

Volume 28 Issue 1

# THE SCHOOL HOUSE

The Publication of the JALT Teaching Younger Learners SIG

全国語学教育学会若い人たちに教える研究部会研究部会定款



## The Teaching Younger Learners Special Interest Group

### **Coordinator**

Grant Osterman

### **Membership Chair**

Paul Nanton

### **Programs Chair**

Benjamin Robertson

### **Programs Co-Chair**

Marybeth Kamibeppu

### **Publications Co-Chairs**

Michael Pettovello

Katie Kato

Kate Sato

Gaby Benthien

### **Treasurer**

Emi Sugita

### **Publicity Co- Chairs**

Samksha Bikari

Andy Whitmyre

### **Webmaster**

Currently Open

### **Officers at Large**

Marian Hara

Aleda Krause

Mary Virgil Uchida



ISSN: 1881-0713

*The School House*

# Table of Contents

Message from the TYL SIG Coordinator	2
2020 Teaching Young Learners Team Introductions	3
Discovering Identities in Discourse: Finding Salience through Conversation Analysis James Kienlong WANG	5
‘Keeping it real’ in the Japanese high school classroom Andrew McCarthy	14
“No Japanese” - Examining the role of L1 in the L2 classroom Benjamin Iain Robertson	16
Sample Lesson Plan; Storytelling Hidayat Polim	21
Submission Guidelines	24

## Message from the TYL SIG Coordinator

Dear SIG Membership,

I would like to take this moment and introduce myself as your new SIG coordinator for the upcoming year. I have lived in Okinawa for more than 30 years and own an international school in Naha City. I also work for two universities as an adjunct. I have been an active member of JALT since 1995 helping here and there as needed, however, this is my first time as SIG coordinator. Therefore, I will look to you all from time to time for guidance.

As many of you know, I came to Japan from the United States. Having done my graduate and post graduate work in education, I am very keen on developing quality programs and professional development that we all can benefit from. I believe in teamwork and am willing to help in any way needed to make our SIG the best in JALT. I will strive for greater communication and more transparency.

Currently we have over 150 members that makes us a medium sized SIG. We have members from all over Japan, and therefore we want to reach far and wide with our professional development. The direction I can see for this SIG is one that facilitates all needs for k-12<sup>th</sup> grade education. We have many experienced members in this SIG, and I plan on utilizing their expertise. Many of the SIG officers are new to this organization but are young and willing to serve as needed. This is a good opportunity to all in the SIG. There are still places to serve if you desire. We are actively looking for a web designer and or maintainer to keep our web presence active and beneficial to all. There is also room to get your ideas out in our SIG publication *The School House*. This is published three times a year and is great for anyone looking to raise their publication count. There will be more on this in the upcoming months, but we have a blind peer-reviewed process of selection and a wide range of possible article themes.

Finally, this is your SIG too, so I welcome any and all suggestions to make our SIG strong and run smoothly. We are a team of early-years educators that are eager to help with the promotion of English education in Japan. Therefore, if you have any needs that are not currently being met, please contact your SIG team!

Sincerely,

Grant Osterman

SIG Coordinator

## **2020 Teaching Younger Learners SIG Team Introductions**

### **SIG Coordinator – Dr. Grant Osterman**

Dr. Osterman has been teaching in Japan since 1993. Originally from a small Midwestern town in the United States, he earned his bachelor's degree in psychology and a master's degree in education from the University of Maryland. After a short hiatus, he completed his doctorate degree from Northcentral University in educational leadership. Over his career, he has taught at elementary schools, junior high schools, universities, and is an administrator at a private school in Okinawa. He joined JALT in 1995 and has served in many roles for the Okinawa chapter. Currently, he is the Okinawa Chapter membership chair and the Teaching Younger Learners Special Interest Group coordinator for JALT. He is active in JALT functions and enjoys monthly professional development trips to Tokyo.

### **Membership Chair - Paul Nanton**

Paul has lived in Japan for about twenty-one years. He has resided in Chiba, Saitama, and now in Tokyo. Most of his teaching has been in junior and senior high schools. When he is not educating young minds, he is busy watching his son playing soccer and his daughter playing tennis. He has been a JALT member for many years. Years back he was actively involved in the Jr / Sr high school SIG, editing their publication and assisting in various conferences. Since the young learners SIG and Jr / Sr high school SIG amalgamated he was the Publications Chair and JALT Junior Site Chair.

### **Publicity Co-chair - Andy Whitmyre**

Andy works at a private elementary school in western Tokyo. He has been in Japan for about 15 years now. He first lived in Miyagi (Sendai), and then Tokyo for the past 8 or so years. He has taught high school, some business English, but mainly elementary, both in public and private schools, and also an immersion after-school program. He is currently considering a masters in the near future.

### **Treasurer - Emi Sugita**

Ms. Sugita started her academic career in 1976, as an English Teacher in the YMCA English Kindergarten. In 2001 she started the creative process for founding the YMCA International Kindergarten which was later opened in 2003 and as of 2004, Ms. Sugita has held the position of principal. Over the years, Ms. Sugita successfully assumed various roles within JALT, both at Conference and local level. For over 10 years, Ms. Sugita has been organizing and running the Registration Desk at the JALT Annual International Conference in her capacity of Conference Registration Chair, while being an enthusiastic and active member of the Association and in 2010 she was a Member of the JALT Admin Committee. From 2004 to 2010 she served as Treasurer of the Hiroshima Chapter as well as Treasurer of the TYL Sig for the past 3 years. In 2012 Ms. Sugita was the Pan SIG Local Liaison. Ms. Sugita has been actively involved with the education of Young Learners for over 40 years, participating in numerous conferences and study groups, internationally and nationally. A licensed teacher of Japanese as a second language and Teacher of English, she is also a prominent figure on the teaching materials market and is constantly cooperating in joint projects with various educational groups nationwide.

### **Publicity Co-chair - Samikshya Bidari**

Samikshya, originally from Nepal, lives with her family in Hachioji, Tokyo. She has a daughter and twin boys. She completed her MBA in India and took a huge gap of 8 years to raise her children. During those years she was actively volunteering “yomikikase and kamishibai” storytelling at the local schools and the community center. Later she started working as an ALT, when she realized she needed some pedagogical training, so she completed a 120 hour TEFL course. She loved reading and learning again, so she started going to West Tokyo JALT workshops and presentations. Still looking to improve upon her education, she is working on her Masters in TESOL from Soka University. She is trying her best to be involved with JALT, mostly to be in touch with pioneers in the EFL and TYL fields. Her future goal is to collect and transfer all the knowledge she gains from Japan back to Nepal.

### **Publications Co-Chair - Michael Pettovello**

Michael has been living in Japan for the last eleven years and has been teaching young learners for most of that time, with a lot of that experience with very young learners. He also has a couple young learners of his own that he is very proud of. For the last 5 years, he has been at his current position where he leads curriculum development and implementation for the "kindergarten" course. Michael really believes strongly in getting students interested in books and reading. He is always looking for ways to improve his classes and learn new things. This year he will be doing his best as the TYL Sig Publications Co-Chair, as well as the JALT Junior Site Chair.

### **Publications Co-chair Kate Sato**

Originally from the south of the UK, Kate started teaching (in France) in 1980, and first came to Japan a few years later. Kate left for about 3 years, in which time she taught EFL in London and then in Dallas, Texas in the U.S. She returned to Japan in 1991 and has lived here ever since. From 2002 she ran her own school for 0-12 year olds, but in 2015 found herself moving towards researching TEYL. She has been active in her regional JALT group for some years (Membership secretary, JALT Hokkaido vetting committee). She is looking forward to contributing to the TYL sig.

### **Publications Co-chair Katie Kato**

Katie studied education and Spanish at University, and dreamed of teaching in South America. She started teaching English in San Diego, and came to Japan to teach in 2009. She opened her own school in 2011 and started a family shortly after. She has never made it to South America, but does love where her life has taken her thus far! She has two little kids who keep her very busy, and she loves teaching and managing her school. She has always wanted to get more involved with JALT, but has been just too busy being a mom. Now, she finally feels like she is ready to take a step forward, challenge herself and get involved.

### **Publications Co-Chair - Gaby Benthien**

Gaby is originally from Germany, but immigrated to Australia when she was 12. She has been teaching foreign languages non-stop since graduating from university in 1991. She started out as a Japanese language teacher at secondary school in Australia, with a short stint as a primary school language teacher as well, before starting work as an ALT at a primary school and Junior high school in Yamanashi. She now teaches at a small private university in Chiba, and half her classes are for students wanting (or having) to teach English at primary or secondary schools. Gaby is interested in both the teaching and learning of additional languages.

### **JJ Co-Chair Marybeth Kamibeppu**

Marybeth, JALT member for many years, is originally from the countryside of New York state (U.S.). She has been living in Hiroshima for the last 5 years, but spent almost 20 years in the Kanto area on and off since she was a student. She taught full-time in the US at the University of Maryland, College Park after getting her master's from the School for en, International Training (SIT) and then came back to Japan. She has taught university, kindergarten, at home, and at junior high schools in Japan. As her children got older, she started back full-time five years ago at an IB school in Hiroshima. She is responsible for all the language learners from K-12, but in the last few years, she has spent less time in the primary and more in the diploma program. She has recently become an IB workshop leader and visiting team member for IB school evaluations. She enjoyed getting to know so many great people as the JJ program chair for the last five years and trying to do the program coordinating. Marybeth has taken on a more active role in the National Election Committee, but will support the TYL SIG as a member -at-large.

### **Programs Chair - Benjamin Iain Robertson**

Benjamin Iain Robertson has been teaching English in various capacities since 2013. From the west of Scotland in the United Kingdom, he completed his bachelor's in Japanese studies and his master's in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages from the University of Edinburgh. Originally an eikaiwa teacher, he has also taught as an ALT at junior high school level and is now an English instructor at the Japan Center for Michigan Universities in Hikone, Shiga. A member of JALT from 2018, he is enthusiastic to share his passion for teaching young learners with others, as well as develop new skills as an active participant in the Teaching Younger Learners Special Interest Group.

### **Officer at Large - Aleda Krause**

Aleda has been in Japan and JALT for 42 years. She started out teaching adults and university students, then had her own child and got into teaching children. She has been doing that for 35 years. With Michelle Nagashima, she started the 'Teaching Children' SIG in 1996 and was the first Coordinator. She has held many positions in JALT over the years and knows a lot of the ins and outs.

# Discovering Identities in Discourse: Finding Salience through Conversation Analysis

James Kienlong WANG

Kanda University of International Studies

MA TESOL Program

## INTRODUCTION

Conversation analysis (CA) can provide English as a foreign or second language (EFL/ESL) teachers with insights into not only classroom-discourse dynamics but also the language-learning processes of their learners (Hale, Hooper & Naani, 2018). The *modus operandi* for conducting this conversation analysis-based action research is to: 1) collect and transcribe collected data, and 2) analyze the data to find something of salience in the pedagogy. Through implementing CA, I was able to find salience in my teaching practice. Finding aspects of your teaching that are prominent and critical can benefit teachers in reflective practice and uncover pedagogical implications. The paper begins with a consideration of the *Initiation-Response-Feedback* (IRF) pattern and how its pedagogical potential has shed light for an interactional framework that delineates ways of engaging in ‘classroom conversation’, leading into Zimmerman’s (1998) proposal for three different aspects of identity: *discourse, situated, and transportable identities*. Following the literature review, I will present the analytical aspect of my study and compare salient examples of teacher and student- initiated discourse, which exemplify the discovery of identity shift. In conducting this conversation analysis-based action research, I hope to answer the questions: Why did my student shift identities (discourse to transportable)? How can teachers and students benefit from unpredictability in discourse?

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### *Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF)*

In the current realm of language teaching, the dominating presence of the teacher-controlled *Initiation-Response-Feedback* (also called Follow-up)(IRF) pattern is generally recognized as representing a serious challenge to teachers and teacher educators alike within the context of communicative language teaching (Richards, 2006: 52). The following example illustrates the power of the IRF pattern as an instrument of pedagogic intent and teacher control:

[Richards, 2006, p. 53—modified]

01	T:	But the writing is on ‘weekends’ which
02		tells you:: that
03	S1:	When
04	T:	Whe::n. Ye::s. ((To S2)) So would you
05		to give me the question again.
06	S2:	When do: when do you go: (.) to
07		on: [weekends
08	Ss:	[(XXXXXXXXXX)

09	S2:	When do you (0.5) when do you go: (0.5) er
10	T:	to
11	S2:	to er (0.5) er (.) er (1.0) weekends
12	S3:	((To S2)) °Taif°
13	T:	When do you go to <i>where</i> ? Banana Street?
14	S2:	When do you (.) when do you go (.) to
15		Taif.
16	T:	<i>Ye:::s!</i>

Line 01 begins with a teacher Initiation, where the use of sound stretching prompts S1 to provide a completion of the teacher’s utterance. S1 delivers the correct Response in line 03 and the teacher repeats and affirms the correct answer in Line 04 with a Feedback (sometimes called “Follow-up”).

Although the IRF pattern represents a significant advance in the current research of teacher-student interaction and understanding of discourse opportunities, Richards (2006) stresses that there is a consequential danger that it will serve for the purpose of its ubiquity and fearfully, leave unaddressed the more forbidding challenge of potentially finding new ways of engaging in classroom conversation.

### ***Conversation Analysis-based Action Research***

For many second language learners, one of the most difficult tasks is learning how to engage in ordinary conversation (Wong & Waring, 2010). Hatch (1978, as cited in Wong & Waring, 2010) suggests that conversation is the medium through which we do language learning. Conversation analysis (CA) can provide English as a foreign or second language (EFL/ESL) teachers with insights into not only classroom-discourse dynamics but also the language-learning processes of their learners (Hale, 2011; Hale, Naani, & Hooper, 2018). Educators who utilize CA are fundamentally concerned what people do in order to have a conversation.

CA’s transcription methods are much more detailed than other qualitative research methods and is detailed in a manner which benefits the second language teacher (Hale, Naani, & Hooper, 2018). Features of pronunciation, intonation, rate of speech, overlapping and length of pauses are represented in CA transcription symbols. Hale, Naani, and Hooper (2018) point out that these features are important because the detailed nature of the transcription symbols can tell teachers not only what was said, but also the subtle linguistic nuances of how something was said (see Appendix A for full list of transcription symbols).

### ***Discourse, Situational, and Transportable Identities***

In light of deepening and enriching understanding teacher-student talk within the language classrooms, I present Zimmerman’s proposal for different categories of identities (1998) which establish a practical foundation for bridging previous discourse-based studies with interactional analyses.

Zimmerman proposed three aspects of identity (1998: 90-91):

1. ***Discourse identities*** are ‘integral to the moment-by-moment organization of the interaction’ and emerge from the sequential development of the talk; orienting participants to engage in specific activities with their respective roles (e.g., *speaker/hearer, questioner/answerer*)



2. *Situated identities* are relevant to particular situations and sustained by the contribution of participants ‘engaging in activities and respecting agendas that display an orientation to, and an alignment of, particular identity sets’ (e.g., *teacher* and *student*)
3. *Transportable identities* are ‘usually visible, that is on the basis of physical or culturally based insignia which furnish the intersubjective basis for categorization’ (e.g., being a *Westerner* vs. a *Japanese student*)

In the next section, I will share my choice of method (context and participants), followed by analysis, which I believe illustrate the potential of these distinctive identities.

## METHOD

### *Context and Participant(s)*

The participants in this study are two young Japanese learners of English: Alice (pseudonym) who is in the 2nd grade of elementary school and has been learning English for 4 years, and Maria (pseudonym) who is a 3rd grader and has been learning English for a little over 4 years. Both participants are currently assigned in the same after-school English program (or commonly known as *Eikaiwa jugyō*) held at their previously attended and affiliated private kindergarten, which is located in Tokyo. Lessons are held once a week for the duration of a 45-minute long lesson. The lesson utilized for the purpose of this study was related to the current curriculum in terms of the order of segments and themes covered for that specific week.

The context for the recorded data varied for each student depending on their subject and topic of discussion as well as their level of proficiency. Alice was learning about the types of clothing we wear during certain seasons of the year. In contrast, Maria’s recording was on greetings and ice-breaking activities that are normally conducted in the beginning of the English lesson. As you will see, an element of unpredictability occurs in the conversation with Maria, which triggers a shift in her discourse and situated identity. In contrast, I will compare Maria’s data to Alice’s, which exemplifies a more teacher-controlled exchange.

## FINDINGS

In Maria’s data (see *Appendix B* for full transcription), there is a presence of an anomaly. The conversation begins with Maria taking on the situated identity of ‘*student*’ and the discourse places her as the ‘*answerer*’ to my identity as ‘*teacher*’ and ‘*questioner*’.

001	T:	So Maria (.) how are you?	
002	S:	I’m h <sub>2</sub> ot a:nd happy.	
003	T:	>>You’re hot and happy (.) Can you ask me?	
004	S:	(3.0) °M:m° (1.0) I’m h <sub>2</sub> ot °and° (2.0) [fine]	
005	T:		[You’re] hot and fine.
006		>>Can you ask Jimmy sensei?<<=<<=	
007	S:	=E:hh to >>how are you?<<	
008	T:	U::m Maria >>Jimmy s <sub>2</sub> ensei?<< I a:m ↑hhot a::nd I’m very	
009		((rubs stomach)) (2.0)	
010	S:	[°hungry°]	
011	T:	[G, very h <sub>2</sub> ungr:y] Good job, very [hungry.]	

The talk begins with my Initiation (line 001) asking Maria how she is, and she gives a Response, followed by my confirmation or Feedback (line 003). Maria misunderstands my attempt at having her asking me, and has her giving

the wrong Response of changing *happy* to *fine* (line 004). However, she manages to give a correct Response with my second Initiation, this time with added stress on who I want her to ask. The conversation proceeds smoothly, until I accidentally deviate myself from the teaching plan and remove myself from seeing Maria's learning moves (line 017). I transition into the segment of giving Maria her attendance sticker for the lesson, unintentionally forgetting to greet my assistant and second teacher in English class, Tommy *sensei* (a stuffed monkey).

017 S: *E:hh* ↓to ((points to animal *sensei*)) (4.0)  
 018 T: O::H (2.0) Do you remember ↑this *sensei*'s name?  
 019 (3.0) >>Is it<< Jojo *sensei*? (3.0) °Maybe°<b:ut is it Jojo> it starts  
 020 with a ↑T=  
 021 S: (2.0) =Tommy [*sensei*]  
 022 T: [Tommy *sensei*] >>Say hello<< Tommy [*sensei*]  
 023 S: [Hello]  
 024 Tommy *sensei*.

Maria knows that we always greet the animal *sensei*, and in response to this, she identifies herself as a 'customer'. This sets the interaction between the teacher, who is placed in the category of 'instructor' and 'supplier' of language, with the newly introduced 'customer' who has been paying to learn English for the past 4 years!

In contrast, Alice's data shows teacher-student interaction, where she conforms with the exchange in her respective discourse and situated identities. Alice is successful in displaying her ability in carrying a conversation with me, scaffolded with the aid of frequent L1 substitution, foreignizing, and teacher-guided shadowing:

005 T: I have ↑ten pairs of shorts. Ten. Hhow about [you Alice?]  
 006 S: [Alice wa] t- \$hh\$ two  
 007 T: Ok >>you say<< I have =  
 008 S: =I have two >>datte *anmanai kara*  
 009 T: s::o what color Alice (4.0) What color are your shorts?  
 010 S: (2.0) *Dakar:a* (2.0) bl:ue *toka* >>eh to<< *nandakke* white [*kana*?]  
 011 T: [Ok] s:o  
 012 white [a:nd]  
 013 S: [u::h] °and° brown  
 (Refer to *Appendix C* for full transcription)

The findings and analyzed data serve to show that simple, yet surprising learner moves (e.g., such as speech act of pointing to remind the teacher) can introduce transportable identities within classroom talk. I have found this to be salient, and illustrated a shift in a learner's dependence on scaffolded, teacher-driven instruction (interdependence) to self-sufficiency (independence) (Hale, 2011). Transportable identities, regardless of being temporary and ephemeral in the discourse, can provide new insight for teachers and in the way they teach. Richards advocates that introducing transportable identities has the potential to create opportunities for engaging in classroom conversation and promote interaction between teacher and student (2006:71~72).

## DISCUSSION OF PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Why did my student shift identities (discourse to transportable)? How can teachers and students benefit from unpredictability in discourse?

As Underhill (2014) proposed, there are sometimes two opposed tendencies we can see at work within the classroom that impact on question of unpredictability and improvisation: one from the learner's viewpoint and one from

the teacher's. From the learner's perspective, she is 'grappling with what is new to her' and 'brings to bear her learning faculties and experiences, including curiosity and the capacity to stay in touch with what is still unknown'. At the same time, she utilizes 'what she knows in order to inform her deductions and inductions, hunches and guesses' to handle the language puzzle she is currently faced with. Underhill called this partly aware and partly unaware tendency, the learner's *learning agenda* (2014:60). It is at this learning point, where our learners' knowledge meet their learning moves, which need to be attended with accurate and immediate feedback.

The teacher, who has trained himself to be conscious and alert of some or most of his student's processes, can sometimes miss their learning moves due to staying 'on course' with what Underhill calls the *teaching plan* (2014:60). It is entirely up to the teacher and if he is less inclined or skilled at taking the lead from the learning that is in front of him, or if he chooses to default to his usual routine, or even stray from it. The IRF is an example of sticking to the teaching plan. With Maria's speech act and shift in identity, my action of unintentionally going 'off course' led me to improvise. I believe that it is this improvisation that enables language teachers to respond and attend to the emergent learning agendas within classroom talk.

So how can teachers and students benefit from identities in discourse? By implicating small changes in our teaching, we can make big changes in language learning (Fanselow, 2018). One possible way is to set expectations and identify my teaching 'ritual' and 'rules' and then intentionally change them, or break them. I can select a certain routine, and either do the opposite or do it differently and see how my students react to it. I can experiment with one class or group of learners and compare it with another. Will I get the same results as Maria's? What possible patterns might emerge?

## CONCLUSION

Prior to utilizing conversation analysis (CA) in my teaching practice, I was not aware of how much I was relying on my teaching plan and resorting to the IRF pattern and missing small details of actual meaningful learning opportunities expressed by my very own students. Conversation analysis is like a self-initiating 'second opinion' that all teachers should add in their teaching pedagogy to reflect in a more careful and critical way. As Zimmerman (1998) proposed, teachers and students are associated with their respective default discourse and situated identities. Only when learners negotiate in the interaction with the presence of their transportable identities, can they create new possibilities and ways to carry on a conversation. The identity shift phenomenon has the potential to break the *Initiation-Response-Feedback* pattern and create real, meaningful opportunities for engaging in classroom conversation that also promotes our learner's learning agenda. With this learning experience and opportunity in conducting conversation analysis-based action research, I shall proceed and continue in my teaching endeavor. I hope to gain more knowledge and familiarity of these practices while always keeping the benefit of my learners in mind.

## Appendix A: CA transcription symbols

.	(period) Falling intonation.
?	(question mark) Rising intonation.
,	(comma) Continuing intonation.
-	(hyphen) Marks an abrupt cut-off.
::	(colon(s)) Prolonging of sound.
w <u>o</u> :rd	(colon after underlined letter) Falling intonation on word.
w <u>o</u> :rd	(underlined colon) Rising intonation on word.
<u>word</u>	(underlining)
<u>word</u>	The more underlying, the greater the stress.
WORD	(all caps) Loud speech.
°word°	(degree symbols) Quiet speech.
↑word	(upward arrow) raised pitch.
↓word	(downward arrow) lowered pitch
>>word<<	(more than and less than) Quicker speech.
<<word>>	(less than & more than) Slowed speech.
<	(less than) Talk is jump-started—starting with a rush.
hh	(series of h's) Aspiration or laughter.
.hh	(h's preceded by dot) Inhalation.
[ ]	(brackets) simultaneous or overlapping speech.
[ ]	
=	(equal sign) Latch or contiguous utterances of the same speaker.
(2.4)	(number in parentheses) Length of a silence in 10ths of a second
(.)	(period in parentheses) Micro-pause, 0.2 second or less.
( )	(empty parentheses) Non-transcribable segment of talk.
((gazing toward the ceiling))	(double parentheses) Description of non-speech activity.
(try 1)/(try 2)	(two parentheses separated by a slash) Alternative hearings.
\$word\$	(dollar signs) Smiley voice.
#word#	(number signs) Squeaky voice.
(Jefferson, 1984)	

Appendix B: CA TRANSCRIPTION 01 (MARIA)

Counter	Line	Speaker	Talk	notes
	001	T	So Maria (.) how are you?	
	002	S	I'm h:ot a:nd happy.	
	003	T	>>You're hot and happy (.) Can you ask me?	
	004	S	(3.0) °M:m° (1.0) I'm h:ot °and° (2.0) [fine]	
	005	T	[You're] hot and fine.	
	006		>>Can you ask Jimmy sensei?<<=	
	007	S	=E:hh to >>how are you?<<	
	008	T	U::m Maria >>Jimmy sensei?<< I a:m ↑hhot a:nd I'm very	
	009		((rubs stomach)) (2.0)	
	010	S	[°hungry°]	
	011	T	[G, very hungr:y] Good job, very [hungry.]	
	012	S	[<mata?>] ((mumbles))=	
	013	T	Y:eah I'm very hungry. U::h. OH (.) ↑B:ut >>Maria<< A:ND	
	014		(1.0) I'm ve↑ry happy.	
	015	S	[°Very happy°]	
	016	T	[I'm very happy.] I'm very happy. ((standing up to grab stickers))	
	017	S	E:hh ↓to ((points to animal sensei)) (4.0)	
	018	T	O::H (2.0) Do you remember ↑this sensei's name?	
	019		(3.0) >>Is it<< Jojo sensei? (3.0) °Maybe°<b:ut is it Jojo> it starts	
	020		with a ↑T=	
	021	S	(2.0) =Tommy [sensei]	
	022	T	[Tommy sensei] >>Say h:ello<< Tommy [sensei]	
	023	S	[Hello]	
	024		Tommy sensei.	
	025	T	Good to [see you.]	
	026	S	[hh °good to see you°]	
	027	T	°Good to see you°°\$hhhh\$ (.) ((holding Tommy sensei doll))	
	028		Do you want to ask him?	
1:17	029	S	(2.0) \$hh\$ H,how are you?	

Appendix C: CA TRANSCRIPTION 02 (ALICE)

Counter	→	Line	Speaker	Talk	notes
		001	T	>> So Alice how many shorts do you have?<< One?	
		002	S	E:hh one, two (.) three, four, five, s- EHH >>nani ga?<<	
		003	T	How many ↑shorts do you have? >>Jimmy sensei<< I have °u:h°	
		004		one, tw:o (.) four, five, six, seven, eight, ( )	
		005		I have ↑ten pairs of shorts. Ten. Hhow about [you Alice?]	
		006	S	[Alice wa] t- Shh\$ two	
		007	T	Ok >>you say<< I have =	
		008	S	=I have two >>datte anmanai kara	
		009	T	s:o what color Alice (4.0) What color are your shorts?	
		010	S	(2.0) Dakar:a (2.0) bl:ue toka >>eh to<< nandakke white [kana?]	
		011	T	[Ok] s:o	
		012		white [a:nd]	
		013	S	[u:h] °and° brown	
		014	T	brown >>Jimmy sensei<< Alice I have whi:te (.) brown (.) black (.)	
		015		gre:en (.) \$yellow\$ (.) re:d, orange, (.) gre:y, na:vy	
		016	S	ne	
		017	T	↑pink (2.0) ↑Ten pairs of shorts Shhh\$ >>Jimmy sensei<<	
		018		[I]	
		019	S	[blue wa?]	
		020	T	So blue is a:h navy blue, navy blue. So navy blue is a ↑dark blue	
		021		>>alright<< Alice so what else [do you-]	
		022	S	[( )]	
		023	T	So what else do you wear Alice? >>Jimmy sensei<< I wear one, a	
		024		I wear a shirt, I wear shorts. °Oh° Alice I wear a? (6.0) ((pointing to	
		025		flashcard))	
		026	S	°no°	
		027	T	No? O:kay >> I wear °sh, sh, sho° (5.0)	
		028	S	Datte Alice naindamo [anma]	
		029	T	[ok]	
		030	S	Dakara [kore ni] shite	
		031	T	[alright] >> so lets say<< I wear pants	
		032	S	I wear pants [a:nd] eh yotsu ga i::i	
		033	T	[a:nd I wear] ok	
		034	S	Datte kore to, kore to, [kore-]	
		035	T	[alright] so you say one more please	
		036	S	One more [ple:ase te	
		037	T	[ok now] >>you have to make sure you say<< I wear =	
		038	S	=(( points at the flashcards)) I wear [↑pants]	
		039	T	[short ] pants? Long pants?	
		040	S	Lo:ng pants.	
		041	T	>>Ok<< a:nd?= =A:nd hh h:ot, ha:t	
		042	S	Hats? Ok, hats.	
		043	T	Un (2.0) °and°	
		044	S	Su:n	
		045	T	Su:n	
		046	S	Su:n	
		047	T	Sunglasses.	
		048	S	Sunglasses, too (3.0)	
		049	T	I wear?	

	050	S	I we:ar (2.0) she-, \$hh\$	
	051	T	Ah you're close. [Shirts.]	
	052	S	[Ahh, shirts.]	
	053	T	Ni:ce Alice. Awe:some. Yeah. So that's what you wear in summer.	
	054	S	°In summer°	
	055	T	Because in summer Alice it's very hh (2.0)=	
2:58	056	S	=very very very very very very very very HOT.	

## REFERENCES

- Fanselow, J. F. (2018). Small Changes in Teaching Big Results in Learning: Videos, activities and essays to stimulate fresh thinking about language learning. *Independently published*.
- Hale, C. (2011). Breaking with the IRF and EPA: Facilitating student initiated talk. In *JALT2010 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.
- Hale, C., Hooper, D., Naani, A. (2018). Conversation Analysis in Language Teacher Education: An Approach for Reflection Through Action Research. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education (HUJE)*, 33 (Special Issue): 54-71.
- Richards, K. (2006). Being the teacher: Identity and classroom conversation. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(1), 51-77.
- Underhill, A. (2014). Training for the Unpredictable. *The European Journal of Applied Linguistics and TEFL*. 3(2): 59-69.
- Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zimmerman, D. H. (1998). Discoursal identities and social identities. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in Talk* (pp. 87-106). London: Sage.

## **‘Keeping it real’ in the Japanese high school classroom**

**By Andrew McCarthy**

### ***Oberlin Academy***

During research which I carried out recently, in the Japanese high school in which I teach, I discovered the benefits of utilizing near peer role models in the L2 (second language) classroom. Researchers in the field of SLA (second language acquisition) have shown the importance of near peer role models (NPRMs) for L2 language learners (Murphey, 1998; Muir 2018). A near peer role model is someone who is similar to ourselves in terms of ‘age, gender, ethnicity, or past experience’ (Muir, 2018: 2). NPRMs can act as language models, offer encouragement and reassurances, help inspire autonomous learning and provide feedback that teachers are not able to (Muir 2018). In the Japanese high school context, NPRMs could be recent graduates who have had a good L2 learning experience at school and are now studying English at university or using English for their jobs. They may also be students who have had a good experience while studying abroad and learning a language.

Studying abroad for a short or long term is of course one way to improve your communicative ability in an L2 by immersing yourself in the language of your hosts. However, as studying abroad costs time and money, it is not a viable option for many students. Those lucky enough to have studied abroad have gained valuable experience and many of them are eager to share their experiences with other students upon their return. Sharing L2 learning experiences among near peers is a useful learning tool which is open to many L2 teachers in Japanese high schools and it allows for an authentic way to not only motivate young L2 learners but also provide them with useful strategies for L2 acquisition. Comparisons could be drawn here with vicarious learning (Bandura 1965), in other words learning that takes place through observational learning or copying. Bandura states that vicarious learning takes place by ‘observing the behaviour of others and its reinforcing consequences, without the modelled responses being overtly performed by the viewer during the exposure period’ (1965: 3).

An opportunity arose recently for me to see if L2 near peer role models could actually have a positive effect on my students’ L2 motivation and acquisition. Upon meeting a 2<sup>nd</sup> year student, who had recently returned from studying abroad for a year in America, I asked him if he would be willing to give a talk in English to my class about his experiences while studying abroad and what strategies he used for L2 acquisition. The students appeared very excited to be spoken to by a *senpai* and they listened very attentively to his experiences and advice as he spoke to them in English. However, I noted that the students found it difficult to ask questions (even in Japanese). Therefore, I asked the *senpai* if he would be willing to give a talk to another one of my classes. He gladly agreed and this time I gave the students time to prepare questions in English first to increase the level of interaction in English. This resulted in more interaction between the students and the *senpai*.

Although it is difficult to quantify how and to what degree this talk increased my students L2 motivation and acquisition, I certainly observed noticeable improvements in their efforts to complete L2 learning tasks in subsequent lessons. Therefore, I really recommend this authentic L2 learning tool that is open to many English teachers in Japanese high schools. I am now tasked with maintaining my students’ increased L2 motivation levels and discovering what else I can do to ‘keep it real’ in the classroom.

### **References**

Bandura, A. (1965). Veracious Processes: A Case of no-trial learning. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. Vol 2.



- Muir, C. (2018). Motivational aspects of using near peers as role models. Part of the Cambridge papers in ELT series. Cambridge University Press.
- Murphey, T. (1998). Motivating with near peer role models. *JALT'97: Trends and Transitions*. Page 201.

## **“No Japanese” - Examining the role of L1 in the L2 classroom**

**Benjamin Iain Robertson**

**Japan Center for Michigan Universities**

### Introduction

“The natural use of the target language for virtually all communication is a sure sign of a good language course.” (Chambers, 1991, p.27).

It seems unlikely that most professional readers would disagree with Chamber’s (1991) statement. After all, it is a commonly held belief among many English language teaching companies that a learner’s native language should be absent from the classroom. One speculation is that this is due to an adherence to the *Direct Method* of language teaching, even though its origins made frequent use of the mother tongue to explain new concepts (Howatt & Smith, 2014).

Younger learners may have a reduced comprehension of how language is constructed compared to more senior learners (Johnstone, 2009) and teachers have limitations on the amount of time and resources to facilitate understanding. Considering there is growing evidence that the use of learners’ native language is a help and not a hindrance (Atkinson, 1993; Butzkamm, 2003; Levine, 2012, Swain & Lapkin, 2013; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002), it may be time to consider a revision of its role in the classroom. It would be unwise and perhaps controversial to suggest judicious use of learners’ target language. However, it is argued that there are scenarios where use of learners’ native language is not only acceptable, but of great benefit for overall language learning.

This paper evaluates the role of learner’s mother tongue (L1) in an English language (L2) teaching classroom with young learners through analysis of the Direct Method, and concludes by addressing concerns over a lack of authenticity when not using the target language.

### Direct Method

What we know today as the Direct Method was derived from two methods which have their origins in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. Both schools of thought emerged around the 1880s. The first, the Reform Movement, centred on teaching the spoken variant of written texts. The second, the Natural Method, focused on teaching conversational English. Whereas, the Reform Movement was pioneered by non-native speakers, the Natural Method built its ideas around the native speaker. Eventually the Direct Method evolved in a way that has neglected the Reform Movements acceptance of translation from learners’ L1 into L2 and has instead become associated with the philosophy that no translation should be allowed. However, this neglects that translation is not simply a means to transfer information between languages, but also an opportunity to express culture (Hervey, Higgins & Haywood, 1995). The role of a teacher is not only to impart language tuition but also the often intertwined cultural knowledge.. Teachers in foreign countries may be, for younger learners, the only representation of their culture. In light of increasing globalisation, an understanding of other’s culture would seem to be a focal part of learning considering many people will go onto interact with foreign people either in or outside of the workplace. As Japan becomes a progressively multilingual and multicultural nation, understanding of culture and cultural context is increasingly more important (Maher, 2002; Maher & Yashiro, 1995; Noguchi & Fotos, 2001).

The Japanese educational system struggles to produce proficient English speakers (Kato, 2000; Kunieda, 2000). Kanno, (2007) points out that one or two English classes a week is unlikely to have a significant impact on their Japanese language development. Arguably, there is the potential for it to have little effect on their English language development either. Many Japanese children go to English classes for an hour or so a week with the expectation of significant gains in their understanding of English. However, learners seldom have much opportunity to practice English outside of the classroom and it is the responsibility of teachers to capitalise on what little instruction time they have. The current assumption under the direct method is that languages are binary and should be learned separately through inductive learning and negotiation of meaning (Cook, 2002; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Cummins, 2008). Yet for many learners, their native language provides the tools to focus attention and attain understanding (Swain & Lapkin, 2013). Keeping this in mind, rather than focusing on how much L2 can be spoken, it would be better to encourage dialogue on how and when to make effective use of both languages (Alptekin, 2002; Nao, 2011). The amount of target language spoken in a classroom context does not provide the only means of measuring the quality of language learnt (Kim & Elder, 2005). A number of researchers have discovered productive uses for the L1 in the classroom, in particular code switching (Atkinson, 1987; Butzkamm, 1998; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). Reasons to use the L1 include mitigating anxiety (Carson & Kashihara, 2012) and granting greater equality for less able learners (Sugie, 1995). Therefore, complete adherence to the Direct Method restricts both teachers' and learners' scope. Inclusion of L1 in the classroom would provide an environment that empowers learners to develop learning strategies that will benefit them in the future – these include negotiation of meaning and code switching that will help learners to transition into a more globalised world where interlocutors in English come from a variety of different backgrounds. This does not mean that the Direct Method should be removed in its entirety, instead it should perhaps be used more sparingly with a less restrictive attitude towards L1 use in the classroom.

#### Target language and authenticity

Authenticity is a benchmark term used to describe language samples, either spoken or written, that convey a natural sense of form (Rogers & Medley, 1988). It is also an umbrella term that can be broken down into more specific concepts such as authenticity in texts, learner authenticity, classroom authenticity and competence authenticity. However, these have conflicting definitions. For example, authentic texts could be considered those that are not altered (Grellet, 1981) or materials designed not for the language learner, but for native speakers instead (Nunan, 1988; Harmer 1991). Attempts have now been made to challenge restrictive views that only consider authenticity in terms of input.

A key result of language teaching is the ability of learners to show a degree of competence in their target language (Bernstein, 2000). Some have argued that as using the L1 in the classroom does not promote authenticity (Atkins, 2013), that somehow this hinders a learner's progression. However, considering that non-native speakers now outnumber native speakers of English (Sharifian, 2013), and that native English speakers' utterances are not always mutually intelligible for non-native speakers (Canagarajah & Wurr, 2001; Cogo & Dewey, 2006), this point seems redundant. English only remains an effective method of spoken communication if it is intelligible to all its speakers from a variety of different language backgrounds (Rias van den Doel, 2007). Therefore, despite a teacher's best efforts, if they are not able to convey meaning solely in the target language, then use of the L1 seems more acceptable. As young learners will have limited vocabulary or grammar to process meaning, the use of the L1 may help to ensure their comprehension. Non-native English speakers often switch between languages when trying to achieve understanding (Ludwig, 1982; Jourdain, 2000) and it seems unfruitful for teachers to try to inhibit this. Moreover, it removes potential opportunities for learners to experience a new kind of classroom context where they can develop strategies that relate to their future needs. When provided with

the right tools, learners can begin to view themselves as emergent bilinguals who can be active participants (Levine, 2012). In this sense, we can empower younger learners and allow them to engage more critically in the learning process – teachers can assist by promoting the use of the L1 as a means of facilitating more learner interaction (McKay, 2003). Perhaps it is best to regard authenticity as “dynamic processes which involve conflict, contestation and reinvention” (Blommaert & Varis, 2013, p. 4). Authenticity is something that is decided upon in the moment of teaching and is subject to the needs of learners. Teachers are in a position whereby they can decide what is authentic for their classroom context. Overuse of learners’ mother tongue is a concern (Atkins, 1993), but the suggestion that it should be excluded is as Phillipson (1992) would suggest “a monolingual fallacy”. Issues such as learner motivation, parental involvement and classroom resources are more likely to impact young learners’ successes in English language learning.

### Conclusion

There is no one method that will be appropriate for all teaching contexts. Nunan’s (1991) suggestion that classroom tasks and activities should be designed with classroom dynamics in mind is still true today. Teachers must be constantly adaptable and critically engaged in the process. There are, of course, times when it is inappropriate to reference learner’s native language, especially in tasks that review what learners already know. However, for younger learners, use of the L1 can help them to negotiate meaning, clear up misunderstandings and maintain motivation. Knowing when and when not to abstain from the use of learner’s L1 is something that is up to the teacher’s discretion and something that requires both reflection and revision as teachers are exposed to new teaching contexts with younger learners.

### References

- Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 56, 57-64.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/56.1.57>
- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource? *ELT Journal*, 41, 241-247.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/41.4.241>
- Atkinson, D. (1993). Teaching in the target language: a problem in the current orthodoxy. *The Language Learning Journal*, 8(1), 2–5. doi: 10.1080/09571739385200261
- Bernstein, B. (2000) *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Blommaert, J., & Varis, P. (2013). Enough is enough. *Hamburg Studies on Linguistic Diversity Linguistic Superdiversity in Urban Areas*, 143–160. doi: 10.1075/hsl.2.10blo
- Butzkamm, W. (1998). Code-switching in a bilingual history lesson: The mother tongue as a conversational lubricant. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1, 81-99.
- Butzkamm, W. (2003). We only learn language once. The role of the mother tongue in FL classrooms: death of a dogma. *The Language Learning Journal*, 28(1), 29-39. doi: 10.1080/09571730385200181
- Canagarajah, A., & Wurr, A. (2011). Multilingual communication and language acquisition: New research directions. *The Reading Matrix*, 11(1), 1-15.
- Chambers, F. (1991). Promoting Use of the Target Language in the Classroom. *Language Learning Journal*, 4(1), 27–31. doi:10.1080/09571739185200411.
- Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2006). Efficiency in ELF communication: From pragmatic motives to lexico-grammatical innovation. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 5(2), 59-93.

- Cook, V. (2002). Background to the L2 user. In V. Cook (Ed.), *Portraits of the L2 user* (pp. 1-31). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94, 103- 115. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x>
- Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In J. Cummins & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (Vol. 5. Bilingual education, 2nd ed., pp. 65-75). Boston, MA: Springer Science + Business Media.
- Grellet, F. (1981). *Developing Reading Skills: A practical guide to reading comprehension exercises*. Cambridge University Press.
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The practice of English language teaching*. London/New York: Person Longman
- Hervey, S., & Higgins, I. & Haywood, L. M. (1995). *Thinking Spanish Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Howatt, A. P. R., & Richard, S. (2014). The History of Teaching English as a Foreign Language, from a British and European Perspective. *Language & History*, 57(1), 75–95. doi:10.1179/1759753614z.00000000028.
- Johnstone, R. (2009). An early start: What are the key conditions for generalized success? In J. Enever, J. Moon, and U. Raman (Eds.), *Young learner English language policy and implementation: International perspectives* (pp. 31-41). Reading, UK: Garnet Publishing.
- Jourdain, S. (2000). A native-like ability to circumlocute. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(2), 185-195.
- Kanno, Y. (2007). ELT policy directions in multilingual Japan. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 63-73). Boston, MA: Springer Science + Business Media.
- Kato, S. (2000, February 17). Futatabi eigo kyoiku nitsuite [English education revisited]. *Asahi Shimbun*, p. 11.
- Kim, S., & Elder, C. (2005). Language choices and pedagogic functions in the foreign language classroom: A cross-linguistic functional analysis of teacher talk. *Language Teaching Research*, 9, 355-380. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168805lr173oa>
- Kunieda, M. (2000). Shogakko no eigo kyoiku [A framework of EngUsh education at elementary schools in Japan]. *Ibunkakan Kyoiku*, 14,4-16.
- Levine, G. (2012). Principles for code choice in the foreign language classroom: A focus on grammaring. *Language Teaching*, 47, 332-348. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000498>
- Ludwig, J. (1982). Native-speaker judgments of second-language learners' efforts at communication: a review. *The Modern Language Journal*, 66(3), 274-283.
- Maher, J. (2002). Language policy for multicultural Japan: Establishing the new paradigm. In S. Baker (Ed.), *Language policy: Lessons from global models* (pp. 164–180). Monterey, CA: Monterey Institute of International Studies.
- Maher, J. C., & Yashiro, K. (1995). Multilingual Japan: An introduction. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 16(1&2), 1–17.
- McKay, S. (2003). Teaching English as an International language: the Chilean context. *ELT Journal*, 57(2), 139–148.
- Nao, M. (2011). The pragmatic realization of the native speaking English teacher as a monolingual ideal. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 3770-3781. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.09.012>
- Noguchi, M. G., & Fotos, S. (Eds.). (2001). *Studies in Japanese bilingualism*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *Syllabus design*. Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: a textbook for teachers*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford University Press

- Rogers, C., & Medley, F., Jr. (1988). Language with a purpose: using authentic materials in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 21, 467–478.
- Van den Doel, R. (2007). Native vs. non-native attitudes to non-native Englishes: Implications for English as an international form of communication. In *1st International Conference on English, Discourse and Intercultural Communication, Macao Polytechnic Institute, 8th to 10th July*.
- Sharifian, F. (2013). Globalisation and developing metacultural competence in learning English as an International Language. *Multilingual Education*, 3(1), 1–11.
- Sugie, S. (1995). Cooperative learning in Japan. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 23, 213-225.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2013). A Vygotskian sociocultural perspective on immersion education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, 1, 101-129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/jicb.1.1.05swa>
- Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 204-218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000119>

## ***Sample Lesson Plan***

***Topic: Storytelling***

***Target Age: Young Learners***

***Author: Hidayat Polim***

### **Rationale:**

Storytelling is an activity that can positively engage students, especially young learners. The linguistic goals are to introduce language structures and vocabulary (Shin & Crandall, 2014). In order to achieve these objectives, teachers should choose the story carefully and be well-prepared to deliver the story to the class: (The teacher should choose a meaningful story that can help develop students' critical thinking skills.) According to Shin and Grandall (2014) there are four core benefits of storytelling.

- Introduce an authentic form of communication
- Introduce new cultures to children
- Help teachers to teach young learners in an entertaining way
- Help develop critical thinking skills.

As such, storytelling is a valuable skill for teachers of young learners. With no limits on ways to modify, adapt, or even change the way we do storytelling, this lesson plan along with its activity might be adapted and re-used as a reference to your own teaching context. There are various types of resources or books which can be used as a reference for storytelling. In this paper, a picture book is used as the medium to help stimulate learners' critical thinking. The sample lesson here uses the picture book 'Piggybook' by Anthony Browne, which introduces the moral lesson and responsibility to do daily chores to young learners.

Keywords: Storytelling, young learner, critical thinking, daily chores, moral lessons

### **Message and lessons learned from 'Piggybook' by Anthony Browne:**

The author of the book wrote the story for young learners to learn about various essential things and daily responsibilities in their everyday life. The story of Piggybook has a great moral lesson for everyone. It tells the importance of supporting each other as a family and the role of a mother, a woman in the family. Throughout the story, young learners can learn about the problems faced by family members. The husband is pictured to be a lazy person, along with his two sons. They spend their days in 'lazy mode'. The mother has to prepare food and meals for everyone in the morning, whilst the sons are watching television. Then, when they get home they rest, beg for meals and enjoy the rest of their day. On the other hand, the mother does not stop working. She does all the household chores for the entire family. She starts with cooking meals, then cleans the house, washes the clothes, does the ironing, and so on. The mother does not stop even when the husband and children get back home. She keeps doing daily chores until everyone else goes to sleep. One day, after many years of doing the same thing, she realizes, it is time for the rest of the family to understand the situation she faces. She escapes the house and tries to give a life-lesson to the family members. The husband and two sons become desperate. In a few days, their house becomes totally messed up, disorganized and dirty. They can not do their tasks without the mother. Luckily, however, the mother comes back home in an attempt to seek a more harmonious family. She meets her husband and sons. She tells everyone to work together for the family. Finally, the husband and the sons realize how the mother always put in a lot of effort to support the family. They now

promise to work together for the daily chores and not to let their mother do all the work. Their newly-found respect for the mother strengthens their family bonds. Their laziness or 'piggy like' behaviour finally diminishes and the father and sons make an effort to become a valuable and useful part of the family.

<b>Title of Story-telling book</b>	Piggybook by Anthony Browne
<b>Student Maturity</b>	Primary Year 2 7-8 year olds
<b>Student numbers/ Class size</b>	10
<b>L2 level</b>	Beginner (EFL young learners)
<b>Duration</b>	35 minutes
<b>Skills to be emphasized</b>	Listening, speaking
<b>Language</b>	Grammar: have and don't have Vocabulary: - Household chores: wash the dishes, wash the clothes, iron the clothes, vacuum the floor, cook the meal, take out the trash.
<b>Objectives</b>	By the end of the lesson students will be able to: - Talk about their daily chores at home. Fill out/in their daily chores table. - Gain respect for their mother, father or guardian - understand the moral responsibility of keeping things clean and helping each other as family members.
<b>Materials</b>	- Worksheets - Slide Presentation - Daily chores chart
<b>Warm-up Before-Storytelling Activities</b>	
<p><b><i>Capture students' attention:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tell students that we are going to meet a new family. Ask them who is in a family.</li> <li>- Show students a picture of a family tree.</li> <li>- Ask students to point to the father, mother, son, daughter, brother, and sister.</li> <li>- Ask the students how many brothers and sisters they have.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Preview the cover and title of the storybook:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Show the cover of 'Piggybook', ask what the students can see and who is in the picture</li> <li>- Teach the name of the author as well as the illustrator of the book (Anthony Browne)</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Predict what will happen</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ask the students why the book title is 'piggy'. Ask if they know what 'piggy' means. Show a picture of a 'Piggybank' to give an illustration that 'piggy' means something that looks like a pig.</li> <li>- Explain the word 'piggy'. The word is usually used to show laziness and greed.</li> </ul>	



<b>Presentation</b> <b>During-storytelling Activities</b>
<p><b>Storytelling:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Begin the story, show the picture and ask who is missing in the picture of the family.</li> <li>- Continue to read and imitate the voice of Mr. Piggot and his sons.</li> <li>- Talk about what is on the table. Ask if it is clean.</li> <li>- Encourage students to read together the chores done by Mrs. Piggot. Ask whether they have ever done these chores or not</li> <li>- Then, continue the story for the evening part where Mrs. Piggot does all the chores. Ask students to predict, “Is there anyone who will help her? Do you think Mr. Piggot or his sons will help after the meal?” “What will they do after eating?”</li> <li>- You know, something bad is going to happen to Mr. Piggot and his sons. [“One evening.....”]</li> <li>- What’s written on the letter from Mrs. Piggot?</li> <li>- “Look, now they turn into..... Ow, that’s horrible!”</li> </ul> <p><b>Comprehension check:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How is the kitchen and house before Mrs. Piggot left and after Mrs. Piggot left?</li> <li>- The table and kitchen look very dirty.</li> </ul> <p><b>Check prediction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will Mrs. Piggot go back to the family?</li> </ul> <p><b>LESSON from the Story</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not one person can do all the work around the house</li> <li>- Family members should work together to make a happy family.</li> </ul>
<b>Practice</b> <b>After-Storytelling Activities</b>
<p><b>Review and retell part of the story</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What are the household chores that Mrs. Piggot does every day?</li> </ul> <p>(Help students to put it in the table)</p> <p><i>Description:</i> Each of the family members has some chore or task to do at home. A chore is a job that you do at home. For example, sweeping the floor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Matching picture and household chores</li> </ul>
<b>Application</b> <b>After-storytelling Activities</b>
<p><b>Chores at my home</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide a worksheet which has pictures of different chores that family members can do at home.</li> <li>- Ask the students to circle the chores they like to do.</li> <li>- Compare their chores with their elbow-buddies. Ask their partners who helps them do those chores?</li> </ul> <p><b>Chores Chart</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Make a slideshow of pictures and words of the name of chores.</li> <li>- Ask the students to choose three chores they can do at home, and fill up in the table by writing the name or drawing the chores into the Chores Chart.</li> </ul>

<b>Assessment</b>
<b>Monitor progress</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- While the students are trying to draw pictures or write the name of the chores on the chores chart, the teacher walks around the class and makes notes of the difficulties the students have.</li> </ul>
<b>Follow-up</b>
<b>Homework</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ask the students to tell their parents about the story they learned in class. Invite them to find out who does what household chores at home. Their family members can help to write or draw the chores in the assigned worksheet. The students will report this back in the next class.</li> </ul>

<b>Ideas for further lesson plan(s)</b>
<p>Lesson objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Understand the concept of the singular and plural form of different nouns (family members or kitchen utensils) and apply it as well.</li> </ul> <p>Connect to prior knowledge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Let's try to check if you know what are some daily chores at home!</li> <li>- What chores have you done at home? What chores do you help with at home? Which chores do you like doing? Are there any chores that you don't like doing? Which chores are easy?</li> <li>- Start with showing students some pictures about different things at home especially items in the kitchen, for example: spoon, fork, bowl, knife, mug, plate, jar, pot, bottle. Figure out if the students know the name of the utensils</li> <li>- Table of pictures (categorize into good or bad manners in the kitchen)</li> </ul>

**References:**

Browne, A. (1986). Piggybook. Knopf Books for Young Readers.

Shin, J. K., & Crandall, J. A. (2014). Teaching young learners English: From Theory to Practice. National Geographic Learning.

## Submission Guidelines

The TYL SIG is looking for submissions for our publication, *The School House*. We are looking for a wide range of material pertaining to young learners (this includes up to and high school students). Contributing to the TYL publication is of benefit not only for you as a means of being published, but also for our members to be informed about what other people in the SIG are doing in terms of teaching and research.

- ✓ We accept different types of articles for *The School House*.
- ✓ All submissions are subject to review by the publications team.
- ✓ Publication of research articles is subject to a double blind peer review. The evaluation process for research-based articles typically takes about three weeks, after which time the author will be informed of the peer reviewers' decision.

### Publication:

*The School House* is published three times a year.

### Deadlines:

Submissions for *The School House* are accepted on an ongoing basis.

### Publication Guidelines

Style: Please follow APA 6 (7) style for English manuscripts.

We accept different types of articles:

- ✓ Feature research-based articles (3,000 - 5,000 words)
- ✓ Short articles (maximum 1,500 words)
- ✓ Interviews (1,000 – 3,000 words)
- ✓ Classroom ideas (maximum 1,000 words)
- ✓ Book reviews (700–2,000 words) 700 – 2,000 words)
- ✓ Conference/ presentation reviews (700 – 2,000 words)
- ✓ Text Reviews (700 – 2,000 words and based on a text you actually used in class.
- ✓ Language program reviews (600 - 1500 words)
- ✓ Other: Pictures, event updates, and other writings dealing with young learners

### Submission procedure

Please send your (APA formatted) document, in an editable electronic format (.doc and .docx are preferred) to [theschoolhouse.tylsig@gmail.com](mailto:theschoolhouse.tylsig@gmail.com).

Please indicate the type of article you are submitting in the body of the email.