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Who Are Non-Native Speaker Teachers and How Can They Be Effective in Teaching?

Ryohei Mizoguchi
(Department of English Studies, Sophia University)

1. Introduction

In Japan, with an increase of people's interest in English language, a large number of billboards for English conversation schools can be observed in cities. What is interesting about them is that they oftentimes advertise that those schools have native speaker teaching staff members. With the effect of this, people seemingly have the general mindset that it is better to learn English from native speaker teachers. Apart from English conversation schools, it is worth discussing the same idea can be applied to English classes mandatory in junior and senior high schools, since most of the teachers are non-native speaker teachers. This question raises discussion on how the non-native speaker teachers can be effective in the students' learning and what they have to offer in Japanese education system.

2. Non-Native Speaker Teachers

According to Braine (2000), the number of non-NESTs (non-native English speaker teachers) accounts for 80% of the total population of English teachers worldwide, yet their qualifications had not been investigated until recently. As a result, simply by the reason that non-NESTs do not speak English as their first language, they were omitted from teacher candidates for ESL courses, where multiculturalism was thought to be a significant element (Braine, 2000).

One of the literatures that shed a light on non-NESTs’ and second language learners’ characteristics was Going Beyond the Native Speaker in Language Teaching by Vivian Cook (1999). He stated that L2 learners can never become a native speaker of that language, and thus it does not make a good sense for L2 learners to emulate their native speaker teachers.

3. Non-NESTs as Role Models

Cook's arguments presented above can be concluded that it is non-NESTs that English learners should follow after as non-NESTs likely have experienced the status of English learners and they are the models that the learners can potentially achieve. Medgyes (1994)
classified non-NESTs’ role as role models into two categories: ‘language model’ and ‘learner model.’

He explained the two types of models non-NESTs can present in the following way: the better proficiency a teacher has, the better language model he or she can be, and the more effort a teacher has put into learning the L2, the better learner model he or she can be (see Figure 1). Needless to say, those who fall into Quadrant I are the best teachers. On the other hand, those who fit into Quadrant IV are making a great amount of effort into learning, but making a slow progress of mastering the L2, and those who are in Quadrant II has not made much effort but somehow achieved an excellent command of the L2 owing to, just to show a few examples, their aptitudes or their fortunate learning experience. The question on which of the two categories of teachers are beneficial to what kind of students is still up to further discussions.

Figure 1. Language model and learner model (based on Medgyes, 1994).

4. Dealing with Errors

Error correction is an area that non-NESTs can be strong at. Indeed, Árva and Medgyes’s research (2000) showed that error correction was listed as one of the perceived strengths of non-NESTs alongside with their focus on grammatical accuracy and controlled in-class activities. In discussing non-NESTs’ error correction, Medgyes (1994) presented two type of learner’s errors: overt errors and covert errors.

The two types of errors are explained in terms of the possibility that the errors are detected. Overt errors are the incorrect utterances that learners make while they attempt to successfully and effectively carry out the communication (Medgyes, 1994), while covert errors can occur when a learner, in an attempt to avoid language errors, tries to use the expression
that is he or she is used to using, but, as a result, it ends up being semantically or pragmatically incorrect (Medgyes, 1994; Gass, 2013; Corder, 1981). The examples of the two types of errors are shown below.

Covert error:
Teacher: Mira, how long have you been in Cleveland?
Student: *I be here for six month.

(Shown in Parrish, 2004, p. 79)

Overt error:
You mustn’t wear a hat at the party.
[Intended message: You don’t have to wear a hat at the party.]

(Shown in Corder, 1981, p. 42)

In the covert error example, the errors are clearly visible as the verb be should be conjugated into have been and the noun month at the end of the student’s utterance should be pluralized into months. However, the example sentence of the overt error does not show any visible grammatical errors, and whoever has received this message likely make an interpretation that is different from the intention of the speaker or writer. In other words, those who interpret this message never doubt its meaning unless they are familiar with how English language learners make errors on the usage of the word mustn’t.

Medgyes (1994) wrote that non-NESTs should be advantageous at predicting what invisible covert errors learners have hidden in their utterances as they have possibly developed their L2 skills making the same kind of errors. He also mentioned that non-NESTs would be able to encourage the students not to be afraid of taking risks so that the covert errors will become visible.

5. Using L1 in the Instructions

Another advantage of non-NESTs is that they can use both the students’ L1 and their L2 in the instructions. The use of L1 in a foreign language classroom has been a controversial topic, but recent literatures imply that L1 should be used purposefully if it is expected to be beneficial for the learners. Cook (1999), for example, encouraged the use of L1 in L2 learning, arguing that the foreign language instructions should acknowledge the positive perspective toward L2 learners, which is that they have full competence in their L1 and partial competence in their L2. He listed mainly two ways of using L1 in the classroom, that is, explanation on grammar rules and meaning of vocabulary, and communication between the students.
In addition, L1 can be used to encourage students to contribute their experience into the language classroom. Llurda (2004) suggested that foreign language classes should count on the students’ previous experience by using their native language and culture. This way, the students will likely feel that their non-linguistic knowledge is valued, and hence their contribution may increase.

In order to ensure that the students’ prior knowledge is going to be beneficial in the classroom, it is also important to discuss the topics that the class will cover. Alptekin (2002) wrote that teachers are encouraged to use teaching materials that are based on local and international contexts which are related to the leaners’ lives. If the classroom topics are related to the students’ daily lives, they are likely to find the connection between their experience and language learning, and therefore their level of participation may increase.

The situation where students’ L1 and L2 are used simultaneously is called translanguaging. The concept of translanguaging in the field of education is defined as “a product of border thinking, of knowledge that is autochthonous and conceived from a bilingual, not monolingual, position” (García & Sylvan, 2011, p. 389). In other words, translanguaging can acknowledge the knowledge and idea that L2 learners can bring into the classroom and strengthen the relevance between their learning of L2 and their life experiences.

6. Conclusion

This article has given the potentials of non-NESTs that could justify their status as language teachers. They are partially to bring forward a counterargument against native-speakerism, which in Holliday’s (2006) definition is the idea that assumes that NESTs present the standard of English language and the methodology of English language teaching.

However, this is not to suggest an exclusive status of non-NEST. Rather, the strengths of non-NESTs and those of NESTs should be utilized to complement each other. Indeed, Medgyes (1994) said that “from the non-NEST's perspective, proficiency resembles a coin” (p. 77), about which he explained that the inferior English proficiency is non-NESTs’ inborn nature, but this can also become their strength in language teaching. Those characteristics are unique to non-NESTs and that is where they can shine. In the same token, NESTs have their own attributes that non-NESTs do not possess. It is desired that they are going to accept the strong points of the other team of teachers and that the students, too, will learn to acknowledge their status with pride.
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**Incorporating CLIL in Mixed-Ability Classes**

**Maki Takata**
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1. **Introduction**

   Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is a teaching approach that integrates the 4Cs: “content (subject matter), communication (language learning and using), cognition (learning and thinking processes), and culture (developing intercultural and global
citizenship)” (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010, p.41). CLIL is also considered to be beneficial to enhance content and language knowledge, cognitive skills, motivation, and creativity of multilevel learners (Marsh, 2002). As there is a growing demand for language teachers to cope with mixed-ability classes, where students differ greatly in wide-ranging variables (Ainslie, 1994), it is essential for them to cope with such diversity in the classroom. Taking these factors into consideration, an exploratory case study was conducted to investigate the effectiveness of CLIL in a mixed-ability setting.

2. Research Questions

As there is still insufficient research that incorporated CLIL in mixed-ability classes, the present study is an attempt to explore the nature of such classroom situations through an investigation of the following research questions:

1. How do learners in a mixed-ability setting perceive classes taught in the CLIL approach?
2. What content and language knowledge do multilevel students learn in CLIL classes?
3. What instances of incidental teaching and learning can be observed in CLIL classes?

3. Research Procedure and Instruments

Table 1 describes the procedure and instruments used in the study. Firstly, six 90-minute CLIL lessons were planned by the researcher, based on CLIL principles and teaching strategies. Secondly, a student profile questionnaire was administered to understand the students’ background information such as age, linguistic level, and language-learni ng background. Thirdly, six 90-minute CLIL lessons were conducted. After each CLIL lesson, the Uptake Recall Chart (URC), achievement test, and post-class questionnaire were administered. Finally, after all six CLIL classes, a 90-minute semi-structured group interview was conducted to gain a deeper understanding of students’ perceptions.

Table 1: Research Procedure and Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Procedure</th>
<th>Description of Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Materials Development</td>
<td>The handouts and visual materials were developed for six CLIL lessons: Lesson 1 (A Trip to Hawaii), Lesson 2 (Acknowledging Ethnic Diversity), Lesson 3 (Food Cultures Around the World), Lesson 4 (Food Waste in Japan), Lesson 5 (Athletes’ Words of Wisdom), and Lesson 6 (2020 Tokyo Olympics).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student Profile Questionnaire</td>
<td>The student profile questionnaire includes items regarding the participants’ age, linguistic level, and language-learning background.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Six 90-minute CLIL classes

The Uptake Recall Chart (URC), achievement test, and post-class questionnaire were conducted after each class. The URC includes the content and language items that the students recall learning in the CLIL lesson. The achievement test includes both language and content items. The post-class questionnaire includes items regarding the participants’ perceptions of the CLIL lesson, understanding of content/language of the lessons, and overall satisfaction.

4. Semi-structured Group Interview

Questions for the semi-structured interview were listed in an interview guide. Actual questions asked to the participants differed depending on their responses and flow of the conversation.

4. Participants

The participants were adult learners of English (n = 8) in a community college class in Tokyo. The participants (four males, four females) had different levels of language abilities, which were identified from both previously taken English proficiency tests and self-reports of their English level. The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) was used in describing the language level of the participants: A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, and C2 (A1 is the lowest level and C2 is the highest level).

Table 2 presents the participants’ background information. The names used to refer to the participants are all pseudonyms. The table shows that the participants differed in wide-ranging aspects. Firstly, in terms of age, the participants differed greatly, where the youngest participant, Daisuke (S1), was in his early twenties whereas the oldest participant, Shigeru, was in his late seventies. Secondly, in terms of their linguistic ability, Yuriko (S5) had the highest linguistic level (B1-B2 level) based on past language proficiency tests. On the other hand, Shota (S3) and Michiko (S4) had the lowest linguistic abilities (A2 level). Thirdly, in terms of students' living-abroad experiences, Michiko (S4), Fumie (S7), and Shigeru (S8) had living-abroad experiences for a range of three months to three years.
Table 2: Participants’ Background Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language Level (CEFR)</th>
<th>Living-abroad Experience</th>
<th>English use in daily life (per week)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daisuke (S1)</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomoki (S2)</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>A2-B1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shota (S3)</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michiko (S4)</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Yes (Thailand, 3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuriko (S5)</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>B1-B2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akiko (S6)</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>A2-B1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fumie (S7)</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>A2-B1</td>
<td>Yes (U.K., 6 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shigeru (S8)</td>
<td>70s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Yes (Ireland, 3 months)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Results

5.1. How do learners perceive classes taught in the CLIL?

The first research question was investigated through the results of the post-class questionnaire and the semi-structured group interview. This section looks into the learners’ perceptions of the CLIL classes in two respects: students’ overall perceptions of the CLIL lessons; and preferences of tasks, activities, and topics.

5.1.1. Students’ overall perceptions of the CLIL lessons

It was found from both quantitative and qualitative data that the participants had a relatively positive view towards the mixed-ability CLIL classes. Firstly, in terms of Item 1 (Did you enjoy the lesson?), Item 2 (Was the topic interesting?), and Item 3 (Are you satisfied with the lesson?), the results indicate that the participants, regardless of their differences in wide-ranging variables, perceived the CLIL lessons in a relatively positive manner (See Table 3). In regard to the mean scores, Items 1 (M=3.68, SD=0.41), 2 (M=3.78, SD=0.33), and 3 (M=3.74, SD=0.35) had higher scores than Items 4-7. This suggests that the participants, regardless of their differences in wide-ranging variables, perceived the CLIL lessons in a
relatively positive manner. Moreover, the tendency seems to be rather homogeneous as SD indicates.

Table 3: Results of Post-class Questionnaire Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Did you enjoy the lesson?</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Was the topic interesting?</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are you satisfied with the lesson?</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was the English difficult?</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was the content difficult?</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Did you feel nervous in the lesson?</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Did you feel confident in the lesson?</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, it was found in the group interview that the participants perceived the CLIL lessons positively and enjoyed learning different topics. They were able to understand the lesson with the support from both their classmates and the teacher. For instance, Michiko (S4) mentioned that although she had difficulty comprehending the grammatical structures used in the lessons, she was able to understand them with the help of her classmates and the teacher. Akiko (S6) mentioned that the CLIL lessons were more enjoyable and meaningful for her compared to the other language classes that she had been taking, which were taught using the GTM. It was also found that despite being adult learners of English, who were cognitively mature and already had some background knowledge about various topics, the students all mentioned that they had learned about new topics and information in the CLIL lessons.

Secondly, in terms of Item 4 (Was the English difficult?), and Item 5 (Was the content difficult?), the results show greater individual differences, indicating that the students perceived the difficulty of the English/content differently: five students (Daisuke (S1), Tomoki
(S2), Shota (S3), Michiko (S4), and Akiko (S6)) perceived the language to be more difficult than the content, whereas Fumie (S7) had the opposite impression. As for Shigeru (S8), he did not find the classes to be difficult at all for both the language and content (M=1.00), and seemed to have enjoyed and been satisfied with the lessons (M=4.00). Still, another student Shota (S3) perceived the language (M=3.00) and content (M=2.80) to be relatively difficult, but enjoyed the classes nevertheless (M=4.00). Such results show that there were differences in students’ self-reported content/language difficulties, which do not necessarily affect the impressions toward the classes.

Thirdly, in terms of Item 6 (Did you feel nervous during the lesson?) and Item 7 (Did you feel confident during the lesson?), which related to students’ psychological factors, the two items had the greatest variation among the participants. Item 6 (M=2.02, SD=0.81), regarding students’ anxiety levels, had the greatest variation among the participants. For instance, Shota (S3) experienced a high level of anxiety (M=3.40) whereas Shigeru (S8) did not (M=1.00). In terms of students’ confidence, on the other hand, Item 7 (M=2.62, SD=0.47) shows that there were less individual differences, suggesting that most learners felt relatively confident in the lesson, despite having different linguistic levels. In the group interview, some students mentioned that they felt anxious when required to speak in front of others or when they couldn’t respond to the teacher’s questions. The results suggest that students are likely to have different perceptions and needs, which should be also addressed when planning and conducting language lessons.

5.1.2. Preferences of tasks, activities, and topics

In this section, the tasks/activities in the CLIL lessons, which were perceived to be enjoyable or difficult, are mentioned. Table 4 lists the items in Section E (i.e. enjoyable tasks/activities) and Section D (i.e. difficult tasks/activities). For instance, in Lesson 1, the travel plan was perceived to be enjoyable for Shota (S3), while it was difficult for Daisuke (S1) and Akiko (S6). In Lesson 3, the foreign recipe activity was perceived to be enjoyable for Tomoki (S2) and Michiko (S4) while it was difficult for Yuriko (S5) and Shigeru (S8). There were also tasks that many of the students frequently enjoyed such as reading a text (Lessons 1, 3, 4), and food cultures (Lesson 3) or tasks that were frequently mentioned to be difficult such as writing a summary for the text (Lessons 1, 2, 3).
Table 4: Preferences of Tasks/Activities and Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>L1</strong></td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>T-plan Hawaiian cuisine</td>
<td>Scanning questions</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salmon</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L2</strong></td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Mixed Plate</td>
<td>Mixed Plate</td>
<td>Ethnic Meals</td>
<td>Graph Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Graph Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed Plate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Word-phrase hunt</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L3</strong></td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food Cultures</td>
<td>Foreign Recipe</td>
<td>Food Cultures</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Food Cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Recipe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Recipe</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Foreign Recipe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L4</strong></td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Japanese food</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scanning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Map Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L5</strong></td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Translating</td>
<td>Popular Sports</td>
<td>Athletes’</td>
<td>Favorite Sports</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quotes</td>
<td>Translating</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quotes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quotes</td>
<td>Popular Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td>Athletes’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Translating</td>
<td>Translating Quotes</td>
<td>Popular Sports</td>
<td>Quotes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quotes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Popular Sports</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L6</strong></td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class Reflection</td>
<td>Schedule for U.S.</td>
<td>Quiz</td>
<td>Schedule for U.S.</td>
<td>Quiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class Reflection</td>
<td>Schedule for U.S.</td>
<td>Quiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Manners</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule for U.S.</td>
<td>Schedule for U.S.</td>
<td>Schedule for U.S.</td>
<td>Manners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **E**: Tasks/Activities that were enjoyable  **D**: Tasks/Activities that were difficult

Furthermore, the results show that some learners perceived certain tasks and activities to be both difficult and enjoyable. For instance, in Lesson 3, Daisuke (S1) perceived the staple food activity to be difficult but enjoyable. Similarly, Shota (S3) perceived the quote translation activity in Lesson 5 to be the most difficult but enjoyable, which was similar to
Akiko’s (S6) perception of the U.S. team schedule in Lesson 6. These results suggest that students enjoyed the class even if the tasks were cognitively engaging.

In terms of students’ preferences of CLIL topics, the students ranked the six CLIL lessons from 1 (favorite) to 6 (least favorite), which are presented in Table 5. The results show that there were great individual differences in the preferences of topics. For instance, Lesson 2 (Ethnic Diversity) ranked first for Shota (S3), Akiko (S6), and Shigeru (S8); third for Tomoki (S2); fifth for Fumie (S7); and sixth for Michiko (S4). These results suggest that different learners, regardless of their language proficiency levels, prefer certain topics above others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>L2: ED</td>
<td>L3: FC</td>
<td>L4: FW</td>
<td></td>
<td>L5: AQ</td>
<td>L6: TO</td>
<td>L5: AQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>L6: TO</td>
<td>L5: AQ</td>
<td>L6: TO</td>
<td></td>
<td>L3: FC</td>
<td>L2: ED</td>
<td>L6: TO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5.2. **What content and language knowledge do multilevel students learn in CLIL classes?**

The second research question was investigated through the results of the achievement test and the Uptake Recall Chart (URC). The achievement test was administered to understand content/language knowledge that students learn in CLIL classes. The URC was used to gain a more dynamic view in the students’ learning process, students’ uptake in the CLIL classes.

5.2.1. **Results of the Achievement Test**

The overall mean scores and SD of the achievement test in Lessons 1 to 6 are shown in Table 6. The test scores were calculated for the language (10 points) and content (10 points) items, the total score being 20 points. Spelling mistakes were not penalized. Overall, Table 6 shows that the average score for language items (M=8.41) was lower than that of content items (M=9.05). The total mean score for all lessons was 17.46. In addition, it can be seen from
the table that there were greater individual differences in the language items (SD=0.86) than the content items (SD=0.59).

Table 6: *Overall Results of Achievement Test (Lessons 1-6)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Items</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Items</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, on an individual level, Table 7 shows the achievement test scores for each individual. The result shows that whether the student got higher scores for language or content differed from individual to individual. In addition, the result shows that despite the participants having different linguistic levels, there was not much difference in terms of the test scores regarding the lowest total score (M=15.40) and the highest total score (M=18.83). Moreover, learners who were perceived to have higher linguistic level, such as Yuriko (S5), who was on the level of B1-B2 level in CEFR, did not necessarily get higher scores in the CLIL achievement test than the other learners with lower linguistic abilities. Therefore, the CLIL achievement test may have been more or less difficult for all learners, regardless of their language proficiency levels, as the test required both language and content knowledge. Such results suggest the potentiality of multilevel learners to feel a sense of achievement in the CLIL lessons.

Table 7: *Individual Results of Achievement Test*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daisuke</th>
<th>Tomoki</th>
<th>Shota</th>
<th>Michiko</th>
<th>Yuriko</th>
<th>Akiko</th>
<th>Fumie</th>
<th>Shigeru</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Lg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>6/10</td>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>6/10</td>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>8/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ttl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Lg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ttl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Lg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.2 Results of the Uptake Recall Chart (URC)

Results of the URC for Lesson 1 are presented in Table 8. Items in the URC are presented in the original form written by the students, and the correct forms of some of the items are given in square brackets. In addition, instances of incidental learning, that is, items that were not initially intended to teach by the researcher are underlined. It is clear from the table that the participants seemed to uptake different language and content items, varying in quantity and quality. Data also indicates that students recalled items that had been taught both intentionally and incidentally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Language Items</th>
<th>Content Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daisuke (S1)</strong></td>
<td>-Vocabulary: self perfection, realization</td>
<td>-アロハが単なる挨拶ではなく、ハワイの人々の信仰や哲学に関する言葉であること。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Grammar: never/ever</td>
<td>-タロ、サイメン[サイミン], アサイー</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tomoki (S2)</strong></td>
<td>-andで続く場合、[カンマ]で繋げる</td>
<td>-Alohaは様々な意味の言葉で構成されている。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shota (S3)</td>
<td>-Vocabulary: wikipedia, quick, gasolin station, gasolin [gasoline] stand</td>
<td>-Aloha's meaning -ハワイの食べ物, activity, tour, 旅行スケジュール, -ハワイの成り立ち、ハワイの位置、島の数、名称</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michiko (S4)</td>
<td>-Vocabulary: sprits [spirits], love ourselves, create feeling and thought, presence, breath, philosophy[philosophy]</td>
<td>-Aloha has [a] deep meaning, Hawaii -food,..pancakes, poke, acai bowl, hamburgers[hamburgers] -peal herver [pearl harbor], activety [activity], marine sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuriko (S5)</td>
<td>-Vocabulary: inspired by, philosophy, respect, Aloha's meanings self-, spread</td>
<td>-loco moco -アロハという言葉の意味が深まった。愛ぐらいしか知らなかったが、隣人愛、哲学、尊敬と深い意味を持つ良い言葉。 -ハワイの食事、local foodsについての知識。 -ハワイの観光資源について(アクティビティ、ショッピング、sightseeing spots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akiko (S6)</td>
<td>-Vocabulary: inspired by, philosophy, respect, Aloha's meanings self-, spread</td>
<td>-about Aloha, reading the meaning, expressing Aloha -Travel plan in Hawaii -Hawaiian food and activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fumie (S7)</td>
<td>-Vocabulary: inspired by, philosophy, respect, Aloha's meanings self-, spread</td>
<td>-ハワイについて, Alohaの意味 -ハワイの食べ物, ハワイ旅行のplanning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3. What instances of incidental teaching and learning can be observed in CLIL classes?

The third research question was investigated using the achievement test and audio-recordings of the CLIL lessons. In the present study, incidental teaching and learning were investigated through items that were categorized as language through learning, that is, language that is used to support students to deeply thinking about the topic to enhance their language learning (Coyle et al., 2010). Instances of incidental learning and teaching were identified through the URC and audio-recordings of the CLIL lessons, examining the language and content knowledge that were not intended to teach by the teacher in the initial lesson plan.

5.3.1. Incidental Learning and Teaching of Language Items

Language items that were categorized as language through learning in each of the six CLIL lessons are presented in Table 9. The items were classified into vocabulary/phrases
and grammar sections. The items that were mentioned in the URC are underlined as instances of incidental learning. It shows the students who recalled the items in the URC in the parentheses. It can be noted however, that the teacher also observed many instances where the students asked and confirmed with each other for words that they could not come up with during the pair/group work, which may not have been heard in the audio-recordings.

Table 9: *Incidental Teaching and Learning of Language Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIL Lesson</th>
<th>Language Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary/Phrases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesson 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Trip to Hawaii</td>
<td>-self-enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-I want to eat both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-underwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesson 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledging Ethnic Diversity</td>
<td>-freshly-caught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-all at once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-inbound and outbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-What are others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-one-fourth [how to read fractions]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-the background of each person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Don’t force your own culture onto others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-take a while</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesson 3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Cultures Around the World</td>
<td>-fried bread with sugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-longtime favorite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-powdered milk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-frozen tangerine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-grind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-spelling of almond, cabbage, parsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-wheat/flour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-pronunciation of butter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-pronunciation of oven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Lesson 4: Food Waste in Japan | -rainy season  
-rice crackers  
-economy  
-self-sufficiency rate  
-temperature  
-climate  
-million/trillion  
-leftover  
-raise awareness  
-dominate  
-corporate endの使い方 | -another…extra… |

| Lesson 5: Athletes’ Words of Wisdom | -triathlon  
-The Imperial Palace  
-That’s my boy  
-lazy | |

| Lesson 6: 2020 Tokyo Olympics | -Paralympics  
-position of players | |

Firstly, the overall results of the six lessons indicate that there were 39 vocabulary/phrase items that were classified as language through learning, which were taught mainly through the students’ asking questions when they encountered words that they were unable to say in English. For instance, the phrase *freshly-caught* in Lesson 2 was introduced during the first task when Shigeru gave a presentation about his travel plan and wanted to find how to say *獲れたての* in English. Another example is *longtime favorite*, which came up in the task where students had a discussion about the school lunches that they had experienced in the past and wanted to know the English word for *長年愛される*.

Secondly, in terms of grammar items, there were six items that were classified as incidental learning in the lessons. The grammatical items were taught mainly through the teacher’s realization of students’ errors during the teacher-student or student-student interaction. For instance, when Shota (S3) asked, “Have you *never* eaten...?” during a pair work in Lesson 1, T decided to give a form-focused instruction in front of the whole class, mentioning that ‘ever’ is used instead of ‘never’ when asking a question about their interlocutor’s experiences. Another example is in Lesson 2, where many students forgot to put
an ‘s’ after victim in “one of the victims.” T noticed the error and decided to give a form-focused instruction to introduce that the noun after “one of the…” should be used in the plural form.

Furthermore, the results show that some of the items that were taught incidentally were also recalled in the URC. As for vocabulary items, eight out of 39 incidental vocabulary items were recalled in the URC by some of the participants. As for grammar items, five out of six incidental grammar items were recalled in the URC. Such results suggest that grammar items that were taught incidentally through a form-focused instruction were more likely to be recalled afterwards in the URC, although there were individual differences. To sum up, the results suggest that classes that incorporate the CLIL approach generate a more flexible and dynamic usage of language, which go beyond what the teacher had intended to teach the students in the original lesson plan.

5.3.2. Incidental Teaching and Learning of Content Items

Content items that were incidentally taught and learned are presented in Table 10. Overall, there were 12 instances of incidental learning regarding content items. The items came up incidentally mainly through the questions that the students asked throughout the lessons such as why there is a union jack in the Hawaii state flag (Lesson 2), what people with a vegan diet cannot eat (Lesson 4), and the American custom where restaurants provide doggy bags to take home leftover food (Lesson 4). In addition, some of the content items were taught by the students, such as Kabaddi and Muay Thai in Lesson 5, which were sports that the teacher did not know and could not explain. The student who knew the sports and their rules were asked to explain them to the other students.

Table 10: Incidental Teaching and Learning of Content Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIL Lesson</th>
<th>Content Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1: A Trip to Hawaii</td>
<td>-whether the color of poi is its original color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-A Japanese word equivalent of the word “Aloha” that is simple but contains many deep meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 2: Acknowledging Ethnic Diversity</td>
<td>-Why there is a union jack in the Hawaiian state flag (former colony of the U.K.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-concept of time differs from country to country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-what is appropriate in one country may not be the case in others (e.g. It is OK to be 30 minutes late for a party in Mexico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 3: Food Cultures</td>
<td>-powdered milk was offered in Japanese schools as school lunches over 65 years ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-tapioca can be made from cassava</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, as students differed in ages, they were able to share their different experiences, learning from one another through different tasks/activities. For instance, Akiko (S6), who worked in a company with workers from different countries, shared her experience in Lesson 6 regarding how she struggles with people who had different manners. Shigeru (S8) also shared his experience in Lesson 3 regarding what Japanese school lunches were like several years after the World War II. Such findings suggest that content knowledge were introduced and co-constructed by both the teacher and student in the CLIL lessons. To sum up, it can be said that CLIL is a dynamic teaching approach with many opportunities of incidental learning and teaching, thus providing a greater variation of content and language items, which were taught by both the teacher and the students.

6. Theory of Practice

Coyle et al. (2010) suggest the importance of language teachers to express their theory of practice, consolidating one’s knowledge and theories of learning implicitly through actual teaching. Therefore, this section interprets the results by presenting the theory of practice of the researcher, mentioning how CLIL was incorporated in a mixed-ability setting in relation to past theories, literature, and research studies. As the teacher of the mixed-ability CLIL class, I will illustrate how the lesson was planned and conducted from a teacher’s point of view.

6.1. Incorporating the CLIL Approach

The main tool used to design the CLIL lessons was the CLIL lesson framework designed by Ikeda (2016). Table 11 presents an overview of the CLIL lesson framework for all six lessons, which were incorporated in the present study. I will present how each section was
considered when planning and conducting the lessons with reference to actual tasks and activities. In addition, I will mention how the lesson procedure was considered in terms of activating, input, thinking, and production.

Table 11: **CLIL Lesson Framework (Lessons 1-6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarative knowledge</td>
<td>Language Knowledge</td>
<td>LOTS</td>
<td>Cooperative Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Lesson 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Lessons 1-6)</td>
<td>(Lessons 1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hawaiian cuisine</td>
<td>- Present perfect</td>
<td>- Remembering</td>
<td>- Pair work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- About the Aloha Spirit</td>
<td>- To infinitive</td>
<td>- Understanding</td>
<td>- Group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tourist spots and activities in Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Applying</td>
<td>- Class Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Lesson 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Peer Scaffolding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hawaiian Mixed Plate</td>
<td>- Past tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- History of the plantation</td>
<td>- Comparatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ethnic background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ms. Ariana Miyamoto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Lesson 3)</strong></td>
<td>- Passive voice</td>
<td>- Remembering</td>
<td>- Pair work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Names of staple food</td>
<td>- Auxiliary verbs</td>
<td>- Understanding</td>
<td>- Group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Names of ingredients</td>
<td>- Passive voice</td>
<td>- Applying</td>
<td>- Class Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recipes of foreign meals</td>
<td>- Auxiliary verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Peer Scaffolding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Lesson 4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Food scarcity around the world</td>
<td>- Relative clauses and pronouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Food waste in Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Lesson 5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Names of Sports</td>
<td>- Comparatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Facts about sports</td>
<td>- Superlatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Famous quotes of athletes</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Negatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Lesson 6)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Information about Sports and the Olympics</td>
<td>- Prepositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Japanese manners</td>
<td>- Should and shouldn’t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedural knowledge</th>
<th>Language Skills</th>
<th>HOTS</th>
<th>Global awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Lesson 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Lessons 1-6)</td>
<td>(Lesson 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Firstly, I began by considering the Content section by brainstorming topics that may be interesting for the students, reflecting on their interests, background knowledge, areas of expertise, hobbies, strengths, and weaknesses of each student. After deciding some possible topics that can be incorporated into the CLIL lessons, I did some research to find different texts, information, videos, graphs, statistics, stories that may be relevant to the topic to consider how they may be used as learning materials in the CLIL classes. Afterwards, the
Communication section was considered to decide how different language knowledge and skills could be incorporated using the learning materials. For instance, for Lesson 2 (Acknowledging Ethnic Diversity), to analyze and compare different graphs that showed the ethnic backgrounds of the people in Hawaii and the U.S. average, I decided to incorporate comparatives. As for Lesson 4 (Food Waste in Japan), I found a reading text about food waste in Japan, which frequently used relative pronouns and relative clauses.

In terms of the four language skills (listening, reading, speaking, and writing), opportunities to use different language skills were provided through wide-ranging tasks/activities. Firstly, listening was mainly incorporated through teacher-student and student-student interaction or watching videos. I also provided some activities focusing on listening, where students listened to the recipes of foreign meals (Lesson 3) or an interview by Kei Nishikori (Lesson 5), filling in the blanks while they listened. Furthermore, I used English as much as possible in the oral introduction or responded to students’ Japanese utterances in English. Secondly, for reading skills, I provided different types of texts that were related to the topic so that students could learn about the topic further through the reading materials. I also wrote down some of the key sentences or ideas mentioned during the discussion so that students could see the written form as well. Thirdly, for speaking skills, students were given different opportunities to express in English in different learning arrangements. I also had students become familiar in talking with smaller groups first before they were asked to report back to the whole class. Fourthly, for writing skills, students were given opportunities to write a summary of the text or write English compositions for homework about a related topic.

In addition to Content and Communication, the Cognition and Culture sections were also considered. As for Cognition, the tasks and activities were designed in such a way that both lower-order thinking skills and higher-order thinking skills were used. Lower-order thinking skills (remembering, understanding, and applying) were used mainly in the first stages of the lesson, so that the language and content knowledge could be activated and clarified for a smooth transition into the latter part of the lessons, which required deeper and critical thinking. Some of the examples of the tasks/activities in the CLIL lessons that required lower-order thinking skills include the following: videos, brainstorming, and form-focused instruction. On the other hand, higher-order thinking skills (analyzing, evaluating, creating) were used to provide cognitively engaging tasks and activities so that the learners were required to think deeply, which included some of the following: analyzing maps and graphs, discussions about ethnic diversity, food culture, food waste, and creating a travel plan.

Lastly, for the Culture section, tasks and activities that required cooperative learning and global awareness were incorporated throughout the six lessons. In terms of
cooperative learning, I had students discuss in pairs or groups first, confirming the answers before asking them to share with the whole class so that students could help each other if they had any difficulty with comprehending the language or content to encourage cooperative learning. In addition, there were some tasks such as the travel plan in Lesson 1 or the schedule for the U.S. team in Lesson 6 where the students had to work together to complete the task. In terms of global awareness, there were some topics that required students to think about different issues related to global awareness such as acknowledging ethnic diversity in Lesson 2 and food issues around the world in Lesson 4. There were also tasks/activities that required students to think about other people in foreign countries such as the discussion in Lesson 4, where they came up with a Japanese food that foreign people may like. In Lesson 6, students thought about some Japanese manners that foreign people may not know when they visit Japan.

In addition to the 4Cs of CLIL, I also considered the CLIL lesson procedure in terms of activating, input, thinking, and output. Firstly, I aimed at beginning the lessons with an activation of the students’ topical knowledge so that there may be a smooth transition into the subsequent activities, as the activating stage refers to the stage where learners become familiar with the lesson topic, enhancing motivation, producing expectations, focusing on the topic, and acknowledging individual differences (Dale, van der Es, & Tanner, 2011). In this stage, I asked students different questions, showed videos, and conducted brainstorming sessions so that the learners were able to activate their background knowledge in different ways. Secondly, for input, I aimed at incorporating multimodal input through reading texts, oral introductions, and visual aids. Thirdly, for thinking, after students have become relatively familiar with the topic, I prepared tasks/activities that were slightly more challenging, as they required deeper cognitive skills. For instance, in Lesson 2, students were asked to analyze a graph that showed the ethnic background of the population and later discuss how to cope with diversity. In Lesson 5, students were asked to create a quote based on the model quote mentioned by a famous athlete. Such tasks/activities required students to think deeply and critically think about the topic in wide-ranging ways. Fourthly, for production, there were opportunities for students to generate their opinions or ideas in both spoken and written forms. For instance, in Lesson 1, students created a travel plan in groups to write down what they wish to do in Hawaii, later presenting their travel plan to the whole class.

In summary, different types of procedure and learning arrangements were incorporated in the lessons so that students were able to learn in a more dynamic way. This was made possible by the flexibility of the CLIL approach to teaching, which allows for rich
selection of tasks and activities and greater creativity in task designing and implementation, which would not be possible in such teacher-centered and grammar-oriented methods as GTM classes, where students typically spend their class time reading texts, translating sentences, analyzing grammar, and engaging in mechanical practice for the supposed purpose of consolidating learned knowledge.

6.2. Issues Surrounding Mixed-ability Classes

The students in the present study differed greatly in their age, language proficiency, educational background, goals, occupation, interests, anxiety levels, strengths and weaknesses. Taking such a diverse classroom situation into consideration, I adopted the CLIL approach instead of the Grammar Translation Method, which is designed for “an ideal homogeneous class” (Santhi, 2011, p.3), where students with greater language knowledge are more likely to get the correct answers. In addition, as the classes were not ability-based, as a teacher, I was not conscious about the language level of the class while teaching, which often happens in an ability-based class, where teachers send students in the lower classes a “downward spiral of low achievement and low expectations” (Dörnyei, 2001, p.35). Instead, as the students differed in wide-ranging aspects, I focused more on their strengths, interests, ideas, and experiences, which could be shared in the classroom through different tasks and activities. For these reasons, it can be said that incorporating the CLIL approach in mixed-ability classes is a better way to cope with learners with diverse backgrounds, strengths, and weaknesses than teaching in traditional teaching approaches or streaming students based on their language proficiency.

7. Pedagogical Implications

Based on these results obtained in the current study, some pedagogical implications can be suggested. First and foremost, CLIL is an appropriate teaching approach for mixed-ability classes, as it was incorporated in a highly diverse setting, where students differed greatly in age and background knowledge. It can be said that such classroom situations to be better than simply streaming students according to their language proficiency. Another implication is that CLIL may be a more flexible approach compared to the GTM or other traditional approaches, as multilevel students were able to gain a positive impression as well as a sense of achievement in the CLIL classes. In addition, the notion of an ‘advanced’ learner seemed to be more dynamic, as different students seemed to do better depending on the tasks/activities. Furthermore, the findings may well suggest that instead of focusing on students’ achievement of language knowledge (e.g. vocabulary and grammar), which is often
emphasized in many of the tests in Japanese schools, a more dynamic assessment of students’ content and language knowledge is necessary to satisfy the intellectual demands of wide-ranging learners in this globalizing society.
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Appendixes

**Student Profile Questionnaire**

Name お名前: ________________________________

Age 年齢 (当てはまるものに☑を付けてください)

☐ 10代 ☐ 20代 ☐ 30代 ☐ 40代 ☐ 50代 ☐ 60代 ☐ 70代 以上

English-learning Experience 英語の学習歴について

1. When did you start learning English? (e.g. from junior high school)

   英語はいつ頃から学び始めましたか。（例: 中学から）
2. Where did you learn English? (e.g. in English classes at school, at conversation schools)
どちらで英語を学習しましたか。(例: 学校の英語の授業、英会話学校、海外)

3. For those who have lived abroad for more than three months: Where did you live? For how long? (e.g. America, two years)
海外で3ヶ月以上暮らしたことのある方のみ:
滞在国・滞在期間をご記入ください。(例: アメリカ、2年)

English Use in Daily Life 日常の英語使用について
4. How many hours a week do you use English in daily life?
1週間に何時間程度英語を使用していますか。

_________ hours (時間)

English Proficiency Level 英語能力について
5. If you have taken any type of English proficiency test (e.g. TOEIC, TOEFL, Eiken), please indicate your highest score or grade. (e.g. TOEIC 550; Eiken Grade 2)
TOEIC、TOEFL、英検等の英語の能力を測る試験を受けたことがある場合はその点数または合格した級をご記入ください。(例: TOEIC 550点; Eiken 2級)

_________________

6. When did you take the English proficiency test? こちらの英語能力試験はいつ受けられましたか。

_________________

7. Please indicate which English level you think you are currently at based on the CEFR table shown below (e.g. A2 level) 現在のご自身の英語レベルに最も近いと思われるレベルを表から選び、ご記入ください。(例: A2)
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Post-class Questionnaire

Name: ___________________________

こちらのアンケートでは選択式・自由記述の設問が含まれます。選択式の質問ではもっとも当てはまる番号をそれぞれ1〜4の中から選び、ご記入ください。

1: No（そう思わない）
2: No, to some extent（あまりそう思わない）
3: Yes, to some extent（ややそう思う）
4: Yes（そう思う）

Overall Impression授業全体の印象
1. Did you enjoy the lesson?授業は楽しめましたか。
   ______
2. Was the topic interesting for you?トピックは面白かったですか。
   ______
3. Are you satisfied with the class?授業に満足しましたか。
   ______

Difficulty of the class授業の難易度
4. Was the English used in the class difficult for you in general?授業で使われていた英語は全体的に難しかったですか。

Source: https://www.fourskills.jp/cefr

CEFR: _________
5. Was the content (topic) of the class difficult for you?
授業のトピックは難しかったですか。

6. Did you feel nervous during the class?
授業中に緊張しましたか。

7. Did you feel confident using English?
英語を自信を持って使えましたか。

- Understanding of English and Topic 英語やテーマへの理解
8. How much of the English did you understand in the lesson? (Percentage)
   _________%

9. How much of the topic did you understand of the lesson? (Percentage)
   _________%

- Tasks/Activities タスク/アクティビティについて
10. Which task/activity did you enjoy or find interesting?
   どのタスク/アクティビティが楽しかったですか。

11. Which task/activity did you find difficult?
   どのタスク/アクティビティが難しかったですか。

- Reflection of all the lessons 全体の振り返り (After Lesson 6 only)
12. 6つのCLILレッスンのうち、総合評価（楽しさ、印象、満足度）の高い順に隣の空欄に1〜6の番号を書いてください。ご欠席された回にはXをお書きください。
   (1→最も高い評価  6→低い評価)
   ① Lesson 1: A Trip to Hawaii (ハワイ旅行プラン)  _______
   ② Lesson 2: Ethnic Diversity (人種の多様性)  _______
   ③ Lesson 3: Food Cultures Around the World (世界の食文化)  _______
   ④ Lesson 4: Food Waste in Japan (日本の食料廃棄)  _______
   ⑤ Lesson 5: Athletes’ Words of Wisdom (スポーツ選手の名言)  _______
   ⑥ Lesson 6: 2020 Tokyo Olympics (2020年東京五輪)  _______

ご協力ありがとうございました！
Uptake Recall Chart (アップテイク・リコール・チャート)

Name: _____________________ Date: ________________

Instructions: What do you remember in today’s lesson? Please answer fully and in detail without looking at anything. 本日の授業で覚えている事項を可能な限り具体的にお書きください。感想を書く必要はございません。

Language (grammar, spelling, pronunciation, punctuation, ways of using the language, words and phrases) 言語について (文法事項・つづり・発音・句読点の使い方・言葉の使い方・語句・表現):

Content (knowledge and information about the topic): 内容について (テーマについての知識や情報):

Interview Guide

Educational Background/English-learning Experience

・ What types of English classes did you experience as a JHS/SHS/university student?

・ Have you ever experienced classrooms that were content or topic-based?

・ Have you studied at a university? If so, what was your major in university?

・ Why did you choose to take the course?

・ What is your current goal in learning English?

Psychological factors

・ In what situations did you feel nervous in using English?

・ In what situations did you feel confident in using English?

・ Has your nervousness/confidence in using English change in any way?
Students’ Perceptions of CLIL classes

· How did you feel about the CLIL classes?

· Did you learn anything through the classes? If so, what?

· Do you have any further thoughts or comments about the classes?
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The Effects of Output-Based Focus on Form on Japanese EFL Learners’ Implicit Knowledge Development through a Text-Reconstruction Story-Retelling Task

Kiyotaka Suga
Michigan State University

In the ASTE meeting, I presented a study of my MA thesis, which investigated the effects of a text-reconstruction output task termed Story-retelling (SR) on Japanese EFL learners’ implicit knowledge development. The first half of the presentation, I introduced (1) the terms focus on form (FonF), focus on forms (FonFs), and focus on meaning (FonM); (2) cognitive rationales for producing output on L2 learning; (3) the importance of using relatively separate measures of implicit/explicit L2 knowledge in quasi-experimental studies; and (4) the potential moderating effects depending on the type of target linguistic forms (i.e., three different types of English relative clauses). In this Newsletter, I will briefly describe the background of the study, the experimental design, results, discussions, and further research questions based on the findings and the limitations of the research project.
Background of the Study

Focus on Form (FonF) in L2 Classrooms

One of the most crucial questions for many second language (L2) teachers and researchers is to identify optimal learning conditions in L2 classrooms (Loewen, 2013). Previous Instructed Second Language Acquisition (ISLA) studies have shown that it is crucial to integrate the emphasis on both form and meaning of the language in L2 instruction (Doughty & Williams, 1998; Long, 1991). Although a strong instructional emphasis has been placed either on form or meaning through explicit grammar-oriented instruction (i.e., focus on forms [FonFS]) or meaning-oriented communicative instruction (i.e, focus on meaning [FonM]), respectively, these two dominant instructional approaches failed to develop L2 learners’ balanced proficiency in terms of fluency, accuracy, and versatility of their language use. To overcome the long-standing challenges of L2 instruction, Long (1991) introduced a new instructional approach termed focus on form (FonF), which aims to draw L2 learners’ attention to certain linguistic forms within meaning-oriented L2 classrooms. The joint processing of form and meaning promoted by FonF has been claimed to facilitate multiple cognitive processes for L2 acquisition, such as noticing, form-meaning mapping, hypothesis testing, and integration of knowledge (Doughty, 2001; Gass, 1997; Izumi, 2013; Schmidt, 2001).

The Roles of Output in L2 Learning

Output-based FonF is one of the important instructional options to direct learners’ attention to target linguistic forms. Previous Instructed SLA studies has shown that meaningful output produced by L2 learners plays crucial roles to learner noticing in subsequent input and then eventually develop learners’ interlanguage (e.g., de Bot, 1996; Izumi, 2002, 2003a; Muranoi, 2007b; Swain, 2005). According to Swain (1995, 2005), the effect of output practice does not end at enhancing development of better L2 productive ability because it reverberates in facilitating cognitive processes that take place during subsequent input and comprehension processing (Gass, 1997; see Swain, 2005 for four functions of output in L2 learning). When L2 learners, for instance, have difficulty in conveying their opinions in their output, they may notice a gap between what they want to say and what they can say.
(i.e., noticing the gap) and they henceforth become more attentive during subsequent input processing to look for what they needed in the previous production episode. Thus, engaging L2 learners in output practice creates an opportunity to notice the gap between their own linguistic resources and the ambient communicative need, which subsequently leads to noticing to enhance acquisition of target linguistic features (see Izumi, 2013 for a neat summary of different types of ‘noticing’).

**Story-Retelling (SR) Task**

Out of a range of options for output-based FonF, a text reconstruction task has been conducted by many L2 teachers and can be easily incorporated into classroom instruction without requiring them to make any drastic pedagogical readjustments. Muranoi (2007a) claims that “having learners reconstruct a text (story) that they have comprehended is one of the most effective instructional techniques that elicit learner output and eventually promote L2 learning” (p. 67). Muranoi (2006, 2007b) introduced a story-retelling (SR) task, which is a type of text-reconstruction task in which learners are asked to reconstruct a text that they have comprehended using a concept map. The concept map is a type of lexical representation which indirectly guides learners to use specific target-linguistic forms. Contrary to the dictogloss task (see Kowal & Swain, 1994; Swain, 1998; Swain & Lapkin, 1995), the first comprehension phase of the SR task does not involve listening and learners’ self-notetaking. Since L2 learners tend to primary focus on lexical elements while engaging in production tasks (Swain & Lapkin, 1995; Hanaoka, 2007; Hanaoka & Izumi, 2012; Uggen, 2012), providing the lexical items using a concept map in the SR task reduces the cognitive load for retrieving these lexical items and enables learners to direct their attention to the target-grammatical forms more systematically, and guides them to use these forms during the retelling than does the dictogloss task, which often fails to direct learners’ attention to specific target-grammatical forms. Furthermore, the use of the concept map enables learners to engage in automatizing their processes for grammatical encoding, phonological encoding, and articulation, all of which are not automatic processes for L2 learners and requires systematic and deliberate practice to automatize these processes (see Levelt, 1989; Izumi, 2003a for detailed descriptions of speech production processes).
Based on these cognitive rationales for the SR task, Muranoi (2007b) tested the beneficial effects of the SR task on L2 learning in his quasi-experimental study. The results of the study revealed that FFGS had a positive effect on learners’ accuracy development in the use of English perfect passive and the effects of the task held over two months. He attributed these positive effects of FFGS to the facilitative roles of output on learners’ cognitive processes of L2 acquisition, such as output-induced-noticing, comparing, and hypothesis formulation and testing (see Gass, 1997 for detailed description on the cognitive processes of L2 acquisition form input to output). The impacts of output through a text-reconstruction task were also investigated in a series of research by Izumi and his colleagues (Izumi, 2000, 2002a; Izumi & Bigelow, 2000; Izumi, Bigelow, Fujiwara, & Fearnow, 1999) and other replication studies (e.g., Leeser, 2008; Li, Ellis, & Zhu, 2016; Li & He, 2017; Russell, 2014; Shintani, 2019; Song & Suh, 2008; Uggen, 2012).

**Measuring the Effects of FonF in ISLA Studies**

Although numerous previous studies have reported positive effects of output on L2 noticing and learning, one of the long-standing challenges of effect-of-L2-instruction studies is to examine how producing output contributes to the development of different types of knowledge (i.e., implicit and explicit knowledge) (Doughty, 2003, 2004; Ellis, 2005, 2015a). While explicit knowledge is the type of knowledge that is consciously available to learners when they have enough time for controlled processing (Ellis, 2005; Ellis, Loewen, Elder, Erlam, Philp & Reiders, 2009), implicit knowledge is not consciously available but can be used intuitively and automatically in real communication without conscious awareness (Ellis, 2005; Loewen, 2015). Because of the obvious advantage of implicit knowledge in real communication, Ellis (2015b) claimed that the prime goal of L2 instruction should be developing learners’ implicit knowledge. Therefore, it is crucial to address the measuring issue on different types of L2 knowledge through empirical studies that employ a type of measurement that can accurately assess L2 learners’ implicit knowledge development (Doughty, 2003, 2004). To address this issue, the present study used an oral elicited imitation (OEI) test as measure of implicit knowledge and untimed picture-cured fill-in-the-blank (FITB) test as a measure of explicit knowledge (see Ellis, 2005; Ellis et al, 2009; Bowles, 2011,
Kim & Nam, 2017; Spada, Shiu, & Tomita, 2015 for test-validation studies of relatively separate measures of implicit and explicit knowledge, also see Ellis, 2015a; Ellis & Roever, 2018; Isbell, in press; Rebuschat, 2013 for a methodological reviews).

**Issues on Grammatical Complexity and L2 Instruction**

Another long-standing question in Instructed SLA is whether the effects of particular FFI are mediated differently by different types of linguistic forms (e.g., de Graaff, 1997; DeKeyser, 1998; DeKeyser, 2005, 2016; Ellis, 2006; Housen, Pierrard & Van Daele, 2005; Teixeira, 2019; Spada & Tomita, 2010; Williams & Evans, 1998). Although previous studies examined the interaction between types of FFI and types of grammatical features, the answer for this question is still unclear, showing mixed results. The primary reason for the mixed results is that different studies used different definitions and operationalizations to categorize various types of linguistic forms, primarily focusing on the complexity (i.e., simple or complex) or the difficulty (i.e., easy or difficult) of linguistic features (see de Graaff & Housen, 2009; DeKeyser, 2005; 2006; Spada, 2011 for detailed discussions on this issue). To address the issue of differential effects of L2 instruction on L2 learning of complex and less complex forms, the study determined the complexity based on the predictions made by Keenan and Comrie’s (1977) Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy (NPAH), Kuno’s (1974) Perceptual Difficulty Hypothesis (PDH), and the empirical findings of Izumi (2003b).

Motivated by the findings and limitations of the previous ISLA studies, the present study explored whether the SR task conducted in the framework of output-based FonF has positive effects on Japanese EFL learners’ implicit knowledge development on English relative clauses using a type of test that can accurately measure learners’ implicit knowledge development. To explore the possible advantages and limitations of both output-based FonF and explanation-based FonFs, the effects of the SR task were also compared with the provision of explicit grammar explanation. Finally, the effects of these two types of form-focused instruction (the SR task and the provision of explicit grammar explanation) were investigated in relation to the degree of the typological complexity of three types of relative clauses (i.e., RC[SU], RC[DO], and RC[OPREP]).
Research Questions

1. Does Story-Retelling (SR) make a unique contribution to developing Japanese EFL learners' implicit/explicit knowledge when it is compared with the provision of explicit grammar explanation?

2. Do the SR and explicit grammar explanation have differential effects on the development of Japanese EFL learners’ implicit/explicit knowledge depending on the complexity of the target linguistic forms: RC (SU), RC (DO), and RC (OPREP)?

Method

Participants

The participants of the study were 33 Japanese EFL university students majoring in foreign language studies at a private university in Tokyo. Their English proficiency levels were intermediate, ranging between 575 to 850 on the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC), $M = 712.27$, $SD = 73.71$. The participants were equally distributed to the three instructional groups based on their TOEIC score (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1. Experimental and instructional design](image-url)
**Target Forms**

The impact of the instructional interventions was tested on the learners’ L2 knowledge development for the three types of English restrictive relative clauses (RCs): RC subject-type (SU), RC direct-object-type (DO), and RC object of preposition-type (OPREP). According to the NPAH, RC (SU) is predicted to be the least marked (or complex) form and RC (OPREP) is the most marked (complex) type of RCs.

**Instructional Treatments**

In the instructional treatments, three treatment sessions were conducted (see Figure 1 for the overall research design). Each instructional session consisted of two phases: the meaning-focused instruction and the form-focused instruction phases. During the first phase of the instructional treatment, all three groups received the same meaning-focused instruction: (1) an oral introduction, in which the instructor provided background information of the reading passages, and (2) a reading comprehension, in which the learners were asked to read a passage with vocabulary glosses. After the first meaning-focused instruction phase, each experimental group received a different form-focused instruction during the task phase (either the SR task, the explicit grammar explanation (EGE), or exposure only input). These instructional conditions were summarized in the followings:

**Story-Retelling Task (Experimental Group 1, SR Group).** The participants of the SR group were instructed to engage in the SR task twice using a concept map (a schematic representation of keywords and phrases), which was aimed to indirectly guide learners to use the target-linguistic forms while reconstructing the text. During the first and second trials of reconstructing the text, the learners were not allowed to access the original text. After performing the SR task each time, the participants were asked to read the original passage again. This input processing phase after the SR performance aimed to facilitate learners’ subsequent output-induced noticing and cognitive comparisons.

**Explicit Grammar Explanation (Experimental Group 2, EGE Group).** The EGE group also went through the same instructional procedures until the task phase. After the comprehension phase, the EGE group received explicit grammar explanations on the target-linguistics forms in their first language (Japanese) using example sentences of RCs used in
the reading passage. Since the SR group engaged in SR twice in the task phase, the explicit instruction group was also provided the explanation twice.

**Exposure Only Comparison Group (Experimental Group 3, Comparison Group).** The comparison group only read the passage twice in the task phase without engaging in any additional form-focused task as did the other two experimental groups.

**Testing Instruments**

The effects of the treatment were measured in three testing phases (pretest, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest) using two different types of measuring instrument: an OEI test, whose requirement of online production and the time pressure encourages the participants to use their implicit knowledge (Ellis, 2005; Erlam, 2006, 2009) and an untimed fill-in-the-blank (FITB) test, which allows learners to access their explicit knowledge with their conscious monitoring. For both tests, 24 items were created and each eight items were created for each of the three types of RCs: SU, DO, and OPREP.

The OEI test was administered in the following procedures: (1) the learners listened to each statement; (2) the learners were asked to decide whether the statement was true, false, or whether they were not sure in four seconds; (3) after judging the content of each statement according to their beliefs, the learners were asked to quickly repeat the statement as accurately as possible in ten seconds (see Erlam et al., 2016 for detailed explanation on creating and administering an OEI test).

In the FITB Test, learners were provided with Japanese translation sentences and some vocabulary glosses for difficult words to fill the blanks. In each test-sentence, an antecedent and the whole modifying clause of RC were blanked.

**Analysis**

The results from the two types of tests (the OEI and Untimed FITB tests) were analyzed quantitatively using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics of all the data from the pretest and the two posttests were first examined. Then, after checking required assumptions, the data were submitted to mixed-design analyses of variance (ANOVAs) using one between-subjects (Group) and one within-subjects (Time) factors. The
between-subject factor (Group) had three levels: the SR group, the EGE group and the exposure only control group, and the within-subject factor (Time) also had three levels: Pretest, Immediate Posttest, and Delayed Posttest.

Results

Results of the Oral Elicited Imitation (OEI) Test

Table 1 summarizes the descriptive results of each group’s OEI test-performances. Visual counterparts of the descriptive results are presented in Figure 2 as boxplots. Each group’s gain scores are also summarized in Table 2 and Figure 3.

To explore the general tendency of the results and to supplement the interpretation of the descriptive results, a mixed-design ANOVA was performed to compare the group means across the three testing phases. Contrary to the original hypothesis, results of the mixed-design ANOVA revealed that a main effect for Time (Pretest, Immediate posttest, and Delayed posttest), $F(2, 58) = 566.48, p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.13$, whereas the effect for Group (SR, EGE, and CG), $F(2, 29) = 0.03, p = .97, \eta^2 = 0.002$, and the interaction between Group and Time, $F(4, 58) = 1.25, p = .29, \eta^2 = 0.007$, did not show any significant results.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the results of the OEI test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Mdn</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>95% CIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>[4.10, 11.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest1</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>[8.61, 15.39]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest2</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>[9.86, 16.68]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGE</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>[4.21, 10.79]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest1</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>[6.88, 14.92]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest2</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>[9.88, 17.32]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>[4.40, 11.96]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest1</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>[6.59, 13.95]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest2</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>[8.96, 15.94]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Gain scores on the OEI test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Mdn</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>95% CIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR-Gain</td>
<td>Posttest1</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>[2.65, 6.25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest2</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>[3.78, 7.66]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGE-Gain</td>
<td>Posttest1</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>[1.87, 4.93]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest2</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>[4.49, 7.71]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG-Gain</td>
<td>Posttest1</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>[0.56, 3.62]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest2</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>[2.31, 6.23]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Boxplots for the three groups’ test performances on the OEI test

Figure 3. Boxplots for the gain scores on the OEI test
Results of the Fill-in-the-Blank (FITB) Test

Descriptive statistics from the test scores by each instructional group are summarized in Table 3. The gain scores of each group are presented in Table 4.

The visual counterparts of the results are shown as boxplots (see Figure 4 and 5).

Results of the mixed-design ANOVA revealed that there was a significant main effect for Time, $F(2, 60) = 40.16, p < .001, \eta^2 = 0.15$, and an interaction effect between Group and Time, $F(2, 60) = 2.96, p = .03, \eta^2 = 0.02$, but there was no significant effect for Group, $F(2, 30) = 0.03, p = .97, \eta^2 = 0.002$. To specify where exactly the differences were across the three testing phases and among the groups, a series of post-hoc pair-wise $t$ tests were conducted. The follow-up comparisons revealed statistically significant differences and the large effect sizes on the gain scores between the EGE group and the exposure only comparison group.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics for the results of the FITB test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$Mdn$</th>
<th>$Min$</th>
<th>$Max$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>95% CIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>[12.93, 18.53]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest1</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>[16.67, 20.23]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest2</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>[18.09, 21.19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGE</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>[10.62, 16.66]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest1</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>[16.44, 21.38]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest2</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>[17.79, 22.21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>[12.28, 19.72]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest1</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>[14.24, 21.58]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest2</td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>[15.90, 21.38]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Gain scores on the FITB test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$Mdn$</th>
<th>$Min$</th>
<th>$Max$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>95% CIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR-Gain</td>
<td>Posttest1</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>[1.10, 4.36]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest2</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>[1.80, 6.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGE-Gain</td>
<td>Posttest1</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>[3.41, 7.13]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of the OEI Test on Each RC Type

Results of the OEI test on each RC type also showed higher scores at the posttest sessions by the two experimental groups (SR and EGE) than by the comparison group (see Figure 6). Concerning the gains scores on each RC type (see Figure 7), both experimental groups (SR and EGE) seemed to be equally more advantageous on their performances on the least marked form (i.e., SU) than the comparison group. However, the differences between the
experimental groups and the comparison group was not observed on more marked forms (DO, OPREP).

Figure 6. Boxplots for the results on the OEI test on each of the three RC type

Figure 7. Boxplots for the gain scores on the OEI test on each of the three RC types

Results of the FITB Test on Each RC Type

Figure 8 shows the results of the FITB test on each RC type (SU, DO, and OPREP). As indicated by the mean scores, both experimental groups (SR and EGE) generally showed higher performances on their posttests compared to the comparison group. The results of the
gains scores on the FITB test also showed similar tendencies observed in Figure 8: both experimental groups (SR and EGE) gained higher scores than the comparison group based on the descriptive statistics (see Figure 9). One interesting tendency was that, especially on the most marked type of RC (i.e., OPREP), providing explicit grammar explanation seemed more advantageous than the other instructional conditions as indicated by the EGE group’s gain scores on OPREP, which was quite contrary to the results of the OEI test.

*Figure 8. Boxplots for the results on the FITB test on each of the three RC types*


Discussion and Conclusions

Effects of SR and Explicit Explanation on Learners’ Implicit Knowledge Development

Contrary to the original expectations, the SR group failed to outperform either of the other two instructional groups (the EGE group and the comparison groups) across the three testing sessions of the OEI test. As shown in the results of the OEI test, the results of the mixed-design ANOVA only showed a significant main effect for Time but not for Group and Interaction between Time and Group. In other words, all the instructional groups improved their test performances from the pretest to the posttests regardless of their instructional conditions. Therefore, the SR treatment did not make unique contribution to the development of the learners’ implicit knowledge compared to the other instructional groups (the EGE group and the comparison group).

A careful re-examination of the detailed research design and the procedures of the OEI test revealed an important methodological recommendation and agenda for future research. Considering the potential practice effect of the OEI test indicated by the gains made by all the instructional groups including the exposure only comparison group, the results of the present study indicated the importance of including a test-only comparison group in the research.
design of effect-of-L2-instruction studies. Also, it is valuable to explore to what extent the OEI test has its test-learning effects if the test is used repeatedly in a quasi-experimental study.

**Effects of SR and Explicit Explanation on Learners’ Explicit Knowledge Development**

In contrast to the results of the OEI test, the mixed design ANOVA test on the results of the FITB test indicated a significant interaction effect between Group and Time. The post-hoc comparisons on the gain scores revealed statistically significant differences between the EGE group and the comparison group in both posttests. Particularly, it is interesting to note that the gains made by the EGE group in the FITB test were apparent right after the instructional sessions, whereas the EGE group’s immediate gains made in the OEI test were not as much evident as the gains in the FITB test.

From this finding, it can be claimed that providing explicit grammar explanation is a very effective instructional option to introduce form-focused instruction and has strong immediate impacts on the learning of RCs, especially when the goal of the instruction is to develop L2 learners’ explicit knowledge. According to the results shown in the present study, this is one of the most evident strengths of providing explicit grammar explanation compared to the other instructional conditions.

**Effects of Different Complexity of the RC Types**

As shown by the results of both OEI and FITB tests, the learners’ test-performances on the marked OPREP were lower than the other less-marked RC types (SU and DO). Comparing the results of the OEI test and the FITB test, the influence by the complexity (or markedness) of the RC types was evident in the OEI test. The results of the learners’ test-performances on each RC type in both tests supported the predictions made by the previous studies on the degree of difficulty and markedness (Doughty, 1990; Izumi, 2003b; Keenan and Cormrie, 1977); thereby, it can be claimed that the marked OPREP was more difficult than less marked SU and DO.

Depending on the degree of complexity and difficulty of the RC types, effects of instruction also appeared to be affected. In the FITB test, both SR and EGE groups showed statistically significant improvement from the pretest to the delayed posttest on the less
marked RC types (SU and DO), whereas only the EGE group showed clear gains on more marked OPREP in the FITB test. As indicated by the significant gain-scores in the FITB test, providing explicit grammar instruction was found to be beneficial on the learning of all RC types regardless of the different complexity of the RC types.

It must be noted that this study was limited by several important methodological problems that need to be considered in future research. First of all, the major limitation was the small sample size (n=33, 10-11 for each instructional conditions). Due to the small sample size for each group, it was very difficult to make convincing arguments with quantitative results. Another major limitation of the study was the lack of the test-only control group in the research design; thereby it became impossible to identify whether their gains could be attributed to the input that they were exposed to in the treatment sessions or a possible test-practice effects caused by taking the OEI and FITB tests multiple times (or a combination of both). Therefore, in future research, especially in the type of research that uses the OEI test, including a test-only comparison group is crucial.

Last but not the least, the present study focused primarily on the product of L2 learning and instruction (i.e., product-oriented research) rather than the processes of learning (i.e., process-oriented research). Therefore, it is valuable to closely examine how L2 output promotes acquisition of L2 grammar by combining the result of a product-oriented research design with a process-oriented research design (de Graaff & Housen, 2009; Hanaoka & Izumi, in press).
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1. **Overview:** ‘Doing nothing’ or abandonment

   This paper is a review summary of my presentation at ASTE meeting No.220 in October 2019. It discusses the issue of test-takers’ abandonment or low performance in language tests with a special focus on writing. The presenter contends that such a test performance is a qualitatively unique phenomenon, not simply a null product on the linear scale of performance, and proposes a new scale in understanding the requirement for second language learners’ development: psychological factor called ‘willingness to participate’ in addition to the two already know scales, ie., language complexity and topic range. Analyses of two instances of MEXT survey suggest that the solution would be approached by providing sufficient
learning opportunities for such practices as prescribed by MEXT’s new Guideline: critical thinking, evaluation, and self-expression （「思考力」・「判断力」・「表現力」）(MEXT, 2017a). Finally we conclude by introducing a questionnaire survey which revealed that active commitment in the daily study would help overcome the psychological demand.

2. Analysis of survey 1: Problem and proposal

A series of annual MEXT Survey on English Proficiency (英語力調査事業) conducted from 2012 to 2017 against approximately 60,000 third-year junior high school students revealed a puzzling anomaly in the test-takers’ performance in writing (Fig.1) (MEXT, 2017b).

Unlike other three skills the writing section exhibited a lump of zero-scorers who amounted to about 11% to 16% of the entire test-takers. Of the two writing tasks Question 2 (semi-structured writing) was, strictly speaking, proved unfair because the test was conducted about 4-6 months before the topic of structured writing in multiple paragraphs was formally
introduced in most textbooks. In a detailed analysis the performance of the same question by national junior high school students did not present any cluster of zero and low scorers, suggesting that the test tasks were within a manageable range of difficulty. A tentative solution for explaining this phenomenon is to introduce a psychological factor which either drives forward or blocks the performance in production (Fig.2).

![Fig.2: Model of three-dimensional target language development]

‘Willingness to participate’, as the presenter calls it, represents the degree of learner commitment in the given task: the higher proficiency the learner achieves, the greater involvement and adaptability to the task is required. Since the national school students cleared this task without much difficulty, one cause of the psychological demand might be exposure frequency: the national school students had studied semi-structured writing at least more frequently than the public school students, the result being the task appearing familiar and easy to deal with.

3. Related literature: What is relevant?

Somewhat related to this core idea are two disciplines: willingness to communicate and communication strategy. Willingness to communicate is a complex interaction of individual
variables (personality, confidence, familiarity, knowledge, proficiency, belief), environment (interlocutor, audience size), and language tasks (MacIntyre, Dörnyei, Clément, and Noels, 1998; Cao & Philp, 2006; MacIntyre & Legatto, 2011; Cao, 2013; Peng, 2014). It even includes anomia, introversion, and low-self esteem in early definitions (Burgoon, 1976). In any definition, willingness to communicate refers to a chronic and static trait that stays constant across individual tasks. It fails to capture the instantaneous nature of the tactics that the test-taker adopts upon specific tasks.

On the other hand, communication strategy appears to be a broad idea in terms of learner strategy. It should cover abandonment as a special case, but the research interest so far has been focused on how learners manage to overcome communication difficulties. Further, Pit Corder’s classical schema (1983 in Færch & Kasper, p.19) refers only to implementation of positive strategies. If we were allowed to elaborate his model we would need to add a route of whether the learner undertakes the given task or not at the outset. The question, then, is what discourages the learner to cope with the task.

4. Analysis of survey 2: The core problem

Earlier in 2015 MEXT had conducted another survey on guideline implementation (学習指導要領実施状況調査) 1. The participants were 4701 third-year senior high school students. They were asked to take a written test (reading and writing) which reflected the communicative ideology of the MEXT Guideline, as well as to answer a questionnaire on how they manage learning English. The test items consisted of eight major themes: (1) stress for discourse focus, (2) inference in reading, (3) contextualised reconstruction, (4) reading comprehension from data and text, (5) text completion, (6) guided writing, (7) word reordering, and (8) discourse connectors.

A simple distribution of the total scores revealed two peaks: one at around 4 points and another roughly around 18 points out of 24 points. A principal component analysis yielded a strong primary component, but the distribution of factor scores was tortured as if the upper score group (9 points and over in blue) and lower score group (8 points and under in red) were artificially merged.
A three-factor analysis clearly classified the test items into three categories:

**Factor 1**: Passive knowledge and static skills

**Factor 2**: Contextual inference, integrative information processing, and self-expression based on evaluation and judgement

**Factor 3**: Discourse comprehension and performance

The distribution of factor scores (sum of individual product of factor loading and actual response) of Factor 1 indicates a marked twin peak (Fig.3 centre) while that of Factor 2 exhibits a single peak (Fig.3 right). The dark area represents the students of the lower half of the total score (ie., below the median). While the upper half students can flourish with Factor 1, the lower half students are severely affected by the lack of Factor 2 scores.

![Fig.3: Distribution of total scores, Factor 1, and Factor 2](image)

Coming back to the issue of low performance in writing tasks, the average factor score of Factor 2 was significantly lower among abandoned responses (sentence length=0) than attempted responses (sentence length>0) ($t=1.991, p=0.047, df=4699$), while that of Factor 1 was significantly higher among abandoned responses than attempted responses ($t=2.076, p=0.038, df=4699$). In other words, it was the shortage of Factor 2 skills (inference, integration, evaluation, and judgement) that led to the abandonment of the task.
5. **Summary and discussion:** Towards the solution

We started this paper by observing the fact of task abandonment or low performance. The writing tasks in the two MEXT Surveys appear to be too demanding for public school students. As long as the test keeps its quality by reflecting MEXT’s Guideline, the low performance will remain a warning sign to the teaching practise in the classroom. The students are supposed to acquire not simply local context-free knowledge and skills but ability to handle discourse and active commitment in reception as well as production. Factors 1 and 2 are considered two independent aspects of this ability description. The twin-peak phenomenon may be a reflection of whether the students have achieved this ability or not yet. One possible solution might be frequency; it is considered highly likely that the more opportunities of organisation practice the less demanding the task becomes.

We now turn to the question of what it means to have Factor 2 abilities. The MEXT Survey on Guideline Implementation was conducted along with a student questionnaire on study behaviour/belief. Table 1 is a list of significant behaviour/belief which affected Factor 2.

[Table 1: Study behaviour affecting Factor 2]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Behaviour/belief</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>t ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QSG1-2</td>
<td>平日の学校外勉強時間</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSE2-03</td>
<td>「コミュニ 1」の授業はよく分かった。</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSE7-02</td>
<td>□ 読む際に概要や要点を捉えるようにしている。</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSE6-14</td>
<td>□ 英語を活かした仕事をしたい。</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSG3-11</td>
<td>□ 文化祭は自分の成長に有意味である。</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSG1-4-09</td>
<td>□ 自分の考えを根拠と共に書く。</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSE6-08</td>
<td>英語学習で国際的視野を広げられる。</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSE4-4-b{2no-z&amp;1yes}</td>
<td>□ 自分の考えを英語で書くのが好き。</td>
<td>14.842</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSE8-10_02{A0-A1}</td>
<td>GTECを受験したことがある。</td>
<td>13.980</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSE8-10_05{A0-A1}</td>
<td>TOEFL/TOEICを受験したことがある。</td>
<td>7.185</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSE8-08_01{A0-A1}</td>
<td>□ 英語力向上のため英語の新聞・書籍を読んでいる。</td>
<td>6.315</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here, the items with ‘□’ represent behaviour/belief which involves active participation rather than passive reception. There are more such items in Factor 2 than in Factor 1. ‘I try to summarise the outline in reading’ (QSE7-02) or ‘I like to write my own ideas’ (QSE4-4-b) are some examples that directly correspond to the overall goal of this test: at least these active participations will lower the affective filter and help overcome the psychological demand. Table 2 is a list of significant behaviour/belief shared by the students who passed the guided writing task (Q6).

**Table 2: Study behaviour affecting the pass in guided writing task**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Behaviour/belief</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>t ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QSG1-2</td>
<td>平日の学校外勉強時間</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSE2-03</td>
<td>「コミュニ 1」の授業はよく分かった.</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSE3-06</td>
<td>□ 英語を読んで概要や要点を捉える活動をした.</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSE5-1</td>
<td>週当たりの英語授業時数</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSG1-6-03</td>
<td>□ いろいろなアイデアを考えようと努める.</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSG1-4-09</td>
<td>□ 自分の考えを根拠と共に書く.</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSG1-9{A6&amp;A5&amp;A3&amp;A4&amp;A2-A1}</td>
<td>大学進学希望.</td>
<td>29.987</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSE4-4-b{2no-z&amp;1yes}</td>
<td>□ 自分の考えを英語で書くのが好き.</td>
<td>15.877</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSE8-10_02{A0-A1}</td>
<td>GTECを受験したことがある.</td>
<td>15.265</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSE4-2-b{2no-z&amp;1yes}</td>
<td>□ 英語内容を読み取るのが好き.</td>
<td>12.994</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSG1-1_10{A0-A1}</td>
<td>□ 世界や国の発展に役立ちたいから勉強する.</td>
<td>9.483</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here again active participation is the key to success. The successful students do not just practice but also are eager to expand the content knowledge — a state of achievement towards the top right in Figure 2.

This paper has discussed the third dimension of target language development, psychological demand. This dimension may not be necessary where sufficient learning opportunity takes place. Where the condition is not met, it will be a convenient tool for explaining the poor performance. As we saw from the questionnaire responses, willingness to
participate is a disposition acquired through experience and interest. Candlin (1983 in Færch & Kasper, p.viii) states that “[I]nstruction should presumably take the form of offering problem-posing tasks to learners so that they may in some concerted way co-exercise their communication and their learning strategies in the accomplishment of the tasks.” There is much language teachers can do to contribute to this psychological factor.

Notes
1 The official report has not yet been published.
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0 はじめに
（1）前任校岩手県立福岡高等学校と現勤務校岩手県立不来方高等学校について

今回発表させていただくのは、主に前任校である岩手県立福岡高等学校に勤務していた8年間、そして現勤務校である同不来方高等学校での2年間での授業実践内容である。福岡高校は岩手県で3番目に創立された旧制中学を母体とする伝統校であり、令和元年度が創立119年目にあたる。校は「質実剛健・文武両道」が示す通り、男女ともに武道で心身を鍛えられた生徒たちが従順かつ熱心に学習に励む学び舎である。受容力は極めて高いが、発信することには抵抗感を覚える生徒が多いのが特徴で、特に英語に対する苦手意識が強く、自己評価が非常に低い生徒が多い。

一方、現勤務校（実は前々勤務校）の不来方高校は昭和63年に創立され、高校の再編計画による統廃合により新たに生まれた高校を除けば岩手県で最も新しい学校である。普通科の中に学系制を敷いており、芸術、人文、理数、外国語、体育の5つの学系によって異なるカリキュラムを持つ特色ある学校である。生徒たちの個性や特技は勿論のこと、進路目標、学び方、気質も多様性に富む。発信することを好む生徒は多いが、学系によってのみならず同じクラスの中でも学力差が大きく、個性を生かしつつ基礎学力の定着を保証する指導が求められる学校である。
（2）次期学習指導要領に求められる4つのCについて

詳しい解説は不要かと思うが、2020年度より施行される次期学習指導要領において育成すべき資質・能力の三つの柱について確認しておきたい。

① 生きて働く「知識・技能」の習得

ここでの知識・技能は「生かす」「活用する」べきものであることが前提となる。それを使って「何ができるのか」を提示・共有して進める学びはまさにCAN-DOリストの活用なしに実現しない。

② 未知の状況にも対応できる「思考力・判断力・表現力等」の育成

4技能5領域のスキルを活用した多様な言語活動を組み立てた生徒主体の授業、つまり「生徒の頭・体・心が動く授業」の実践が求められていると考える。同時に、教科書の字面をなぞるにとどまらない内容言語統合学習（CLIL）を通じて、生徒が深い次元で教材とは関わり思考し、多様な考えに触れ判断し、柔軟かつ逞しく自己表現する力を育成する必要がある。

③ 学びを人生や社会に生かそうとする「学びに向かう力・人間性」の涵養

「学びに向かう力」は、習得した知識や技能、思考・判断・表現力をどの方向に生かすかをコントロールするものであり、教室から巣立った後も学び続けようとする学習意欲の維持と密接に関連している。そのためには、自律した学習者の育成が鍵であり、外国語学習を通じて健全な世界観を育むことも大切であると考える。

そこで今回の実践発表で提案したいのが「CLILとCAN-DOの5つのCでつくる授業」である。

つまり「内容(Content)」「言語(Communication)」「思考(Cognition)」「協学(Community/Culture)」の4つのCから成る学びに、目標・指導・評価の一体化の柱であり且つ学習意欲の高揚と維持を支える「CAN-DO」のCを生かした授業づくりの背景にある考え方と実践例を紹介するのが本稿の目的である。

なお、本稿では「CAN-DOリストの形での学習到達目標」を「CAN-DO」ともしくは「CAN-DOリスト」と表現させていただいた箇所もあることを予めご了承いただきたい。
1 CAN-DOリストの設定と活用

この項では、CAN-DOリストの活用が、外国語学習における指導と評価の一体化だけでなく学習者の動機づけにも資することを、Dörnyei(2001)が提唱した学習動機づけの局面に沿って述べさせていただく。

(1) 学習集団（生徒・教員のチーム）作りでのCAN-DO活用＝動機づけの基盤となる環境作り

① CAN-DO理念と目標の共有：教室が同じ方向に向かっているという意識の共有

●教師と教師をつなぐCAN-DO!

生徒観・指導観・授業観・言語観を教師同士が共有することにより、“My Classroom主義”から脱却し、“Students in OUR school”を全員で伸ばそうという協働意識が生まれる。過度なクラス間の平均点競争から、より良い学びの共同体を作るためのチーム作りへと意識がシフトする。また、教科担当者全員が同じCommunicative Approachを基盤とした授業を行い、均質の授業を保証することは、学習者の安心感と学びへの肯定的な意識づけを促す。（授業担当者によって指導法や授業内容に格差があってはならないことは、年度初めに授業担当者が発表される際の生徒の反応、テスト作題者に応じて異なった試験対策をしなければならないと生徒が危惧する様子を見れば、一目瞭然である。）

② 達成できること＝teacher expectation を共有：支持的な雰囲気・支持的な学習集団の形成

●生徒と教師をつなぐCAN-DO！“Yes, you CAN-DO it” attitude

生徒が達成できることに関して教師が十分に高い期待値を持ちつつ、また積極的にその期待を生徒への言動に表しながら指導を行えることも、CAN-DOリストが生徒と教師間で共有されてこそ得られるメリットである。「うちの生徒たちには無理」という安易な言葉によって教師自らがCAN-DOを台無しにしてしまうとはならない。

③ 緊張をほぐす活動・小集団活動などを取り入れた授業の実践：“WE”意識の形成と保持

●生徒と生徒をつなぐCAN-DO！“Yes, we CAN-DO it” attitude

Warm Up等の緊張をほぐす活動を効果的に行うことにより、教室にComfort Zone（心地よい場所）が生まれる。Pair Work（緊張を軽減しながら発話を増やす活動）やGroup Work（豊かな多様性を引き出す活動）を取り入れながら、双方向コミュニケーションの経験を積めるように授業を組み立てることで学習集団の中に“WE”意識や結束性が芽生える。教室全体が「本時のCAN-DO」が示す同じ方向へと進むための助走として、授業内プロセスの重要な役目を果たすと言えよう。
（2）学習到達目標としてのCAN-DO活用＝学習開始時の動機づけ

① CAN-DO形式での年間・単元・本時の学習到達目標設定：ゴールと成功基準の明確化
　●授業と授業をつなぐCAN-DO!
　　卒業時に生徒たちにできるようになってほしいことから逆算し、3か年の目標⇒年間の目標⇒学期の目標⇒単元の目標⇒本時の目標へとより具体的に落とし込んでいく。CAN-DOリストの形での学習到達目標の提示は、「公式の目標記述（e.g.学習指導要領）」と「授業目標（e.g.シラバス内の目標記述）」、「生徒が授業中に達成したいと目指している目標」との間のギャップをなくし、ゴールを明確にする。また、達成できることを前提とした明確なゴール提示は、教室内外での成功基準を明確化するものであり、達成に向けた意欲的な学びをもたらすことも可能となる。

② 進歩を実感する基準の提示：効果的な成功例の提示（Modeling）
　＝目標言語を駆使する理想的な自分像（Ideal L2 Self）
　の形成を促進
　＝生徒の成功期待感の喚起
　コミュニケーション重視の教室では、ペアワーク・グループワーク等を通じて、生徒たちは効果的に成功例を確認することができる。CAN-DOリストに基づいた授業では、説明よりも具体的な見本や例を示すことが重要であり、特に教室内にRole-model（Ideal L2 Self）が存在することは学習者を刺激し、目標（成功像）を思い描きやすくする。また、「このレベルのパフォーマンスならば、学習や訓練を経れば自分でもできるようになるかもしれない」と生徒自身が成功期待感、そして進歩を実感しながら自己肯定感を抱くようになる。到達可能な目標は、生徒たちの主体的な学びを促す上で重要である。

③ 授業と全体目標の関連性の明確化：生徒が毎時の授業と個々の言語活動の価値を認識
　●活動と活動をつなぐCAN-DO!
　シラバスの中にCAN-DO形式の到達目標を明示することにより、個々の授業や言語活動が年間進度表の「いつ行われるものなのか」ではなく、3年間の学びの中で「どのような学習到達目標に向かうためのステップとして行われるものなのか」に焦点を当てることができる。また、CAN-DOリスト形式の目標提示により、個々の言語活動が、大きなCAN-DOリストの枠組み及び一連の活動のどの部分に位置するのか、授業全体の目標にどのように関連しているのかを、教師と生徒が共通認識で
きる。教師が個々の活動に意味づけすること、学習者が個々の活動に意義や価値を見出すことは、学習意欲の高揚に資する。例えば、音読等のドリル・プラクティスがどのようなアウトプットの最終形につながるかを示すことで、単調になりがちな訓練に目的意識を持って取り組めるように学習者の意欲を喚起できる。

(3) 授業改善を支えるCAN-DO活用＝動機づけの維持と保護

① CAN-DOを支柱とする4技能5領域統合型の授業実践: 成功体験の蓄積を保証する授業内活動設計

知識偏重の講義主体の授業では、授業内に生徒ができるようになったことを確認する機会がほとんどない。CAN-DOリストの形での目標に沿った4技能5領域統合型授業は、生徒の言語使用を促し、コミュニケーションの中で経験値を高めることが可能になる。また、その小さな成功体験の積み重ねこそが生徒の自信と自己肯定感情、学習意欲の高揚につながる。また、指導者間で共通のCAN-DOを持つことにより、共通の「見取り」感覚を持って活動の難易度調整を行うことができる。

② 方向性に沿ったぶれない到達目標: 教材を活気づける自由裁量: 学習者に深く関連づけた教材の開発

教室の方向性がCAN-DOリスト形式の学習到達目標にしっかりと導かれていることにより、指導者によってテクニックや教材の味付けが多岐にわたり、指導のスタイルや内容の軸が大きくぶれなくなる。教師が「教材を活気あるものにする自由裁量」を与えられることで、教材研究の深めながら授業実践に工夫を施すこと、教師間の活性化と成長につながることが期待できる。ただし、CAN-DOの共有が十分でないと、指導軸となるApproachやMethodが崩れ、個人のtechniqueに依存する授業の乱立に逆走する恐れもあるため、継続的な校内研修が前提であり不可欠である。

●教材と生徒をつなぐCAN-DO!

教材という「食材」をどのようなレシピを用いて料理するか（評価規準の設定）は、シラバス作成の段階で共有されているべきであるが、どのような味付けをするか、スパイスを選ぶ楽しさは、目の前の生徒を最もよく知る教科指導担当者に委ねられる。教科書の内容と生徒自身の日常体験や個性を関連づけることにより、生徒は教材と自分個人の対比を通して、自己と対峙する機会を与えてくれた教材に価値を見出すことが期待される。

③「できるようになりたいこと」への意識づけ: 選択肢を持つ自由: 貢献: 教え合い
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学習者自律性の涵養: 社会【Community/Culture】と関わろうとする姿勢の育成

言語活動中心の授業を行うことにより、1つだけ存在する正解へと導くのではなく、自分自身がどのように感じ、考え、どのような言葉で発信したいのかを自ら決めて表現する自由を与えることにより、生徒に学びのOwnershipを与えることが肝要である。また、ペア・グループワークの過程で、自分が学習集団に貢献しているという意識と実感が得られるように活動を工夫することも大切である。仲間同士で教え合ったり助言したりすることを推奨し、学習者自律性を高めることも、”Yes, We CAN!”意識ができない教室では難しいことではない。

現実社会(Community/Culture)と生徒をつなぐCAN-DO

教室外での発信の機会を捉え、自発的に社会に関わろうとする姿勢、「教室⇒学校⇒市町村⇒都道府県⇒国⇒地域⇒世界」へと視野を広げ、関わろうとする姿勢を育む視点からも、”Yes, you CAN do it”と生徒の背中を押すツールとしてCAN-DOは有効である。

(4) 評価のためのCAN-DO活用=肯定的な自己評価・内省の促進

1. 生徒の言語パフォーマンスに関する肯定的なフィードバック

「できないこと」ではなく「できること」「できるようになったこと」に焦点を当てた評価を行えることもCAN-DO活用の醍醐味である。そのための評価方法・評価規準・評価基準は、CAN-DOリスト形式の学習到達目標を基に教師間で十分に協議することが必要である。

2. CAN-DOリストを用いた自己評価の実施: 定期的な進歩確認の機会提供と成長の可視化

生徒たちが「自分にできるようになったこと」「これからできるようにしたいこと」を意識できるようにCAN-DOリストを活用する。これが自律した学習者たちの姿勢を育成する一助となる。

3. 筆記テスト以外の方法も用いた継続評価:パフォーマンステストとフィードバック

CAN-DOリスト形式の目標に準じた4技能5領域を測るテストを実施することで、目標・授業・評価の一体化を図る。筆記試験のみでは測れない技能についてはパフォーマンステストとフィードバックで評価を行う。
オーマンステストを実施し、フィードバックも行うこと、その意義や方法についても生徒たちに周知しなければならない。パフォーマンステストが「評価する」ことが主たる目的のテストではなく、「どこまでできるようになったかを披露し、確認する」チャンスであることを生徒に伝え、緊張せずに楽しめる雰囲気を構築したい。同時に、教師側も多様なパフォーマンス内容を楽しみに姿勢を示すことが肝要である。

④自己評価シート・授業日誌などの活用: 生徒による自己評価力・相互評価力・内省力の育成

生徒たちに自己評価・相互評価する機会を与えることにより、学びの主体が自分たちであり、「評価される」ことが終点ではないという認識を促す。また、授業についてのコメントを教師が拾って授業に反映させることで、生徒の主体的な学びの維持と継続をサポートすることができると考える。

2 通常の授業内活動

(1) 通常の授業の流れ

1の項で述べたCAN-DOを活用しながら、実際にどのように授業を実践してきたかについて紹介させていただく。概ね、基本的な通常の授業の流れは、村野井(2006)が提唱するPCPPを参考に以下のように行ってきた。
(2) Warm-Up例

① 本時のアウトプット活動に必要な表現の導入としてのWarm-Up

本時の学習内容が「人物の共通点について話し合う」だった場合には、"have ~ in common"という表現が必須である。この表現の使用場面を引き出すために、複数名の著名なアスリートの画像を用意し、人物当てゲームの後で、「二人の共通点」「三人の共通点」を話し合わせながら、"What do they have in common?"と尋ね、「Both of them are…」「All of them have …」の形で答える練習をしていく。

② 既習の文構造・表現を活用する練習としてのWarm-Up

前時までに「無生物主語」と「強調構文」を学んでいた際に、既習文法事項の復習として次のような対話練習をさせてみた。

A: What makes you happy?
B: makes me happy.
A: Oh, makes you happy?
B: No, it is that makes me happy.
A: Why does it make you happy?

1st Roundではここまでを練習し、2nd Roundではpartnerを変えて3 turnまで。3rd Roundでは更にpartnerを変えて3 turn +で会話を制限時間まで継続させる。
B: Because ...

会話の継続

とくに、強調構文を生徒に使わせたいと思うと、

Dancing makes me happy. (下線部を強調した文に書き換えなさい。）

という指示をしてしまいがちであるが、英文の一部を強調しなければならない必然性を感じずに（つまりForm, MeaningがわかってもUseの局面が欠落している状況で）、ターゲット文構造の定着は期待できない。つまり、文法にリアリティを持たせる文脈が必要なのである。既習事項を文法構造でドリル学習することも大切だが、「文法は使える！」という実感が生徒の学習意欲を刺激するように思える。そのために、文法・語法の知識を活用する経験値を高める実際のコミュニケーションの場面を教室内言語活動で設定したいと常に考えている。また、数単元前の既習事項を思い出し、生産文法として活用するコミュニケーション活動を意図的に設けることも、極めて有効であると感じている。

３　本時の学習内容のテーマの導入としてのWarm-Up

物語（本時では“Romeo and Juliet”）を読んで、その登場人物たちが犯した過ちについてディスカッションを行うことがアウトプット活動として用意されている授業では、”Have you ever made any mistakes?”をトピックとした即興会話をWarm-Upとし、「過去の自分の失敗話」を相手にわかりやすく伝えることをさせた。テーマを生徒自身に引き寄せて自らについて語らせること（Personalization）、「あの時、ああしてたら失敗しなかったのに」という内容を語らせることで既習文構造の仮定法過去完了を意識させたいと狙った。ともに、その後に用意されている言語活動の前哨戦として位置づけ設定した。

3）定番の活動例: Story Retelling

Story Retelling（これよりSR）は、多くの先生方がアウトプット活動の初歩の段階で実践されている言語活動であろう。（次期学習指導要領では、読んだことについてその内容を伝える活動までが「読むこと」に含まれることになる。）同じテキストを読んだ後でのSRはインフォメーションギャップがないため多様性に欠けるため意義が見出しづらいという声も聞くが、工夫次第では非常に効果的な活動になることは多くの学校での実践例が示している。SRはキーワードへの意識や統語的なきづきを伴い、「読むこと」から「話すこと」へ段階的に「スキル間をつなぐ橋渡し」的な活動となる。また、音読や唱読といった基本的な音声活動を経て、Story Tellerを変え
たり、自分の意見を1文付け加えたりしながら、より自由度の高いスピーキングへ発展させることもでき、「基本から応用への橋渡し」的な活動であるとも言える。

① Story Retellingの例その1: サッカーゲーム

サッカーゲーム枠を作り、すごろく式のマス

に本文の内容に関連する絵や写真（キーワードでも可）を置く。ペアの生徒それぞれが相手のゴールに向かって、じゃんけんしながらコマを進める。止まったいマスの絵や写真について英文で説明しなければならない。（ダブルスにすると助け合いが生まれる。）最後は自分でオリジナルの英文を作ってシュートをするとゴールとなり得点が入る。1周することで生徒たちは無意識のうちに本文内容をなぞり、リレー・リテリングをしていることになる。ルールを柔軟に変えて何度も繰り返してプレイすることも可能である。
（1回目は絵の説明、2回目はプラス1英文、3回目は感想・コメントつき等）

② Machu Picchuすごろく

ペアもしくはダブルスで行う。カードを引きながら、そのカードに書かれている既習語彙やキーワードを使って英文を作り、コマを進めながら教科書の物語を再生していく。ボードにはマチュピチュの遺跡に至るまでの山道ルートの写真を用い、ビンガム教授らが探索を行った気分を味わえるように試みた。一回休み、振り出しに戻るなどのアンラッキーカードを入れると、必ずしもテキストの時系列に沿った再話とはならないが、ゲーム性は高まる。複数の学者の学説を説明することを求められる固い内容の単元だったが、生徒たちは好評であった。
授業内アウトプット活動例
次に、極めてSoftなCLILっぽい(?)ものではあるが、教科書の単元の題材を生かしながら４つのCを大切にして行った授業内アウトプット活動の例をいくつか提示したい。

(1) 活動実践例1:宮沢賢治の幸福観に学び、「しあわせ」について考えよう！
○ねらいとCAN-DO
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>知識・技能</th>
<th>勧誘の表現</th>
<th>ショートスピーチ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>思考・判断・表現力</td>
<td>プライオリティー</td>
<td>セールストーク</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

・事前に準備して、メモの助けがあれば、自分が考える幸福の要因について、整理して伝えることができる。(Speaking Lev. 4-3)
・幸福になるために必要な要因について、自分、グループの意見をまとめ、やりとりできる。
(Speaking Lev.4-7)

○Procedure
① 教科書本文の読解より、「しあわせを再定義する必要がある」とを読み取る。
...We need a revolution, a peaceful revolution that will allow us to redefine what “happiness” means. Happiness is not just having a lot of money to spend. Even our own personal happiness depends on the happiness of many others.
(Lesson 4 The World of Miyazawa Kenji Is Our World
Genius English Communication II, Taishukan)

② 『「しあわせ」の定義は？「しあわせ」の構成要素は？』というテーマで自由に話し合う。

③ グループ毎に1つずつ「しあわせの要素」(e.g. longevity, money, love and marriage, friendship, etc.)を決め、その「保険」をセールスする。グループで話し合い、1要素につき保険の価格を20〜25ハピネスコイン（仮想の通貨）程度で設定する。
→そのしあわせの要素を売り込むポイントについてグループで作戦会議をする。各自が1分間でセールストークができるようにスピーチ練習を行う。
④ 各班からひとりずつ同じトランプの札を持っている生徒が集まり、新しいグループで1対1のセールス合戦を行う。各セッションは1人1分ずつの計2分を目安とし、時計回りに移動しながらパートナーを順次変えてスピーチを続ける。(Sushi Bar回転寿司型)
⑤ 各自が100ハピネスコインを所有するものとする。セールストークセッション終了後、元のグループA~Iに戻り、購入したい「しあわせ」の保障を話し合いランク付けする。
⑥ 「しあわせになるために必要な要因」についてグループで話し合い、意見をまとめて発表する。また、「しあわせの定義」について各自が考えをまとめてまとまりのある英文でエッセイを書く。

(2) 活動実践例2: 3つの願い：イスラエル・パレスチナの若者の願いを代弁しよう！

〇ねらいとCAN-DO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>知識・技能</th>
<th>仮定法</th>
<th>ストーリーリテリング</th>
<th>物語・手記の要約</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>思考・判断・表現力</td>
<td>ジグソープレゼンテーション</td>
<td>ディスカッション</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

・予め準備した上で写真等を用いながら、パレスチナ・イスラエルの十代の若者が書いた手記の概要を簡単に説明することができる。（Speaking 4・Lev. 3）
・パレスチナとイスラエルの長期に渡る紛争について学んだことについて感想・意見を整理し、登場人物に宛てた手紙を書くことができる。（Writing 3・Level 3）

〇Procedure

①イスラエル兵に殺害された愛息の臓器を、イスラエルの子どもたちに提供したパレスチナ人の父親に関する英文を読む。
②音読の段階で、登場人物の心情が現れている英文や台詞等に着目しながら、音声表現を工夫するよう促す。
③音読と並行して、各登場人物の台詞を拾う。

グループ内で役割分担し、その人物の視点から、物語をリテリングする。適宜、自分なりの解釈や創作を加えても構わないこととする。グループ内で、各登場人物になりきって、やりとりをする。

＊トランプによる役割分担例）

パレスチナ人父　ユダヤ人少女
パレスチナ人少年　ユダヤ人母親
（感謝を表す表現と仮定法）

④グループごとに異なるイスラエル、パレスチナの10代の若者の手記（“Three Wishes”）を読み、「自分の友人」の言葉としてまとめる。
⑤ イスラエル人・パレスチナ人双方の友人を持つ生徒が半々になるようにグループを再編し、「友人の手記」の内容を互いに伝え合う。（リテリング）
⑥ 双方が願っていることについて話し合い、双方の平和のための「3つの願い」を絞り込んで書く。（仮定法の活用・ディスカッション）
⑦ 主人公に宛てた手紙の形式で、自分の意見を書いてまとめる。

（3）活動実践例3: 差別撤廃・人権のために闘った人の共通点を語ろう！

○ねらいとCAN-DO

知識・技能
過去形 人物が持つ美徳を表す形容詞 時系列で出来事を描写する
ストーリーリテリング

思考・判断・表現力
ポスタープレゼンテーション ディスカッション エッセイライティング

Today's CAN-DO

・差別の撤廃や人権のために闘った人物について調べたことをまとめ、絵や写真などの資料を使いながら、聞き手にわかりやすく説明できる。（Speaking 3・Lev. 4）
・差別の撤廃や人権のために闘った人物たちの共通点について、ワークシート等を使って準備をすれば、話し合いに参加でき、意見のやり取りをすることができる。（Speaking 7-Level 3）

○Procedure

① アパルトヘイト政策による差別や不正と闘った黒人運動家とジャーナリストの友情に関する実話を読む。（授業の流れは2－①を参照）
② 6人グループで差別の撤廃や人権のために闘った人物を1人選び、その人物についてグループで調べ、ポスターにまとめ。内容についてはグループで協議し協力して準備するが、ポスターのレイアウトや写真の選択などは各自が自由に行い作成する。
③ 6人を縦に3人ずつの2チーム（HomeとTravelers）に分け、Travelersチームの生徒達がラウンド毎に移動してパートナーを変えながら1対1の「渡り鳥型プレゼンテーション」を行う。この際には、ポスターを用いて、調べた人物について1人称で語るよう指示する。それぞれが「自己紹介」、「自分の」経歴や信念について90秒語り合い、その後の60秒を質問やコメントのやり取りをしながら対話を継続するように指導する。5つのラウンドを経て、生徒全員が異なる5名の人物と対話することになる。
ポスターに加えて、その人物になりきるために小道具などをグループで揃えても可としたため、サングラスをかけたマルコムXと十字架を身につけたマザー・テレサがインタビューし合ったり、ストールを巻いたマララ・ユスフザイと金、緑、黒3色のネクタイを着けたネルソン・マンデラが互いの労をねぎらい合ったりしている稀有な光景が教室に展開する。お互いのスピーチを聞きながら、生徒は各自で「その人物についての情報」をメモしたり、「その人物が持っている美德（勇気・説得力・強い意志・忍耐強さなど）」をリストから選んで印をつけたりしながらワークシートをうめていく。

④ ホームのグループに戻り、6名の人物が共通して持つ美德について話し合う。
⑤ 自分自身と英雄たちを比較し、自分に足りないものを記す。
⑥ 自分が将来どのような人間になりたいかについて、英文に書いてまとめる。

(4) 活動実践例4:Romeo & Julietを救出せよ大作戦！

〇ねらいとCAN-DO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>知識・技能</th>
<th>助動詞+have + 過去分詞</th>
<th>仮定法過去完了</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>助言の表現</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ストーリーリテリング

思考・判断・表現力

ディスカッション レターライティング

Today’s CAN-DO

・多様な考え方ができる話題について、立場を決めて意見をまとめ、互いに合意できる部分とできない部分を整理して話すことができる。（Speaking 7-Lev.5）

・物語の登場人物に助言の手紙を、まとまりのある英文で書くことができる。（Writing 3-Level 4）

〇Procedure

① Shakespeare、Romeo and Julietに関する英文を読む。
② グループ内で、各登場人物になりきって、リテリングをする。

※トランプによる役割分担例)

ロミオ ジュリエット
ロレンス神父 父・母

他

③「悲劇を招いた一番の罪人は誰か？」について話し合う。
（仮定法過去完了 ＋ should/shouldn’t have p.p.の活用）
④ 二人の主人公が死なずに済むようタイムマシンに乗って、登場人物の中の1人だけに助言できるとしたら、いつどのタイミングで誰に渡すか考えて助言の手紙を書く。（相手に応じた助言の表現）

(5) 補足説明:プレゼンテーション（スピーチ）セッションの形について

以上に述べたとおり、授業内アウトプット活動で生徒の頭・体・心を動かすために、そのアウトプット形態が大きな意味を持つ。筆者がこれまでに行ってきた活動とその利点と弱点についてまとめている。
① ジグソー型プレゼンテーション

〇個々の発表者にフォーカスできる。
×小グループ内とは言え、発表に緊張感が伴う。
○パブリックスピーキングの訓練となる。×生徒間インタラクション量が少ない。

２ Sushi Bar（回転寿司）型プレゼンテーション
○グループの代表として生徒の責任感が増す。×一週するまでに時間がかかること。
○発表の回数が多く、繰り返しによる上達を実感できる。×生徒の人数（奇・偶数）に左右される。

３ 渡り鳥型プレゼンテーション
○生徒のグループへの帰属意識を維持できる。×全生徒のモニターが難しい
○個々の生徒の適度な責任感を育むことができる。
○生徒間の自由なやりとりが増量する。
○発表の回数が多く、繰り返しによる上達を実感できる。×生徒の人数（奇・偶数）に左右されない。（欠席者や不登校傾向の生徒が罪悪感を覚えずに済む。）
○生徒全員の適度な発表回数が確保できる。

筆者が渡り鳥型プレゼンテーションの形式を考えついたのは、クラスに不登校傾向を持つ1人の女子生徒がいたことがきっかけであった。その生徒Mさんがなかなか教室に入ることができずその年度もまま半年が過ぎようとしていた。たとえアウトプット活動中心の授業展開を基本としていても、生徒自身が人前で英語を話すことに抵抗を覚え、ストレスを感じるようでは、教室はコミュニティーになりきれない。教室、グループワークのチームが「ホーム」と感じられる帰属意識を持たせるにはどうしたらよいか。欠席・欠課があっても「なんとか遅れを取らずについていく」と感じさせるにはどうしたらよいか。級友のサポートを得ながら、同じ内容を一緒に準備する部分を中心に添えつつも、各自の自由裁量で好きなように創造できる余地を残した活動はどのように準備できるか。緊張やストレス無しに一斉に全員が声を出して自己表現できる場でありながら、グループの代表として自分も貢献できているという達成感につなげるにはどうしたらよいか。熟考した結果、思いついたのがこの方法であった。元来、美術に興味があり、絵を描くのが好きだったMさんは級友たちと一緒にポスターを作成していく過程からクラスに合流できるようになり、ついには英語の時間に合わせて登校してくれるようになった。そして、この形でのプレゼンテーション体験を複数回重ねるうちに、堂々と英語を話す姿を披露してくれるようになった。その後は徐々に登校も安定し、Mさんは無事に高校を卒業した。Mさんの様子を見ていて学ばせてもらったことは、自分の意見や考えがありさえすれば居場所がある教室、知識偏重ではなく生徒個々の意見の重みを大切にする空間だっ
教室においては、「ことば」を得た生徒は、強くなれるということである。そして、「ことば」を学び得た生徒は、自分にも他者にも優しくなれるということである。

（6）考察：「生徒の頭・体・心が動く言語活動」とは

以上のような授業内活動の実践を通して、生徒たちが英語を教科として学ぶ学習者であると同時に、言語としての英語の使用者として成長する様を目指すためにしてきた。これは、高校生たちが吸収力のある柔軟な頭・体・心をフルに動かしながら自己表現を行う機会を楽しんでくれているからだと思いている。筆者が考える「生徒の頭・体・心が動く言語活動」の条件は以下の通りであり、CLIL型授業が極めて有効であることがここでもおわかり頂けるだろう。

① 生徒が教材しっかりと向きあえる活動
（生徒が興味を持てない？いや、教材を面白くしようとしているか？
まずは教師が教材を面白くできるだけの知識と知的好奇心を持っているか？
参考となる図書を最低3冊読んで、「教材にハマる」経験をしているか？）
② 生徒が自分の言葉で自分の考えを表現できる活動
（自分の言葉と友人の言葉を大切にできるように！）
③ 生徒の思考に自由度が与えられている活動
④ 生徒が自分自身・他者と正面から向きあえる活動
（言葉を使っている自分を意識できるように！）

4 パフォーマンス評価実践例

4技能5領域型の授業を実践すればするほどに、紙ベースでのテスト評価ではどうしても測れない能力を評価しなければならない必然性を認識する。特にスピーキングのスキルを測るパフォーマンステストの必要性やその方法については盛んに議論されてきたところである。

実は、筆者にはスピーキングテストに関して苦い経験がある。10年前に不来方高校がスーパー・イングリッシュ・ランゲージ・ハイスクール(SELHi)研究指定校だった際に初めてのスピーキングテストを計画し実施した時のことである。1学年8クラスの生徒全員にヘッドセットをつけて①初見のパッセージを音読させ録音、②ワードマップを頼りにその物語をストーリーテリングさせて録音、③その内容に関する考えを
自由に即興で1分間スピーチさせて録音、④全員分のリテリング、即興スピーチを書き起こし、⑤書き起こし原稿を発音・内容・英文の複雑さや多様さ・正確さなどの観点を設けて採点するという作業を行った。有効なデータを採取することはできたが、英語科スタッフの統一意見は、「もう二度やりたくない！」であった。テストすること自体が自己目的化してしまい、生徒・教員が疲弊しきってしまうのでは、「持続可能な」学びからかけ離れていく。あらゆるパフォーマンス評価は、生徒のよりよい学びを促すフィードバックと学習意欲の向上につながって然るべきであるのに、これでは本末転倒である。そこで、ここでは生徒にも教師にも物理的・精神的負担の少ないスピーキングテストの実践例を紹介したい。これは、国の施策の1つである英語教育推進リーダー中央研修の際に、各自研修グループを巡回しながら指導しているプリティッシュ・カウンシルのトレーナーの姿を見て思いついた形式である。

(1)スピーキングの指導と評価の難しさ
パフォーマンス評価の中でも、スピーキングテストが実施しにくいと言われる要因をまとめてみると、概ね以下のようなになると考える。
① 教師の視点から
ア. 時間がかからない。（授業を2コマ費やすか？授業内で終了しなかった場合には、昼休みや放課後の時間を使って行うか？）
イ. 評価方法が煩雑そう。（評価規準・基準はどのようにしたらよいか？整合性・妥当性のある評価は可能か？評価者同士の目線合わせも難しいのではないか？）
② 生徒の視点から
ア. 英語を話すのは苦手。特に即興は厳しい。
イ. 1対1のテストや大勢の前の発表だと緊張のあまり話せなくなる。
③ スピーキングテストそのものの難しさ
ア. 「発表」は評価しやすいが、「やりとり」は評価しにくい。
（インタビューテストも、生徒から質問することは殆ど無く、実質双方向になっていない。）
イ. 授業との連続性、効果的なフィードバックが難しい。
（テストそのものがイベントに陥らないように授業の延長上に位置づけ、生徒が自信をなくさないようにテストにするには？）
ウ. 話すこと前もって準備して話す活動は多いが、即興で話す活動で評価する機会が乏しい。
グループでのスピーキングテスト実践例

(1) で述べたようなスピーキングテストの在り方を検討した結果、以下のようなグループディスカッション形式でのスピーキングテストを考えついた。2015年の前期中間試験の一環として前任校福岡高校で初めて試験的に実施してみた。学年担当者がそれぞれ実施してみて、生徒・指導者双方から好感触が得られたため、英語科教員全員で実施することとした。回を重ねつつ協議を重ね、評価規準やT1、T2の動き等に改良を加えて現在の形に至っている。

① 手順

② 評価規準・基準について

T1とT2がそれぞれ3つの観点から、A/B/Cの3段階で各生徒のパフォーマンスを評価して数値化する。

その平均値を成績とし、観点1は「関心・意欲・態度」、観点2と3は「表現の能力」の評価に組み入れる。ちなみに平成30年度入学生1年次の第1回テスト（前期中間考査）での評価の観点は

〇1コマの授業内で完結する！
〇簡素な評価規準に即した！
〇生徒が比較的緊張なく受験できる！
〇生徒が事前に練習はできるか？
・Attitude/Motivation
・Content
・Conversational Interaction (Turn Taking)

の3つとした。

③ 共通理解を図るべきこと

ア．事前にトピックと評価規準・基準については生徒に知らせ、準備をする時間を保証すること。

（事前に自分の意見を述べるスピーチの練習はできるが、当日には即興でのやりとりが評価される。

個人の練習を促しつつ、PreparedとImpromptuの双方を確認できるようにする。また、評価規準・基準を予め伝えておくことで、合格点を得るために何をどのように表現したらよいのかを示し、生徒が目的意識を持って練習できるようにサポートする。）

イ．評価規準の項目は2～3観点に絞ること。

（短時間での実技試験のため、可能な限り観点を絞り込み、教師同士の評価がぶれないようにシンプルにすることが肝要である。）

ウ．評価担当者間で、目標、テストの位置づけ、授業との関係、CAN-DOについて話し合うこと。

（教師が単独で実施できないため、どうしてもCAN-DOを基本とした目線合わせが必然となる。また、複数の教師がクラスをまたいで評価することで、学年全体の生徒のスピーキングスキルの伸びを確認することができる。結果を共有し、授業内でのアウトプット活動の質を振り返ることで、教師側の反省を促す効果も期待できる。）

(3) 生徒たちの反応（ふりかえりシートより）

以下に紹介するのは、不来方高校平成30年度入学生が、グループディスカッションによるスピーキングテストを初めて受けた直後に記入した「ふりかえりシート」の回答の抜粋である。シートの内容は、

①スピーキングテストでの自分のパフォーマンスの振り返り、②ディスカッションテストについての意見・感想、③自分自身の英語の学習についての振り返りで、計10問から構成されている。下の棒グラフは、各質問に対する生徒の回答を1学年全員および学系別に集計したものである。
自由記述より：
●Q5）で「楽しかった」理由は？
・仲間の発言も聞きながら、いっぱい話せたから。
・思ったよりも話せたから
・英語でたくさん会話をすることが新鮮だったから
・友達の新たな一面を知ることができたから
・失敗を恐れず、友達と会話できたから
・自分の意見を言えたから
・みんながうなずいて聞いてくれたから
・皆が分かりやすく話してくれて会話を続けることができたから
・習っていない単語を絞りだそうとしたときが楽しかった。

●気づいたこと、今後努力が必要だと思ったことは？
・もっと英語を話すことに慣れたいと思った。（外）
会話表現をもっと勉強して、相手の話したことにに対してしっかりと自分の意見を言えるようになりたい。（外）
表現の幅をもっと広げたい。（外）
相手が答えたことにもう少しうまく質問できるようにしたい。（体）
質問に対して単語で返してしまうときがあったので、文で返せるようになりたい。（体）
これが分かるともっと話せるなと思ったから、単語をもっと覚えていく。（体）
文法を学びたい。語彙力を身につけたい。（体）

感想
初めは自信がなくて不安だったけど楽しく話せた。すごく楽しかった。（外）
今日はとても楽しかったです。あのままの自分ですぐにし、とても盛り上がったし、テストじゃないかのように楽しかったです。日常でも英語でこのように話したいと思いました。（外）
表現の難しさと話し合う楽しさを感じることができて、英会話の面白さを知ることができて良かったです。（人理）
英語で話すのは疲れると、それ以上に楽しかった！またやりたい。（体）
とても楽しかったです！初めて英語を話すことが楽しいと思いました。メンバーみんな、先生、ありがとうございました。（芸）
他の話題を自分達で考えたりもしたいです。（外）

テスト中の動画で様子を見てもわかるとおり、生徒たちは臆することなく英語で対話を続けている。そして、英語が苦手な生徒も多く有する体育学系クラスでも、97％が「楽しかった」と回答し、「文法を学びたい。語彙力を身につけたい」と答えている生徒も散見される。「みんながうなずいて聞いてくれたから」楽しかったというコメントもあり、英語でのやりとりは本来楽しいものであることを気づかせてくれる。また、友人の発話については「内容」にフォーカスし、自分の発する英語に関しては「語彙・文法」への意識が高まっていることにも気づく。パフォーマンス評価が、個々の生徒の内省を促し、「もっと〇〇ができるようになりたい」という動機づけにつながっていることが見て取れる。

（4）ディスカッションによるパフォーマンス評価の成果と課題
① 成果
○ 物理的にも評価の本質的にも、パフォーマンス評価は1人ではできない。したがって、教員集団がCAN-DO、評価規準等を共有し、目線あわせが自然にできるようになる。

→目標・授業・評価の一体化→授業改善
○ 生徒が自分と級友のパフォーマンスを確認し内省することにより、次の目標に向けて具体的に学習方法を見直し始める。

→主体的な学び・自律した学習者の育成

② 課題
△ トピックに沿った語彙・語法、文構造の指導と定着を促す指導を継続的に行う必要がある。

→より「正確に」「適切に」英語の発話を修正
△ 題材の難易度が高くなっても流暢さや自信度を維持できるような段階的な支援が必要である。

指導の工夫＝言語活動のねらいの明確化と演習量の保証
△ 「話し合いっぱなし」に終わらず、「やりとり」した内容をまとめて「発表」する活動へとつなげるなどの工夫が必要である。

→技能統合を意識した言語活動の工夫

5 まとめ
(1) CLILの要素を取り入れた授業は、生徒の頭・体・心を動かす言語活動の実践を可能にし、「生きた学び」を形成する場となる。
「生きた学び」を生む授業とは、次のような授業であると考える。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) 生きる！</th>
<th>(2) 生かす！</th>
<th>(3) 生む！</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>① 生徒が生き生きと学ぶ授業</td>
<td>① 教材を生かす授業</td>
<td>① 生徒の英語を生む授業</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>② 「ことば」が生きる授業</td>
<td>② 知識や技能を生かす授業</td>
<td>② 学びの共同体を生む授業</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>③ 生命を尊ぶ授業</td>
<td>③ 学びの旬を生かす授業</td>
<td>③ 生徒のempathyを生む授業</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
（2）CAN-DOリストの形での学習到達目標は、授業の質を保障し、生徒の学習動機づけの保持を助け、自律した学習者を育てる。また、教師の方向感覚・バランス感覚の維持にも資する。

（3）授業改善と評価の工夫（パフォーマンステストの実施含む）は、目標・指導・評価の可視化をもたらし、生徒が自らの成長を実感する機会を与えることで学習動機づけにつながる。また、教師の目標合わせ、チーム力の向上にも資する。

したがって、5つのCで作る授業は、「生徒のよりよい学びに向けてのプラスの波及効果」と「授業改善に向けてのプラスの波及効果」の双方をもたらすことが期待できると言えよう。

1月25日（土）の発表時に投影したパワーポイント資料を基にこの報告書を作成したが、説明がすっきりで分かりにくいことは否めない。補足説明が必要な個所への質問がある方、実際のワークシートデータやCAN-DOリスト等の資料をご覧になられた方がいらっしゃれば、ご連絡いただければ幸いです。

(ptf4-matsuo-miyuki@iwate-ed.jp)

6 参考文献

小池生夫編著. (2013). 『提言 日本の英語教育 ガラパゴスからの脱出』光村図書。
向後秀明. (2018). 「次期学習指導要領に基づく英語教育改革の方向性と教員に求められる資質・能力」大学英語教育学会第57回大会全体シンポジウム資料。
根岸雅史. (2015). 「日々の授業で実践する『話すこと』の指導と評価の提案」上智大学・ベネッセ英語教育シンポジウム報告書。ベネッセ教育総合研究所。
文部科学省. (2013). 『各中・高等学校の外国語教育における「CAN-DOリスト」の形での学習到達目標設定のための手引き』
文部科学省. (2010). 『高等学校学習指導要領解説 外国語編・英語編』開隆堂。
文部科学省(2011). 『国際共通語としての英語力向上のための5つの提言と具体的施策』

ASTE Home Page: http://www.bun-eido.co.jp/ASTE.html

上智大学他の言語教育関係のホームページ

1) 上智大学のホームページ http://www.sophia.ac.jp/
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   民間のNPOとして小学校の英語教育の指導者を認定する組織です。
   http://www.j-shine.org/
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    http://www.asiatefl.org/
11) The International Research Foundation for English Education (TIRF)
    http://www.tirfonline.org/
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12) Benesse 教育開発研究所 https://berd.benesse.jp/
13) ARCLE (Action Research Center for Language Education)
    http://www.arcle.jp/
14）英検で海外留学 http://www.eiken.or.jp/ryugaku/index.html
15）TOEFL http://www.ets.org/toefl/
16) 小学校学習指導要領 http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/micro_detail/_icsFiles/afIELDfile/2018/09/05/1384661_4_3_2.pdf
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21）高等学校外国語解説書 http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/micro_detail/_icsFiles/afIELDfile/2019/03/28/1407073_09_1_1.pdf
22）平成28年度英語教育改善のための英語力調査 報告書 http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/kokusai/gaikokugo/1382899.htm
23) その他の文科省の外国語教育資料サイト http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/kokusai/gaikokugo/
24）大学入試センター https://www.dnc.ac.jp/
大学入学共通テストに関する最新の情報が随時掲載される
26）PISA Results http://factsmaps.com/pisa-worldwide-ranking-average-score-of-math-science-reading/
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