

Use of Focus on Form for Developing English Language Proficiency of Elementary School Teachers

MAEDA, Koji

School of Professional Development in Education, Graduate School of Education, Nara University of Education

Abstract

Elementary school English education has been attracting attention, but teacher education in this area has not been established. Developing teachers' English proficiency as well as their teaching skills is an urgent issue. In this study, what kind of instruction, using what kind of material is effective for the development of English proficiency required for elementary school teachers in Japan is examined with three Japanese graduate students in the teacher education course. Three explicit instructions with past tense and three implicit instructions with future tense were given to all of them using a task directly related to their work. Their improvements in the use of the target grammatical items were measured with pre- and post- tests. Explicit focus on form instruction seemed to be effective in terms of the development of both accuracy and fluency.

Key Words : teacher education, explicit grammar instruction, focus on form, foreign language activities

1. Background of this study

1. 1. English Education Reform in Japan

Obligatory foreign language activities were officially introduced into Japanese elementary schools in 2011. It is taught to 5th and 6th graders for 35 periods (45 minutes per period) each year. Instruction is delivered by the team-teaching of a homeroom teacher and an assistant language teacher or by a homeroom teacher alone or with personnel in the community, etc. The objective of foreign language activities in elementary schools is to form the foundation of pupils' communication abilities in foreign languages while developing the understanding of languages and cultures through various experiences, fostering a positive attitude toward communication, and familiarizing pupils with the sounds and basic expressions of foreign languages. Among these objectives, three goals should be achieved through foreign language activities classes at elementary school: (a) to develop the understanding of languages and

cultures, (b) to foster a positive attitude toward communication, and (c) to familiarize pupils with the sounds and basic expressions of foreign languages. MEXT provided every pupil with a textbook, *Hi, friends! 1 and 2*, and its digital material for instruction. It also provided each elementary school with a guidebook for training to teach English, and asked every prefectural board of education and every school to conduct 30 hours of teacher education. However, it is not easy for elementary school teachers to acquire the skills that will help pupils achieve the three goals after only 30 hours of training because most of the teachers have not majored in English or studied TEFL.

Under the new course of study which will be fully implemented in 2020, English will become a subject. According to *English Education Reform Plan corresponding to Globalization* by MEXT,

In order to promote the establishment of an educational environment which corresponds to globalization from the elementary to lower/

upper secondary education stage, MEXT is working to enhance English education substantially throughout elementary to lower/secondary school upon strengthening English education in elementary school in addition to further advancing English education in lower/upper secondary school. Timed with the 2020 Tokyo Olympics, in order for the full-scale development of new English education in Japan, MEXT will incrementally promote educational reform from FY2014 including constructing the necessary frameworks based on this plan. (MEXT, 2013, p.1)

The plan says that, in the third and the fourth grade, English Language Activities classes will be given 1-2 times a week with supervision by the homeroom teacher to nurture the foundations for communication skills. In the fifth and the sixth grade, in addition to class teachers with good English teaching skills, actively utilizing specialized course teachers, English Language (Subject) classes will be given three times a week to nurture basic English language skills. In order to achieve these goals, teachers' English proficiency and teaching skills must be developed. To improve English teaching skills of elementary school teachers, MEXT is planning not only to develop and provide audio training materials but also to improve the teacher education program and promote teacher employment. This will help elementary school teachers to improve their teaching skills to some degree, but their voluntary learning of English will also be indispensable.

1. 2. English Abilities Required for Elementary School Teachers

There are mainly two situations where elementary school teachers need to use English. One is the foreign language activities classes where teachers need to direct the pupils and engage them in the language activities in English. The other is the preparatory meetings where teachers plan their classes with assistant language teachers. Teachers need to explain the aims and the class procedures to the assistant language teachers and exchange opinions with them over the plan. In planning the development of elementary school teachers' English proficiency, attention should be paid to these two issues.

2. Literature Review

2. 1. Instruction of Grammar

Grammar instruction was traditionally delivered under grammar-translation method, where grammar rules are explained explicitly, and then learners apply the rules to interpret the text. This teaching methodology was not successful in leading the learners to L2 acquisition and was replaced by audio-lingual method, where repetition and pattern practice are the dominant activities. This method also did not work effectively in terms of L2 acquisition due to the lack of L2 use in meaningful contexts. Communicative language teaching, which emphasizes meaning-focused instruction, has taken the place of the audio-lingual methods. In this approach, less attention is paid to grammar instruction.

In the second language acquisition research, whether grammar instruction is necessary for the development of second language proficiency has always been an important topic. The necessity of grammar instruction in second language acquisition has been discussed from three positions. One is the non-interface position, which argues that explicit knowledge can never be transferred into implicit knowledge through explicit teaching of grammar (Krashen, 1982, 1985). On the contrary, the idea that explicit knowledge can be changed into implicit knowledge through instruction is called the strong interface position (Dekeyser, 1998). The other position is the one just in between the two, and it is called the weak interface position. Many researches have been done on whether grammar instruction is effective in language learning, and if so, what kind of instruction is more effective than others.

This study was conducted in Japan, an EFL environment, where the L2 input that learners receive only comes from class. In such an environment, whichever position of the three we may take, it is indispensable for learners to have some kind of form-focused instruction to push their L2 learning forward, otherwise they wouldn't be able to form any knowledge of language with such a limited amount of input. Therefore I would take form-focused instruction as a means of teaching grammar.

2. 2. Focus on Form

As the traditional L2 teaching method that separated grammar from communicative contexts was not successful, communicative language teaching has become dominant. Among the communicative approaches, content based teaching such as task based language teaching, has emerged based on output hypothesis and interaction hypothesis. At the same time, however, grammatical accuracy is difficult to develop only through meaning-focused instruction (Swain, 1985). Also, as the noticing hypothesis emphasizes the importance of noticing of target language forms for language acquisition (Schmidt, 1990, 2001), it has been considered important to draw learners' attention to language form during communicative language use. Long (1991) suggested a focus on form approach.

Focus on form means having learners become conscious of which language form to use in order to convey their messages in the course of communication. The focus on form approach enables learners to pay attention to language form in a communicative context and to connect form, meaning, and function of a certain message. Focus on form tasks and instruction techniques vary: some are explicit and some are implicit, some are input providing and some are output eliciting.

2. 3. Explicit Instruction vs Implicit Instruction

Norris and Ortega (2000) made a meta-analysis on 49 researches of L2 instruction effects which were published between 1980s and 1990s and found the superiority of explicit instruction over implicit instruction. Explicit instruction includes explicit explanation of the target language or consciousness-raising tasks. On the other hand, they pointed out that the superiority of explicit instruction may be due to the fact that the tests used in most of the researches are to measure the explicit knowledge not the implicit knowledge.

Spada and Tomita (2010) also conducted a meta-analysis on 41 form-focused instruction researches, and studied where different results were made between the two instructions both on learning simple grammar rules and complex grammar rules. The result was that explicit instruction was more effective than implicit instruction regardless of the complexity of

grammar rules. They also studied to see if there is any relationship between the two instructions and knowledge types (explicit and implicit) acquired. They found that explicit instruction resulted in higher results both in explicit knowledge test and in implicit knowledge test, especially significant in implicit knowledge of complex grammar points. These results show that explicit instruction can enhance implicit knowledge, which learners can utilize in communication and denied the non-interface position. However, Spada and Tomita pointed out that these tests used for measuring the implicit knowledge cannot always measure the implicit knowledge and that the development of more valid test is necessary.

To conclude, explicit instruction is effective in L2 learning but more research is necessary about how effective it is to the development of implicit knowledge.

3. Method

3. 1. Research Questions

1. Does explicit instruction help learners improve their accuracy better than implicit instruction?
2. Does explicit instruction help learners improve their fluency better than implicit instruction?

3. 2. Participants

Three graduate students who will start working as elementary school teachers participated in this study. All of them are in the second year at School of Professional Development, Graduate School of Education, Nara University of Education. They are Japanese who were born and raised in Japan. Their L1 is Japanese and L2 is English. They are studying for these two years to develop their skills as elementary school teachers, and none of them majored in English in university. Their profiles are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Profile of the participants

| Participant | English learning period | JHS English teacher's license | STEP grade |
|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| A.A. | 8 years | Yes | 2 nd grade |
| B.B. | 8 years | No | Pre 2 nd grade |
| C.C. | 8 years | No | 3 rd grade |

A.A., has the highest English proficiency of the three. He enjoys talking with others both in Japanese and English. He lived abroad for three years when he was in high school. In the high school, all the classes were conducted in English. He is fluent in daily English conversation but often makes errors and has difficulty expressing his ideas especially when talking about topics above the daily level. His English proficiency in terms of STEP test is 2nd grade level. He majored in psychology in university. He has a junior high school English teacher's license as well as elementary school teacher's license and is interested in English education in Japan. He has taught several English classes at an elementary school on his teaching practice during these two years.

B.B., is an outgoing person who likes chatting with others. He has no experience living abroad or studying English outside of school but is interested in communicating with others in English and showing positive attitude toward English communication. He has not taken English classes since he finished his second year at university. His English proficiency level is pre 2nd grade level. He is good at communicating with others using communication strategies such as gestures, facial expressions, and drawing pictures. These strategies help him a lot with his communication in English. Although he often makes grammatical errors, his positive attitude toward communication also helps him communicate successfully with others. His major was music education and is good at singing. He taught one or two English classes on his teaching practice during these two years.

C.C., is rather shy compared with the other two participants, but still enjoys talking with others. He has never lived abroad or studying English outside school. He has not studied English for about eleven years since he finished second year at university. After graduating from university, he worked for a company for more than 5 years. After that, he decided to become an elementary school teacher and entered this graduate school. His main interest is in developing learners' autonomy. His English proficiency is about at STEP 3rd grade level. His vocabulary and grammar use is very limited and he often stops when speaking English. His pronunciation is

sometimes difficult to understand. Although he thinks he needs to practice and improve his English skills, he feels he is not good at it and does not like to communicate in English very much.

3. 3. Tasks and the Target Structures

These students are going to start working as elementary school teachers in next April; thus, they start teaching foreign language in half a year. All of them are motivated to study English, and especially they want to improve skills that are necessary to conduct English classes as well as English proficiency itself. As mentioned earlier, there are mainly two kinds of English skills that are necessary for elementary school teachers; English skills to conduct their teaching and those to talk and discuss about lesson plans with assistant language teachers. Therefore I chose one of these, practicing discussion about lesson plans (see Appendices A and B) with assistant language teachers, as the task for this teaching project.

I talked with the three students and planned a task to match a real situation they would meet when they start teaching. The task involves explaining and talking about the lesson plan with an assistant language teacher. Each participant is supposed to be a homeroom teacher. Each of them is supposed to have taught the previous English class by himself and he is going to team teach the next class with the assistant language teacher. He is explaining about these two English classes to the ALT. This task is composed of two parts; explaining what they did in the previous lesson and explaining what he is planning to do for team teaching with the ALT in the next class. They are given a teaching plan book for elementary school foreign language activities and asked to explain two continuing lesson plans. The book is written in Japanese and each lesson plan is shown in a chart, so they cannot translate the sentences directly from Japanese to English, but they need to compose the sentences by themselves and organize the sentences so that it is easy for the ALT to understand. The students had to explain the lessons orally, but they were also allowed to use notes to draw pictures for helping the explanation. I played the part of ALT. The ALT basically listened but sometimes gave scaffolding

and corrective feedback on their errors.

The target language selected for this study was past tense and future tense. In the former part of the task, the students had to explain their lesson that had been done, so they described the story in past tense. In the latter part of the task, they had to explain their lesson that was going to be done, so they used future tense. These situations usually happen when talking about lesson. Thus these are structures that elementary school teachers have to acquire first. That was why these structures were selected as target of this teaching practice.

3. 4. Procedure

Three instructions were given to each of the three students and pretest and posttest were given to measure the improvement. Each instruction was about 45 minute long including reflection of the task. The schedule is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Project Schedule

| Participant | Pretest | 1 st instruction | 2 nd instruction | 3 rd instruction | posttest |
|-------------|---------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|
| A.A. | Nov. 2 | Nov. 9 | Nov.16 | Nov. 30 | Dec. 7 |
| B.B. | Nov. 2 | Nov. 9 | Nov.16 | Nov. 30 | Dec. 7 |
| C.C. | Nov. 2 | Nov. 9 | Nov.16 | Nov. 30 | Dec. 7 |

As for pretest, the following two tasks were given.

Tasks; You are an elementary school teacher. In your foreign language activities class,
 1) Tell your pupils what you did last weekend.
 2) Tell your pupils what you will do this weekend.
 You have one minute for each speech.

The test was given to each student incidentally so that they would not see each other’s performance. The tasks were not given to the students in advance, and the student who had finished the test earlier were asked not to tell the others about the tasks. The first task “Tell your pupils what you did last weekend” was aimed at eliciting stories told in past tense. The second one was aimed at future tense. One minute was timed, but the student wasn’t stopped when one minute is over and allowed to finish his speech.

Three instructions were given to each student in November, 2015. The procedures for all the instructions were the same. The students were asked to perform the following tasks.

Tasks; You are an elementary school teacher. You taught your previous foreign language activities class by yourself, and you will team teach your next class with an assistant language teacher. You are now explaining your teaching plans to him.
 1) Tell the ALT what you did in the previous class.
 2) Tell the ALT what you will do in the next class.

The students were allowed to select any lesson plans from the book that were given.

There was no time limit to their performance, so they could explain as much as they wanted. During the performance, I played the role of the ALT. I listened to the students’ explanation of the teaching plans and did not disagree with the plans. No instruction or explanation about the target structures, past tense and future tense were given before students’ performance of the tasks because these target structures are the ones the students were already familiar with. Instead, each time the participant made a mistake about the target structures, corrective feedback was provided. Instructions on target structures were given explicitly on the past tense and implicitly on the future tense. Each time they made a mistake with the target structure, past tense, in task 1, I told them that they had made a mistake by giving explicit correction or metalinguistic feedback, and elicited their modified output. I gave recasts for future tense, so whether the students notice the errors they made were up to them. When they made errors with non-target structures, no feedback was given as long as the output was understandable. When the output was not understandable, they were asked to repeat or paraphrase what they said (clarification request). They were allowed to draw pictures, use gestures or to show pictures to the ALT. The instruction was given individually, but they were allowed to see each other’s performance. All three participants saw all the others’ performance. After each performance, about 15 minutes were spent for reflection on the performance. During the reflection time, the students could ask questions or ask for advice. I gave general comments on their performance.

After the three instructions were finished, the posttest was given. As for posttest, the following

two tasks were given.

Tasks; You are an elementary school teacher. In your foreign language activities class,
 1) Tell your pupils what you liked to do when you were an elementary school pupil.
 2) Tell your pupils what you will like to do when you are seventy years old.
 You have one minute for each speech.

The test was given exactly the same way as pretest was given.

All the performances on pretest, instructions, and posttest were recorded and analyzed. The results of pretest and posttest were compared in terms of accuracy (rate of appropriate use of the target structure) and fluency (speaking speed (wpm)).

4. Results and Discussion

4. 1. Pretest

Task 1)

Student A.A.

Last Friday I **went** to my grandparents' house. My grandparents live in Shizuoka. I take, I **took** *Shinkansen* to go there. It **takes** three hours. In my grandparents' house, I **played** *Shogi*, do you know *Shogi*, with my grandfather. He **was** very strong. I **was** **enjoyed** it, I **enjoyed** it. I **went** to Hamamatsu. Hamamatsu is very famous for eel. Eel is *unagi*. I love *unagi*, and I **ate** *unaju*. I want to go there again. Thank you.

Although he made several mistakes he noticed them immediately and modified them appropriately. These quickly modified errors were to be counted as 0.5 errors in this study. As for the underlined "take", both present and past tense can be applicable. After the speech he said that he intended to use the past tense, so this was counted as an error in the use of target structure. There were eight occasions in his speech that he should use past tense. Among them, he made one error and two 0.5 errors. That counts up to two errors, so his accuracy is calculated as 75 % ($6 / 8 = .75$). He also spoke 79 words in 57 seconds. His speaking speed was 83 words per minute. In this study, the rate of appropriate use of the target structure is considered in terms of accuracy, and speaking speed (wpm) is considered in terms of fluency. As for other points, although there was an error in number (eel), that was the only error recognized in his speech. He spoke clearly as if

he were speaking to the pupils.

Student B.B.

Last Saturday, I **went** to Youth Challenge Forum which university student **thinking** about future of Nara, Nara's sightseeing, Nara Park, and so on. In this event there **are** four groups and my group is the group which the student **think**, **thought** about sightseeing. In fact, when I **was** a university student, I **majored** in sightseeing. And I **can** spend happy time in this event. After this event, I **went** to *Torikizoku*, do you know *Torikizoku*? It is a space of drinking, with my friend, Masa. Masa **drank** so much, and I **am** worried about his health.

This participant tried to talk about his special event on the weekend, but it seemed the event was a little challenging for him to describe accurately. As a result, he could not access correct words for the situation, and frequently made errors. Especially at the end of the speech, he seemed to have forgotten that he was supposed to speak to the pupils during English language activities at school! He was basically conscious of using the target form, past tense, but when he was thinking how to express the situation, he seemed to have been unconscious of that.

Student C.C.

I **went** to Universal Studio Japan last week. Member is Ichiro, Taro. We **enjoy** ... because ... so ... **stay** till final time. I **become** sick, **sleeping** always in bed.

This participant has not had English lesson for 11 years and recently started to practice English. He had one minute for his speech, but he often stopped being at a loss what to say next. It was difficult for him to put the words in order to form a simple sentence.

The result of this task is summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Result of Task 1

| Participant | Fluency (wpm) | Accuracy (%) |
|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| A.A. | 88 | 75 |
| B.B. | 65 | 60 |
| C.C. | 35 | 35 |

Task 2)

Pretest of this task was done right after task 1) and the students' performance was analyzed in the same way as task 1). Its result is shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Result of Task 2

| Participant | Fluency (wpm) | Accuracy (%) |
|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| A.A. | 83 | 75 |
| B.B. | 58 | 50 |
| C.C. | 29 | 20 |

The speed of speech became faster with all three students and accuracy didn't change with A.A. while the other two of them showed higher rate than task 1). Increase in speed was probably due to the fact that they had made one speech just before they made this task 2) speech. Higher rate in accuracy with future tense by relatively low-proficiency students can be thought of as the difference in complexity. Also it is because Japanese speakers find inflection (past tense) in English rather difficult.

4.2 Instructions

Instructions were given to each student three times. In the instructions, the students were required to explain two teaching plans. The students could select two teaching plans (two continuous periods) and explain what he taught in the previous class and what he and the ALT are going to do in the next class. During the performance, I listened, and when they made errors on the past tense, I gave explicit instruction. For example, when a student said, "Then I explained the rule of the game, and pupils listening," I gave elicitation by responding to it, "And what did pupils do? And pupils ... " "Listened, Pupils listened." When a student said "When pupils were singing, I prepare for the game," I gave them meta-linguistic feedback by saying, "'Prepare' is present tense. You are talking about the past, so you should say it in the past tense. So you should say ... " "prepared for the game." Students liked this type of explicit instruction. They would quickly write down the modified output on a notebook and they seemed satisfied when they found something to improve. As for future tense, on the contrary, I used implicit instruction. When a student said, "When we sing a song, I tell pupils to sing loud," I gave him a recast by saying "OK, when we sing a song, you will tell them to sing in a loud voice." In such cases, students often noticed the modification, but when multiple points were fixed at the same time

in the recast, they seemed to be unconscious of the modification of tense. The instructions were done individually but other students were allowed to observe the instruction. All the three participants were very keen on the study. Although they were not required to attend other students' instruction, all of them joined all the other students' instruction. They recorded each other and asked each other questions. Two of them (B.B. and C.C.) listened to their own recording and wrote down what they said in the performance, and even modified the writing again. During the reflection time after the task performance, the students asked many questions about the expressions and grammar points, so estimated 45 minutes usually became 50 or 55 minutes long.

4.3 Posttest

After all three instructions, a posttest was administered. After the three instructions, they seemed to have got more used to and feel less nervous about speaking English. The result of the summary of the test and the comparison with the pretest are shown in Table 5 and 6

Table 5. Result of Task 1

| Name | Fluency (wpm) | Improvement (%) | Accuracy (%) | Improvement (%) |
|------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|
| A.A. | 85 | +2.4 | 80 | +6.6 |
| B.B. | 76 | +31.0 | 75 | +50 |
| C.C. | 42 | +44.8 | 20 | 0 |

Table 6. Result of Task 2

| Name | Fluency (wpm) | Improvement (%) | Accuracy (%) | Improvement (%) |
|------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|
| A.A. | 79 | -10.3 | 75 | 0 |
| B.B. | 72 | +10.7 | 65 | +8.3 |
| C.C. | 38 | +8.5 | 40 | +14.2 |

Table 5 shows that improvement can be seen in all the students, especially significant with the two students with lower proficiencies. From Table 6 also, improvement can be seen in all the students, but this time it is not as significant as Task 1. From the comparison of the two charts, we can say that explicit instruction was more effective than implicit instruction especially with the learners with low proficiencies.

5. Conclusion

The research questions were as follows.

1. Does explicit instruction help learners improve their accuracy better than implicit instruction?
2. Does explicit instruction help learners improve their fluency better than implicit instruction?

The results indicated possibilities that explicit instruction was a more effective method on the improvement of English proficiency of the graduate students who are in the elementary school teacher education course. Further studies in this area are necessary because developing elementary school teachers' English proficiency is our countries' pressing task. This instructional approach of using the task directly related to their work seemed to be effective both in motivating the learners and in improving their English proficiency. However, when we look at the improvement of fluency and accuracy respectively as I set the research question, the results varied depending largely on the participant.

As for question 1, participants A.A. and B.B. showed greater improvement after explicit instruction than implicit instruction, but C.C. did not show improvement after explicit instruction while improvement was seen after implicit instruction. We have to have a closer look at this fact before we can answer yes to this question.

As for question 2, all the participants showed better improvement after explicit instruction than implicit instruction. From the results, the answer can be yes. Through the explicit instruction, the participants became more confident, so that they could speak without stopping to think what to say next.

Although the participants seemed to show improvement in this study, there are things to improve. First, the number of participants is too small to statistically answer the questions. Next, in this study, the students were so keen on their study that they studied a great deal at home using various strategies. This made the factors that helped them improve their proficiencies complex, and we cannot directly identify the reason. Lastly, this instruction was conducted only three times, which should be repeated several more times to precisely measure the improvement.

As the development of elementary school

teachers English proficiency is an urgent issue, we need to continue studies of this area.

References

- DeKeyser, R. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp.42-63). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis*. London/New York: Longman.
- Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: a design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, D. Coste, R. Ginsberg & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp.39-52).
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science & Technology. (2013). *English Education Reform Plan corresponding to Globalization*.
- Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 50*, 417-528.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*, 129-158.
- Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp.3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spada, N., & Tomita, Y. (2010). Interactions between type of instruction and type of language feature: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 50*, 263-308.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass and C. Madden (Eds), *Input in second Language Acquisition* (pp.235-253). Rowleys, Mass.: Newbury House.

Appendix A. Teaching Plan (奈良市外国語科指導事例集 p.149)

第5学年 外国語科指導事例 (28)

| | | | |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------|
| 1 | 単元 | Lesson9 “I study Japanese.” (5時間) | |
| 2 | 主題 | 「外国の学校の様子を知ろう」 (2/5) | |
| 3 | ねらい | ・異文化について理解を深める。 | |
| 4 | 準備物 | Hi, friends!1, テレビ・パソコン (電子黒板), 絵カード, 巻末絵カード, ふりかえりカード | |
| 5 | 展開 | | |
| | 児童の活動 | 担任の支援 | ALTの支援 |
| | ①はじめのあいさつ | 笑顔で楽しい雰囲気をつくる。 | 笑顔で楽しい雰囲気をつくる。 |
| | ②Review チャンツ ♪Sunday, Monday, Tuesday♪ (P.34) | 1) 曜日のカードを提示する。 | 1) 児童と一緒にチャンツをする。 |
| | ③Practice チャンツ ♪What do you study?♪ (P.34) 1) 音声 (ALT) を聞き, リズムに合わせてチャンツをする。 2) さくらとたくに分かれて, チャンツする | 1) 音声 (ALT) を聞き, どんな教科が出てくるか発表させる。 2) 教科の絵カードを黒板に貼り, 出てくる教科の絵カードを指しながらチャンツをさせる。 | 1) 児童と一緒にチャンツをする。 |
| | ④Activity ☆聞き取りクイズ (P.34) ☆ 2) 音声 (ALT) を聞いて, オーストラリア・韓国・中国の学校生活について分かったことを発表する。 | 1) 3つの国旗を確認させる。 2) 音声 (ALT) を聞かせ, それぞれ分かったことを書かせる。 3) その他の国の学校生活について映像資料などを提示する。 4) 日本との違いや共通点を発表させる。 | 4) さまざまな国の学校生活について経験から話をする。 |
| | ⑤Activity ☆教科カルタ (巻末絵カード) ☆ 2) 巻末絵カードを切り取る。 3) グループで円になり, 中央に絵カードを1セット置く。 全) “What subject is this?” 担) “It is ~.” 取った児童) “It is ~.” と繰り返す。 | 1) 代表の児童 (ALT) とカルタ取りの説明をする。 3) カードを取った児童は教科名を発音させるようにする。 | 1) 担任と代表の児童とカルタ取りの説明をする。 |
| | ⑥ふりかえり | | |
| | ⑦終わりのあいさつ | | |

Appendix B. Teaching Plan (奈良市外国語科指導事例集 p.148)

第5学年 外国語科指導事例 (27)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 単元 | Lesson9 “I study Japanese.” (5時間) | |
| 2 | 主題 | 「教科を英語で言ってみよう」 (1/5) | |
| 3 | ねらい | ・教科の言い方に慣れ親しむ。 | |
| 4 | 準備物 | Hi, friends!1, テレビ・パソコン (電子黒板), 絵カード, ふりかえりカード | |
| 5 | 展開 | | |
| | 児童の活動 | 担任の支援 | ALTの支援 |
| | ①はじめのあいさつ | 笑顔で楽しい雰囲気をつくる。 | 笑顔で楽しい雰囲気をつくる。 |
| | ②Review チャンツ ♪Sunday, Monday, Tuesday♪ (P.34) | 1) 曜日のカードを提示する。 | 1) 児童と一緒にチャンツをする。 |
| | ③Activity 1 ☆スリーヒントクイズ (P.32) ☆ | 1) 教科の絵カードを黒板に貼り, 教科名を確認する。 | 1) 教科名を発音する。 |
| | 2) 音声 (ALT) を聞いてどの教科か予想し, 発表する。 | 2) 音声 (ALT) を聞かせ, 何の教科か予想して, 理由をもとに, 発表させる。 3) 慣れてきたら, 実態に応じて, 他にもスリーヒントを作り, 出題する。 | 2) 実態に応じて, スリーヒントを作り, 出題する。 3) 教科名を発音する。 |
| | ④Activity 2 ☆キーワードゲーム☆ | 1) キーワードの教科を1つ選び, 絵カードを黒板に貼る。 | |
| | ⑤Activity 3 ☆聞き取りクイズ (P.33) ☆ | 1) 答えを確認しながら, 黒板に時間割を書き, 一緒に発話させる。 2) What subject do you like? と好きな教科を尋ねる。 | 1) 時間割の教科を発音する。 2) What subject do you like? と好きな教科を尋ねる。 |
| | ⑥ふりかえり | | |
| | ⑦終わりのあいさつ | | |

☆キーワードゲーム☆

- 1 ペアになって向かい合い, 二人の間に消しゴム等を置く。
- 2 消しゴムを取った児童がキーワードの教科を相手に好きか尋ねる。 “Do you like it math?”

☆聞き取りクイズ (P.33) ☆

- 1 音声 (ALT) を聞き, 今日の時間割は何か考え, 発表する。
- 2 好きな教科を聞かれたら, I like English. などと答える。

フォーカス・オン・フォームによる 小学校教員の英語運用能力の育成

前田 康二

奈良教育大学大学院教育学研究科教職開発講座（教育課程、英語教授法）

小学校における英語教育が関心を集めているが、この分野においての教員養成及び研修が確立されているとは言えない。教員の英語運用能力の育成は、指導技術の習得とともに喫緊の課題である。本稿では、どのような教材を使ったどのような指導が小学校教員に求められる英語運用能力の育成に効果的であるかについて、教員養成課程の3人の大学院生を対象とした指導から考察する。3人の学生それぞれに対して、小学校での英語指導に必要な場面に直結したタスクを用い、過去形の明示的な指導と未来形の暗示的な指導をそれぞれ3回ずつ実施し、それらの文法項目の運用についての向上を事前テストと事後テストで測定した。結果からは、明示的なフォーカス・オン・フォームによる指導が、正確さ及び流暢さの両面の向上に有効であることが考えられる。今後、方法の改善とともに、対象者及び指導回数が増加などにより、この分野での研究を継続していく必要がある。