



Evaluation of the Communicative Tasks in the Course Book of Business English 1 at University of Phan Thiết

UYÊN-MINH LE NGUYEN

Faculty of Foreign Languages, University of Phan Thiet, Vietnam

Abstract: In this paper, I will evaluate communicative tasks in Business English 1 (B.E.1) which is currently used to teach a group of part-time learners at University of Phan Thiet (UPT). English language teachers at UPT have encountered a number of challenges in devising B.E. teaching materials. The educators often dedicate a great deal of time to modify materials to meet students' and their own needs. They still have to comply with the curriculum framework from the Ministry of Education as well as UPT. The salient target of the task is that the students can apply the way of telephoning in a business transaction. A survey with three ramifications of questions was designed and piloted, including two face-to-face semi-structured inquiries for the teacher's interview before and after the class session. The data obtained via the student questionnaire were coded for the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Most of the students perceived the task as enjoyable and useful to learn English; however, around 10 to 15 percent of them did not. Optimistically, the large components (65%) had nothing to be unsatisfied with the task. There were seven suggestions which can be considered the way to modify and improve the task in order to enhance the learners' enthusiasm. In the first stage of the survey, a pre-task and post-task interview was conducted. In the latter stage, the teacher offered some empirical action points of the lecture innovation for future use. The teacher has been cognizant of encouraging every student to individually and cooperatively accommodate the real communicative use of English.

Key words: Evaluation, communicative tasks, Business English, materials design

I. Introduction

Over the last decades, Vietnam has been internationally integrated into various aspects. Lingua francas, especially English, has become a linked medium to fill the gap between cultures, develop a market-oriented economy, and contribute to diplomatic relations as well as national security. The acquisition of the English language naturally follows the needs of Vietnamese people. Recent years have seen a significant application of a wide range of major-based text-books and coursebooks at universities. In this paper, I will evaluate communicative tasks in the instructional material of Business English 1 (B.E.1) which is currently used to teach a group of part-time learners at University of Phan Thiết (henceforth UPT) who study in the evening after their long work day. The rationale of the material determination may derive from the setting of teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) in Vietnam where English teaching is taught to a test-oriented purpose, not to the real use. In this in-service class, the students have a non-English major bachelors' degree with an intermediate or lower-intermediate level of English proficiency. Therefore, the selection of B.E.1 addresses the needs of these students who expect to acquire language knowledge and skills to perform in their daily work. Accordingly, I will discuss benefits and challenges while compiling the series of B.E. coursebook at UPT. An

ensuing survey will be conducted in one of the classroom sessions to revolve if B.E. can be appropriately adapted for these particular students.

II. Benefits and Challenges of Developing Materials

2.1 Benefits of Developing Business English Instructional Materials

On the one hand, devising instructional materials can be beneficial for both lecturers and learners, including “empowering teachers” (Núñez et al., 2009; Kumaravadivelu, 2007) and “increasing students’ motivation” (Tomlinson, 2003; Núñez, 2010; Harmer, 2012). First, a drastic increment of foreign enterprises in Lam Dong province requires recruited employees to be more equipped with work and communicative skills. To deal with customers and colleagues in an arbitrary language (i.e. often English), the personnel have enrolled in in-service courses at UPT or the local Foreign Language Centers. Regarding the demands, the professors of Foreign Language Faculty at UPT have attempted to compose B.E. materials over several years as (Núñez et al., 2009) cites that “teachers are empowered to make decisions about their material” to address the adult learners’ needs of exposing English in their business-related ambiance. The educators actively eliminated conventional issues of theorized and unauthentic lessons from the rigid educational curriculum that is pertinent to encourage students to communicate all the time while doing the activities and cooperating in groups solving different real-world tasks. The predominant purposes of the course are to develop productive skills in both verbal and written form in compliance with formal vocabulary and expressions of the Business discipline. Furthermore, a sine qua non of materials development is that the preceptors have to be knowledgeable, as extracted from their practical teaching and trained experience which concurs with their professional progression and promotion.

Due to understanding the learners’ anticipation with scrutiny by listening to their voices and opinions, the instructors have designed the materials relevant to increase students’ learning volition. It is necessary to conceive the materials and activities that the students themselves find interesting and willing to participate in. Simultaneously, Cárdenas (2000) claims learners have the needs of not only language competence, but also emotional aspects. Therefore, the task design should be based on observing students’ cultural background and realities in order to foster them to share their own experiences and previous cognition (Tharp et al., 2000). As a result, the students have gradually overcome the anxiety in the oral drill thanks to the supportive and friendly atmosphere (Suba I, 2010). Ziaga (2016) suggests that a repertoire of teaching techniques and explicit guidelines for pair and group activities such as role-playing, discussion, and audiovisual presentations helps inspire learners more excitement to involve in the learning process. Correspondingly, while producing materials, the teachers can flexibly add or integrate learning activities to trigger their students’ attentive and positive attitude.

2.2 Challenges of Developing Business English Instructional Materials

Apart from several aforementioned advantages of devising B.E. teaching materials, the English language teachers have encountered a number of challenges. First and foremost, besides the various requirements of the students working at a diversity of companies, Harwood (2010) indicates the needs of educationists, educational institutions, and stakeholders (i.e. parents and sponsors). The educators often dedicate a great deal of time to modify materials by omitting, reducing, extending and replacing activities (Maley, 1998) to meet students’ and their own needs, but they still have to comply with the curriculum framework from the Ministry of Education as well as UPT. Notwithstanding, it is also necessary to adjust the administrative framework constraints which are found to hinder the incremental cultivation of the learners. If the creators of the teaching materials had unforeseen the compliance, their efforts to generate the materials would presumably be wasted and resulted in a non-directional consequence.

In term of the students’ different levels of English language competence and cognitive abilities, how to make a generalized material is another hindrance that the tutors as materials developers frequently deal with as

Aguirre and Ramos (2011) assert that “there is a mixture of students in the classrooms coming from different backgrounds, socioeconomic statuses, ethnicity and religious beliefs”. It is the fact that approximately 20 part-time students who have attended in the in-service course at UPT cannot be classified or divided into smaller units as low, mediate and high-level classes. Likewise, it is impossible, in timing restrictions, for the mentors to focus on every individual who learns at a disparity pace and progress. According to Willingham (2009), the “too easy” side would cause students’ boredom and low effort; on the reverse side, it might make the students fall behind owing to “too hard”. Consequently, orchestrating activities and ensuring achievable goals for a vast array of student groups is extremely strenuous.

With regard to the time and budget consumption, the pedagogues have to be present in classrooms and synchronously design the materials that may consume a plenty of their energy and devotion. However, the salaries and project budget of the educational institution are not equal to their workload and contributions. The university supposes that devising teaching materials is one of the schoolmasters’ responsibilities. Needless to say, a dearth of being engaged in entrepreneurship and commercial experts forces the teachers to access a wide range of information sources such as newspapers, magazines, and websites about the specificity. Unless a systematic evaluation is carried out, the deficiencies of language and content quality, even plagiarism might inevitably occur (Holguín & Morales, 2014). On that account, extra time promoting to proofread the materials to avoid shortcomings and an assessment procedure are completely crucial.

Typically, the main characteristics of the majority of the students are a paucity of communicative skills, detached feeling, and group dependence. Initially, they are often bashful in expressing their ideas or performing in public. Moreover, part of the learners perceive the isolation and loneliness in individual working space. Eventually, the custom of Vietnamese community-based working has been engraved in their mind for generations, so some students have a habit of relying on the other group-members due to their lack of critical and independent thinking skills. Compared to the traditional pedagogical methods, the new task-based language teaching (TBLT¹) approach in the B.E. entails the teachers to instantly reply to feedbacks and be trained to access technological equipment. In this respect, the success of the B.E. coursebook application leaves a consideration to teachers, students, and other stakeholders.

III. Describing and analyzing the communicative task

The evaluated communicative task is the speaking task in Unit 1 (Telephoning) of the B.E.1 coursebook (See Appendix A). In this section of the paper, according to Tomblin’s (1998, p.227) suggestions, I will describe and analyze one of the tasks that I, as an observer, had a chance to attend the class. Telephoning is a specific type of information gap task in which the learners communicate with each other to gain information. The teacher put the students in pairs and then, she gave each pair two cards with requests on the cards.

Student A: Your Company’s new price lists are still at the printers. You expect them to arrive today. A customer calls with a request. Write down the details. (B.E.1, p.10)

Student B: Phone your partner and ask him/her to send you an up-to-date copy of their company’s price list. Don’t forget to give your name and address. (B.E.1, p. 60)

The verbal instructions were supplied to assist the students to imagine a business situation of making a phone call and take notes of the conversation by using the sentence patterns given in the previous lessons (B.E.1, pp. 2-8). Occasionally, the students were prompted to ask their professor for clarification and checked the understanding. After that, the students practiced role-playing with their partners in five minutes for preparation. The learners engaged in the language activities of listening to the guidelines and speaking to each

¹ From “Task-based language learning”, in *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. Retrieved December 24, 2017 from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Taskbased_language_learning&oldid=812661830

other and to their mentor. To accomplish the task, the learners in pairs took turns to “act out” in front of the class. Feedbacks on the learners’ performance from their classmates and teachers occurred at the final stage. The salient target of the task is that (1) the intermediate students can apply the way of telephoning in a business transaction. Besides, the task also (2) enables the students to acquire new linguistic knowledge and improve their fluency in connection with pedagogical objectives. Finally, the supplementary objective is (3) to increase the students’ positive attitude and motivations. Overall, the task involves the learners focusing on “meaning rather than form” (Nunan, 1993) as well as producing and interacting in the target language. The task duplicates challenges as faced in real-life circumstances. The explicit nature of the task is either fictional for those who imagine the business contact via a phone call or authentic for those who actually work in a foreign joint venture. In this case, the teaching target is “to facilitate language acquisition” (Tomblin, 1998, p. 229) which meets the students’ needs. The nature of the task is multifaceted that means an integration of the real-world and pedagogic kinds. In the operation process of the task, repetition of dialogue frames within the lesson and recalling vocabulary/ sentence structures from previous lessons were undertaken. In other words, the students had to retrieve their intermediate and long-term memory. Also, the task analysis comprises a range of other aspects (See Appendix B).

IV. Evaluations of the communicative tasks

Unlike my colleagues who are originally teachers at colleges, universities, secondary and tertiary schools, I have worked as an editor for the Television and radio station of Lam Dong province for more than twelve years; consequently, I am just “an outside evaluator to bring perspective to the evaluation” (Tomblin 1998, as cited in Alderson, 1992). According to Tomblin (1998, p.234), collecting information for evaluation of tasks can be implemented in a number of stages. Within a time limit, I cannot holistically apply an instructed evaluation; thus, only a few steps were selected. A survey with three ramifications of questions was designed and piloted, including two face-to-face semi-structured inquiries (See Appendix C and D) for the teacher’s interview before and after the class session, and one questionnaire to 20 part-time students of the class (See Appendix E). It would be easier to use the available questionnaire in Tomblin’s (1998, p.235) figure 5 for the student respondents who had been foreseen incapable of momentarily replying sophisticated queries prior to the lecture. In the next section, the data obtained via the student questionnaire were coded for the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, version 20.0). As is displayed in **Table 1**, in the three first questions, the students could quite easily (75%)/ very easily (10%) complete the task while three of them (15%) found it difficult. Most of them perceived the task as enjoyable and useful to learn English; however, around 10 to 15 percent of them did not. In relation to gauging “the objectives of the task have been met” (Tomblin 1998, p.235), it is easier when qualitative data of the question 4 in the students’ questionnaire are classified into corpora (**Table 2**) according to the above-named objectives of the task and converted into quantitative data (**Table 3**).

Table 1

Percentage of the students’ opinions about the accomplishment, enjoyment, and usefulness of the task

Question 1: How easily could you do this task?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	very easily	2	10.0	10.0	10.0
	quite easily	15	75.0	75.0	85.0
	only with difficulty	3	15.0	15.0	100.0
	Total	20	100.0	100.0	

Question 2: How enjoyable did you find this task?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	very enjoyable	7	35.0	35.0	35.0
	quite enjoyable	11	55.0	55.0	90.0
	not enjoyable	2	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	20	100.0	100.0	

Question 3: How much did this task help you learn English?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	very much	11	55.0	55.0	55.0
	some	6	30.0	30.0	85.0
	not very much	3	15.0	15.0	100.0
	Total	20	100.0	100.0	

Table 2

The corpora of the students' responses (Question 4: Can you write one thing you liked about this task?)

The Objectives	The students' responses
(1) The students' target:	1. The task connects to my own lives 2. The task connects to my own work 3. The task helps me learn how to make a phone call in business 4. The task helps me more cooperative with their co-workers 5. The task helps me overcome an anxiety of communication in real-world 6. The task helps me deal with the real situation 7. The task helps me be brave to talk to foreigner via a telephone
(2) The Pedagogic objective:	8. The task is useful for learning English 9. The task helps me acquire more language knowledge 10. The task helps me more confident and fluent in communicating/speaking 11. The task helps me know how to use terms/ patterns to ask teachers for clarification 12. The task helps me fill the information gaps 13. The task makes me practice speaking skills
(3) The additional objective	14. The task inspires me to enjoy learning English 15. The task helps me have a good time in classroom 16. The task inspires me to be a good teacher
(4) Others:	17. I had no idea

Table 3 indicates that six students (30%) recognized that the task had addressed their own needs and the same percentage had denoted its pedagogical goals whilst 25 percent of them realized the learning motivation from the task. The rest (15%) had no self-directed learning or no idea. Optimistically, the large components (65%) had nothing to be unsatisfied with the task. In addition, there were seven suggestions which can be considered the way to modify and improve the task in order to enhance the learners' enthusiasm (listed in Table 4).

Table 3

Question4 Frequencies

	Responses	N	Percent	Percent of Cases
One thing you liked about the task	The students' target	6	30.0%	30.0%
	the pedagogic objective	6	30.0%	30.0%
	the additional objective	5	25.0%	25.0%
	others	3	15.0%	15.0%
Total		20	100.0%	100.0%

Table 4

Question5 Frequencies

	Responses		Percent	Percent of Cases
One thing you did not like about the task	I had nothing to dislike about the task	13	65.0%	65.0%
	Time for practicing speaking skills is not enough	1	5.0%	5.0%
	The teacher should have focused more on pronunciation practice and correction for students	1	5.0%	5.0%
	The task was too difficult to follow because I had not attended the previous class	1	5.0%	5.0%
	Not everyone had a chance to perform because of a time shortage	1	5.0%	5.0%
	The time for preparation was not enough	1	5.0%	5.0%
	Some spoken items were so formal that I rarely found in my casual conversations with my foreigner clients/ counterparts	1	5.0%	5.0%
	The task should have been more interesting with pictures/videos	1	5.0%	5.0%
Total		20	100.0%	100.0%

In the subsequent stage, the pre-task and post-task interview information from the teacher was utilized to compare; as a result, the task has met the above-mentioned objectives. A disadvantage the teacher stated is that some of her students have low self-esteem; correspondingly, they need more frequent cultivation. As for the validity and reliability of the data, the positive classroom atmosphere and students' behaviors through my observation opportunity was partially a successful manifestation of the task. In the latter interview, the teacher offered some empirical action points of the lecture innovation for the future use which is displayed in the recommendation part below.

5. Conclusion and recommendation

In the light of the findings via the survey, it can be emphasized that the coursebook of B.E.1 is acceptably and feasibly applied in the context of the in-service class at UPT conforming to the students' requests, the pedagogical and practical implications as well as a 'surge' of learning autonomy. Nevertheless, the respondents expressed their idea that the communicative tasks should be revamped in a collaboration with a duration expansion (e.g. extra time for preparation, practice/ rehearsal and guidance), and a fruitful input (e.g. pictures or visual footage). There are still 10 to 15% of the students who are misled into rote-

learning and learning for passing examinations. The teacher has been cognizant of encouraging every student in her class to individually and cooperatively accommodate the real communicative use of English. In favor of the task being used again in the future, a necessity of recommendations for communicative language teaching (CLT²), in particular arranging a friendly meeting with native speakers of English outside/ inside the classroom should be given. As a whole, the coursebook was basically formulated by the demands of the learners and instrumental orientation that exchanging of information in English is a must at a workplace in the era of globalization.

References

1. Aguirre, J., & Ramos, B. (2011). *Fostering skills to enhance critical educators: A pedagogical proposal for pre-service teachers*. HOW, A Colombian Journal for Teachers of English, 18(1).
2. Cárdenas, M. (2000). *Producing materials to respond to children's local needs*. ELT Conference 2000, Bogotá, Colombia.
3. Harmer, J. (2012). *Essential teacher knowledge. Core concepts in English language teaching*. England: Pearson Education Limited.
4. Kumaravadivelu, B. (2007). *Cultural globalization and language education*. London, UK: Yale University Press.
5. Nunan, D. (1993). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
6. Núñez, A., Téllez, M. F., & Castellanos, J. (2012). *A framework for materials development: A path for in-service teachers to build up the instructional design of their research projects*.
7. Ramos Holguín, B., & Aguirre Morales, J. (2014). Materials development in the Colombian context: Some considerations about its benefits and challenges. *HOW*, 21(2), 134-150. <http://dx.doi.org/10.19183/how.21.2.8>.
8. Subai, G. (2010). What are the main sources of Turkish EFL students' anxiety in oral practice? *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 1(2).
9. Tharp, R., Estrada, P., Dalton, S., & Yamauchi, L. (2000). *Teaching transformed: Achieving excellence, fairness, inclusion, and harmony*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
10. Tomlinson, B. (1998). *Materials development in language teaching* (1st ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
11. Willingham, D. (2009). *Why Don't Students Like School? A cognitive scientist answers questions about how the mind works and what it means for the classroom*. Wiley, San Francisco, USA.
12. Ziaga, R. (2016). 12 ways to motivate your students. *ELT Teacher's corner*. Retrieved from <http://www.teachers-corner.co.uk/12-ways-motivate-students/>

²From "C is for CLT" in *An A-Z of ELT*, by Scott Thornbury, 2015. Retrieved December 24, 2017 from <https://scottthornbury.wordpress.com/2015/03/08/c-is-for-clt/>

Appendix A

This appendix includes the related extract from the unit 1 of Telephoning task of the coursebook of B.E.1. Succeeding the extract, the task will be parsed by depicting in a table which is replicated Tomblin's (1998, p.210) task analysis sheet and some Littlejohn's (1992, as cited by Tomblin, 1998, p. 211) definition of task aspects (Appendix B)

Appendix A

This appendix includes the related extract from the unit 1 of Telephoning task of the coursebook of B.E.1. Succeeding the extract, the task will be parsed by depicting in a table which is replicated Tomblin's (1998, p.210) task analysis sheet and some Littlejohn's (1992, as cited by Tomblin, 1998, p. 211) definition of task aspects (Appendix B)

Unit 1 Telephoning

PRESENTATION

1 Study these forms. What are they for?

3 Listen to the two telephone conversations and complete the forms



Conversation 1

SALES PROSPECT	Galaxy	
	Computer Supplies	
	Customer Details	Areas of Interest (Tick✓)
	Name <input type="text"/>	Firesafe Cabinets
	Company <input type="text"/>	BZ 9 <input type="checkbox"/> BZ 10 <input type="checkbox"/> BZ 11 <input type="checkbox"/>
	Address <input type="text"/>	Action Necessary (Tick ✓)
	Fax <input type="text"/>	Send Brochure/ <input type="checkbox"/>
Tel. <input type="text"/>	Sales Literature <input type="checkbox"/>	
	Send Quote <input type="checkbox"/>	
	Arrange a Sales Visit <input type="checkbox"/>	
	Phone Back <input type="checkbox"/>	

Conversation 2

ORDER REQUEST	Galaxy		
	Computer Supplies		
	Quantity	Description	Ref. No
	<input type="text"/>	<i>Photoconduc tor Units</i>	<input type="text"/>
	Action Necessary		Order Received by
	Contact name <input type="text"/>	Name <input type="text"/>	
	Company <input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Fax <input type="checkbox"/> Email	
Address <input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Phone		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Urgent		

2 Listen to the conversations again and answer these questions.

-  3a a. Why doesn't the switchboard operator connect the caller immediately?
b. What does the woman say she'll do?
-  3b c. What question does Christophe Terrien ask about the photoconductor units?
d. What does Mary Thatcher ask Christophe Terrien to do?

3 Match the words and phrases (1-10) with similar meanings (a-j).

1 The line's busy.	2 Will you hold?	3 I'll put you through	4 A code.	5 An extension number.
-----------------------	---------------------	---------------------------	--------------	---------------------------

6 Who's calling please?	7 Hold on.	8 This is ...	9 Go ahead.	10 Anything else?
----------------------------	---------------	------------------	----------------	----------------------

a I'll connect you.	b One moment.	c An office number.	d Could I have your name?	e I'm ready.
------------------------	------------------	------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------

f The line's engaged.	g A country or area number.	h Is that all?	i Can you wait?	j ... speaking.
--------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------	--------------------	--------------------

LANGUAGE WORK

Starting calls Study these phrases for starting calls

IDENTIFYING WHO IS SPEAKING

This is Paul Henig.
Paul Henig speaking.
Is that Julia Gardini?

SAYING WHO YOU WANT TO SPEAK TO

Could I speak to ... ?
Can I speak to ... ?
I'd like to speak to ...
Extension 596, please.

Supplying the missing words in these conversations.

- 1 Ms Brunnet Sales Department, good morning.
Mr Keller _____ Helena Steiner, please?
Ms Brunnet Hold on. I'll get her.
- 2 Mrs Steiner Hello, Sales.
Mr Keller _____ Helena Steiner, please.
Mrs Steiner _____.
- 3 Switchboard Curtis Holdings
Mr Keller _____ 293, please.
Miss Delmont Accounts Department.
Mr Keller _____ Jean Delmont?
Miss Delmont Yes, _____. How can I help you, Mr Keller?

3 We use these phrases to ask if it's OK to do things.

ASKING	SAYING YES	SAYING NO
Can I ...?	Yes, please do.	I'm afraid ...
Could I ...?	Of course,	I'm sorry but ...
May I ...?	* Yeah, go ahead. ** Help yourself.	

* Informal

** Inviting someone to take something

3 When you transfer information by phone, try not to leave long silences or pauses. These phrases will help you.

STARTING	Ready?	Go ahead.
CONTINUING	Have you got that?	Got that.
FINISHING	Anything else?	That's all.
CHECKING	Could you read that back to me?	Could I read that back to you?

Requests

1 We use these phrases to ask other people to do things.

Can you ... ?	Could you ... ?	Would you ... ?
---------------	-----------------	-----------------

You're on the phone. What do you say in these situations?

- a. You can't hear the other person.
- b. You want them to repeat something.
- c. They are speaking too fast.
- d. You want them to spell a word.
- e. You want them to transfer you to the Finance Department.

Appendix B

Task analysis sheet

UNIT 1: TELEPHONING		
Communicative task	Speaking task	
I. WHAT IS THE LEARNER EXPECTED TO DO?		
A. TURN TAKE		
Initiate	/	The learner(s) is expected to freely discuss or ask questions for clarification

Respond		
Not required	/	The learner(s) is expected to listen to the instructions
B. FOCUS ON		
Language system		
Meaning		
Meaning/system relationship	/	The task focuses on the meaning and the sentence patterns for making a phone call.
C. OPERATION		
Repeat identically		
Repeat selectively	/	Using dialogue frames
Repeat with substitution	/	Substitution drills
Repeat with transformation		
Repeat with expansion		
Repeat from STM (short-term memory)		
Repeat from ITM (intermediate term memory)	/	Recalling vocabulary/ sentence structures/ phrases within lesson.
Retrieve from LTM (Long- term memory)	/	Recalling vocabulary/ sentence structures/ phrases from the previous sessions
Apply language rule	/	Using vocabulary/ sentence structures/ phrases to telephone in the business environment
Negotiate	/	Free discussion with the partner
II. WHO WITH?		
Learners individually to whole class		
Teacher and learners, whole class observing	/	a selected learner answers a question; others listen to.
Learners with whole class simultaneously		
Learners in pairs/groups simultaneously	/	The learners discuss in pairs.
Learners in pairs/group, class observing	/	a pair of students 'act out' a conversation on a telephone
III. WITH WHAT CONTENT?		
A. FORM		
a. input to learners		
PowerPoint	/	The lesson content is presented on PP projector.
Oral words/phrases/ sentences	/	Encompassing in the Unit and the Information Files of the coursebook for a drill
Oral extended discourse		a dialogue on tape (Being introduced in the previous class session)
Written words/phrases		
Written extended discourse		
Sounds/music		
b. expected output from learners		
Oral words/phrases/ sentences	/	responding to a drill and role-playing as a phone-call maker/ recipient

Oral extended discourse		
Written words/phrases/sentences		
Written extended discourse		
B. SOURCE		
Materials	/	Dialogues in the coursebook
Teacher	/	The teacher recounts his/her own experiences
Learner(s)	/	The learners recount their own experiences
C. NATURE		
Personal opinion		
Fact		
Fiction	/	Dialogues between imaginary roles
Non-fiction	/	The real world challenges the students to face while working at their company
Personal information	/	Details of learners' personal information (e.g. name, address, etc.)
Linguistic terms		
Metalinguistic knowledge		

Appendix C

Teacher Pre-Task Interview: Evaluation Of Communicative Tasks in the Course-book of Business English 1

1. What are the target learners of your class?

2. How many students are there in the class?

3. What is the level of English proficiency of your students in the class?

4. Describe the communicative task in the used coursebook

(1) How will the task instructions be supplied to the students?

A. In verbal form: communicate by speaking English

B. In non-verbal form (a diagram/ a picture, etc.): using gestures, eye signals, diagram, and tables.

(2) What kinds of language activities will the learners engage in?

A. Listening

B. Reading

C. Speaking

D. Writing

(3) What are the activities that the learners will have performed in order to accomplish the communicative task?

A. A role-play

B. Drawing a diagram

C. An individual oral presentation

D.

.....

(4) What are the interactions expected to happen in the communicative task?

A. Teacher and learners, the whole class observing. E.g. a selected learner answers a question; others listen to.

- B. Learners to the whole class. E.g. learners' feedback on group work.
 - C. Learners with the whole class simultaneously. E.g. choral repetition
 - D. Learners in pairs/groups, class observing. E.g. a group 'acts out' a conversation
 - E. Learners in pairs/groups simultaneously. E.g. learners discuss in groups.
5. What will it presumably be in the operation process of the communicative task?
- A. Oral repetition of words/ sentence patterns as they are introduced
 - B. Repetition of dialogue frames
 - C. Recalling vocabulary within the lesson
 - D. Recalling vocabulary from previous lessons
6. What are the objectives of the task?
- A. to enable the students to acquire new linguistic knowledge
 - B. to enable the students to improve their fluency
 - C. to enable the students to adapt the real- world task
 - D. to increase the students' learning positive attitude and motivation
7. What sources are they in favor of applying this communicative task?
- A. Dialogues/ language focus in the coursebook
 - B. Teacher recounts on own experience
 - C. Learner(s) recounts on own experience
 - D. On the Internet and other references
8. What is the nature of the communicative task?
- A. A pedagogical task
 - B. A real-world task
9. Are there any problems you have previously encountered with such a task? What are they?

Appendix D

Teacher Post-Task Interview: Evaluation of Communicative Tasks in the Coursebook of Business English 1

- 1. Did the students request clarification when they did not understand something?
- 2. How many students accomplished the communicative task as required?
- 3. How many students did not accomplish the communicative task as required?

Why?

4. Did the task work in terms of its objectives?
5. What was it in the operation process of the communicative task?
 - A. Oral repetition of words/ sentence patterns as they are introduced
 - B. Repetition of dialogue frames
 - C. Recalling vocabulary within the lesson
 - D. Recalling vocabulary from previous lessons
6. Were there any problems while applying this communicative task to your target students? Why so?
7. Should the task be used again or abandoned?
8. Can you indicate ways in which the task might be improved for future use?