

【原著】

Recorded Speaking Practice and its Effects on Student Confidence and Motivation

Tyler A. Montgomery, Kelly E. Rose and Craig A. Nevitt

録音したスピーキング練習が学生の自信と意欲に及ぼす影響

Tyler A. Montgomery, Kelly E. Rose and Craig A. Nevitt

Abstract

The research discussed below is part of an ongoing action research project in a private university in western Japan. The subjects of the study were students in a freshman English language course and were, on average, low-proficiency beginners with a median TOEIC (LR) score of 275. The authors investigated whether recorded speaking practice (RSP) with individualized feedback could increase student confidence in speaking English and motivation to study English. A mixed-methods approach was used to measure confidence and motivation. Results from quantitative analysis were mixed, while the qualitative analysis showed stronger positive support that individualized feedback on RSP can increase confidence and motivation. The paper concludes with suggestions for researchers who would like to adapt the project to their own classroom and future directions for the RSP project.

概 要

本研究では、日本の私立大学で実施しているアクションリサーチについて考察する。調査対象者は、1年生向けの初級英語科目の履修生である。本研究の目的は、学習者個々に対するRSP (recorded speaking practice) を伴うフィードバックにより、学習者の英語学習に対するモチベーション及びスピーキング能力の向上を検証することである。調査は、定量的及び定性的方法を用いて実施した。定量的調査では有意な結果を得られなかったものの、定性的方法では、RSPが学習者のスピーキング能力及び英語学習に対するモチベーションの向上に繋がることを明らかにした。調査結果は、RSPの活用が教育現場や関連分野の研究に貢献する可能性を示している。

Introduction

This paper describes part of an action research project conducted over the course of three years at a small, private university in western Japan. The project started in the first (spring) semester 2017 and is continuing through the second (fall) semester 2019-2020. For the purposes of this paper, the authors will focus on the results from the first semester and the beginning half

of the second semester of the 2019-2020 school year. The primary focus of this study was to investigate how written and verbal feedback on recorded speaking practice (RSP), as provided by peers and instructors (in this case the authors), affects the motivation and confidence of English language learners. Using self-reported surveys and spoken production word count, the authors measured the impact of personalized feedback and practice on students' confidence in speaking English and their motivation to study English.

The sixty-one participants are all enrolled in a small liberal university in Japan. The nature of the department the students are enrolled requires extensive English language study, with up to seven classes a week conducted all in English. The RSP research activities are only conducted in a first-year English communication class, held twice a week. Participants have varying degrees of fluency, ranging from level A1 to B1 on the Common European Frame of Reference and a median TOEIC score of 275. All participants provided written informed consent allowing their survey results and class work to be used as part of this research project. The authors' institution's review board gave permission to conduct this research project.

Results showed that students found the detailed feedback useful and it informed their future English study. Quantitative analysis found that spoken production increased significantly over the course of the project. Analysis of qualitative data found a positive trend in participants' confidence in speaking English and motivation to study English in the future.

Methods

The development of the RSP program as an action research project has been evolving over three years. The methods presented here are the most current iteration of the RSP. The cohort was divided into classes of 20 students, meeting twice a week for 90 minutes. On average one RSP unit took four weeks to complete. Class time dedicated to RSP varied based on each task (recoding, rewriting, reflection and pair practice), averaging ten minutes per class. Students were required to complete any unfinished work outside of class. Twice each unit, the authors provided RSP feedback, which averaged 30 minutes per student.

Training

The authors conducted a 90-minute training session to introduce all the students in the cohort to the project on the first day of the 2019 academic year. Students analyzed example scripts using the RSP rubric (Appendix A). From this, students learned how to avoid common mistakes in addition to gaining a clear understanding of how to use the RSP rubric. Additionally, this time allowed the authors to provide students with well-defined aims with the goal of demonstrating performance expectations. To ensure student understanding of the procedures, L1 verbal instruction was used.

Rubric

The RSP rubric was created for students to track improvements in their spoken production and for both students and authors to indicate student performance. The scales enable the students to rate their own ability to produce acceptable introduction (greeting the audience, and clearly

stating the topic) and conclusion (restatement of topic), say each of the six topics (see *Recording and Writing*) on the speaking prompt provided, and produce acceptable details for each of the six topics. The concept of *acceptable* for introductions, conclusions, and details was explained in the training session at the beginning of the semester (see *Training*).

Three additional scales at the bottom of the rubric were for instructor use only, where the authors indicated students' grammar, spelling, and pronunciation and intonation performance. The authors felt that these categories could not be subjectively rated by the students themselves. The authors then supplemented the basic rubric by providing additional written feedback as well as voice recordings in the case of intonation and pronunciation guidance (see *Teacher Feedback and Corrections*).

Recording and Writing

For each unit of the RSP, students were first given the RSP Prompts sheet with six prompts (topics) which were based on content to be covered during the unit of instruction. A period of two minutes was provided for thinking about the prompts, with another two minutes immediately afterward to record a speech including the following elements: an introduction and conclusion, one sentence for each of the six topics, and one or more details in support of each topic. The word *details* was used, as this was the easiest terminology that encompassed additional information, examples, or clarification of the topics.

Next, as homework or classwork, students listened to and transcribed their recordings. On the transcript, students highlighted the introduction and conclusion statements, each topic, and the details in specific colors. This served as both a metacognitive awareness strategy for students, and aided instructors when counting the topics and details. The recordings and transcripts were shared with the authors digitally using iOS apps. Students then indicated their word count and rated their performance on the RSP rubric in three categories: Introduction/Conclusion, Topics, and Details.

Teacher Feedback and Corrections

The authors reviewed the student RSP transcripts while listening to their RSP recordings to check pronunciation and confirm each transcript's accuracy. After listening and ensuring validity, teacher feedback was completed in three stages. First, the authors marked student performance on the same RSP rubric used by the students (see *Rubric*). Second, the authors indicated grammar and spelling corrections for the students to make in a subsequent rewrite (see *Student Rewrites*). Finally, the authors wrote a combination of task-level, product-level, and process-level feedback on the RSP Teacher Feedback sheet (Appendix B), which has separate rows for each aspect of the student RSP rubric: word count, introduction and conclusion, topics, details, grammar, spelling, and pronunciation/intonation. This allowed the authors to give organized process-level feedback for each criterion.

Since there were clear expectations regarding the need to speak as many words as possible, provide an introduction and conclusion, address all six topics, and have one or more detail sentences for each topic, it was possible to give specific feedback on a student's output, as well as include process-level praise. In the grammar row, the authors praised correct usage and offered

specific tips for improvement. Within the pronunciation and intonation rows, the authors provided recorded audio feedback and examples. Thus, the authors aimed to provide a wealth of feedback to students in the hope that it would, as Hattie (2012) describes,

provide cues that capture a person's attention and helps him or her to focus on succeeding with the task; it can direct attention towards the processes needed to accomplish the task; it can provide information about ideas that have been misunderstood. And it can be motivational so that students invest more effort or skill in the task. (p. 129)

Student Rewrites and Reflections

Once the students reviewed the written and audio feedback and corrections, they rewrote their transcripts, attempting to correct the errors as well as include elements that were lacking in the original writing. Whenever possible, the authors avoided providing specific phrasings for the corrections and instead provided hints so that the student could complete the task using his or her own words.

After finishing these steps, the students completed the First Student Reflection. Students could use either the feedback comments from their instructor or the comments from the checkboxes below the written feedback to fill in two boxes, one for something they perceived they did well and the other for something they could improve. Then the students reflected and filled in two additional boxes, one indicating things the instructor said they had done well and the other specifying areas the instructor thought they could improve. Below these four boxes, the students wrote a goal and then selected what they intend to practice from a series of items with feedback checkboxes.

The entire RSP process, including Recording and Writing, Teacher Feedback and Corrections, and Student Rewrites and Reflections, was repeated at the end of the unit. They filled out the Last Student Reflection (Appendix C) which is similar to the First Student Reflection with an additional comments box and check boxes for which of the suggested grammar activities the student completed.

RSP Pair Practice

Once or twice during a unit, depending on the available class time, students were placed in randomized pairs to perform RSP pair practice. Similar to the First Recording and Writing, students viewed the RSP Question Prompts sheet and had two minutes to mentally plan how they would address the six prompts. Then they were given two minutes per partner to have a discussion using the Question Prompts. To create more of a dialogue, students were encouraged to ask questions or comment on their partner's speech. After speaking, students wrote partner feedback and a self-reflection on the RSP Student Practice sheet, indicating one or more speaking aspects they felt they did well and one or more aspects they would like to improve. Students indicated the same for their partners and shared their advice afterwards.

Measuring Confidence and Motivation

A mixed-methods approach was used to better understand how the RSP influenced students'

confidence and motivation. Students were given surveys written in English with L1 translations provided (English questions provided in appendix D) to gauge their self-reported confidence and motivation based on a four-point Likert scale. To gain deeper insights into student responses, after each survey question students were asked to explain their answer in their native language (Japanese). Surveys were given before and after each RSP unit and a separate survey was given at the end of the first semester for a total of five surveys in the first semester and two in the second semester 2019 (as of the publication date). For the purposes of this paper, only the results of the pre-RSP surveys for units 1, 2, and 3 will be discussed because unit 4 will be conducted after submission of this paper.

Results

The following section reports the results of a quantitative analysis of three pre-unit surveys as well as an analysis of word counts. A qualitative analysis of a survey at the end of the first semester can be found in the discussion section. The post-RSP survey questions were modified throughout the semester according to the feedback received in earlier iterations of the RSP in order to address student and classroom needs. However, the authors kept the pre-RSP survey questions the same throughout the 2019 school year to help facilitate a year-long comparison of student self-evaluations. For the purposes of this paper, only questions regarding confidence and motivation and only the first three administrations (out of four) are included in the following tables. The surveys were completed after the students' first recording for each unit of RSP but before any feedback or edits were completed. The fourth will be administered after the publication of this paper. For a full list of questions included in the pre-RSP survey and the survey given at the end of the first semester, see Appendix D.

The questions in the pre-RSP survey were inspired by those related to self-efficacy from Hayashi (2014), the Academic Motivation Scale from Vallerand et al (1993) (utilizing translations by Tanaka & Hiromori (2007)), and metacognition by Dermitzaki and Efklides (2000). However, as Dörnyei and Ushioda (2013) have observed, "motivation questionnaires are highly context-dependent and therefore even well-established batteries cannot be simply transferred to learning situations other than where they were developed without making considerable adjustments" (p. 213-214). The authors used the results of earlier iterations of the RSP (Nevitt & Rose, 2018; Rose & Nevitt, 2017) to inform the version used here.

Table 1. Pre-RSP Survey Results over Three Administrations of RSP

	RSP 1 May 2019	RSP 2 July 2019	RSP 3 November 2019
<i>Q1: I believe I have a high English ability.</i>			
I highly think so.	2.27%	0.00%	2.27%
I moderately think so.	6.82%	13.64%	4.55%
I moderately do not think so.	50.00%	61.36%	65.91%
I highly do not think so.	40.91%	25.00%	27.27%

<i>Q2: I am motivated to study English.</i>	RSP 1	RSP 2	RSP 3
I highly think so.	54.55%	65.91%	40.91%
I moderately think so.	36.36%	25.00%	52.27%
I moderately do not think so.	2.27%	6.82%	4.55%
I highly do not think so.	6.82%	2.27%	2.27%

<i>Q3: How confident are you that you can do the RSP well?</i>	RSP 1	RSP 2	RSP 3
I am very confident.	31.82%	6.82%	20.45%
I am moderately confident.	52.27%	70.45%	52.27%
I am not that confident.	15.91%	22.73%	27.27%
I am not confident at all.	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

<i>Q4: How much are you motivated to study in order to improve on RSP?</i>	RSP 1	RSP 2	RSP 3
I am very motivated.	52.27%	40.91%	27.27%
I am moderately motivated.	45.45%	50.00%	63.64%
I am not that motivated.	2.27%	9.09%	9.09%
I am not motivated at all.	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

The quantitative data for changes in student self-reported motivation and confidence are not dramatically positive. From Q2, students feeling unmotivated to study English to some degree went from 9.09% to 6.82%. Moreover, in Q3 student self-reporting of non-confidence regarding RSP increased from 15.91% to 27.27%, and the number of students who self-reported being highly motivated to work on the RSP in Q4 reduced by 25 percentage points. Therefore, the authors are prompted to admit some shortcomings in the RSP process for increasing student self-perceived confidence and motivation. However, further study is necessary to evaluate if this is a flaw in the questionnaire/evaluation or the actual process.

Table 2. Changes in Transcript Word Counts

		RSP 1	RSP 2	P Value
average first word count	n = 51	48.49	60.32	< .01*
average last word count	n = 43	91.95	105.89	< .05*

		RSP 2	RSP 3	P Value
average first word count	n = 51	60.32	74.5	< .01*
average last word count	n = 43	105.89	94.49	.089

Recorded Speaking Practice and its Effects on Student Confidence and Motivation

		RSP 1	RSP 3	P Value
average first word count	n = 51	48.49	74.5	< .01*
average last word count	n = 43	91.95	94.49	.28

Note: Significance was set at < .05 noted with a*.

Students' average word count between the three first recordings increased significantly for each unit, as shown in Table 2. Such a measure is an example of potential criterion variables according to Dörnyei and Ushioda (2013), and the authors acknowledge that for motivation and achievement the "relationship is indirect" (p. 201). Nevertheless, the change in word count from students' first recording over the span of the project indicates a positive trend. This may indicate that student ability on spontaneous production has increased because students are only given two minutes to formulate what to say upon introduction to each new set of topic prompts. Increased word count would suggest that students are becoming better at the RSP tasks despite the unfamiliarity of the topics, and also possibly gaining confidence in their speaking ability. This is the most promising outcome regarding quantitative data on the RSP. Word count did not increase between the three last recordings. This may be due to the fact that students only had two minutes to talk, and there is a limit to how many words students at this level can say within the time allowed.

One other positive outcome was the qualitative data. As explained in the *Measuring Confidence and Motivation* section, each Likert-scale question on the surveys was followed by a comment box requiring students to explain their reasoning. The incentive for this open-ended question is two-fold: to prompt students to think more carefully about their answers and to allow the authors a better understanding of said answers. This supplied a large amount of information, all of which cannot be cataloged in the current paper. Some of the more noteworthy comments are detailed in the discussion portion below.

Discussion

It is agreed that effective feedback has a multitude of benefits (Hattie, 2012 & Chappuis, 2015) and so the authors launched this project to examine the effects such feedback can have on student motivation and confidence.

To provide customized feedback, each student's starting point in a task, namely the spoken language they can produce on a particular topic, needed to be determined and then their progress monitored after a certain amount of practice and instruction time. Hattie (2012) cites Sadler's (1989) description of feedback which,

aims to reduce the gap between where the student 'is' and where he or she is 'meant to be'—and the more transparent they make this status for the students, the more students can help to get themselves from the points at which they are to the success points, and thus enjoy the fruits of feedback. (p. 129)

In the self-reported surveys conducted both during each RSP unit as well as one comprehensive survey at the end of the first semester, students appreciated this diagnostic routine with one writing, “because you know where you are not good or you can find something you are good at” and another succinctly stating, “(the RSP) clarified what I can and cannot do.”

The peer practice element of the project yielded interesting comments. Overall, most favored the spoken interaction between students with some reporting learning new expressions or a lowering of their anxiety level during the exchanges. Others were more competitive with one commenting that his motivation to study English increased “because I thought I could say more than my opponent.” However, there were some negative effects of peer practice with a few students feeling their language weaknesses exposed. “I was embarrassed because I was not good at pronunciation,” and “I don’t want to bother (my partner).” Therefore, although incorporating interactive practices benefited the majority of students, lower English ability students or those with higher affective filters need to be considered (Brown, 2007).

Overall, many students found the detailed feedback provided by the authors to be informative with comments such as, “The feedback was detailed and carefully written, showing what I could and could not do, and what I should study. I think it was motivational.” Naturally not all comments were positive, but they did reveal that the lower a student’s ability the less appropriate they felt the feedback to be. One such student, who consistently indicated being unmotivated by the RSP wrote, “I don’t feel motivated because I don’t have the ability to speak English and feel that RSP is not suitable for me.” However, in a later questionnaire, when indicating a slight increase in motivation, the same student wrote, “I’ve been studying English a little recently because I want to do something.” Accordingly, the authors were able to better understand their students’ motivation through the qualitative data.

Given the plethora of informative feedback provided to each student, new questions ultimately arise, such as how much error correction should be provided by instructors? As Chappuis (2015) asks, “Do we ever remind students of what to correct and then when they do an incomplete job, we take over and finish the work for them?” (p. 111). To combat this tendency of over-correction, and reduce the workload, the authors utilized standardized comments and checklists. This provided guidance to the student in strong and weak areas without doing the work for them. Specifically, regarding grammar, as stated in the methods section, instead of noting every inaccuracy within a transcript, the authors only selected one point and recommended an optional follow-up activity. This helped reduce some of the correction burden on the authors and eased linguistic demands for lower-ability students. However, as the project continued students tended not to do the suggested grammar activities on the whole. This may have been due to the fact that students maintain a relatively heavy English course load, and since the activities did not contribute directly to their RSP score, it may have discouraged them from completing the tasks. Therefore, a challenge with this kind of project is determining the appropriate balance of feedback and suggested corrections due to the variety among individual students.

Another question persisting throughout this study was, how well can such feedback be internalized by each student and then demonstrated on a post-assessment? Throughout this study the authors noted some students who did not seem to improve between the first and last recordings, despite the quantity of feedback. Likewise, the qualitative data in the form of student

self-reported surveys indicated a sense of helplessness among lower English ability students. The authors wondered if such students were what Deci and Ryan (as cited in Vallerand & Bissonnette, 1992) called *amotivational* (Nevitt & Rose, 2018). Indeed, as an accommodation in the most recent version of the project, the authors added written Japanese language support to the materials. After observing this trend over the course of two years, the authors continue to refine the materials, including adding native language support.

Conclusion

For the students and authors, the RSP project has been a valuable and productive experience, where in-classroom trial and error and constant project modification have produced a well-rounded spoken-production program which can be easily adapted to many EFL situations. The main goal of the RSP project was to increase student motivation in speaking English and confidence in studying English. These goals were met, but not necessarily in a straightforward manner. Interestingly, there were other unintended positive effects of the program, which will be discussed below.

For the students, survey and spoken-production results show that they experienced moderate advances in motivation to study English and confidence in speaking English. While completing RSP itself was not necessarily a motivating factor to study English, the personalized feedback from the authors and peers did have a positive impact on overall motivation and confidence to pursue their English study goals, as evidenced by the survey responses conducted throughout the RSP. Students reported that they were able to pinpoint specific areas in their English learning that they could improve, while at the same time recognizing strengths they already possess. Additionally, the overall increase in spoken production throughout the project is concrete evidence that students were motivated enough to practice and improve their speaking ability in general. However, the idea behind RSP was not only to see spoken production improvements within the project, but to boost the students' underlying confidence and motivation in English learning. The authors believe that the RSP project has been successful for the majority of participants in that regard after looking at the positive comments written in the surveys.

The authors also found one welcome but unintended result of the RSP: they learned about students' backgrounds, life goals, and personal lives. As a result, the authors felt a closer connection and more empathy towards this group of students than those in other classes. By hearing the challenges students face inside and outside the classroom, they had a better understanding of what the student experience entails, and the difficulties students face on their English learning journey. While not directly related to motivation and confidence, these insights are still valuable and will be considered when adapting RSP in future projects.

RSP is a project which can be adapted to a variety of EFL contexts. In the future the authors plan to integrate modified forms of RSP into other existing classes, including an English for hospitality and customer service course. The authors hope readers interested in improving confidence and motivation in an EFL setting will consider adapting this project to their classroom needs.

Notes

1. For more information about the authors' previous work on this project, see Nevitt & Rose (2018), and Rose & Nevitt (2017).

References

- Brown, H.D. (2007). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (3rd ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Chappuis, J. (2015). *Seven Strategies of Assessment for Learning* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Dermitzaki, I., & Efklides, A. (2000). Aspects of Self-Concept and Their Relationship to Language Performance and Verbal Reasoning Ability. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 113(4), 621–637. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1423475>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2013). *Teaching and Researching Motivation* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible Learning for Teachers: Maximizing Impact on Learning*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hayashi, H. (2014). 動機づけ視点で見る日本人の英語学習—内発的・外発的動機づけを軸に— [A motivational perspective of Japanese people learning English: Focusing on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Kansai University, Osaka, Japan. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10112/9344>
- Nevitt, C.A., & Rose, K. (2018). Utilizing Pre-and Post-assessments in an EFL Classroom II: Effects of Spoken Production Assessments on Student Confidence and Motivation. *Bulletin of Hiroshima Bunkyo Women's University*, 53, 11–31.
- Rose, K., & Nevitt, C.A. (2017). Utilizing Pre-and Post-assessments in an EFL Classroom I: Effects of Grammar/Vocabulary Assessments on Student Confidence and Motivation. *Bulletin of Hiroshima Bunkyo Women's University*, 52, 15–32.
- Tanaka, H., & Hiromori, T. (2007). 英語学習者の内発的動機づけを高める教育実践的介入とその効果の検証 [The effects of educational intervention that enhances intrinsic motivation of L2 students.] *JALT Journal*, 29 (1). Retrieved from <http://www.ebscohost.com>
- Vallerand, R. J., & Bissonnette, R. (1992). Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and Amotivational Styles as Predictors of Behavior: A Prospective Study. *Journal of Personality*, 60(3), 599–620. Retrieved from <http://www.ebscohost.com>
- Vallerand, R. J., Pettetier, L. G., Blais, R. B., Briere, N. M., Senecal, C. B., & Vallieres, E. F. (1993). Academic Motivation Scale (AMS-C 28): College Edition. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53. Retrieved from <http://www.ebscohost.com>

—2020年9月24日 受理—

Appendix A

RSP Rubric

Unit Recorded Speaking Practice

Introduction & Conclusion							
First	Saying an introduction and conclusion		Only saying an introduction or conclusion		Not saying an introduction or conclusion		
Last	Saying an introduction and conclusion		Only saying an introduction or conclusion		Not saying introduction or conclusion		
Topics							
First	Saying 6	Saying 5	Saying 4	Saying 3	Saying 2	Saying 1	Saying 0
Last	Saying 6	Saying 5	Saying 4	Saying 3	Saying 2	Saying 1	Saying 0
Details							
First	Saying 6 good details	Saying 5 good details	Saying 4 good details	Saying 3 good details	Saying 2 good details	Saying 1 good detail	Saying 0 good details
Last	Saying 6 good details	Saying 5 good details	Saying 4 good details	Saying 3 good details	Saying 2 good details	Saying 1 good detail	Saying 0 good details
TEACHER ONLY	Grammar						
	First	Having all correct grammar	Having mostly correct grammar	Having some correct grammar	Having a few correct grammar		
	Last	Having all correct grammar	Having mostly correct grammar	Having some correct grammar	Having a few correct grammar		
	Spelling						
	First	Having all correct spelling	Having mostly correct spelling	Having some correct spelling	Having little correct spelling		
	Last	Having all correct spelling	Having mostly correct spelling	Having some correct spelling	Having little correct spelling		
	Pronunciation & Intonation						
	First	Having all clear pronunciation/intonation	Having mostly clear pronunciation/intonation	Having some clear pronunciation/intonation	Having little clear pronunciation/intonation		
	Last	Having all clear pronunciation/intonation	Having mostly clear pronunciation/intonation	Having some clear pronunciation/intonation	Having little clear pronunciation/intonation		



Appendix B

Example of Teacher Feedback

	FIRST Recording	LAST Recording
Word Count	You said 81 words. This is great for your first recording. Next time try to say 100+ words.	You said 118 words. This is almost 40 more words than your first recording. Great job!
Introduction & Conclusion	You said a good introduction. Remember to add, "...for listening about my trip to Tokyo." in your conclusion.	You said a good introduction and conclusion. You remembered to add, "...to my trip to Tokyo." in your conclusion. Nice.
Topics	You said all 6 topics. Great.	You said all 6 topics. Good job.
Details	You said details for 5 of the 6 topics. Next time talk about... ⇒ How many days you were in Tokyo. OR ⇒ How old you were when you went to Tokyo with your family.	You said details for all 6 topics. You also said 2-3 details for 3 topics. Excellent! You remembered to say a detail about how many days you were in Tokyo.
Grammar	Please look at Key Grammar Point #2 Plurals. Some of your verbs were in past tense, but some were not. Please practice Key Grammar Point #5 Regular / Irregular Verbs.	Your plurals are much better. Most of your verbs were in past tense. Remember to make "is" in the past tense too.
Spelling	You misspelled 7 words. Please check the dictionary and be more careful when writing your script.	You corrected all of your words. Great! Remember, it is spelled "hello" (there is no "w").
Pronunciation	Please speak with a loud voice. It was difficult to hear some of your words. Please listen to the voice tag and practice "relaxing."	Your pronunciation and intonation were much better. I would easily understand you. Wonderful! Please try speaking with a louder voice in the future.
Intonation	Your intonation is getting better. Keep practicing your speech and try to speak faster and go up and down with your voice.	

Appendix C

*Student Reflection Template***Last Student Reflection**

	My teacher said I did this well:
	I did this well:
	My teacher said I can improve...
	I can improve...
Grammar	I completed... <input type="checkbox"/> Key Grammar 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Key Grammar 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Key Grammar 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Key Grammar 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Key Grammar 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Key Grammar 6 <input type="checkbox"/> Key Grammar 7 <input type="checkbox"/> Key Grammar 8 <input type="checkbox"/> Key Grammar 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Bonus Grammar 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Bonus Grammar 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Bonus Grammar 3
My Goal	
My Practice	I will practice... <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 48%;"> <input type="checkbox"/> 言った単語数は多い Saying many words <input type="checkbox"/> すべてのトピックを言う Saying all the topics <input type="checkbox"/> トピックに関する説明は多い Saying many details <input type="checkbox"/> 発音はほとんど正しい Having clear pronunciation <input type="checkbox"/> その他: Other: </div> <div style="width: 48%;"> <input type="checkbox"/> 文章の書き出しをちゃんと言う Saying an introduction <input type="checkbox"/> 文章の終わりをちゃんと言う Saying a conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> 文法はほとんど正しい Having correct grammar <input type="checkbox"/> 英語らしいリズムと抑揚で言う Having good intonation </div> </div>

Write your ideas about your speaking in Japanese and translate into English below.

Appendix D

Survey Questions

Pre-Unit Survey

I believe I have a high English ability.

I am motivated to study English.

I am satisfied with my ability in English.

I can do tasks in English well.

How difficult do you feel this speaking for Unit (1,2,3) RSP will be?

How much effort will it take you to do the speaking for Unit (1,2,3) RSP?

How much effort will it take you to do the listening/writing for Unit (1,2,3) RSP?

How confident are you that you can do Unit (1,2,3) RSP well?

How much are you motivated to study in order to improve on Unit (1,2,3) RSP?

End of semester survey

Indicate how the RSP speeches (alone) influenced your confidence to speak English.

Indicate how the RSP conversations (pair work) influenced your confidence to speak English.

Indicate how the RSP teacher feedback influenced your confidence to speak English.

Did you read the RSP teacher feedback?

Indicate how the RSP student feedback influenced your confidence to speak English.

Indicate how the RSP speeches (alone) influenced your motivation to study English.

Indicate how the RSP conversations (pair work) influenced your motivation to study English.

Indicate how the RSP teacher feedback influenced your motivation to study English.

Indicate how the RSP student feedback influenced your motivation to study English.

Indicate how the RSP (in total) influenced your motivation to study.

Indicate how the RSP (in total) influenced your ability to speak English.