Cultivating Learner Autonomy within Groups

Ben Grafström

grafstro@gipc.akita-u.ac.jp

The Center for the Promotion of Educational Research and Affairs

教育推進総合センター　グラフストロム　ベン

Abstract

The Conversation Circle (CC) is the ALL Rooms' longest consistently organized activity offered to Akita University students. CCs meet twice weekly and are a time for students interested in learning and/or practicing English to use it as a spoken language, rather than just studying it to pass an exam. Since students may not have many opportunities to speak English for prolonged periods of time during their day to day routines, CC time is precious.

In the past CCs have been largely unstructured, meaning that many "conversations" were not really "conversations," but rather just aimless rambling. When topics were decided and conversations were attempted, they were largely dictated by the ALL Room's faculty and/or student staff, and not by the participants coming to practice English, which hardly made for an autonomous learning environment. Starting in the spring semester of the 2014-15 academic year, the ALL Rooms faculty responsible for the CC meetings began making the CCs more participant-centered with the hope of making the CCs more popular and more meaningful for participants. The following paper describes 1) how ALL Rooms' faculty and staff began giving CCs more structure to allow for more authentic "conversation" among participants and 2) how selecting and discussing CC topics has become participant-centered.

Akita University opened its autonomous language learning center during the fall of 2010. Named the "ALL Rooms" (Autonomous Language Learning Rooms), the center's mission is to foster autonomous English language learning among Akita University students. The ALL Rooms provides students a place for language study and practice as well as the support they need to continue to learn English beyond what they are taught in the classroom.

The ALL Rooms' main resource room holds volumes and volumes of traditional materials such as English test-prep books, vocabulary-building books, graded readers, and audio materials that can be used for both listening and speaking practice. Students are free to use these materials for self study, but are encouraged to study and practice with partners or in small groups.

Aside from the traditional study methods, the ALL Rooms' student staff plan and implement activities like English movie nights, *manga*/comic book clubs, Halloween parties and other fun, non-traditional events at which students can socialize and have opportunities to speak the English that they spend so much time studying. These activities have proved successful in bringing together like minded students with a desire to speak English in casual, social settings. Such activities provide students with the encouragement and peer support that they need to persevere in their pursuit of English proficiency.

Many of the social activities that the ALL Rooms have offered over the past 5 years have been done rather irregularly and are often canceled once the students who plan and organize them graduate or return to their home

countries (as is the case with exchange-student staff). The Conversation Circle (herein referred to as the CC) is the one activity that has consistently been meeting on a weekly basis for at least the past 3 years. The CC started as a weekly, 90 minute session at which students could come to the ALL Rooms for group discussion practice. This year it has increased to two 90 minute meetings per week. Typically, one exchange student staff member is in charge of facilitating the CC. Not all exchange students are native English speakers themselves, hailing from such countries as Israel, Kenya, and Romania (to name a few), so one of the native English-speaking ALL Rooms' faculty supervisors is also on hand in case there are any technical questions about language usage. It should be clear that CCs are not English lessons, but rather a time for participants to utilize their language skills. Therefore the ALL Rooms' faculty and staff who are present at the CCs are not regarded as teachers or instructors, merely facilitators for conducting conversations as smoothly as possible.

Since the ALL Rooms have steadily employed exchange students who are then charged with facilitating the CCs, many conversation topics tended to be focused on the exchange student's native culture or with introducing them to Akita life. Also in past years, CCs would rarely have pre-determined, pre-arranged, topics that were agreed upon by the participants. Instead conversation topics would be whimsically decided at the last minute by the ALL Rooms' faculty and staff, or by any participants in attendance. This may not be an inherently wrong approach, but ALL Rooms' faculty began to notice some negative trends. One trend was that since topics were not pre-established, many popular topics would be repeated a second or third time throughout the semester, causing students who attended frequently to become bored or disinterested. Another trend was that time would be wasted at the beginning of the CC trying to decide a suitable topic. This was particularly troublesome because participants tend to have a variety of skill levels, so high ability participants would often dominate the decision making process.

To counteract the issues of wasting time, deciding topics haphazardly, and making sure that topics reflected the abilities and interests of all students, at the beginning of the 2014-15 academic year the ALL Rooms faculty supervisors decided that CC topics for the semester would be decided in advance. The faculty and student staff agreed that deciding on topics for the year would cut back on a lot of time wasting during the CC. The ALL Rooms' faculty supervisors believed that by polling participants at the beginning of the semester about what topics they would be interested in, CC topics chosen in advance could be selected much more carefully and would reflect the participants' variety of interests. After reflecting on this decision the faculty also concluded that deciding topics in advance would allow participants the option to prepare for conversations before coming to the CC.

Although this appeared to be a good idea from a management perspective, the faculty wanted to be sure that deciding CC topics in advance would be a participant-driven activity. By being a participant-driven (or learner-driven/learner focused) activity, the faculty could assure that this process would be aligned with the center's spirit of autonomy and not just a convenience for time-sake or convenience-sake. By giving the CC participants more control over what topics would be discussed, the new model for running the CCs would be a better approach for fostering learner autonomy.

Procedure

During Week 01 of classes of the 2014-15 academic year, the ALL Rooms' staff began advertising that the CC would begin meeting twice weekly, starting during Week 02 of classes, which was April 15th (Tuesday) & 16th (Wednesday). They advertised formally using social media, printing posters and displaying them on campus, and by visiting first year students' English classes. They also advertised informally simply by word of mouth.

These first CC meetings during Week 02 were meant to provide new participants with some general information about the CC, for students and staff to introduce themselves briefly to each other, and to generate topics for the upcoming semester's CCs. So, at the CCs during Week 02, the ALL Rooms' staff in charge of the CCs distributed a form to each of the CC participants who were present at those first two meetings. The form had three items on it for

participants to respond to:

    1) "In the future, I will need English for…"

    2) "I want to be able to talk about _____ in English."

    3) "For the Conversation Circle, I think talking about _____ would be interesting."

The ALL Rooms' staff read the items to the participants to make sure that each item's meaning was clear. A translated version of each item in Japanese also appeared on the form for clarity. The ALL Rooms' staff instructed the participants to write down as many responses to each of these items as possible within 10 to 15 minutes in either Japanese or English and that using a dictionary was allowed. The staff instructed the participants not to discuss or share their answers with the others, which was meant to encourage as much personal input from the participants as possible without being influenced by the other participants. Each item had sufficient space for participants to handwrite their answers. Participants do not generally participate in both the Tuesday & Wednesday CC (they usually prefer to come on one day or the other) so there was no problem with the staff collecting two response-forms from the same participant.

The next step was to collect and code the responses, which was done twice, independently by me and a staff member. The purpose of coding the responses was to separate similar responses into groups, which would help focus the suggested discussion topics. The staff member who coded the responses and I then compared our results. After some discussion we merged and/or refined our results to create a final list of discussion topics to be used for the spring semester's conversation circles.

At the next CC meetings held during Week 03 the staff showed the list of topics, which were extracted from the participants responses the week before, to the participants. The staff also showed a calendar of the spring semester's CC dates to the participants. The staff instructed the participants to discuss the list of topics and then to work as a group to decide which topics would be discussed on which dates. The list of topics was the same for both the Tuesday CC and the Wednesday CC, however the Tuesday CC participants only decided the Tuesday topics, and the Wednesday CC participants only decided the Wednesday topics.

After this process of generating topics in which participants had interest, coding the participants' responses, discussing potential topics and assigning them to specific CC meetings on the calendar, the CC was finally able to begin meeting and discussing designated topics beginning in Week 04.

The ALL Rooms' staff and I followed the same schedule and procedures for soliciting discussion topics, coding the collected responses, and presenting participants with a list of topics to select from in the fall semester. Figure 1 summarizes this procedure.

Figure 1. *Schedule for generating and establishing Conversation Circle topics*

Week 01	no Conversation Circle due to first week of classes
Week 02	Conversation Circle participants generate potential topics; an ALL Rooms staff member and faculty supervisor code the responses independently, then consolidate the coded responses into one list
Week 03	Conversation Circle participants discuss potential topics and schedule them throughout the semester
Week 04	begin Conversation Circles with arranged discussion topics

Results from the Participants

In the spring, 14 participants attended the Week 02 CC and took the survey to generate ideas to use as CC discussion topics. Each participant filled in a survey, yielding 98 results. Figure 2 shows how many results were written for each item on the survey.

The next step was to code the 98 responses to each item to determine which responses were similar enough to be

Figure 2. *Total Item Responses to Spring Conversation Circle Topic Survey.*

Item	# of Results
In the future I will need English for…	37
I want to be able to talk about _____ in English.	28
For the Conversation Circle, I think talking about _____ would be interesting.	33
Total:	**98**

grouped together. An ALL Rooms' staff member and I coded the results independently, and then compared our coded results. We agreed that the 98 responses from the participants' surveys could be grouped into 22 discussion topics. Since some of the responses appeared multiple times and some only appeared once, we decided that these 22 topics could be further reduced into three tiers: priority topics, secondary priority topics, and third priority topics. Figure 3

Figure 3. *Selection List for Spring 2014-15 Conversation Circle Discussion Topics*

Priority Topics:	English for work/business General communication skills Travel "About me" Sports My country & culture Other counties & cultures My major Movies Music
Second priority	Food Books/reading English exams (*eiken*, TOEIC, TOEFL, etc…) Study abroad
Third priority	News/current events Comics/*manga* Dreams Hobbies Part-time jobs My [future] dream *Anime* Japanese music

Figure 4. *Spring 2014-15 Conversation Circle Topics*

Tuesday's Topics		Wednesday's Topics	
May 20th	News/current events	May 21st	Movies
May 27th	Movies	May 28th	Music
June 3rd	Travel	June 4th	Part-time jobs
June 10th	Study abroad	June 11th	News/current events
June 17th	English exams (*eiken*, TOEIC, TOEFL, etc…)	June 18th	Marriage
June 24th	Rainy days	June 25th	Tastes & Smells
July 1st	Summer vacation	July 2nd	*Missing data**
July 8th	*Missing data**	July 9th	English for work/business
July 15th	Summer festivals	July 16th	*Missing data**
July 22nd	"How was your weekend?"	July 23rd	"How was your weekend?"
July 29th	"Free discussion"	July 30th	*Missing data**

*The information regarding what topics were discussed on these days was not reported to the faculty by the staff responsible for running the CC. Consequently this information was not available at the time of publication.

shows the 22 coded topics and the tiers in which they were grouped.

The next step was for CC participants to choose the topics that they wanted to discuss during the spring semester. The participants who attended the Tuesday CC only scheduled the Tuesday CC topics, and the participants who attended the Wednesday CC only scheduled the Wednesday topics. The ALL Room's staff explained to the participants how their initial responses were coded and organized into three tiers. The staff then requested that the participants give preference to the topics in the "priority topic" category when selecting topics. Figure 4 shows the topics that participants selected for the spring 2014-15 semester. We encouraged the participants to select topics only once for Tuesdays and once for Wednesdays. However, we did not think that having the same topic on both Tuesday and Wednesday of the same week would be a concern since the participants who meet on those days are usually different.

In the fall, 10 participants attended the Week 02 CC, which was when the ALL Rooms' staff conducted survey for CC topics. Each participant filled in a survey giving us a total of 10 surveys, yielding 67 results. Figure 5 shows how many results were written for each item on the survey.

As in the spring, the next step was to code the 67 responses to each item to determine which responses were similar enough to be grouped together. Once again an ALL Rooms' staff member and I coded the results independently, and then compared our coded results. We agreed that the 67 responses from the participants' surveys could be grouped into 25 discussion topics. Since some of the responses appeared multiple times and some only appeared once, we prioritized these topics by dividing them into two tiers: most common responses and least common

Figure 5. *Total Item Responses to Fall Conversation Circle Topic Survey.*

Item	# of Results
In the future I will need English for…	29
I want to be able to talk about _____ in English.	18
For the Conversation Circle, I think talking about ____ would be interesting.	20
Total:	**67**

Figure 6. *Selection List for Fall 2014-15 Conversation Circle Discussion Topics*

Most Common Responses:	"Communication" (in general) Learning/ "my major" Work/ working with foreigners Travel/ study abroad Sports/ watching sports Movies/ watching movies Making friends Reading books in English Global/ national issues Hobbies "My opinion" Dreams
Least Common Responses	TV programs *Anime* The weekend Childhood Other countries Today's dinner Halloween Buying things online "What we *did* or *will do* over school breaks" Personal experiences Music Nice restaurants in Akita The foreign ALL Rooms' staff

responses. Here, "common" refers to responses that appeared often as participants' responses. So for example, a number of participants may have written "my major," whereas perhaps only one or two participants may have written "music." Therefore, "my major" appeared more frequently, or "commonly", as a response, which we believe to be a sign of its popularity as a topic. Figure 6 shows the 25 coded topics and the categories in which they were grouped.

The next step was for CC participants to choose the topics that they wanted to discuss. The participants who attended the Tuesday CC only scheduled the Tuesday CC topics, and the participants who attended the Wednesday CC only scheduled the Wednesday topics. Figure 4 shows the topics that participants selected for the spring 2014-15 semester and Figure 7 shows the topics scheduled for the fall semester.

Figure 7. *Fall 2014-15 Conversation Circle Topics.*

Tuesday's Topics		Wednesday's Topics	
October 21st	Hobbies	October 22nd	Learning/ "my major"
Oct. 28th	Travel/ study abroad	Oct. 29th	Halloween
November 4th	Halloween	November 5th	Nice restaurants in Akita
Nov. 11th	Childhood	Nov. 12th	TV programs
Nov. 18th	Anime/manga	Nov. 19th	Travel/ study abroad
Nov. 25th	Today's dinner	Nov. 26th	Movies/ watching movies
Dec. 2nd	Personal experience	Dec. 3rd	Reading books in English
December 9th	Movies	December 10th	Hobbies
Dec. 16th	Music	Dec. 17th	ALL Room's Christmas Party (*no discussion*)
January 13th	New Year's	January 14th	Dreams
Jan. 20th	First dream of the year	Jan. 21st	*Anime*
Jan. 27th	Winter sports	Jan. 28th	Childhood
February 3rd	What is your goal?	February 4th	Today's dinner
Feb. 10th	Opinion about the CC		

Results

After each CC, the ALL Room's staff administered a 9 item Likert scale survey to the CC participants (Appendix A). The goals of soliciting discussion topics from CC participants and allowing the participants to schedule topics in the order that they wanted and on the days when they wanted to, was to give the participants greater control over their own English language practice during the CC. These goals are aligned with the ALL Rooms' mission of fostering a spirit of learner autonomy through the CC activity. Therefore this paper will analyze a few of the survey items that connect with these goals. These items are: Item 2 (I spoke/participated in today's conversation as much as I hoped), Item 3 (I was interested in today's CC topic), Item 4 (I prepared for today's CC topic before I came to the CC), and Item 8 (I used some new English words/phrases today). The following discussion of results will be limited to the spring semester's survey responses, since the fall semester is not yet completed.

Figure 8 shows the spring 2014-15 semester's CC topics, the dates on which they were discussed, each post-CC survey items' average rating, as well as the item's overall rating and standard deviation, which appear in bold at the bottom of the figure.

"I spoke/participated in today's conversation as much as I hoped" (Item 2) received the highest rating on June 11th when the topic was "News/current events" with a rating of 4.80. The average rating for Item 2 over the whole semester was 3.86. The overall standard deviation for Item 2 was 0.45.

A rating of 4.76, or two deviations above the item's average rating, would mean that participants who filled out

Figure 8. *Responses to 6-point Likert scale post-Conversation Circle Survey*

6= Strongly Agree 5= Somewhat Agree 4= Agree 3= Disagree 2= Somewhat Disagree 1= Strongly Disagree

Date	Topic	N=	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Item 9
20 May	The news	9	2.89	4.44	4.22	2.78	4.22	4.44	4.67	3.56	5.33
21 May	Movies	8	3.25	3.75	4.38	2.63	4.00	3.75	3.88	4.00	4.50
27 May	Movies	6	2.83	3.50	4.83	2.83	4.33	3.83	4.33	3.83	4.83
28 May	Music	8	2.50	3.75	4.13	2.88	4.25	3.75	4.13	3.75	4.00
3 June	Travel	11	2.91	2.91	4.27	2.45	3.91	2.82	4.09	3.82	4.82
5 June	Part time jobs	4	2.50	3.50	4.25	3.50	4.25	3.50	4.50	3.75	5.50
10 June	Studying Abroad	5	3.60	3.80	4.80	2.80	5.40	4.40	4.60	4.20	5.20
11 June	Current Events	5	2.20	4.80	4.40	2.80	3.80	4.00	4.40	3.40	5.00
17 June	English Tests (TOEIC, TOEFL, etc)	9	2.44	4.11	4.89	2.89	5.11	3.78	4.67	3.44	5.11
18 June	Marriage	6	4.17	3.67	4.50	2.50	4.00	3.83	4.17	4.00	5.00
24 June	Rainy Days	9	3.22	3.56	4.22	2.44	4.22	4.11	4.56	3.67	5.11
25 June	Tastes & Smells	7	2.71	4.00	4.86	2.14	4.57	3.43	4.57	4.29	5.14
1 July	Summer Vacation	11	2.45	4.36	5.00	2.73	4.82	4.18	4.27	3.64	5.09
9 July	English for working/ careers	6	2.83	3.67	4.00	3.00	4.67	4.33	4.50	3.83	4.67
15 July	Summer Festivals	9	2.89	3.56	4.22	4.00	4.11	3.89	3.78	3.89	5.00
22 July	How was your weekend?	9	2.78	4.22	4.78	2.78	4.56	4.44	4.56	4.11	5.22
23 July	How was your weekend?	4	3.00	4.00	4.25	3.75	4.25	4.25	4.50	4.50	5.00
29 July	free topic	3	2.33	4.33	5.00	4.00	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	5.00
Total N=		129									
Item average			2.86	3.86	4.50	2.86	4.39	3.92	4.35	3.85	4.96
Item STDEV			0.48	0.45	0.33	0.53	0.42	0.45	0.27	0.34	0.34

the survey felt strongly about their response for that item. Since participants rated June 11th's topic (News/current events) a 4.80, it can be said that participants felt strongly about this response. Similarly, a rating less than 2.96 (two deviations below the average) such as June 3rd's topic (Travel), which was rated 2.91 would mean that participants felt strongly about this response.

Therefore it could be said that on June 11th participants really did speak or participate as much as they hoped to about the topic of news and current events. This is important because if participants do not feel satisfied about their level of speaking and/or participating, then they may stop coming to the CC, which would have a negative effect on the ALL Rooms.

As for "I was interested in today's CC topic" (Item 3), two CC topics received the same highest rating of 5.00. These two topics were "summer vacation" on July 1st and the open discussion held on July 29th. The average rating for Item 3 over the whole semester was 4.50 with a standard deviation of 0.33.

Even though the CC topic on two separate days received a rating of 5.00, which appears to be a favorable, high rating, neither one of these item's rating falls above a rating of 5.16, which is two deviations above the average rating. Therefore, although these ratings appear to be high, it cannot be said that respondents felt strongly about this response.

One of the purposes of participants suggesting topics and deciding on the final calendar of CC topics was to have topics in which the participants showed interest. So it is a slightly disconcerting that participants did not respond stronger to this item. One reason could be that the participants who were polled for topics at the beginning of the semester were not the same who actually participated in that particular day's CC.

The discussion topics "summer festivals" (July 15th) and the open discussion (July 29th) received the highest ratings for Item 4 (I prepared for today's CC topic before I came to the CC) with a rating of 4.00. Item 4's average

rating over the semester was 2.86, with a standard deviation of 0.53. A rating two deviations above the average, which in this case would be 3.92, would indicate a strong response to this item. Both of these topics on both of these dates received a 4.00 rating, well above 3.92 which shows that respondents felt strongly about their response to how much they prepared for that particular day's CC. These were the only two CCs that were rated highly (that is, two deviations above average) for this item.

One of the goals of establishing a calendar of CC topics at the beginning of the semester is to give participants the opportunity to prepare to discuss topics prior to coming to the CC. The faculty in charge of the ALL Rooms believe that preparing some words or phrases (related to the respective topic) to practice before coming to the CC is a better approach to learning than simply showing up. From the standpoint of an educator trying to promote autonomous learning, all one can do is to provide learners with information (such as the day's conversation topic) in advance and to encourage them as much as possible to prepare, whether they do so or not is up to them. That being said, it is odd that the CC topic "open discussion" (which means that there really was no set topic) received such a strong rating for the item, "I prepared for today's CC topic before I came to the CC." Perhaps the wording of this item needs to be re-examined.

The open discussion (July 29th) received the highest rating for Item 8 (I used some new English words/phrases today) at 4.67. The average for Item 8 was 3.85 and the standard deviation was 0.34. Two deviations above the average is 4.53, therefore July 29th's rating of 4.67 for the open discussion indicates a strong response to this item. This was the only CC to receive such a strong response of two deviations above the average for the item "I used some new English words/phrases today."

From an educators' perspective, ideally participants would be using new words or phrases every time they came to the CC. The mediocre overall average for this item may indicate a gap between learners' expectations and the ALL Rooms' faculty expectations.

Discussion

This project is a positive step in making the ALL Rooms' faculty, staff, and CC participants overall more actively engaged in autonomous learning than in past years. However the method and subsequent results could be open to much scrutiny and need to be refined. A few of my closing thoughts on this project appear below.

One issue with having participants generate their own discussion topics at the beginning of the semester is that participants, especially 1st year students or "new" students, may not have a clear concept of what topics make good discussion topics. Taking participants' language ability into account is one factor that is needed when choosing a good topic, which is difficult for many learners to do. Also, the question over having a broad topic or a narrow topic is important to consider. Many educators who promote autonomy think broad topics are better so that learners have more leeway in choosing the direction of the conversation themselves, whereas some think that a focused topic provides more structure for learners who are unfamiliar with such a fluid learning approach. By collecting more feedback from participants in the future the ALL Rooms' faculty and staff may be able to better gauge which approach to choosing topics best suits the Conversation Circle.

Another important point is that there was not a control group with whom to compare responses to the surveys. For example, since the CC meets twice a week, usually with different participants, one of those CCs could act as the control group. Having a control group could provide a clearer context for some of the responses the survey items received.

One final point is the issue of which language should be used to survey the participants after each CC. The APA dictates that participants should be surveyed using their native language. One would think that since Akita University is a Japanese university and that Japan is such homogenous country, that CC surveys should be conducted in Japanese rather than English. However many CC participants are *not* Japanese--many are Chinese, Indian, Korean, Mongolian,

and Vietnamese. The amount of work it would take to create proper translations of the survey so that participants could take the survey in their native language is far too great for the ALL Rooms' capabilities. But, since foreign students do need to have a certain Japanese language proficiency to attend Akita University, perhaps a bilingual English/Japanese version will suffice.

Closing

As the ALL Rooms continue to expand, so too will their offerings to Akita University's student body. One of the most popular offerings that the ALL Rooms has for Akita students of all English language levels is the English Conversation Circle. Although attending the CC is not a requirement for class and appears to be a casual, social activity, there are many ways that the ALL Rooms' faculty and staff can make it somewhat structured and meaningful for learners. One such way is to take the learner-centered approach and have participants choose which topics that they want to discuss and when they discuss the agreed upon topics. This approach fosters the spirit of autonomy that the ALL Rooms' seeks to promote on campus.

Appendix A: *Post-Conversation Circle Survey for Participants*

CC Participant Survey

Date:_____   Topic: _____

Read the following statements. Then, please circle ○ the number that best corresponds to your feeling.

6= Strongly Agree 5= Somewhat Agree 4= Agree

3= Disagree 2= Somewhat Disagree 1= Strongly Disagree

1）今日のＣＣで英語を話すのは緊張した。I was nervous about speaking English at today's CC.
　　　　　⑥　　　　⑤　　　　④　　　　③　　　　②　　　　①

2）思った通りに話す・練習することが出来た。I spoke/participated in today's conversation as much as I hoped.
　　　　　⑥　　　　⑤　　　　④　　　　③　　　　②　　　　①

3）今日のトピックは興味探かった。I was interested in today's CC topic.
　　　　　⑥　　　　⑤　　　　④　　　　③　　　　②　　　　①

4）ＣＣの前に今日のトピックについて準備をした。I prepared for today's CC topic before I came to the CC.
　　　　　⑥　　　　⑤　　　　④　　　　③　　　　②　　　　①

5）海外の文化について新しいことを知った。I learned something new about foreign cultures from today's CC.
　　　　　⑥　　　　⑤　　　　④　　　　③　　　　②　　　　①

6）日本文化について新しいことを知った。I learned something new about Japanese culture from today's CC.
　　　　　⑥　　　　⑤　　　　④　　　　③　　　　②　　　　①

7）新しい英語の語彙・表現を知った。I learned new English words/phrases today.
　　　　　⑥　　　　⑤　　　　④　　　　③　　　　②　　　　①

8）いくつか新しい英単語を使った。I used some new English words/phrases today.
　　　　　⑥　　　　⑤　　　　④　　　　③　　　　②　　　　①

9）今学期、ＣＣにもっと来たいと思う。I plan on coming to many more CCs this semester.
　　　　　⑥　　　　⑤　　　　④　　　　③　　　　②　　　　①