

Analysis of Student Feedback for a Tourism English Course Based on Group Projects

Darrell HARDY

Abstract

Course or curriculum developers often follow well defined steps in creating a new course or program. Typically the initial step involves data collection in the form of needs analysis which ideally should gather information from a number of sources, such as input from administration, teachers, and especially the students themselves. From the needs analysis course goals and objectives can be formulated and other course decisions can be implemented. Unfortunately, the creation of a new course does not always follow typically prescribed or linear notions of course development. More often than not teachers or course developers who have been required by university administration to develop a language course or program within a limited time frame, have to cut corners and create courses without the benefit a comprehensive student needs analysis. It is only after a pilot course has been completed that teachers can gather student feedback and realign course goals and objectives. This project reports the results of an end of course student questionnaire of a pilot of an English for Special Purposes (ESP) course. The questionnaire focused on several prominent features of the course: project based activities, group work, and peer evaluation. The results indicate that the students generally viewed these features as positive to provide language and vocational training. However, the results also suggested that the students desired some changes, especially in providing more language support.

Key words

Course Development, Course Evaluation, English for Specific Purposes , Tourism English Projects

1. Introduction

It is often the case that teachers or course developers are required to create courses in the absence of all the information required to make thorough decisions about course design. There could be a number of reasons for this, such as insufficient time or limited resources to conduct a proper needs analysis. A proper needs analysis requires not only information from administration, but also information from students in the form of questionnaires, interviews, and diagnostic tests (Brown, 1995; Richards, 2001)). This is especially the case for ESP courses where student input into the context of language use for vocational purposes is an important consideration. (Basturkmen, 2010; Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998;

Harding, 2007; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987)

Another difficulty in obtaining accurate information to create ESP courses which reflect student needs is that university students may not yet have a clear vision of their future career paths. Therefore, expecting them to provide a detailed description about their future language needs maybe rather unrealistic. Also, in a diverse industry such as tourism, deciding on language which is specific to one area may benefit some while providing no benefit to others. Therefore, it often it is up to the teacher or course developer to make assumptions about situational language use that students may encounter in their future careers and prioritize these needs into a working syllabus.

Even though somewhat handicapped without a complete needs analysis, course developers who are also involved in teaching within the program have certain advantages. First of all, teachers should have access to back ground information on students such as biodata and scores on diagnostic or placement tests. Also, the creation of a new course may be a result of a perceived institutional need which helps to define the parameters of the new course and set general goals. Furthermore, actual experience teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) courses within the faculty should provide EFL teachers with personal insight into the needs and wants of the particular group of language learners and this will be an advantage when designing courses.

In such cases where limited information is available during course development an initial run of the course can be monitored and assessed at various stages and at the completion of the pilot program. Course evaluation in this manor gives teachers or course developers an opportunity to reflect on possible deficiencies and consider making revisions to more accurately match student wants and needs.

2. Literature Review

This section briefly reviews theory and procedure for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) course development, and special considerations for ESP course development. Also, the theoretical bases for other relevant concepts such as Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT), Cooperative Learning, the completion of projects as course goals and evaluation, and peer evaluation of projects will be discussed in this section. Finally, procedure and considerations for end of course evaluations will be discussed.

2.1 EFL Course Development

In contemporary language teaching, course design is usually a well-defined process that includes a variety of factors ranging from theories of language and language learning to the daily planning of lessons. To overview this process, it is useful to consider the general framework proposed by Richards and Rodgers (2001) which divides the process into three interconnected areas of development: *approach, design, and procedure*.

According to this model, *approach* considers the course developers view on the nature of language and language learning. Currently many EFL course developers have adopted the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach (Littlewood, 1981; Richards & Rodgers, 2001) which takes the

viewpoint that language is a tool for communication and language learning should be based on Communicative Competence which, according to Canale (1983), consists of four components: Grammatical competence (knowledge of grammar and vocabulary), Sociolinguistic competence (the ability to understand roles and social context), Discourse competence (the ability to infer meaning of elements in the context of longer text or discourse) and Strategic competence (to employ communicative strategies, such as to initiate, cope, repair, and terminate communication). Language learning is based on the idea that language is for communication and the focus should be on conveying meaning. Although form and language functions are important, having a purpose to communicate, often in the form of tasks, provides the stimulus for learning (Littlewood, 1981; Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Following the *approach*, according to Richards & Rodgers is the *design* stage which focuses mainly on organizing and presenting materials in a way which will benefit a certain group of learners the most. The way to organize and present materials is through the course syllabus (Nunan, 1988; Yalden, 1987) which will arrange materials in a way the designer feels important for the learners. For example, he / she may start from simple language and scale to more complex, or prioritize from general use to more specific. The *approach* decided on will influence the syllabus type used in the course. Generally in CLT, Yalden (1987) describes a dichotomous series of syllabus types with the structural syllabus (focus on form) on the left side and communicative syllabus (focus on meaning) on the right side. Often developers will decide on an integrated syllabus which includes a number of themes such as topics, tasks, and / or situational language use.

The third stage of the Richards & Rodgers framework, *procedure*, relates to the teaching techniques, and the presentation, and practice of materials in the classroom. In general, classroom activities are centered around communication with a focus on expressing meaning. Littlewood (1981) categorizes communicative activities into two types: *functional communication activities* which involves tasks where students have to share information to solve problems, follow instruction, or complete tasks; and *social interaction activities* which include roleplays, situational skits, discussion, and debates.

The Richards & Rodgers framework is useful in analyzing and comparing different “methods” of language teaching; however, it seems to lack a systematic procedure for course development. Brown (1995) on the other hand, offers a more concise guide to course development in which he suggests a series of interrelated steps.

The first and perhaps the most important step is the *needs analysis* which should consider data from university administration, perceived student needs, gaps in language proficiency, and especially student needs. Student input is very important in this step and should include data from biodata, student questionnaires, student interviews and diagnostic and proficiency tests. It is information obtained at this step that will determine the course goals and lesson objectives of the course.

Once the course goals and lesson objectives have been set after analyzing the data from the needs analysis, objectives can be arranged to achieve course goals and syllabus design and materials can be decided on that best sets out to achieve these objectives and goals. During this stage developers must also consider assessment to determine if the course objectives have been met by students. This is usually

determined by criterion based tests.

2.2 ESP Course Development

ESP courses fall under the category of Content Based Instruction (CBI) which Richards & Rodgers define as “... an approach to second language teaching in which teaching is organized around content or information that students will acquire, rather than around a linguistic or other type of syllabus.” (p. 204). In other words, the focus is not so much on language learning but learning through language.

The CBI theory of language is that language is used for specific purposes and is used more as a tool to access content which often requires learners to utilize multiple language skills. As a theory of learning Richards & Rodgers state that “People learn a second language most successfully when the information they are acquiring is perceived as interesting, useful, and leading to a desired goal.” (p. 209). From this definition we can see a clear link to needs analysis. As stated by Hutchinson and Waters (1987) “... it is an approach to language learning, which is based on learner need.” (p. 19)

Once the ESP course goals and objectives have been determined through the needs analysis, decisions need to be made regarding materials and syllabus type and design. An ESP syllabus is different from an EFL syllabus in that it focuses on presenting content rather than language. The closest CLT syllabus type to an ESP syllabus is the Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT) syllabus according to Yalden (1987).

2.3 TBLT versus ESP, Cooperative Learning, Group Projects and Peer-Evaluation

Even though the focus of the TBLT syllabus (language learning) and ESP syllabus (meaning through language) are different, there are some attributes to TBLT that could benefit ESP students, especially if their language ability is limited. First of all, TBLT requires students to work in groups and group work simulates Cooperative Learning which according to Jacobs & Hall (2001) “... encourages mutual helpfulness in the groups and the active participation of all members.” (p. 52). Jacobs & Hall list the benefits as increasing student talk, more varied content and language forms, increase of comprehensible input, greater negotiation of meaning and affective factors such as a more relaxed and enjoyable atmosphere which contributes to greater motivation.

Also, tasks in the TBLT sense can be applicable to ESP, though the focus should be more on conveying meaning rather than the practice of language. However, in an ESP class of EFL students, language practice is usually desirable. Lee (2000) defines a task as follows:

A task is (1) a classroom activity or exercise that has (a) an objective attainable only by the interaction among participants, (b) a mechanism for structuring and sequencing interaction, and (c) a focus on meaning exchange; (2) a language learning endeavor that requires learners to comprehend, manipulate, and / or produce the target language as they perform some set of work plans. (p. 32)

If the goal of an ESP course is the completion of projects in groups, then the ESP syllabus begins to resemble a TBLT syllabus if projects are completed in a series of steps (objectives).

The creation of projects in an ESP course has a number benefits. According to Stoller (2002),

When incorporating project work into content-based classrooms, instructors distance themselves from teacher-dominated instruction and move toward creating a student community of inquiry involving authentic communication, cooperative learning, collaboration, and problem solving. (p. 102)

Other benefits include the opportunity to integrate multiple language skills and provide a means of assessment.

For an ESP course with the goal of the completion of project(s), the successful completion of the project(s) should be the bases for evaluation. Involving students in the evaluation of projects in the form of peer evaluation provides a number of benefits. Topping (1998) claims that, "Such assessment is intended to help students plan their own learning, identify their own strengths and weaknesses, target areas for remedial action, and develop meta-cognitive and other personal and professional transferable skills." (p 249)

2.4 Course Evaluation

An important and perhaps often neglected stage in course development is the evaluation of the course after the course has been implemented. Richards (2001) defines course evaluation as follows:

Curriculum evaluation ... focuses on collecting information about different aspects of a language program in order to understand how the program works, and how successfully it works, enabling different kinds of decisions to be made about the program, such as whether the program responds to learners' needs, whether further teacher training is required for teachers working in the program, or whether students are learning sufficiently from it. (p. 286)

Course evaluation usually seeks to determine the effectiveness of course goals and objectives, though other aspects of the course, as deemed important by the course developer, may also be assessed. Brown (1995) suggests two general approaches to gathering data to evaluate course effectiveness: *Formative evaluation*, which is the gathering of data during the course to allow for minor changes and adjustments while the course is still in process; and *Summative evaluation* which is an end of course evaluation to determine if the course has been successful, efficient, and effective.

The participants of a course evaluation could include the students, course developers, administrators, and sponsors. Richards (2001) advocates student participation as follows:

Students are often key participants in the summative evaluation of the program, providing evidence of their gains in language proficiency and completing evaluations on the way the program was taught and the relevance of what they have earned to their needs. (p. 294)

Data for summative evaluation may be either quantitative (questionnaires, grades) or qualitative (written responses, interviews of students and teachers). A common way to ascertain student opinion is by conducting an end of course questionnaire.

Research Questions:

Based on the results of an end of term questionnaire, the data was analyzed to determine the

following:

1. Did course goals and objectives meet student expectations?
2. Did the students find the projects relevant and that basing goals and course evaluation on the completion of group projects provide a positive learning experience?
3. Did group work enhance students' learning experience?
4. Did student involvement in evaluation help to reinforce course objectives?
5. What shortcomings or deficiencies, if any, did the questionnaire reveal?

3. Methods

3.1 Introduction

This project was conducted at a major university in Tokyo, Japan within the faculty of International Tourism. Students who major in tourism are required to take several English language courses in their first and second year. The focus of this study is a newly developed course titled English for Tourism Projects (ETP) which was designed to be a 15-week one semester course. The initial offering of this course was in the spring of 2017 from April to July.

3.2 Participants in this study

Two classes of ETP participated in this study, both consisting of students of approximately pre-intermediate English language ability. The students were placed into classes according to TOEIC scores taken the previous December. The TOEIC scores ranged from 350 to 415. The students who participated in this study were second year Tourism majors aged 19 or 20. All together 46 students participated in the survey, 10 male and 36 female. All students are Japanese nationals.

3.3 The Course

The course was designed as a response from administration as a need to offer an ESP course with a focus on providing students with practical experience in situations that they may encounter when they graduate and seek employment in the tourism industry. This course was designed to be a one semester mandatory course for second year students in the faculty of International Tourism.

The course, ETP, is based upon a content based syllabus which consists of three sections. The goal of each section is to create and present a project in groups of four. Students are required to work in the same group for the duration of each project and are required to work together to complete a project in four classes (four weeks) and present on the fifth week. The lesson objectives have been set up to systematically lead to the completion of the projects. The following is a brief description of the projects:

Project 1: Creating a travel brochure and package tour. Groups decide on a country or region and create a travel brochure including an itinerary for a one-week package tour. On the final (fifth) class, groups present their projects in the form of a role-play between customer and travel agent.

Project 2: Regional tourism in Japan. Groups decide on a prefecture in Japan (excluding Tokyo) and

create a power point presentation based on several criteria. On the fifth class groups give their Power Point presentations.

Project 3: Job interview role-play. Each group is in charge of interviewing and selecting students for a tourism related job. Also, students select and apply for jobs (not the one their group is responsible for). The application includes writing a cover letter, resume, and practicing Job interview role-play. On the fifth class, groups evaluate the applicants' cover letters, resumes, and conduct job interviews. Group members then decide on two successful applicants.

Students are assessed on their groups' completed projects and presentations. Students are also required to participate in assessment of other groups' projects

See Appendix A for the course syllabus.

3.4 Instrumentation

A questionnaire was designed to obtain student feedback on several aspects of the newly developed ETP course. The questionnaire consisted of a list of statements in English about the course and students were instructed to select one of the following responses: disagree a lot, disagree a little, agree a little, and agree a lot. The statements were divided into four sections: about the course and projects, group work, peer evaluation, and projects. Students were also encouraged to write a comment on possible ways to improve the course. A sample of the survey is listed in appendix B.

3.5 Procedure

At the end of the final class in week 15, students were asked to complete the questionnaire. The students were told that the data would be used for research purposes and to make improvements in the course. They were also informed that participation was optional and that their participation or non-participation would have no bearing on their final grade in the course whatsoever. All students agreed to complete the survey and completed the questionnaire in approximately 10 minutes. After that, the questionnaires were collected and the data analyzed soon after.

4. Results and Discussion

This section presents the results of the student questionnaire about the ETP course and considers the implications of these results. Data is presented in five sections: about the course and projects work, group work, peer evaluation, student comments, and project preferences.

4.1 About the course and project work

The first part of the questionnaire focuses on questions which attempt to assess the students' overall feelings about several aspects of the course and the use of projects. Statements 1, 2, and 4 in particular inquire about the use of projects as useful for their future, as a way to learn English, and as a preference over regular paper tests. When calculating the average of questions 1, 2, and 4, the majority of students

Table 1 *About the course and project work*

Statements	Disagree a lot (%)	Disagree a little (%)	Agree a little (%)	Agree a lot (%)
1. The tourism projects in this course are useful for my future.	0	2	46	52
2. The objectives of the lessons were very clear.	0	7	43	50
3. Working on projects helped me to learn English.	0	7	35	58
4. I prefer projects to regular paper tests.	0	22	24	54
5. I could speak much English in this class.	2	22	37	39
6. The English level was good for me.	2	17	44	37
7. There were too many projects.	9	48	24	19
8. There was too much homework.	11	44	30	15
9. I would like to study more grammar.	2	11	54	33

n = 46

surveyed (56%) agree a lot, 35% agree a little, 10% disagree a little, while 0% disagree a lot. In general, it can be said that almost all of the students found project work to be a practical method of learning English.

Statement 3 inquired specifically about the lesson objectives and over 90% of students agreed that the lesson objectives were clear. This indicates that the students understood the course goals and lesson objectives, which of course, is important, especially for an ESP course.

Statements 5 and 6 enquired about the English use and level and most students responded positively, however, it should be noted that approximately 20% (statement 5 (24%) and statement 6 (19%)) disagreed. Students were expected to communicate in English among group members; however, most students found it difficult to maintain an only English speaking environment and often reverted to L1 usage. The rather unstructured environment of language use in groups and the variety of situations overwhelmed most students.

Students responded positively to the need to study more grammar (statement 9) which re-enforces the desire for a greater focus on language. Students have identified a gap in their language ability and the language required to communicate with group members and thus have expressed a need for language support.

Statements 7 and 8 enquired about homework and work load. Before the course began, informal discussions with other teachers expressed a concern that three projects in one 15-week term may be too much work for students. Although some students agreed that there was too much, the majority stated that this was not an issue.

4.2 *Group work*

The second part of the questionnaire focused on student opinions of working predominantly in groups to complete and present projects. Statement 1 simply states if students enjoyed working in groups and all students agreed with this statement including 67% which agreed a lot. This strongly suggests that

Table 2 *Group work*

Statements	Disagree a lot (%)	Disagree a little (%)	Agree a little (%)	Agree a lot (%)
1. I enjoyed working in groups.	0	0	33	67
2. I enjoyed making decisions about the projects in groups.	0	0	57	43
3. It was easier to understand with my group members' help.	0	4	50	46
4. Working in a group made it easier to plan our projects.	0	4	44	52
5. Working in a group motivated me to study harder and complete the homework.	2	7	43	48
6. I could learn more by working in groups.	0	9	48	43

n = 46

working in groups is an enjoyable way for students to learn and practice English. Related to this, statement 5 asks about motivation to study harder and complete homework tasks and over 90% agreed. This corresponds to Dömyei's (2001) concept of "cohesive learner group" (p. 43) in which the formation of groups encourages bonding and the development of a share responsibility to work together to complete course goals and objectives

Statements 2, 3, 4, 6 relate to cooperative learning and the results of the questionnaire verifies some of the benefits of cooperative learning as stated in the literature review. Students overwhelmingly agreed to these points. This confirms that cooperative learning through peers in group work is a very powerful tool for language learning and working on projects seems to focus this point and give it more purpose.

4.3 *Peer evaluation*

Table 3 *Peer evaluation*

Statements	Disagree a lot (%)	Disagree a little (%)	Agree a little (%)	Agree a lot (%)
1. Evaluating travel brochures and roleplays was useful.	0	4	51	39
2. Evaluating other groups Power Point presentations helped me understand the presentation criteria.	0	2	52	46
3. Checking and evaluating resumes and cover letters helped me to understand how to write a good resume and cover letter.	0	9	39	52
4. Doing job interviews and choosing the best applicant helped me understand what is important in a job interview.	0	9	48	43

n = 46

In this course, students were required to participate to some degree in peer evaluation of each project.

Also, several in class tasks required students to provide feedback to group members for the completion of homework tasks such as peer editing of resume and cover letter. Most students found peer-evaluation to be a useful learning tool, especially for peer editing resumes and cover letters.

4.4 *Student comments*

Students were asked to write a comment or suggestions on how to improve the course and of the 46 students who completed the questionnaire, 12 wrote comments. The majority of the comments were positive (9), 2 neutral, and 1 possibly negative (rather vague). Also, 4 of the 12 comments were positive about group work and 2 positive about the projects.

4.5 *Project preference*

Table 4 Project preference

Questions	Project 1 (%)	Project 2 (%)	Project 3 (%)
1. Which project did you find the most useful for your future?	17	37	46
2. Which project did you find the most enjoyable?	52	23	20
3. Which project helped your English the most?	20	30	50

n = 46

From the data listed in table 4, it seems that project 3 (job interviews) was the most practical project because students felt it was the most useful for their futures and provided the best opportunity to use English. Project 1 was voted the most enjoyable project. Project 2 (Power Point presentation) ranked number 2 for all three questions. In other words, it was neither the best nor the worst which isn't bad. Also, administration requested a Power Point presentation as one of the projects since it is considered a useful skill and wanted to give students the chance to give a presentation in English.

5. *Conclusion*

The overall results of the student questionnaire to evaluate the ETP course were very positive. Even without a thorough needs analysis, students seemed to be content with the course goals, objectives and content. Research questions 1 – 4 can thus be answered affirmatively, confirming some of the positive assumptions about project work, group work, and peer evaluation that were discussed in the literature review.

Research question 5 asks if the questionnaire revealed any short comings in the course and students indicated that the addition of more language support would be desirable. This confirms in class teacher observations in which students struggled to maintain an English only environment in the classroom. Most students found it difficult to cope with the diversity of interactions in a group environment and often shifted back to the L1.

As mentioned in the literature review, an ESP syllabus resembles a TBLT syllabus and perhaps a focus on form can be structured into the existing syllabus to help students achieve lesson objectives while maintaining an English only environment. Possibly, the review of helpful language functions and the use of scripted role-plays could be added for support.

Course development is an ongoing process.

References Cited

- Basturkmen, H. (2010). *Developing courses in English for specific purposes*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brown, J.D. (1995). *The Elements of Language Curriculum: A Systematic Approach to Program Development*. Boston: Heinle.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J.Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication*. pp. 2-28. London: Longman
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St. John, M., J. (1998). *Developments in English for Specific Purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harding, K. (2007). *English for Specific Purposes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purposes; A learning-centred approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, G., & Hall, S. (2002). Implementing Cooperative Learning. In J.C. Richards & W.A. Renandya (Eds), *Methodology in language teaching an anthology of current practice* (pp.107-118). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krahnke, K. (1987). *Approaches syllabus design for foreign language teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lee, J, F. *Tasks and Communicating in Language Classrooms*. Boston: McGraw-Hill
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *Syllabus Design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J., & Rogers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. pp. 18-35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stoller, F. (2002). Project Work: A means to promote language and content. In J.C. Richards & W.A. Renandya (Eds), *Methodology in language teaching an anthology of current practice* (pp.107-118). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Topping, K. (1998). Peer Assessment Between Students in Colleges and Universities. *Review of Educational Research*. 68(3), 249-276.
- Yalden, J. (1987). *The Communicative Syllabus: Evolution, Design and Implementation*. London: Prentice-Hall International.

Appendix A

English for Tourism Projects, Course Outline:

Projects	Goals	Lessons Objectives
Project 1: Travel Brochure and Travel Fair	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create a travel brochure focusing on promoting a city, country, or area 2. Create a one week package tour 3. Role-play: travel agent - customer 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analyze text to determine the appropriate style for advertising 2. Decide on the language features to make descriptions more attractive 3. Decide on the country or area your group will focus on 4. Start writing your description
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of package tours 2. Review the features and important points of a typical package tour 3. Decide on the content and features of your group's package tour
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluate the design and content of a sample brochure 2. Review some of the important pictures and text you need in your brochure 3. Begin designing your brochure
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discuss the procedures of the Travel Fair. 2. Decide pairs for the Travel Fair, compare your travel agent and customer conversations (homework) and practice. 3. Complete your brochure
		Perform Travel Fair; groups complete brochure / role-play assessments
Project 2: Power Point Presentation – Regional Tourism in Japan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review effective PP slides, and presentation skills 2. Research regional tourism about a specific region in Japan 3. Present about regional features, major attractions, SWOT, tourism trends, and give recommendations 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Compare two presentations – discuss the good points and bad points of each 2. Review presentation skills and how to make proper Power Point slides 3. Decide on the prefecture in Japan to focus your presentation on and your focus
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Report and discuss the information you researched 2. Discuss and decide on the design and content of your Power Point Presentation
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Peer review and edit a group member's script from last week 2. Decide the introduction, conclusion, and transitions
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review assessment and presentation evaluation form 2. Decide the order of presenters 3. Practice presentation
		Project 2 presentations. Students complete and submit presentation assessment forms

Projects	Goals	Lessons Objectives
Project 3: Job Application and Interview	1. Review the content of a CV and Cover Letter 2. Students write CV and Cover Letter in English 3. Role-play job interviews 4. Analyze and match candidates to a job	1. Introduce project 3 and choose one of the jobs offered 2. Review the main points and format of a resume
		1. Peer editing of 1st draft of resume 2. Review the main points and format of a cover letter
		1. Peer editing of 1st draft of cover letter 2. Develop a list of questions for the job interview role-play
		1. Discuss procedure for next week's job interview 2. Read through and assess the applicants' cover letters and resumes according to the score sheet 3. Practice and assessment of job interview role-play.
		Job Interviews; groups decide and announce successful candidate; submit individual assessment forms and documents

Appendix B

English for Tourism Projects Course Survey Questions

About the Course				
	Disagree a lot	Disagree a little	Agree a little	Agree a lot
1. The tourism projects in this course are useful for my future				
2. The objectives of the lessons were very clear				
3. Working on projects helped me to learn English				
4. I prefer projects to regular paper tests				
5. I could speak much English in this class				
6. The English level was good for me				
7. There were too many projects				
8. There was too much homework				
9. I would like to study more grammar				
Group Work				
1. I enjoyed working in groups				
2. I enjoyed making decisions about the projects in groups				
3. It was easier to understand with my group members' help				
4. Working in a group made it easier to plan our project				
5. Working in a group motivated me to study harder and complete the homework				
6. I could learn more by working in groups				
Peer Evaluations (scoring)				
1. Evaluating travel brochures and roleplays was useful				
2. Evaluating other groups power point presentations helped me understand the presentation criteria				
3. Checking and evaluating resumes and cover letters helped me to understand how to write a good resume and cover letter				
4. Doing job interviews and choosing the best applicant helped me understand what is important in a job interview				
Comments: If you have any suggestions on how to improve this course, please write a comment below				

Projects	Project 1	Project 2	Project 3
1. Which project did you find the most useful for your future?			
2. Which project did you find the most enjoyable?			
3. Which project helped your English the most?			

グループプロジェクトに基づく観光英語コースの学生フィードバックの分析

ダレル・ハーディ

[要約]

コースやカリキュラム開発者は、新しいコースやプログラムを作成する際によく定義された手順に従うことがあります。通常、初期段階ではニーズ分析の形でデータ収集が行われ、管理、教師、特に学生自身からのインプットなど、多くの情報源から情報を収集することが理想的です。ニーズ分析コースから、目標と目的を策定し、他のコース決定を実施することができます。残念なことに、新しいコースの作成は、必ずしもコース開発の通常の規定または線形概念に従うとは限らない。限られた時間枠内で語学コースやプログラムを開発するために大学の管理が必要とされている教師やコース開発者は、包括的な生徒のニーズ分析の恩恵なしにコーナーを削り、コースを作成する必要があります。パイロットコースが完了した後にのみ、教師が学生のフィードバックを収集し、コースの目標と目標を再調整することができます。このプロジェクトは、特別目的英語コース (ESP) コースのパイロットに関するコース終了学生アンケートの結果を報告します。アンケートは、コースのいくつかの顕著な特徴、すなわちプロジェクトに基づく活動、グループワーク、ピア評価に重点を置いた。結果は、学生が一般的に、これらの機能を言語と職業訓練を提供するために積極的に見ていることを示しています。しかし、結果はまた、特に言語サポートを増やすために、学生が変更を望んでいることを示唆しました。

[キーワード]

コース開講コース評価特定目的向け英語観光英語プロジェクト