

Artifact N

---

Name of observer: Qing Zhang Level of class observed: Intermediate Chinese

Topic of the day's lesson: At Restaurant

**Indicate whether the teaching strategies below were *effective* or *ineffective*. Briefly JUSTIFY your assessment.**

- Use of target language [quality and quantity of L2; teacher talk vs. student talk]:  
**effective** ✓ **ineffective**

Throughout the class, the teacher was speaking Chinese. A rich input within a limited 50 minutes produced good results. Students were willing to express their likes and dislikes, their knowing about China in Chinese. The teacher speaks good Chinese as a native speaker. She paid special attention to the students' pronunciation in terms of tones in Chinese.

One time the student asked her in English, but the teacher responded and clarified in Chinese. There were three or four times the students spoke English in their choral response, but the goal was to figure out what the Chinese word in that context means.

The only time the teacher spoke English was when she explained *cao mi*. She said "Brown rice", trying to give the students the basic idea here.

- Use / integration of 4 skills [listening, speaking, reading, writing]:  
**effective** ✓ **ineffective**

Due to a large input from the teacher, in general, students received good training in listening, speaking and reading. The teacher was able to quickly connect to what they already learned and create dialogues for students to practice repeatedly. According to students' performance, they showed a good command of reading Chinese characters. The class spent no time in developing students' writing skills.

- Use of visuals [book, board, technology supported]:  
**effective** ✓ **ineffective**

The teacher used PPT to present words and pictures simultaneously. It gives students a "delicious" and clear understanding of Chinese dishes.

## Artifact N

In terms of the text, she did not completely move the text to the board. From my understanding, She deconstructed the main text and created the meaning by putting the phrases and sentences into a real-world situation.

- Length / variety of activities [indicate average # of minutes per activity]:  
**effective** ✓ **ineffective**

	<b>Class Activity</b>	<b>Time length</b>
10:05- 10:10	<b><i>Topic Introduction</i></b> The teacher asked students a couple of questions concerning eating. For example, “What’s your favorite restaurant on campus?” “Did you eat breakfast before coming to class?”	5 minutes
10:11- 10:21	<b><i>Vocabulary Review</i></b> Use a picture of typical Chinese eating-together to indicate the differences in US-Sino dinner table culture;  The teacher put words on slides with corresponding images. She described each item, asked students to repeat after her and created one-to-one dialogues for the sake of practice.	10 minutes
10:22- 10:52	<b><i>Text Reading</i></b> The teacher deconstructed the text and highlighted the important words and phrases on the board. She was trying to make connections and create a possible scenario for students to practice.	30 minutes
10:53- 10:55	<b><i>Act It Out</i></b> Three students came to the front to play roles. Two of them played customers and	2 minutes

## Artifact N

	another did the waiter. Students improvised their own dialogue using what they learned in class.	
--	---	--

- Personalization of materials [relevance to students' lives]:  
**effective** ✓ **ineffective**

The chosen topic is strongly related to students' everyday life. It involves food, food taste and seasonings. The opportunities to indicate the difference and similarity between the U.S. and China produced by the teacher enable students to make a good analogy to their own life experiences.

- Small group work [number of students, purpose of activity]:  
**effective** **ineffective** ✓

None.

- Error correction [frequency and kind]:  
**effective** ✓ **ineffective**

Students did not make many mistakes. Error correction occurred only two times . One was about pronunciation, and the other about grammar- the subject and the object. The teacher did not say exactly "you are wrong". She repeated after the student and changed her intonation, providing the space for that student to figure out his/her mistake.

## Artifact N

**Was this lesson successful? BRIEFLY justify your overall evaluation of the class.**

very successful   somewhat successful  not successful

In general, the class was a great success. I really enjoyed it.

In light of the teacher-student interaction, it is easy to tell the teacher is quite popular among the students. A black student even shouted “I love you, teacher” in class. When asked to draw a map of China on the board, students were willing to come to the front, though they were not certain about their drawings. A sound relationship between the teacher and the whole class is a strong drive for her to organize the lesson. Her good sense of time contributes to class management as well. On the other hand, the teacher’s introduction of the differences between America and China informs the students’ basic impression of Chinese culture, which also becomes an aid for learning Chinese.

The class realizes the goal of communication in language teaching. Since the topic is strongly related to daily life, the teacher does not have too much difficulty transforming the text teaching into a real-world task. Her ability to quickly connect to the students’ prior learning and create a situation for student pairs to practice new words and sentences helps students make use of real-life situations that necessitate communication. The teacher was speaking the target language all the time to maximize the possibilities of improving students’ listening, reading and speaking skills within that short 50 minutes. Writing is not involved in the lesson. In my view, this is not a problem as the main goal of the class is to encourage students to perform communicative behavior.

Artifact N

---

However, this Intermediate Chinese class is not perfect. In the end of the class, when three students came up and acted out a scene, I found their language use was quite creative and productive, part of which had nothing to do with what the teacher was teaching that day. I believe the students' potential is not fully tapped, partly because the activity is not engaging and not required of higher-level thinking. Essentially, the practice is all about repetition. The teacher could produce more productive practice for students.