning. The activities embody the essential components usually proposed for TBLT: context, purpose, outcome, and activation of their framework of knowledge and skills.

• Level 3: As second language speakers, they develop their own competence in English through experiential language learning. For many, this is an important experience in developing their communication skills.

Regarding level 3, the students agreed at the beginning of the course that they would benefit most by using English as the medium for communication. Groups varied in how consistent they were with this.

**Collaborative learning strategies and techniques**

Two hazards which may threaten the success of task-based learning (whether in teacher education or in second language learning) are ‘premature closure’ and ‘social loafing’. The former refers to the phenomenon that groups come to a quick and easy decision without considering an issue in depth. The second refers to the phenomenon that some students do not participate fully in group discussion but prefer to let others do all the work. To help reduce these phenomena, techniques associated with collaborative learning offer useful ways of structuring task-based learning. Here are some of the techniques used in the activities described below (others may be found in e.g. Littlewood, 2009; McCafferty et al., 2006; Sharan, 1999).

**Jigsaw**

• A task is designed with three or four subtasks which contribute towards the final outcome. For example, the outcome may be a presentation and the
subtasks may involve reading an article, watching a video and interviewing classmates.

- In groups of three or four students, each member works on one of the subtasks.
- After students have worked on their separate subtasks, they return to their groups and contribute to preparing the group outcome, e.g. the presentation.

There may be a preliminary stage in which groups of students with the same subtask work together and help each other (‘expert jigsaw’).

**(Forward snowball)**

- Each student is given a set period of time (e.g. three minutes) in which to list (e.g.) four facts or ideas related to a theme.
- Students form pairs, discuss, and expand their ideas into a list of eight.
- Pairs form groups of four, who discuss and produce a combined list, deleting ideas which are repeated but attempting to add more, to produce sixteen.
- These are shared with the class.

The effect is similar to ‘brainstorming’, in which the aim is to accumulate as many ideas as possible.

**(Reverse snowball)**

- Each student writes down ideas on a given topic, for example, what are the six most important characteristics of a successful language teacher.
- Students in pairs then discuss and attempt to reduce their combined list by agreeing on the six (or seven, etc.) most essential points.
- Pairs form groups of four, who again discuss and reduce their combined list, to produce an agreed list of the most essential points.
- These are shared with the class.

Whereas forward snowball leads to an accumulation of many ideas, reverse snowball encourages critical analysis and evaluation in order to select the most important ones.

**(Think, pair, share)**

- A topic for discussion is given to the class.
- Each student has a short period of time to think about it and jot down notes.
- Pairs of learners share ideas with each other for a further period.
- Pairs share their ideas within a larger group or the whole class.

This simple technique can be inserted spontaneously into almost any class as a way of maintaining involvement. The students in each pair may also be asked first to interview each other on the topic in question.

**(Three-step interview)**

- Students form groups of four, in which they choose or are assigned a topic for discussion.
- Each group of four divides immediately into two pairs.
- In each pair, A interviews B about the topic but does not express his or her own opinions. B then interviews A in the same way.
- The two pairs re-form into a group of four, in which they share ideas and opinions, enter into free discussion, and attempt to reach an agreement on the issue.
- Their conclusion may be reported to the class or form the basis of written report, etc.

**(Constructive controversy)**

- Students form groups of four and are assigned (or choose) a topic for debate (e.g. the pros and cons of using a published textbook).
- Each group divides into two pairs.
- Each pair is asked to support one side of the issue.
- Pairs research the issue and review the arguments on both sides.
- Groups of four are re-formed and a debate takes place, as each pair tries
to convince the other pair of their own side of the issue.

- After a time, they step out of the ‘formal’ debating structure and engage in free discussion.

**Numbered heads**

(This is a way of organizing the feedback or reporting stage after group work.)

- In each group of (e.g.) four, the students are asked to assign numbers from 1 to 4 to each member.
- At the feedback or reporting stage, the teacher simply indicates a group and a number.

Each student has an equal chance of being asked to report and must therefore stay fully involved in the preceding group discussion.

**Collaborative tasks for teacher education**

In this section some collaborative tasks are described in which the students explore aspects of language learning and teaching and, simultaneously, have direct experience of task-based learning and develop their communication skills (i.e. the three levels of learning mentioned earlier).

The tasks are presented in the sequence followed in the MA course. There were of course many other learning activities.

**What is second language learning like?** (See Littlewood, 2012, for a more detailed description.)

1. Each student writes down one or two metaphors (expressed as similes) which characterize his or her perceptions of language learning (by completing the frame ‘Learning a second language is like ... because ...’).
2. In the next session all the resulting metaphors are given to all students.
3. Groups discuss the metaphors and decide on (a) the six metaphors which best characterise, for them, the nature of second language learning and (b) the aspects of second language learning which each of the six metaphors captures.
4. Each chosen metaphor is given a score and the most popular ones are identified.
5. The outcome is a profile of the class’s perceptions of second language learning.

**The experience of second language learning**

In Hayhoe (1998), Ruth Hayhoe describes her second language learning experiences in four stages of her life.

1. In groups of four, each student is given a section of the article corresponding to one of the stages and makes notes (in a table) about the writer’s (a) learning opportunities, (b) reasons for learning, (c) strategies for learning and (d) outcomes of learning for that stage.
2. The groups of four come together and share results in ‘jigsaw’ mode.
3. Each group then focuses on just one dimension of learning (opportunities, reasons, strategies or outcomes) and analyzes how it changed in different stages of Hayhoe’s experience.
4. Based on an interview schedule similar to the table used in the first step above, students interview each other about their own past learning experiences.
5. Some students report to the class about either their own or their partner’s past learning experiences.

(In the course, this activity provided the basis for individual written accounts. It was also used to illustrate how such an account may be structured initially either around the main stages of learning or around the main dimensions of learning.)

**Strategies for motivation**

Renandya (2013a, 2013b) discusses ‘5Ts’ of motivation: Teacher, Teaching method, Task, Text and Test. In Renandya (2013a) they are presented in the form of a circle with ‘Teacher’ in the centre.
1. Each group of four or five students is asked to generate (in ‘forward snowball’ mode) as many factors or strategies as they can that affect motivation in the domain of each of the 5Ts.

2. In the next session, the students are given all the results and each group is asked to focus on just one (assigned) of the 5Ts. In ‘reverse snowball’ mode, each group is asked to agree on the six most important strategies for that T and formulate them as ‘commandments’ to themselves as teachers (as in Dörnyei & Csizér, 1998).

3. The resulting 30 commandments for motivation reflect the class’s perception of motivational strategies for language learning.

4. They may also form the basis of a class-designed questionnaire to be given to students or teachers.

(In the course, the five sections were also used to illustrate alternative ways to design and format questionnaire items.)

**Principles for a postmethod pedagogy**

1. The students receive input about the ‘set methods’ which have influenced the development of language teaching, e.g. the grammar translation method, the audio-lingual method, situational language teaching and others included in e.g. Littlewood (2008) and Richards & Rodgers (2001).

2. They are asked to identify two ideas or techniques from each method which they would accept as important, even though the method may no longer be accepted as valid as a complete ‘package’.

3. They are also introduced to the rationale for ‘postmethod’ pedagogy and the proposals for postmethod principles and strategies put forward by Ellis (e.g. 2005) and Kumaravadivelu (e.g. 2006).

4. Based on this input and also their own learning experience, groups of three are asked to list what they themselves propose as the ten most important

5. In the next session, each trio uses their own ten principles as a basis for evaluating an extract from a task-based lesson.

6. Trios double up to form groups of six. Here they share each other’s principles and formulate a joint evaluation of the lesson extract for a presentation to the whole class.

**Techniques for teaching language skills and systems**

This task is based on the principles of ‘pecha kucha’ (a presentation in which 20 PowerPoint slides are set to advance automatically at 20 second intervals). This is gaining in popularity but is still something of an adventure for most students. A good selection of pecha kucha presentations related to TESOL is available through the KOTESOL website.

1. Students are introduced to the notion of pecha kucha and watch some examples.

2. Each group of four or five is asked to prepare (in ‘jigsaw’ mode) a pecha kucha on one of the language skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking) or one of the language systems (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation), based e.g. on the relevant chapter in Nunan (2003) and any other input they may choose.

3. Groups are given the option to either present the pecha kucha ‘live’ or to record it for viewing in class. (In the course, one group chose to record it.)

The pecha kucha format proved a useful focusing device and was effective in stimulating students to use their own words rather than highlight and read from a text. It also increased fluency.

**Conclusion**

Chinese students, like Japanese students, have a reputation for being passive and reticent in class (see e.g. Xie, 2010). In the
task-based learning activities reported in this article, the students contradicted this reputation and illustrated their wish to participate whole-heartedly and to explore ideas in creative, critical ways. This contributed in no small way to making the class into a cohesive ‘learning community’ (Watkins, 2005) in which every member could learn with and from each other.
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Introduction

The Language Learner History project is meant to be a creative alternative to more conventional student self-introduction tasks at the beginning of a course. Students get the opportunity to reflect on their language learning experiences up to that point in their lives and share them with their peers. Other aims of the project are to introduce students to the process of preparing a presentation, and the poster carousel presentation style.

The project consists of a series of tasks, with subsequent tasks building on previous ones. Students first learn the steps of the presentation preparation process: brainstorming, outlining, creating a first draft, giving and receiving feedback, finalizing the draft, and practicing. Students then work their way through these steps, each of which is a separate task. The final goal of the Language Learner History project is a poster carousel presentation, during which students present their language learning experiences to small groups of peers.

Preparation

Collect a few pictures that are representative of your own language learner experiences and print them on A4 size paper in color. Alternatively, you could prepare a timeline of your language learner history as an electronic presentation (Power Point, Keynote, Prezi).

Task sequence

The task sequence designed for this project is based on Willis & Willis (2007), and includes the following stages: priming, preparation, target task, and follow-up task.
**Priming**

This stage involves a teacher-led introduction of what the Language Learner History project is. For the priming stage you will need about 10 minutes at the end of the lesson previous to the start of the project. Create a timeline on the board, and use the A4 size pictures you printed as illustrations for the different events in your language learning history. If you have samples of students’ work, they are very effective in giving students an idea of the type of posters they will be creating (see Appendix 1). After introducing the project, ask the students to bring pictures of important events in their language learning experience. These can be personal photos, or photos of books, movies, or music that inspired them.

**Preparation**

This stage requires a full 90-minute class period, and additional time outside of class for the students to finish preparing. In order to prepare for the poster carousel presentations, it is important to follow a number of steps based on process writing, because students can significantly improve their performance by focusing on how something is produced and not only on the final product (Nation, 2009). For this project, the following 6 steps were employed: (a) brainstorming, (b) outlining, (c) drafting, (d) feedback, (e) finalizing the draft, and (f) practicing. Each step is developed into a task that leads into the following task.

**Presentation preparation steps.** This is a teacher-led discussion task during which you will attempt to elicit the presentation preparation steps from the students. Make a list with the following 6 points on the board:
1. brainstorming
2. outline
3. 1\textsuperscript{st} draft
4. feedback on 1\textsuperscript{st} draft
5. final draft
6. practice

**Brainstorming.** Distribute the blank A4 sheets, and show students on the board how to create a mind map of the most important events in their language learning history. Stress that students should write down as many events as they can think of, as well as some details about each event. After they finish the mind map, they will choose the most significant 4 or 5 events.

**Outline and 1\textsuperscript{st} draft.** Explain that for this particular project, the outline and the 1\textsuperscript{st} draft can be completed at the same time. The outline is a chronological timeline of the 4 or 5 most important events, starting with the earliest ones, and ending either with the present situation of the students’ language learning, or with their future aspirations. Next, instruct students to create a timeline on the back of the mind map, and encourage them to create a mock design of the poster at the same time.

**Feedback on first draft.** When they finish designing their posters, students share their work in groups of 3 or 4. Each student briefly introduces the 1\textsuperscript{st} poster draft and the other students in the group provide advice on how to improve the poster content and design.

**Final draft.** Distribute the blank A3 sheets, and make the stationary supplies available. Students create their final posters. As the students work, make sure to walk around and provide some additional feedback, especially by pointing out grammar and spelling mistakes on the students’ posters.

**Practice.** Students prepare the speech for their presentation and practice at home. Make sure to tell the students how many minutes they are expected to present (the suggested range is between 3 and 5 minutes), and instruct them to practice with a timer.
**Target task**

The target task for this project, the poster carousel presentation (see for example, Toland & Crawford, 2012), and the follow-up task will be carried out in the second 90-minute period. The poster carousel presentation style involves students presenting to small groups of their peers, rather than at the front of the class. Presentations are carried out simultaneously around the room, much like poster presentations at a conference. There are several ways to organize the poster carousel, but for this project students in one group take turns to present to the members of the same group. Below is the detailed procedure for the target task:

- Put students in new random groups of 4 or 5, depending on the size of the class.
- Give the students some more time to practice and instruct them that they will not be able to use their notes during the presentation. While they practice, walk around the room and give some suggestions for improving delivery.
- The members of each group put their posters on the wall in a different area of the classroom.
- Ask groups to choose the order of the presentations.
- When the groups are ready, start the timer for the first presenters.
- After the first presenters finish, the other group members ask follow up questions.
- If time allows, you can give some feedback to the presenters, focused on their presentation delivery.
- Repeat the previous three steps until all presenters have finished.
- At the end of the poster carousel session, encourage students to walk around the room and look at other groups' posters as well.

**Follow-up task**

This is a reflections task, and it is meant to give students the opportunity to think about their performance during the project, as well as about ways they can improve in the future. The task can be carried out in two ways. You can ask the students to fill out a reflections sheet (see Appendix 2). Alternatively, you could ask groups to discuss what was successful and what they need to improve and then present their conclusions to the class.

**Additional follow-up tasks**

Depending on how much time you have available in the course, you could incorporate more follow-up tasks. Below are some suggestions.

1. Focus on form. You could collect the presentation speeches, look for common errors, and prepare a grammar lesson for the next lesson focusing on these grammatical aspects.
2. Focus on form. Groups put together lists of useful presentation phrases related to self-introductions, introducing the topic, moving to a new topic, finishing the presentation, and inviting questions. Then, compile a list on the board and discuss it with the whole class.
3. Task repetition. Following the focus on form tasks, students revise their presentation speeches, and repeat the poster carousel target task. Groups can then discuss improvements in their performance.

**Conclusion**

For many Japanese learners, studying English can often be a difficult process. The Language Learner History project offers learners the opportunity to reflect on their experiences, both positive and negative. More importantly, students get the chance to share these experiences with their peers, which I have found to increase motivation, based on analysis of students'
written feedback on the project. In a small case study involving feedback from 40 students, respondents mentioned that they enjoyed watching their peers’ presentations, as well as working on their own presentations. Also, when asked to provide comments on their future presentation performance, students mentioned that they want to work hard to improve their performance in the next presentation, and some expressed a desire to study abroad.

Other than the motivational value of the Language Learner History project, it is also an effective way to introduce presentation skills into any course. As this project is designed for the beginning of a course, more time is spent on creating the content of the presentation than on practicing delivery skills. However, this is a good way for the teacher to gauge the delivery skills of the students at the beginning point, and build on those later in the course.

Finally, through the group work inherent to the poster carousel task, the Language Learner History project can lay the foundation for the group work skills essential to any task-based course.
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Appendix 1 – Samples of student posters
Appendix 2 – Project reflections sheet

**Language Learner History**

Name: _______________________

**Project Reflections**

Class: ______  Date: ______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did you learn in this project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What was interesting or useful for you? Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What was difficult for you? Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesson Plan 2
Around the international business table: A task utilizing direct/reported speech and active translation skills

Matthew W. Turner
Rikkyo University

- Key words: Business English, task-based learning, direct/reported speech, language translation, group work
- Level: Intermediate and above
- Learner age: University level
- Preparation time: 30 minutes
- Activity time: 60 minutes
- Materials: Double-sided handout containing pre-task activities (see appendix 1), main task role cards (see appendix 2), optional post-task (see appendix 3)

Introduction
In an ever-globalizing job market, the success of Japanese university graduates depends more and more on the individual’s ability to communicate with speakers of other languages. Students seeking work with multinational companies may require additional business skills input to prepare them. This task goes someway to introducing learners of general English courses to the conditions and rigors of international and multilingual business environments by using the language function of direct and reported speech, together with the learners’ active translation skills in order to complete a task that reflects interactions within small multilingual business meetings.

Preparation
This task should ideally take place at a stage where the learners are already aware of the differences between, and uses of, direct/reported speech, the learners may not be aware however of specific vocabulary needed to perform basic business transactions. Using part A of the handout provided in appendix 1, or one similar, introduce some essential vocabulary items, before using part B of the appendix to review and refresh the nature of direct/reported speech.

Procedure
Pre-task
Step 1: Arrange the learners into three different groups, this can be done by numbering the learners. In the later parts of this lesson, one group will be Japanese speakers, one group will be English speakers, with the final group of learners acting as intermediary translators, roles of which may exist in a multilingual business environment. Each group will have the chance to alternate roles; however try not to reveal each of the forthcoming roles at this stage. Further partner up the learners amongst their
three groups in order to complete the following steps.

Step 2: On the board, prepare the following questions: what are international business meetings?; what kind of things do people discuss?; and what difficulties could there be during these meetings? Allow the learners a few minutes to discuss these questions, listening to the learners’ ideas and noting anything of interest on the board. As this lesson is orally-focused, you may wish to conduct this step as a fluency activity, such as ‘4-3-2’, outlined in Nation (2001), or a warm up familiar to your learners and context. In Nation’s activity, one half of the group answers the questions as speakers, while the others listen and offer supportive reactions. The speakers repeat their answers three times, eventually repeating their initial 4 minute question responses in just 2 minutes. The speakers communicate their ideas to a new listener on each timed round. The learners then switch speaker and listener roles.

Step 3: Having fully elicited ideas from the learners and briefed them on the task and aims of the lesson, give each learner a copy of the handout (see appendix 1) and direct them to part A. Have the learners complete part A, matching each vocabulary item to the Japanese counterparts. The vocabulary presented here will later feature in this lesson’s main task. For this stage, the learners return to their groups arranged at the beginning of step 1.

Step 4: On completion and feedback of part A, encourage the learners to move on to part B, which is designed to review direct and reported speech patterns, as well as to present the previous vocabulary items in extended sentence form. Again, give feedback and offer correction where necessary.

Step 5: For part C, the learners are presented with a small incomplete dialogue containing three different speakers (see appendix 1). Have the learners complete the first example based on the utterances provided, before completing the freer exchange with their own ideas, while following the conventions of direct/reported speech previously introduced in Part B, and the vocabulary introduced in Part A of the handout.

Task
The following task utilizes business-specific vocabulary as well as the direct/reported speech language functions to foster the conditions of an international business meeting where more than once language may be spoken and translation is needed.

Step 1: Making sure the learners remember their original three groupings, instruct the first group to stand in a line at the front of the class, the second group to stand in a line along the middle of the room and the third group to stand along the back of the class. Explain that the first group can only speak English and that the third group can only speak Japanese for this task. Explain that the person in the middle must act as a translator between the two other speakers.

Step 2: Model what is expected from this task, for example as the English speaker at the meeting, make a request. As the translator in the middle, you should then move to the Japanese speaker to relay the necessary information for them to understand in direct speech. The Japanese speaker then replies accordingly, with the translator using reported speech to return the Japanese speaker’s response in English.

Step 3: Once the learners understand the nature of task, hand the learners the role cards (see appendix 2) and gesture for them to read their roles. Instruct the learners to work through each scenario, continually alternating roles. Each group should make use of the vocabulary presented at the beginning of the lesson, as well as direct and reported speech patterns. Let the task run for the available time, monitoring each group and intervening only when necessary.

Post-task
For homework, and as a way to consolidate the learning that took place during this lesson, have the learners complete a series of captions, like the one’s provided in appendix 3, based around one of their business meeting tasks. Encourage the learners to remember what was discussed during the meeting and reflect this in their captions through the use of direct/reported speech.

**Conclusion**

The task detailed here attempts to introduce the learners to the conditions of a multilingual business meeting within the safe confines and focuses of the language classroom. This task has meaningful applications to the learners’ potential careers and is also both an enjoyable and positive way to make use of the learners’ L1 for the purpose of communicative translation. For learners who don’t exclusively study business English for authentic uses beyond their time at university, this activity provides a useful focus in this specific area. Although an international business meeting is just one example of a multilingual context where direct/reported speech could be used together with translation skills, teachers reading this are encouraged to experiment with different real world communicative transactions that may require the need for such skills as translation between speakers of different languages, which this task attempts to facilitate.
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**Appendix 1**

**Pre-Task, Part A:**

*Match the English words on the left to the Japanese words on the right:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfair / Fair (A)</td>
<td>取引、契約</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower / Higher (A)</td>
<td>提案する、提供する / 提供、提案</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share (N)</td>
<td>交渉する</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price (N)</td>
<td>価格、価段</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate (V)</td>
<td>シェア</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider (V)</td>
<td>検討する</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer (V) / (N)</td>
<td>低い / 高い</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal (N)</td>
<td>偏った、アンフェア / 正当な、フェア</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete the ‘direct’ and ‘reported’ speech sentences using the words in English above. Please look at the example below:

**Pre-Task, Part B:**

Example:

“Can you offer us a better deal?”

**Direct speech:** He said “can you offer us a better deal?”

**Reported speech:** He asked if you could offer them a better deal.

1. “I’d like to negotiate a lower price with you.”

**Direct speech:**

**Reported speech:**
2. “Would you consider offering a more competitive share percentage?”

**Direct speech:**

**Reported speech:**

3. “A deal cannot be made with the high prices you are offering today.”

**Direct speech:**

**Reported speech:**

*Pre-Task, Part C:*

*Complete the conversation between the three people below using the vocabulary from part A and ‘direct’ and ‘reported’ speech patterns from Part B:*

**English Speaker:**

I'd like to negotiate a higher price with you, how about £1.50 per item? This would be a fairer offer.

**Japanese Speaker:**

Mr. Suzuki?

**English Speaker:**

I'm afraid that £1.50 is the lowest price I can offer.

*Complete the conversation using your own ideas:*

**English Speaker:**

**Translator:**

**Japanese Speaker:**

**Translator:**
Appendix 2
Main-Task Role Cards:

International Business Meeting: Scenario 1

English Speaker You would like to negotiate a higher price for items that your Japanese speaking client would like to buy. The items can be of your own choice.

Japanese Speaker You are not willing to accept the price that your English speaking colleague is offering, however you would like to consider a different way to make a deal.

Language Translator Move between the two speakers, using direct and reported speech to tell each speaker what the other speaker is saying.

International Business Meeting: Scenario 2

English Speaker Your Japanese business partner has just made you a very generous offer. You would like to accept the offer, however would like more information about the deal.

Japanese Speaker You are happy that your English speaking colleague will accept the offer and would like to tell him/her more about the deal.

Language Translator Move between the two speakers, using direct and reported speech to tell each speaker what the other speaker is saying.

International Business Meeting: Scenario 3

English Speaker You are interested in making a deal with your Japanese business partner, however you would like to negotiate a lower price for the items the he/she is trying to sell.

Japanese Speaker You would like to sell your company’s items to your English speaking business partner, however you are not willing to go below the price that you offered. The items can be of your choice.

Language Translator Move between the two speakers, using direct and reported speech to tell each speaker what the other speaker is saying.
Appendix 3

Homework:
• Key words: Team building, business courses, L1 avoidance
• Level: Intermediate to Advanced
• Age: University
• Preparation time: 15-20 minutes
• Activity time: 60-90 minutes
• Materials: 20 strands of dried spaghetti pasta, one yard of string, one yard of sticky tape, one marshmallow and one pair of scissors (per group). Projector and screen for optional follow-up.

Introduction
I have used this lesson as an introduction in business communication courses at the university level. The purpose of the main activity is to raise awareness of the importance of communication in cooperative situations, provide some opportunity for group bonding and provide a platform to discuss useful language items for group discussion. Initially inspired by a TED talk (Wujec, 2010) on group dynamics in business, the main activity challenges students to work together to build a free standing structure using 20 strands of dried spaghetti, one yard of string and one yard of sticky tape. The structure must support the marshmallow and stand freely without any help from participants, the whole activity must be completed in 18 minutes and the group who builds the tallest structure (from table top to marshmallow) wins. In the activity phase of the lesson, L1 use is penalised by banning the offending group from any communication or gesture at all for one minute, thus reducing their ability to complete the task. This activity forces students to use language spontaneously and creatively in order to achieve a shared goal. It also provides an opportunity to look at the mechanics of discussion and offer students advice on how to improve their own discussions.

Pre-task (10 minutes)
Put students into groups and ask them to rank the following social groups in order of the best to worst communicators: CEOs, kindergarten students, university students, lawyers, and engineers. Elicit each group’s ranking and reasons (anecdotal ideas are fine) and add your own thoughts, such as that kindergarten students are good communicators because are less shy about giving their opinions. This phase of the lesson is intended to activate students’ ideas on communication in a light-hearted way.
Main task including explanation (25 minutes)

After each group receives their materials, explain as quickly and clearly as possible that they have 18 minutes to build a structure that can support the marshmallow and that the tallest structure wins. Next, make students aware that in the event of any Japanese being spoken, the whole group will incur a 1 minute penalty, during which time students will not be allowed to do anything. Start the activity, monitoring students throughout, and enforcing the no-Japanese policy rigidly. In my own experience, the creative and fun nature of the activity reduces students’ inhibitions and students do attempt to plan and build a structure collaboratively. I have never encountered students trying to circumvent the rules by remaining silent and attempting to build without communicating with each other but this is perhaps a possibility. The activity requires a degree of communicative ability and works much better in classes with a positive working atmosphere. I therefore recommend using this lesson at the start of term, when students are perhaps more open to new activities.

Results collation (5 minutes)

At the end of 18 minutes, inform students that the challenge is over and they must take a step back from their table. It is possible that some groups will fail to make any structure at all and equally possible that each group will successfully make something. In the case that more than one group successfully erects a free-standing structure, measure the structure from table top to marshmallow top, congratulate the winning team and clear away the structures.

Reflection (15 minutes)

After a short break, ask students in their groups to discuss and agree upon answers to the following questions which you then check aloud:
1. What was difficult about the “marshmallow challenge”?
2. If you could do the “marshmallow challenge” again, how would you do it differently?
3. If the teacher offered a reward (100,000 yen), how would it affect your performance results? Do you think you would do better or worse? Why?
4. In their opinion, how well would the following groups do if given the challenge? Lawyers, Architects & Engineers, Kindergarteners, CEOs, Business School Students.

Language Focus (20 mins)

The completion of the activity, and also the subsequent discussion outlined in the ‘reflection’ part of the lesson provide students with an opportunity for meaningful discussion in English. I suggest spending time at this point to consider students particular strengths and weaknesses in English discussion and offer feedback. This part of the lesson requires the teacher to be quite reactive and it is impossible in this space to cover every possible weakness that students may have. I have personally used this time to focus on turn length, use of silence, and how to use discourse markers in English to begin discussions, agree and disagree politely, and change turns. This can also serve as a good foundation for how the teacher expects discussions to be conducted moving forward through the course.

Optional add-on (10 minutes)

Depending on students’ level, the accompanying TED video can be used with or without subtitles to show interesting findings about which social groups did best in the task. I have followed this by asking students to produce an ‘advice sheet’ to give other imagined groups before beginning the activity. On this sheet, students must agree upon and write 5 pieces of
advice (e.g. plan your structure on paper first, choose a leader to design the structure).

**Conclusion**

This activity makes a great ‘jumping off’ point for an extended group project and I have used it personally to help groups bond in the first class before a semester-long task based course. I am also confident that it could be used to prompt further discussion on communication styles or simply as a great stand-alone class based on TBL ideas. One of the problems facing language teachers in monolingual classes such as those often found in Japanese tertiary institutions is the temptation among students to use their shared L1 as a backup in cases of misunderstanding or communication breakdown. The fun and competitive nature of this activity, alongside the English only rule has, in my experience, served to encourage the exclusive use of the target language.

**About the Author**
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