

ABSTRACT

Foreign language learners can practise consequential communication without being required to disclose private events. This article sets out a disclosure-optional approach to paired narrative speaking for adult learners of English as a foreign language who can recount a short sequence of past events and ask relevant follow-up questions. Classroom self-disclosure is examined in relation to language-learner identity, motivation, engagement, privacy management, task-based teaching, and drama-based pedagogy. The reviewed findings warrant preserving opportunities for voluntary personal expression, but they do not demonstrate that autobiographical disclosure is necessary for language development or communicative engagement. The teaching arrangement permits remembered, altered, invented, and teacher-supplied accounts without requiring learners to certify which details are true. It preserves the same communicative demands for every account: narrating a plan, identifying an obstacle, explaining its cause, responding to a listener, and checking the listener's reconstruction. Six classroom requirements specify how teachers can provide preparation assistance, maintain unshared narrative details, distribute speaking and listening responsibilities, assess language rather than intimacy, and control later circulation. Two complete 50-minute lessons are supported by five shared event starters, ten private variation cards, a model account, a listening record, and performance descriptors. A separate evaluation procedure distinguishes practical access to the alternatives from evidence of maintained learning and learner control.

KEYWORDS: foreign language pedagogy; optional self-disclosure; oral narratives; learner autonomy; privacy rules; communicative assessment

1. PERSONAL MEANING AND THE RIGHT NOT TO DISCLOSE

An oral-language teacher can legitimately ask learners to explain a disagreement, describe its causes and consequences, and answer questions about how it ended. The instruction "Describe an important disagreement in your family and explain how you felt" adds another requirement: the learner must supply information about family relationships. The alternative "Describe a disagreement between two people, using an actual, altered, invented, or supplied event" retains temporal sequencing, explanation, evaluation, and interaction while leaving the account's factual origin to the speaker. Both prompts are instructional illustrations, not quotations from a textbook or examples collected from classrooms. The difference matters because a language objective and an autobiographical requirement are not interchangeable.

The value of a meaningful task lies in having something worth communicating and a genuine reason to communicate it to another person. In [1], second-language poetry makes individual experience and purposeful expression central to literacy activity. That emphasis usefully challenges language practice conducted without an expressive purpose. It does not follow, however, that every meaningful utterance must describe an event in the speaker's life. A learner may invest attention in explaining why an appointment failed, debating a fictional character's decision, or helping a partner resolve an incomplete account. These activities can involve selection, interpretation, and responsibility for meaning without authorizing an instructor to demand personal history.

Replacing every autobiographical task with impersonal sentence completion would sacrifice precisely the purposeful interaction that makes communicative language work educationally useful. Unrestricted storytelling poses a different difficulty: a learner may have to invent people, places, events, and relationships before beginning to practise English. A suitable non-autobiographical route therefore needs a bounded event, accessible linguistic support, an actual reason for a partner to listen, and feedback tied to the language objective. Merely appending "or make something up" to a

personal question does not ensure that those conditions are met. The central teaching decision concerns access to meaningful language work, not the value of fictional content in itself.

A disclosure-optional activity permits four legitimate routes into the same communicative task while preserving common linguistic responsibilities. A learner may recount an experience, alter an experience, invent an account, or work from a supplied event. Learners may combine these routes; they are not assigned publicly visible categories. The teacher does not ask which route was used and does not reward the factual status of an account. At the same time, choosing the origin of the material does not excuse incomplete preparation, an incoherent explanation, or failure to listen. The rule changes who controls personal information while leaving the language objective in place.

This article addresses three interconnected instructional questions. First, what can studies of classroom disclosure actually establish about participation and language development? Second, what must a speaking task require so that experienced and invented accounts both provide an opportunity to explain, clarify, and respond? Third, what evidence would justify a claim that the choice is genuinely usable and does not compromise subsequent performance? The response takes the form of a teaching convention, six implementation conditions, a fully specified two-lesson unit, and a research procedure that compares permissible forms of participation. They are interdependent: an option offered only after a learner refuses a question, a listening task solvable without listening, or grading based on personal candour defeats the purpose of the arrangement.

The teaching unit is written for adult learners of English as a foreign language who can produce a brief connected account of past events and ask basic follow-up questions with vocabulary support. The planning example covers approximately 16–30 learners working in pairs; this range helps allocate class time and is not a tested enrolment limit. Instruction and sample utterances are in English, with opportunities to practise past-time reference, temporal connectors, reasons, and clarification questions. Adaptation to younger groups or languages with different person marking, evidentiality, or register systems requires review of the linguistic demands rather than a direct transfer of the worksheets. No assumption is made that all learners wish to disclose nothing; the same arrangement protects learners who choose to share a personal experience.

2. WHAT THE DISCLOSURE STUDIES ACTUALLY SHOW

Teacher disclosure can play a constructive relational role, but evidence about teacher disclosure should not be treated automatically as evidence that students benefit from compulsory personal disclosure. Henry and Thorsen [2] analyse 258 observed English lessons in Swedish secondary schools; their detailed analysis identifies 25 instances of teacher self-disclosure suitable for closer examination. The findings concern teacher identity work and its motivational relationships, not whether pupils learn more by disclosing their own lives. In six university English courses in Morocco, Jebbour and Mouaid [3] observed four teachers who used personal examples to explain content. Student-initiated responses and reciprocal sharing occurred, but the observation does not establish that every student welcomed these exchanges or that autobiographical sharing caused measurable gains in proficiency. The evidence supports keeping voluntary exchange available, not making reciprocation an assessed duty.

Learners' willingness to share also depends on the level of detail requested, the social setting, the audience, and the interactional conditions surrounding the task. Tutton and Cohen [4] interviewed ten Australian university students taking online French classes who reported medium or high foreign language anxiety. The participants described comfort with low-level personal disclosures, alongside the importance of peer interaction and preparation strategies. This finding should not be turned into a universal list of safe questions: sharing a routine preference in one class is different from reporting a family conflict in another. In a five-week language-exchange project, Fondo and Erdocia [5] obtained nine active participants from twelve recruited learners. Partner familiarity, task form, and learner characteristics complicated the relation between anxiety and disclosure. Its exploratory design cannot identify a general effect of invented accounts, but it gives practical grounds for allowing alternatives and attending to the partners who will hear them.

The language-learning evidence is more limited than the evidence concerning participation, relational interaction, and learners' reported experiences. In the study by Jebbour [6], fifteen Moroccan university learners completed a writing pretest, six prompts about positive personal experiences, and a posttest. Descriptive improvements in some writing characteristics did not amount to a statistically significant overall result; an uncontrolled study of this size cannot isolate the effect of self-disclosure from repeated writing practice or other influences. Jebbour [7] developed a ten-item questionnaire with 183 university English learners and reported exploratory evidence about the frequency of disclosures. Frequency is not the same as a learner's freedom to withhold information. Taken together, these

studies make a case for examining how teachers invite disclosure and respond to it; they do not demonstrate either the necessity of private revelation or the instructional effectiveness of withholding personal information.

3. MEANING, BIOGRAPHICAL TRUTH, AND LEARNER CONTROL

3.1. THREE SEPARATE DECISIONS

A classroom narrative has at least three distinguishable features that should not be collapsed into a single notion of “personal” content. *Personal relevance* concerns the value a learner finds in discussing a problem or explaining a decision. *Biographical truth* concerns whether the narrated events actually happened to that learner. *Disclosure control* concerns which private details, if any, the learner allows others to hear and whether those details may be repeated or recorded. A task can have high relevance without being factual, and an entirely factual account can contain little information that its speaker considers private. These distinctions are used to specify teaching decisions; they are not presented as an already validated psychological scale.

The library-notice activity illustrates this separation in a concrete instructional setting. One speaker may recall arriving after the actual weekend closing time, another may adapt a different experience, and a third may choose the card stating that an old notice caused the difficulty. All three can explain the sequence, contrast two opening times, answer a question about when the notice was checked, and clarify why the plan failed. A listener needs that explanation, not evidence of the speaker’s identity. Even a fictional narrative can reveal interests or recognizable details, and a learner’s voice may be identifiable. A no-verification rule therefore limits required disclosure; it is neither a promise of anonymity nor permission to ignore a concern raised during class.

3.2. IDENTITY, MOTIVATION, AND PARTICIPATION

Research on language-learner identity helps explain why declining a particular autobiographical question should not be equated with refusing participation in language education. Norton and Toohey [8] relate identity to access and participation, while Darvin and Norton [9] discuss investment in terms of identity, ideology, and capital. In an oral task, these perspectives draw attention to the position the teacher asks a student to occupy. A learner may be able and willing to explain how a disagreement was resolved while declining to speak as a daughter, parent, spouse, or witness to a particular family event. The instruction should permit the language work without requiring acceptance of that personal position. Neither cited publication reports a test of the lesson materials offered here.

The practical availability of alternatives is also a motivational and instructional issue. Ryan and Deci [10] describe autonomy, competence, and relatedness as important to self-determined motivation. The second-language review by Al-Hoorie et al. [11] documents how self-determination perspectives have been used in language-learning research and identifies uneven treatment of their components. In classroom terms, an option is meaningful only if the learner understands it, has the materials and time to use it, and does not expect a lower mark for choosing it. A learner given an eight-minute preparation period and a 200-word reading may not have the same workable alternative as a partner with an immediate personal story. Supply brief event cards and language support to address that imbalance; do not infer from the existence of a menu that the learners experienced control.

Philp and Duchesne [12] distinguish behavioural, cognitive, social, and emotional dimensions of engagement in language tasks. The teaching record accordingly focuses on what learners do with language: identifying an obstacle, organizing past events, asking a question that advances understanding, attending to a partner’s answer, and improving an unclear causal explanation. Counting autobiographical details would confuse exposure with participation. Even counting speaking minutes is insufficient if one student repeats a memorized account while the partner has no reason to listen. In this unit, learner engagement is evidenced by contributions to a shared interpretive task rather than by confessional content.

Disclosure has a social destination as well as a speaker, because information that is shared becomes available to other participants under particular classroom conditions. Petronio and Child [13] analyse how people manage information through privacy rules and decisions about revealing or withholding it. Applied to classroom activity, the teacher should name the immediate audience, explain that classmates will not be asked to verify personal facts, and seek a separate choice before moving an account into a recording, presentation, website, or other wider setting. A partner may remember a disclosure despite the rule, so confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. These are practical protections derived from the privacy problem; they are not procedures already established as effective by the cited study.

Learners can also experience anxiety during an invented or supplied exchange, so removing autobiographical pressure does not remove every source of speaking difficulty. The research assembled by Teimouri et al. [14] identifies relations between language anxiety and achievement, while Dewaele and MacIntyre [15] examine anxiety and enjoyment as distinguishable aspects of classroom experience. Effiong [16] directs attention to social conditions affecting willingness to speak. An invented event does not prevent fear of an incorrect tense, criticism from a partner, or unfamiliar vocabulary. Optional disclosure addresses one avoidable requirement—public access to autobiography—while pronunciation practice, explicit language assistance, respectful feedback, and supportive group management remain necessary.

3.3. AN INSTRUCTIONAL OBLIGATION AND QUESTIONS FOR TESTING

Where a language objective can be met by recounting an accessible invented event, requiring a learner's personal history needs a further and explicit curricular justification. In the present narrative lessons, competence is demonstrated by explaining the event and responding to a partner, not by certifying who experienced it. This position does not claim that all autobiography is inappropriate. Students who wish to share an experience may do so within the agreed audience; students who do not wish to share should have an equally serious communicative role. The teacher's obligation is to safeguard the learning opportunity while not treating avoidable personal exposure as the cost of participation.

Three questions remain open to empirical observation and should not be answered from the existence of the materials alone. Can every learner exercise the alternative before preparation begins, without having to request special treatment? Can short supplied cases and limited variations prevent excessive reading or invention demands while preserving real listening? Do students report greater control, and do they perform equally well on unfamiliar narrative tasks after instruction? These questions involve different forms of evidence. Lesson observations can reveal uncompleted plans, unequal speaking turns, and authenticity questions; learner interviews can expose misunderstanding or hidden grading pressure; later independently rated performances are needed to assess transfer. Comfortable participants and apparently successful classroom exchanges are not substitutes for those separate findings.

4. SIX CLASSROOM REQUIREMENTS

4.1. THE PARTICIPATION CONVENTION BEFORE PREPARATION

The teacher begins by stating the participation convention explicitly: "Our accounts may be remembered, changed, invented, or based on the event cards. Everyone practises the same language skills. You do not need to tell us whether an event happened to you. Ask your partner questions that help you understand the account, not questions asking them to prove where it came from." The rule applies to the whole class before topics or cards are distributed. A first-person narrator may be fictional, and the teacher demonstrates this explicitly using the poster account in Appendix C. Doing so avoids making a supposedly authentic teacher confession the model for good speaking.

The timing and normality of the choice are essential because an alternative offered only after visible hesitation can itself mark a learner as exceptional. Offering invention only to a visibly hesitant learner makes that learner request an exception. The teacher instead presents all four routes as ordinary ways to accomplish one task and hands out the same planning support to everyone. The teacher may ask whether the speaker has a clear obstacle or a consequential detail, but not whether any part of the account is "really true". A learner can volunteer a personal example without receiving more speaking time, praise, or assessment credit for its intimacy. Questions that pursue biography after a learner declines are redirected to the event being explained.

4.2. EQUAL LANGUAGE RESPONSIBILITIES WITH FLEXIBLE CONTENT

The learning objective remains stable even though the factual origins of the event accounts may differ. The narrator identifies an intended action, recounts what happened, explains why a difficulty arose, describes a response, and answers a relevant question. The listener reconstructs the account and refers to spoken evidence supporting an explanation. Choosing among three sensitive autobiographical topics would not satisfy the participation convention; similarly, copying a supplied event word for word without dealing with questions would not meet the speaking objective. Learners can use the same language bank and story structure while choosing events that require no personal information.

If the target includes past-tense first-person narration, a constructed narrator must be allowed to say "I went",

“I thought”, and “I checked” without implying that the account is autobiographical. Table 1 consolidates the six classroom conditions, the observable checks associated with them, and corrective actions when the intended balance breaks down. Switching invented accounts to third person would change pronoun, reference, and sometimes verb-form demands across participants. Teachers working in other languages must inspect how evidentiality, honorifics, register, and person marking affect these alternatives. A change in factual origin should not unintentionally change the grammar or discourse objective being assessed.

TABLE 1. SIX CONDITIONS, CLASSROOM CHECKS, AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

Classroom condition	Observable teacher and learner action	Failure and corrective action
1. Communicative outcome	Listener reconstructs an account containing at least one privately selected feature and supports an explanation with spoken evidence.	Reconstruction can be completed from the common sheet without attending to the speaker. Add a private variation or unfamiliar case.
2. Bounded content	One ordinary event with a plan, obstacle, response, and outcome. Check whether a keyword plan is ready after eight minutes.	Invention becomes elaborate, or supplied reading occupies the whole period. Shorten the case or offer oral support to everyone.
3. Linguistic opportunity	First-person past reference, sequence, cause, and relevant response remain available. Inspect actual exchanges rather than count mandatory forms.	A route changes person or genre, or learners only recite a script. Restore the target opportunity.
4. Preparation support	Same time, planning frame, vocabulary bank, and access to seeds and oral explanation. Record assistance and unfinished preparation.	A route needs systematically more support or lacks ownership. Revise material before asserting burden comparability.
5. Interaction and feedback	Both learners speak and listen; teacher uses the same language criteria. Observe role completion, time, questions, and feedback distribution.	Personal stories obtain extra attention, or one partner loses a turn. Restore allocation and examine feedback practice.
6. Source and audience	No source label or truth test; initial paired audience is specified. Check instructions and episodes of verification.	Peers or teachers demand authenticity, or wider use is assumed. Restate the rule, redirect questions, and seek a separate circulation choice.

Note. These checks support lesson management; their success does not establish identical cognitive demand or retained attainment. The eight-minute preparation period is specific to this unit.

4.3. OPPORTUNITY, PREPARATION DEMAND, AND PERFORMANCE

Three comparisons prevent an easy but misleading assertion that all content routes impose equal demands simply because they share the same timetable. *Opportunity* concerns whether everyone receives the same preparation period, language support, chances to speak and listen, and feedback criteria. *Preparation demand* concerns the effort required to remember, disguise, invent, or read the event. *Performance* concerns what the learner can demonstrate on a defined task. The first can be checked directly through lesson organization. The second needs completion records, requests for support, and learner accounts of the process. The third requires common assessment criteria and, for a learning claim, performance on material not simply rehearsed during class.

Providing eight minutes to everyone addresses unequal allocation of preparation time, but it does not necessarily equalize preparation demand. One learner may build a usable account from a remembered event immediately, while another spends most of the interval decoding a supplied card. A partner who already knows both variation cards may reconstruct the account without listening. A teacher who praises a personal story for its sincerity may alter the practical value of the non-autobiographical option despite identical scoring instructions. These failures have separate remedies: reduce reading, provide oral support, change a known variation, or examine feedback. They should not be hidden under a claim of instructional equivalence.

Routine teaching does not need to classify students according to the truth status or autobiographical origin of their accounts. Instead, the teacher can record who completed an outline, who received a speaking and listening turn, whether the listener identified the unshared detail, and what form of help was needed. If a later voluntary research interview asks about the route used, responses must be treated as self-selected descriptions rather than evidence that one narrative origin caused better language performance. The rules governing privacy are part of the intervention being examined; breaking them to obtain a convenient research variable would invalidate the educational purpose.

5. TWO LESSONS: WHY DID THE PLAN FAIL?

5.1. OBJECTIVES, MATERIALS, AND THE UNSHARED EVENT DETAIL

The unit contains two lessons of 50 minutes each and keeps speaking and listening responsibilities visible throughout both sessions. Learners practise chronological narration, reference to past events, explanations of cause, account-focused questions, and checks on a listener's understanding. The speaking outcome is a comprehensible plan–obstacle–response–outcome account; the listening outcome is a reconstruction identifying the detail that explains why the plan failed. A successful exchange does not require a dramatic incident or a single preselected solution. The decisive detail may involve an entrance, a mistaken box, an opening-time notice, a reservation, or an incompatible charger.

The complete student handout in Appendix A provides the convention, a seven-question planning frame, a short language bank, and five event starters. The ten private alternatives are listed in Table 3, with two bounded possibilities for each shared starter. Appendix B contains two alternative private detail cards for each starter, making ten cards in total. Appendix C includes the separate poster example, the listener's reconstruction sheet, three annotated speaking/listening examples, and a teacher feedback record. The printable teacher record is presented in Table 4. All materials were written for the teaching illustration; no classroom trial, validation study, or collection of student performances is claimed. They can be printed directly or adapted to learners' vocabulary and reading proficiency.

Every student can read the shared description of an event, but a partner cannot see the narrator's completed plan or selected variation card before reconstruction. For example, the shared library event only states that a notice gave an opening time and that the building was closed when the narrator arrived. One private version explains that the notice referred to weekdays and the visit occurred on a weekend; another explains that the notice had been superseded. The listener cannot identify which cause applies by reading the common sheet. A student may also supply a comparably ordinary variation, alter an experience, or combine given and invented details without specifying which elements are factual.

The resulting information difference is deliberately small so that the communicative need comes from attentive listening rather than from complicated world-building. The task asks the listener to establish the relevant cause by attending to the spoken account; it is not a test of dramatic performance, personal memory, or complex world-building. A speaker who has difficulty inventing can select a ready-made card and explain it in their own English. A speaker who struggles with reading can receive an oral version of any card. Both forms of help are offered to the class as learning support, not as evidence of a student's desire for privacy. The listener's written record should reflect what was heard rather than the guess most familiar from the common event.

5.2. LESSON ONE: PLANNING, NARRATING, AND CHECKING

During the first five minutes, the teacher states the no-verification rule, identifies the initial audience as the partner and the teacher supporting the task, and explains that no recording or public display is planned. Two questions show the difference between understanding a narrative and investigating the narrator. "Which entrance did the person use?" seeks task information; "Is that the place you meet your friends?" seeks biography and is unnecessary. Learners may choose to discuss their lives, but a partner cannot require that explanation to complete the task. The teacher uses the same boundary when giving feedback.

The next seven minutes use the fictional poster account in Appendix C to model how a listener can request information needed for causal understanding without investigating biography. The teacher reads the initial paragraph without the later clarification. Learners identify the intended destination and the obstacle, then ask why a narrator who knew the room number followed a misleading sign. After the second paragraph supplies the missing information, they describe how it changes the causal explanation. The model makes a question useful because one relationship is initially unclear; no learner has to reveal their own experience to demonstrate how a listener can request a clarification.

Students then receive eight minutes to prepare a keyword plan rather than a memorized or fully scripted monologue. Each selects an event and an unshared, consequential detail. The plan records the intended action, first event, obstacle, attempted response, outcome, and causal explanation. It should be brief enough to narrate without reading a complete script. The teacher checks two features: the account can be told in a short sequence, and the listener will need to hear something that the shared event starter does not reveal. The teacher does not ask what happened in the learner's real life. A student can exchange a difficult card for a simpler one without announcing the reason.

Pair interaction occupies fourteen minutes and distributes both narration and attentive reconstruction across the two learners. After seven minutes the partners reverse roles. In each round the narrator has up to two minutes to tell the

account; the listener has approximately two minutes for an account-focused question or clarification; approximately two minutes are used for a reconstruction and an explanation supported by something the speaker said; the final minute is for a brief joint note on the language that helped or obstructed understanding. These allocations preserve a turn for both students without forcing unnecessary questions where an account is already clear. When no repair is required, the listener may compare two plausible causes or ask which detail most influenced the outcome.

While pairs work, the teacher observes temporal reference, clarity of causal explanation, relevant responses, and whether both partners can complete their speaking and listening roles. An eight-minute language clinic can distinguish “Then I checked the message”, which places an event in sequence, from “I checked because nobody was at the entrance”, which explains a motive. “When I arrived, the library was already closed” establishes a state relative to an arrival. Feedback is targeted to communicative effect rather than mandatory use of complex forms: a learner need not include a past perfect construction merely to display sophistication. Whole-class illustrations should use the fictional teaching account or de-identified language with permission and without sensitive detail.

The final eight minutes allow learners to improve one short oral segment and complete an exit response focused on communicative revision: “What did you make clearer for your partner?” A response may identify a better causal connector, a corrected reference to an event, an added detail, or a question that helped reconstruct the account. It may also identify a need for a shorter event or more vocabulary assistance. The teacher records unfinished plans and missed participation opportunities for the next lesson without interpreting them as unwillingness to disclose. A first-lesson product is evidence of supported classroom communication, not a score for retained proficiency.

5.3. LESSON TWO: A DIFFERENT EVENT AND MORE PRECISE EXPLANATIONS

The second lesson begins with five minutes of retrieval practice involving past reference and cause–effect expressions. The teacher reiterates that learners can use a different account origin from the one they chose in the first lesson. A six-minute demonstration uses the library-notice example to distinguish “Was the difficulty the closing time itself?” from “Was the difficulty your interpretation of the notice?” A productive listener tests an account’s explanation, not the speaker’s honesty. The demonstration also shows how an answer can clarify an apparent contradiction without requiring a biographical defence.

Eight minutes are allocated to preparing another short narrative, preferably with a different obstacle or private variation so that the interaction is not a simple repetition of Lesson One. A learner can use the reservation or charger event, choose another card, adapt a remembered incident, or compose an ordinary fictional event that still has a plan, obstacle, response, and outcome. The unshared detail must remain unknown to the listener until narrated. Pairs then work for fourteen minutes, with role reversal and the same time and language support as in the first lesson. Partners may be changed where this supports listening, but familiar pairs can be retained when new pairing would add avoidable difficulty. A classroom study would document that teaching decision.

After hearing the account, the listener completes two evidence-focused statements: “The plan failed mainly because ...” and “The detail supporting that explanation was ...”. The narrator can confirm, clarify, or challenge the interpretation by referring to information within the account. The speaker’s keyword plan and card stay hidden until the reconstruction is complete. Recognition of the shared event alone is not enough: the listener must distinguish, for example, an incorrect seat row from a reservation for a later session. The question measures whether the partner attended to the telling rather than merely remembered the worksheet.

Nine minutes of feedback follow the descriptors in Table 2. Each learner identifies one effective speaking or listening choice and one way to make the exchange more intelligible. The teacher samples different pairs during the unit and records contributions that were actually heard; one teacher cannot observe every pair continuously. The final eight minutes are used to retell a clearer segment and identify the expression, added explanation, or question responsible for the improvement. Whole-class sharing relies on the teacher’s fictional account unless the learner independently agrees to a clearly stated larger audience. Sharing with a partner during the activity does not authorize classroom display or recording.

The two instructional products remain analytically distinct: the speaker’s organized causal narrative and the listener’s evidence-supported reconstruction. One can succeed while the other still needs assistance. The task thus creates a reason to attend to another speaker, instead of giving credit solely for polished monologues. A better second attempt within the lesson demonstrates immediate supported performance; it does not by itself establish lasting improvement. That stronger inference would require assessment with unfamiliar material after an interval and attention to alternative explanations such as practice, teacher feedback, and different starting proficiency.

6. ASSESSING NARRATIVES RATHER THAN INTIMACY

The assessment target is the ability to explain and negotiate an intelligible account of a failed plan, not the intimacy, factual origin, or emotional intensity of the content. The event's factual origin, emotional force, seriousness, sincerity, and the learner's willingness to reveal private information do not belong in that target. Table 2 gives evidence-based formative descriptors for four speaker contributions and two listener contributions. Appendix C provides a printable record with three entries—met, developing, and not observed—alongside a short excerpt or teacher observation. These are feedback categories, not an interval scale for calculating achievement scores. A teacher should identify which feature was heard and how it affected understanding.

TABLE 2. FORMATIVE DESCRIPTORS FOR SPEAKER AND LISTENER CONTRIBUTIONS

Dimension	Evidence of the objective	Evidence directing further support
Speaker: narrative organization	Plan, obstacle, response, and outcome can be followed; reference and sequence supply essential links.	Order, actor, or reference remains unclear after an available clarification.
Speaker: causal explanation	A reason is distinguishable from what happened next and supported by a narrated detail.	The cause is absent, inconsistent, or indistinguishable from a sequence.
Speaker: linguistic resources	Vocabulary, past reference, and linking expressions convey intended relationships; errors do not routinely obstruct them.	Missing words or connections repeatedly obscure the event or its relationships and require targeted support.
Speaker: response	Answers address the actual question and clarify, qualify, or extend the account when an opportunity occurs.	Repetition does not address the question, or the answer introduces unresolved contradiction.
Listener: reconstruction	The reconstruction uses spoken evidence and includes the private variation without importing missing links from the seed.	The reconstruction repeats the common seed, omits the variation, or invents essential information.
Listener: question or extension	A question, comparison, or extension is grounded in the account and advances understanding.	Questions are disconnected from the account or require unnecessary biographical verification.

Note. Record “met”, “developing”, or “not observed” with a short piece of task evidence. “Not observed” is not a score of inability. These categories support feedback and are not numerical research outcomes.

Useful feedback names a communicative relationship or information gap that affected understanding. “Your partner identified that the library was closed, but could not tell why you used the wrong time” points to an omitted cause. “Your explanation did not identify which sign you followed” points to a missing reference. “Make your story more personal” supplies no valid evidence of narrative competence. Learners who volunteer a personal example should receive the same attention to chronology, explanation, and response as those who use a fictional one. The teacher should also check whether an apparently helpful compliment rewards an intimate disclosure rather than a particular linguistic achievement.

Speaking and listening need separate judgements because the success or difficulty of one role does not automatically establish the quality of the other. A weak reconstruction may reflect distraction, an unfamiliar word, or a listener's unjustified assumption, rather than defective narration. Conversely, a patient listener can rescue an unclear account with multiple prompts. Compare the spoken detail with the listener's response and describe what each learner did. A clear account need not produce artificial misunderstandings to receive credit. When the partner asks no question because the explanation is sufficient, an evidence-based extension can show responsiveness, or the teacher may mark that dimension “not observed” rather than infer inability.

These descriptors can guide formative teaching immediately, but they should not be treated as a validated summative scale without further development and evidence. Formal scoring requires precise level boundaries, rater training, suitable performance examples, and examination of agreement and task-form comparability. The category “not observed” records missing evidence rather than zero competence, and “met” and “developing” are not automatically equally spaced numerical points. Any later effectiveness study must develop its score interpretation independently before comparing mean performances or declaring a change educationally acceptable.

7. CONDITIONS THAT CAN UNDERMINE THE CHOICE

7.1. UNEQUAL STATUS AND LEARNERS WHO WISH TO SHARE

A formally neutral policy can still favour autobiography through teacher attention, praise, display choices, or unequal follow-up. A teacher may spend longer discussing personal accounts, praise a learner for revealing feelings, or choose true stories for the most visible displays. Such conduct tells students that invention is tolerated but not fully valued. The teacher therefore needs to monitor distribution of attention and the content of praise, not only wording on the handout. The opposite problem also matters. A learner who wants to narrate a real event should not be forced to fictionalize it or treated as imprudent merely for sharing. The aim is to make the language task accessible on either route and to avoid awarding academic value to degrees of intimacy.

7.2. UNEQUAL PREPARATION DEMAND AND ACCESS

Remembering an actual event, changing recognizable facts, inventing a plausible sequence, and interpreting supplied text all involve different kinds of preparation work. Short event starters reduce the need to create an entire setting; variation cards supply an immediate causal possibility; keyword outlines lower memory and planning demands; and oral versions reduce reliance on reading proficiency. None of these supports guarantees identical difficulty. Teachers should note which students finish the outline, which ask for simpler language, and which need assistance establishing an obstacle and an outcome. Assistance is offered routinely so that accepting it does not publicly identify a privacy concern. A usable choice must fit within the same lesson, not merely exist in an instruction.

The initial audience in this unit is deliberately limited to the partner and the teacher supporting the task. A recorded assessment, visitor, class presentation, poster display, or online publication changes that audience and can change the meaning of earlier consent. Each new use requires a specific invitation that can be declined without penalty. Even a fictional narrative may expose a learner's voice, opinions, or recognizable relationships, so no general promise of anonymity or absolute secrecy is appropriate. The narrower classroom commitment is that the teacher will not require verification of origin, unnecessary identifying detail, or public circulation. Learners should be encouraged to avoid details they would not wish to be repeated by classmates.

7.3. YOUNGER LEARNERS, OTHER LANGUAGES, AND SAFEGUARDING

The unit is specified for adults, and adaptation to younger learners requires additional attention to age-appropriate content and safeguarding. For adolescents, the topics, wording, and example events should be age-appropriate, and the participation rule should be explained in language that learners can use independently. Classroom welfare obligations apply regardless of whether an account is presented as factual. Teachers should respond to an unexpected safeguarding concern through established institutional procedures rather than assuming fiction prevents harm. Research with minors also requires applicable guardian permission, the learners' assent, and a clear distinction between ordinary instruction and optional research participation. Adult research similarly requires appropriate review and voluntary arrangements where learner records or performances are collected.

In some languages, the grammar, evidential force, or social meaning of first-person narration differs substantially from the English examples. Evidential marking can signal whether events were witnessed; honorifics and register can depend on relationships among narrators and listeners. Teachers must then adjust alternatives so that one route does not inadvertently receive a different grammatical task. Genre also matters. A real complaint, medical account, insurance report, application, or incident statement may require factual accuracy. Invented cases can be used for rehearsal, but a practice rule does not justify false claims in real documents. When the curriculum expressly requires autobiographical reflection as its learning objective, alternatives need a separate educational and assessment rationale rather than an automatic assertion of equivalence.

8. EVALUATING CLASSROOM USE AND LEARNING

8.1. ESTABLISHING WHETHER THE CHOICE WORKS IN PRACTICE

The first evaluation should establish whether learners understand the arrangement and can complete the intended communication with the materials and support provided. The teacher and a small, varied group of learners would review the handout and explain what they believe they may invent, what the teacher assesses, and who initially

hears each account. Interviews would not request the life events learners deliberately withheld. Observers would record keyword-plan completion, help requests, unfinished turns, attempts to reconstruct from the shared starter alone, authenticity questions, and differences in feedback. Appendix D supplies six draft questionnaire items and a classroom implementation record. The implementation fields are organized in Table 5. These materials require testing before they can be treated as research instruments.

The early evaluation should identify concrete implementation failures before claims about benefits are considered. If learners do not understand that they may use fiction, the opening explanation has failed. If reading consumes most of eight minutes, the cards or oral support need attention. If a partner can infer an entire story from the common handout, the selected detail does not create a reason to listen. If teachers give extra praise to personal accounts, the scoring rule is not being implemented. Sampling learners with different reading proficiency and comfort with invention helps expose these problems. The aim at this stage is to learn whether the activity can be enacted, not to claim a causal effect from a convenience group.

8.2. A COMPARISON THAT DOES NOT REQUIRE DISCLOSURE

A subsequent class-level comparison can test what is added by permission to draw on personal experience without requiring disclosure in either condition. The *flexible-origin* condition would allow actual, altered, invented, and supplied accounts. The *fiction-only* condition would use openly constructed events that learners may adapt. Both conditions would receive the same preparation period, event boundaries, first-person narration rule, private variation cards, pairing arrangements, teacher feedback, and audience protections. Neither would require autobiography, identify a learner's chosen factual origin, or penalize declining the research. Differences in outcomes could then be considered against the specific difference in instructional permission rather than against a harmful compulsory-disclosure condition.

The causal question concerns being *offered* the flexible-origin arrangement rather than being offered supported fiction alone, not the causal effect of an individual's self-selected narrative origin. It does not identify the effect of actually telling a true story, because learners select that action themselves. Allocating whole classes within comparable teacher or institution groups can reduce mixing of participation rules, although enough classes are needed to estimate the uncertainty associated with clustering. Teachers must be trained in both conditions and their behaviour documented. A crossover sequence is problematic: once learners know that truth need not be authenticated, that understanding cannot simply be erased in a later lesson. Any design choice should be settled and justified before collecting outcome data.

8.3. TWO SEPARATE REQUIREMENTS FOR A POSITIVE FINDING

Two outcomes answer different questions and should therefore be interpreted separately before any joint conclusion is drawn. One asks whether offering flexible-origin accounts maintains later narrative performance at an educationally acceptable level relative to the fiction-only condition. The other asks whether learners experience greater control over content origin, classroom questioning, and grading expectations. Feeling more comfortable is not evidence that language performance was preserved. A similar test score is not evidence that learners understood or trusted the privacy rule. A strong joint finding would require both results, each from suitable measurements and each accompanied by uncertainty estimates. A positive result on only one outcome should be reported as such.

A suitable performance assessment would take place about two weeks after the second lesson and would use unfamiliar narrative material to reduce simple rehearsal effects. An assessment before instruction and an immediate post-unit performance would help describe starting differences and short-term change. The two-week interval is a study-design choice, not an established optimum for language retention. A justified alternative may be selected before a study begins. The delayed comparison is more informative than a classroom retelling because it asks whether learners can transfer sequence, causal explanation, and account-focused questioning to material they did not practise in the unit.

Preservation of performance requires a defensible non-inferiority margin rather than simply relying on a non-significant difference between groups. Before viewing trial results, teachers and assessment specialists should examine scored performance examples and identify the largest plausible loss that would still leave educationally acceptable narration and listening. That decision must be expressed in the final score units and considered alongside the consequences of moving between proficiency descriptors. No numerical margin is supplied here because there is no established scoring scale or independent evidence with which to justify one. Without that foundation, comparisons should report estimated differences and confidence intervals without claiming non-inferiority.

Write the expected between-condition score difference as $\Delta = \mu_{\text{flex}} - \mu_{\text{fiction}}$, with higher scores reflecting stronger narrative performance. Let $\delta > 0$ denote the independently justified maximum acceptable loss. For a prespecified two-sided 95% confidence interval, the non-inferiority decision requires

$$\text{LowerCI}_{95\%}(\Delta) > -\delta. \quad (1)$$

The decision in Equation (1) is stronger than the absence of a statistically significant difference. The control outcome also needs a specified comparison, a defensible score interpretation, and uncertainty estimates. Favourable responses to a single item must not be substituted for a validated control measure. The results would be considered together only after the two decisions were examined separately.

8.4. TASKS AND MEASURES USED TO JUDGE LEARNING

The follow-up assessment should not give the fiction-only class an unfair advantage merely because those learners worked exclusively with supplied cases during instruction. Both groups can be familiarized with the assessment format without seeing the specific test items. Two balanced unfamiliar forms are suitable candidates: a brief supplied event with one private variation, and a picture sequence in which the learner selects an ordinary obstacle or response. The former tests attentive reconstruction of spoken detail; the latter gives a non-disclosing visual route to narrative explanation. Scoring should use the same construct and rater instructions on both forms. Pilot work must examine reading demands, form order, and whether one form systematically advantages a condition.

These assessment forms demonstrate performance with new, non-disclosing material and therefore address only a bounded form of transfer. They cannot represent every kind of personally meaningful classroom expression, and they do not measure a learner's private willingness to reveal information. A separate, optional speaking assessment that permits either origin may broaden interpretation, but it should not replace the defined delayed endpoint after results become known. Each form should also be reported individually when combined scores might conceal one form on which learners encountered disproportionate difficulty.

Appendix D offers six short candidate items covering comprehension of the rule, ability to prepare an account, expected influence of personal content on marks, pressure to authenticate, and understanding of the audience. Some ask about pressure, so a high agreement response does not consistently indicate better control. Cognitive interviews and pilot analysis should determine whether questions are understood and whether any combined score is justified. The frequency questionnaire studied by [7] does not directly measure freedom to decline disclosure, making uncritical adoption inappropriate. A learner who refuses a process item must not be asked to explain what private fact they withheld.

8.5. ANALYSIS, MISSING OBSERVATIONS, AND ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

Before a confirmatory comparison, a registered protocol would identify class allocation, the study population, the delayed performance endpoint, the separately defined control outcome, scoring rules, the non-inferiority margin and its justification, assessment forms, and the handling of missing observations. Statistical analysis should account for learners within classes, teacher or institution grouping, starting proficiency, and task form. If repeated performances are collected, their correlation also needs attention. The number of teachers, classes, and learners must be calculated from defensible assumptions about the outcome scale, class-level similarity, acceptable loss, expected attrition, and the desired confidence-interval precision. An arbitrary sample size would be misleading in the absence of these inputs.

For a non-inferiority claim, allocation-based and adherence-sensitive results should both be considered because deviations from the assigned teaching conditions can make groups appear artificially similar. Adherence concerns whether teachers provided the assigned participation rule and comparable materials; it does not concern a student's willingness to disclose. Missed lessons, refusal of recording, incomplete assessment, and unanswered questionnaires are different sources of missing information. Sensitivity analyses should assess whether plausible differences among learners with unobserved performances could reverse the conclusion about maintained language ability. Reporting fewer completed tests as if they were normal participation would conceal a potentially important cost of the arrangement.

Performance raters should be unaware of instructional allocation wherever practical; attempts at masking, failures of masking, and agreement among raters should all be documented. The two conditions should use identical teaching materials except for permission to select personally originating content. Recorded performances and ordinary unrecorded classroom observations require separate notices, consent arrangements, access limits, and retention rules. A learner who declines to be recorded should not be characterized as less engaged. If a valid non-recorded alternative

is unavailable, the missing performance and its interpretive consequences should be reported rather than quietly excluded from the study.

A voluntary account of whether a learner chose a remembered or invented event may help explain implementation, but it remains a self-selected process description and cannot establish the causal advantage of either narrative origin. Qualitative interviews should actively look for disconfirming experiences: a rule that was not believed, inaccessible cards, excessive reading, an unwelcome fictional role, praise that privileged autobiography, or pressure from a partner to establish truth. These experiences matter even if overall questionnaires suggest comfort. A classroom finding would be convincing only when the implementation records, measures of control, and delayed language performances address different but compatible aspects of the same instructional decision.

9. CONCLUSION

Meaningful foreign language communication does not inherently depend on learners confirming that a narrated event belongs to their own lives. A student may choose the factual origin of an account while remaining responsible for the accuracy of its internal sequence, the clarity of its causal explanation, and the quality of interaction with a listener. The central classroom boundary is simple: the teacher evaluates what is communicated and understood, not how much of a learner's private life has been made available. Autobiographical expression can remain welcome without becoming the route by which a learner proves commitment or earns attention.

The teaching unit makes this boundary concrete through an advance participation convention, five shared event starters, ten privately selectable narrative variations, equal role allocations, language-focused feedback, and explicit audience limits. A listener must identify an unshared detail and explain the cause of a failed plan; merely choosing fiction is not a substitute for the work. These details are necessary because a verbal promise of choice can coexist with extra preparation demands, a listening exercise that requires no listening, or hidden rewards for intimacy. Teachers can check each failure in ordinary classroom records without investigating which students are describing actual events.

The two lessons, printable forms, and assessment descriptors specify a complete instructional arrangement, but they have not been tested as an intervention and should not be represented as evidence of measured learning gains. Classroom observations and a carefully designed comparison are therefore needed before making claims about improved autonomy, equal preparation demand, or retained language attainment. The educational case for the arrangement remains independent of a promised effect size: when private biography is unnecessary for a communication objective, students should be able to meet that objective without having to verify their personal history.

Study Materials and Ethical Considerations. Not applicable.

Data Availability. No new empirical dataset was generated for this article.

Conflicts of Interest. The author declares no competing interests.

Funding. This research received no external funding.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies. Generative artificial intelligence tools were used solely to assist with language editing, stylistic refinement, and $\text{\LaTeX}$ preparation. The author reviewed and verified all AI-assisted wording, interpretations, citations, and references and accepts full responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, and scholarly content of the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hanauer, D. I. (2012). Meaningful literacy: Writing poetry in the language classroom. *Language Teaching*, 45(1), 105–115. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444810000522>
- [2] Henry, A., & Thorsen, C. (2021). Teachers' self-disclosures and influences on students' motivation: A relational perspective. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 24(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1441261>
- [3] Jebbour, M., & Mouaid, F. (2019). The impact of teacher self-disclosure on student participation in the university English language classroom. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 31(3), 424–436. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1244991>
- [4] Tutton, M., & Cohen, D. L. (2026). Foreign language anxiety and self-disclosure in online university French classes. *Language Teaching Research*, 30(6), 3185–3205. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688231221392>
- [5] Fondo, M., & Erdocia, I. (2018). Exploring foreign language anxiety and self-disclosure relationships in task design for e-tandem speaking practice. In P. Taalas, J. Jalkanen, L. Bradley, & S. Thouësny (Eds.), *Future-proof CALL: Language learning as exploration and encounters—short papers from EUROCALL 2018* (pp. 54–58).

- [6] Jebbour, M. (2021). Self-disclosure and Moroccan EFL learners' writing development: Effects on complexity, accuracy, and fluency. *Journal of Language and Education*, 7(1), 127–140. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2021.8620>
- [7] Jebbour, M. (2020). Developing a student self-disclosure measure: A pilot study. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 5(1), 17–27. <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v5i1.374>
- [8] Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2011). Identity, language learning, and social change. *Language Teaching*, 44(4), 412–446. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000309>
- [9] Darwin, R., & Norton, B. (2015). Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 36–56. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000191>
- [10] Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, Article 101860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
- [11] Al-Hoorie, A. H., Oga-Baldwin, W. L. Q., Hiver, P., & Vitta, J. P. (2025). Self-determination mini-theories in second language learning: A systematic review of three decades of research. *Language Teaching Research*, 29(4), 1603–1638. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221102686>
- [12] Philp, J., & Duchesne, S. (2016). Exploring engagement in tasks in the language classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 36, 50–72. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190515000094>
- [13] Petronio, S., & Child, J. T. (2020). Conceptualization and operationalization: Utility of communication privacy management theory. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 31, 76–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.08.009>
- [14] Teimouri, Y., Goetze, J., & Plonsky, L. (2019). Second language anxiety and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 41(2), 363–387. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263118000311>
- [15] Dewaele, J.-M., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2014). The two faces of Janus? Anxiety and enjoyment in the foreign language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(2), 237–274. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2014.4.2.5>
- [16] Effiong, O. (2016). Getting them speaking: Classroom social factors and foreign language anxiety. *TESOL Journal*, 7(1), 132–161. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.194>
- [17] Ellis, R. (2017). Position paper: Moving task-based language teaching forward. *Language Teaching*, 50(4), 507–526. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000179>
- [18] Erlam, R. (2016). 'I'm still not sure what a task is': Teachers designing language tasks. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(3), 279–299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814566087>
- [19] Piazzoli, E. (2018). *Embodying language in action: The artistry of process drama in second language education*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-77962-1>
- [20] Galante, A., & Thomson, R. I. (2017). The effectiveness of drama as an instructional approach for the development of second language oral fluency, comprehensibility, and accentedness. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(1), 115–142. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.290>

A. STUDENT SHEET: PREPARING AN ACCOUNT

Activity: Why Did the Plan Fail?

Constructed classroom material. Use this sheet for either lesson; adapt the vocabulary to the class.

OUR PARTICIPATION CONVENTION

Practice accounts may be remembered, changed, invented, or based on the material below. You do not need to identify which details are factual or explain your choice. Everyone prepares, speaks, listens, and works towards the same language goal. Your first-person "I" can be a fictional narrator. Your partner should ask about the account, not require information about your life.

The initial audience is your partner and the teacher supporting the activity. There is no planned recording or public display in this teaching unit. Any later recording, wider presentation, or online use requires a separate arrangement and choice. Other people may remember what they hear, so avoid details you do not want to circulate. Do not include identifying information unnecessarily.

YOUR GOAL

Tell one short account of an ordinary plan that did not initially work. Help your partner understand the sequence and explain the difficulty. Listen to your partner's account and support an explanation with something they actually said.

You can use simple language that communicates the relationships clearly.

PREPARATION FRAME

Use keywords rather than a full script. You have eight minutes in the example lesson. Keep your completed plan to yourself until the exchange is over; this creates a reason for your partner to listen.

1. Intended plan: What did the narrator want to do?
2. First event: What did the narrator do first?
3. Obstacle: What prevented the plan from working?
4. Attempted response: What did the narrator try next?
5. Outcome: What eventually happened?
6. Explanation: Which detail helps explain the difficulty?
7. Private variation: Which detail have you chosen that is not fixed in the common seed? You can use a variation card or create an ordinary detail. This need not be personal information.

LANGUAGE BANK

For sequence: “at first”, “then”, “after that”, “by the time”, “when I arrived”. For explanation: “because”, “so”, “although”, “I thought ... but ...”, “the main problem was ...”. For clarification: “Do you mean ...?”, “Which notice/box/entrance was it?”, “What changed after that?”, “Was the difficulty mainly ... or ...?” These are optional resources, not a recitation checklist.

SHARED EVENT STARTERS

Seed 1: The Wrong Entrance.

I planned to meet someone outside a building. I waited at the main entrance. A message referred to another entrance. I walked around the building. Decide privately what caused the misunderstanding, what you tried, and whether the meeting happened.

Seed 2: The Duplicate Box.

I needed paper cups for a group activity. Two boxes looked similar. I took one and found notebooks inside. Decide privately why that box was selected, what response was possible, and how the activity continued.

Seed 3: The Opening-Time Notice.

I planned to borrow a book. I used a notice stating an opening time. The library was closed when I arrived. Decide privately what was wrong with the information, what you checked, and what happened next.

Seed 4: The Reserved Seat.

I arrived with a seat reservation and sat down. Another person arrived and questioned the seat. Decide privately which detail was misread, how you checked it, and where you eventually sat.

Seed 5: The Charger.

I brought a charger to a study session. Its connector did not fit the available device. Decide privately why the mismatch occurred, what alternative you tried, and how the session continued.

Everyone can use any seed, change it, combine it with experience, or invent another bounded event. An oral explanation is available to the whole class. Do not identify the source. Do not show your chosen variation before the listener reconstructs the account.

B. PRIVATE VARIATION CARDS

Constructed material. Cut along the horizontal rules or let learners choose a card privately. Any learner may use a card; no card indicates a personal source or privacy preference.

CARD INSTRUCTIONS

Choose one card or create a comparable detail. You may change vocabulary or small details. Use it to explain your account in your own words; do not read a whole scenario as a script. Your partner knows the common seed but not the card you selected. Keep the card out of your partner's view until the reconstruction is complete.

TABLE 3. PRIVATE VARIATION CARDS FOR THE FIVE SHARED EVENT STARTERS

Seed and version	Private possibility for the account
Entrance A	An old message described the side entrance, but a newer message changed the meeting point to the main entrance. You read the old message. You called and met at the main entrance after walking back.
Entrance B	Both people used the same message, but you interpreted “front” differently because you approached the building from different streets. You described a nearby sign and then found each other.
Box A	The labels were correct, but one label faced the wall. You selected by box size. Returning for the cups delayed the activity.
Box B	The box labelled “cups” had been reused for notebooks. You checked another box, found the cups, and started on time.
Notice A	The notice was current for weekdays, but you arrived on a weekend. You checked the weekend hours and returned the next morning.
Notice B	The notice was old. You found a newer notice on the door, borrowed the book on another day, and changed your study plan.
Seat A	You read the seat number correctly but confused the row letter. You checked the reservation and moved to another row.
Seat B	Your reservation was for a later session. A staff member checked it and found a free seat for the current session.
Charger A	You brought a charger for your own device but were using a borrowed device with a different connector. You worked on paper until a partner shared a suitable charger.
Charger B	You packed the correct charger for an older model of the device. No suitable replacement was available, so you moved the session and finished later.

TEACHER CHECK

Before the narration, privately ask whether the learner has chosen one unresolved detail and an outcome. Do not ask which parts happened to them. If the listener already knows the full selected version, offer a different card or a new ordinary variation. If a learner needs help reading, provide a brief oral version without identifying why they chose support. Evaluate how the account is communicated, not the sophistication of the account's invented details.

C. MODEL, LISTENER FORM, AND FEEDBACK RECORD

A CONSTRUCTED MODEL DISTINCT FROM THE SEEDS

Teacher introduction: “This is a constructed practice account. Its narrator is fictional.”

I planned to take a poster to Room 12 before a group presentation. I checked the room number in a message and entered the building. I followed a sign pointing upstairs. When I reached the room, another group was working there. I went back to the entrance and asked for directions. A staff member showed me the correct room. I arrived a few minutes late, but the group waited and we began together.

Ask the class which connection is unclear. A useful question is: “If you knew the room number, why did you follow the wrong route?” Supply this clarification:

The sign was from an earlier event and pointed towards a room on a different floor. I trusted the sign without checking the floor in the message. When I asked, the staff member explained that Room 12 was downstairs.

This answer explains a relationship inside the account. It does not establish the teacher's biography. Different interpretations are acceptable when grounded in the account, such as misleading information combined with an unchecked assumption.

LISTENER RESPONSE FORM

Use keywords during the account and give your reconstruction orally. Do not copy the common seed as your answer.

1. The narrator planned to: _____
2. The important sequence was: _____
3. The obstacle was: _____
4. The response and outcome were: _____
5. The privately selected detail I heard was: _____
6. My question or extension was: _____
7. The plan failed mainly because: _____
8. The spoken detail supporting that explanation was: _____
9. The speaker's correction or confirmation was: _____

The "private detail" concerns an undecided story feature, not a secret from the speaker's life. If the account is clear, compare possible causes or ask which feature mattered most; do not invent a misunderstanding to meet a quota.

ANNOTATED CONSTRUCTED PERFORMANCES

Example A: Developing explanation. "I wanted a book. I go library. The time six. I arrive five thirty. Closed. Then next day."

The broad event is recoverable, but the source of "six" and the reason for closure remain unclear. Past reference is inconsistent, though the teacher should identify its effect on understanding rather than count errors alone. A listener can ask, "What said six, and was that information correct?" Appropriate feedback is: "Explain which information you used and why it did not match the opening time." The account's factual origin contributes no assessment evidence.

Example B: Objective met for the observed explanation. "I wanted to borrow a book after class. I read a weekday notice saying the library closed at six, so I arrived at half past five. It was Saturday, and the weekend notice said five. I checked the door notice and returned on Sunday morning. The main problem was that I used the weekday hours for the weekend."

The sequence, obstacle, response, and cause are supplied. The private variation concerns which time applied. A listener might ask, "Did you check the weekend notice before or after arriving?" If the speaker answers "After arriving", that response clarifies the account. Feedback can acknowledge the distinction between the intended time and the applicable time. Neither linguistic complexity nor personal intimacy is required beyond the communicative objective.

Example C: Listener evidence requiring support. A listener responds to Example B: "You used an old notice and came back the next day." This repeats another available seed variation rather than the version narrated. The teacher should ask the listener which spoken detail supports "old". The error is evidence about reconstruction; it must not automatically lower the speaker's organization judgement.

A FORMATIVE RECORD FOR EACH LEARNER

Learner classroom identifier: _____ Lesson: _____

Record M = met, D = developing, or N = not observed. These are feedback categories, not a numeric scale.

One successful feature: _____

TABLE 4. FORMATIVE RECORD FOR SPEAKER AND LISTENER CONTRIBUTIONS

Observed contribution	M/D/N	Short evidence from the account or exchange
Speaking: narrative organization		
Speaking: causal explanation		
Speaking: linguistic resources		
Speaking: relevant response		
Listening: reconstruction		
Listening: question or extension		

One revision or support need: _____

Next opportunity needed for an unobserved contribution: _____

Do not record source, honesty, emotional intensity, or assumed sincerity. Avoid unnecessary identifying content in the evidence note. Peer feedback supports reflection; it does not establish an individual proficiency score.

D. CANDIDATE PROCESS ITEMS AND IMPLEMENTATION RECORD

Illustrative questions for a future evaluation study. These questions have not been validated and are not ready for research recruitment. Institutional review, consent arrangements, cognitive testing, and measurement development precede research use.

CANDIDATE ITEMS ABOUT THE ARRANGEMENT

Offer a five-category agreement response, with “prefer not to answer” available. Analyze items separately during development; do not add them into a validated score by assumption.

1. I understood that I could use an invented or supplied account.
2. I could choose content without explaining why I chose it.
3. I could prepare a usable account with the time and support provided.
4. I expected my marks or feedback to depend on whether my account was personal.
5. I felt pressure to say whether the account had happened to me.
6. I understood who would initially hear my account and whether wider sharing was planned.

Items 4 and 5 describe pressure; a higher agreement response is not improved control. Item wording, interpretation, scoring, and any scale structure require development before a confirmatory trial. Learners are not asked to explain which private content they withheld.

COGNITIVE-INTERVIEW PROMPTS

“What would you do if you did not want to use something from your own life?” “What do you think the teacher will assess?” “Which details does your partner need to hear?” “Who is allowed to hear the account after this task?” “Was any option difficult to use?” Explore instruction interpretation, not the content of an undisclosed experience. Seek accounts that challenge the proposed arrangement as well as favourable responses.

IMPLEMENTATION RECORD

This record describes opportunities and enactment. It does not establish equal cognitive burden or causal effects. Routine teaching use and research collection have different purposes and permission requirements.

TABLE 5. CLASSROOM IMPLEMENTATION RECORD FOR THE DISCLOSURE-OPTIONAL ARRANGEMENT

Field	Record without inferring biography
Class, lesson, pairing	Use task identifiers; record original/new pairing and teacher/block conditions.
Convention	Was it explained before preparation? Was first-person fictional narration modelled?
Preparation	Number completing a keyword plan; types of help requested; reading or invention difficulties; actual time.
Information gap	Was at least one unresolved detail privately selected? Could reconstruction be produced from the seed alone?
Role allocation	Were both speaking and listening roles completed? Note missed roles and observed time distribution.
Verification pressure	Note requests to prove truth or identify source, who initiated them, and how the teacher responded.
Feedback	Record dimensions addressed and distribution of attention; note praise for intimacy or sincerity if it occurred.
Audience	Note proposed recording, display, or extension and whether a separate meaningful choice was offered.
Deviation and response	Identify support or material changes; record why they were needed without classifying actual source use.

E. PUBLISHED EVIDENCE AND ITS INSTRUCTIONAL ROLE

The publications listed below provide different kinds of support for the teaching decisions. Only the first group directly examines disclosure in educational or language-exchange settings. The remaining publications address motivational, social, linguistic, or task-design issues; they should not be interpreted as trials of optional autobiographical narration. Table 6 identifies the purpose and limitations of each set of works; the bibliography supplies identifiers and links for checking individual publications.

TABLE 6. READING GUIDE FOR THE CITED RESEARCH

Cited works	Specific relevance and limit
[2, 3]	Teacher disclosures within actual English lessons; the studies concern relational interaction and voluntary student turns, not required student autobiography or a disclosure-optional teaching trial.
[4, 5]	Learner experiences of sharing in online French study and language exchange; useful for considering interpersonal conditions and low-level disclosure, not for establishing universal topic safety.
[6, 7]	Frequency of student disclosure measured in a 183-student pilot and writing development examined in a 15-student study; neither estimates gains caused by optional autobiographical disclosure.
[1, 8, 9]	Meaningful literacy and the social positions available to learners; these works illuminate expressive purposes and identity without testing the specific task cards.
[10–12]	Autonomy and motivation, self-determination in language learning, and dimensions of engagement; used to specify observable work rather than assume that choice guarantees attainment.
[14–16]	Anxiety, enjoyment, achievement associations, and classroom social conditions; these studies do not isolate the effects of optional autobiographical content.
[13]	Privacy rules and control of information circulation; motivates explicit audience boundaries without claiming the classroom rule has been validated.
[17, 18]	Task properties, instructional difficulty, and the importance of meaningful exchange; motivates the private causal detail and listener reconstruction.
[19, 20]	Imagined language use and drama-based oral instruction; supports instructional plausibility but does not establish a separate effect for the permission to withhold autobiography.

The event starters, ten variation cards, poster model, learner examples, and process items in this manuscript are educational materials written for this article. They do not represent observations, participant quotations, or findings from an unreported intervention.