Practical Training Sessions to Prepare Pre-Service Teachers to Conduct English Activities at the Elementary School Level

Mai Matsunaga

Abstract

This study explored effective training procedures as part of a class offered to university students in a teaching certificate program. More precisely, the author empirically examined the effectiveness of two styles of training procedures on giving game instructions, a commonly used skill in elementary schools. Specifically, this study attempted to answer the following research questions: 1) whether the instructor's demonstration group (group A), in which their instructor demonstrates game instructions, significantly improves their game instruction skills after three training sessions, 2) whether the participants' demonstration group (group B), in which they themselves act out game instructions, significantly improves their game instruction skills after three training sessions, and 3) whether there is a significant difference in the improvements of game instruction skills between groups A and B. To measure the effectiveness of these sessions, a set of criteria for teaching skills (Matsunaga, 2009a) was employed. The results of statistical analyses implied that both groups A and B's styles of training procedures helped to improve the participants' skills in giving game instructions. Moreover, group A had significantly higher gains on the test compared to those of group B. These positive results indicate that allotting more time to practicing certain skills, especially when the instructor offers a demonstration, can better prepare pre-service teachers to conduct English activities. Future classes, therefore, should consider incorporating more practical training sessions into their syllabi.

Key words: pre-service teachers, elementary school English activities, training sessions, giving game instructions

Introduction

While English activities have been required for the fifth and sixth grade students in public elementary schools in Japan (MEXT, 2008a), the issue over the quality of teaching has repeatedly been one of the obstacles elementary schools have faced. In other words, more than 90% of English classes are taught by homeroom teachers (MEXT, 2008b) who are not necessarily trained English teachers. Therefore, the level of English teachers in terms of their English ability and teaching skills has been at the center of discussion among researchers (Butler, 2005; Higuchi, Kanamori, & Kunikata, 2005).

Subsequently, in order to more effectively promote a higher quality in elementary school English education nationwide, training sessions based on a clear set of standards should be offered not only to in-service teachers but also to pre-service teachers, i.e., university students in teaching certificate programs. Researchers teaching pre-service teachers at universities have proposed syllabi for methodology classes on teaching elementary school English (Egawa, 2008; Ito, 2010; Izumi, 2007; Koda, 2009; Yoshida, Kodera, Terada, & Honda, 2006). These syllabi often include both theoretical aspects such as objectives of English activities and methodology on teaching elementary school English, and practical aspects such as learning how to teach songs and chants, and experiencing micro-teaching. Moreover, some researchers (Hojo & Matsuzaki, 2010; Matsumiya, 2010) have suggested appropriate content for methodology classes based on the feedback they have received from their students. According to the feedback, pre-service teachers tend to prefer learning practical skills such as English conversation skills and game instruction skills, to learning theoretical elements. These proposed syllabi and feedback from pre-service teachers suggest that universities should offer pre-service teachers ample practical training regarding English ability and teaching skills before they go into an actual classroom as a student teacher. Yet, to date, neither extensive research on the actual contents of practical training sessions for pre-service teachers nor empirical studies on the effectiveness of the contents of training sessions have been done. In regards to the current situation, this study explored effective training procedures for university students who plan to become teachers in the future at a primary or secondary level. More precisely, this study empirically measured the effectiveness of a specific training element regarding teaching skills of elementary school English activities, giving game instructions in English.

Research Questions

In this study, the participants were divided into two groups, groups A and B. Both groups A and B received three, approximately 30-minute training sessions on giving game instructions in English. Although the number of sessions and the contents of game activities were the same for both groups, the styles and procedures of the sessions were different between the groups. Regarding group A's sessions, their instructor demonstrated game instructions as if the participants in group A were elementary school students. On the other hand, the participants in group B had to act out game instructions themselves as teachers to other classmates.

Specifically, this study attempted to answer the following research questions.

1. Are there significant improvements in pre-service teachers' skills to give game instructions after receiving three training sessions in which their instructor demonstrates game instructions (group A)?
2. Are there significant improvements in pre-service teachers' skills to give game instructions after receiving three training sessions in which they themselves act out game instructions on their own (group B)?
3. Is there a significant difference in the improvement of pre-service teachers' skills to give game instructions between groups A and B?

Method

Participants

The participants in the study were 29 second to fourth-year students at a Japanese university in Osaka who were enrolled in two *Methodology of Teaching English I* classes taught by two different Japanese instructors, one of whom is the author, in the first semester in 2011. This methodology class is one of the required classes in an English teaching certificate program offered to literature, economics, and law majors at the university. The students in this program plan to teach at a primary or secondary level in the future. In order to take the methodology class, the students are required to have a minimum TOEIC (the Test of English for International Communication) score of 400, and the average score of the participants in this study was 550, ranging from 405 to 810. In this study, the 29 participants were divided into two groups: 16 students who took the other instructor's class as group A, and 13 students who took the author's class as group B. The ANOVA (one-way analysis of variance) results on the pre-test scores

between the two groups indicated that there was no significant difference in the scores of the pre-test between the groups ($F(1, 27) = 1.49$, $p = .23$ for game 1, and $F(1, 27) = .21$, $p = .65$ for game 2). This suggested that the two groups exhibited a level of skills in giving game instructions in English similar enough to justify continuing statistical analyses on the data.

Materials

Test Materials

Giving game instructions was chosen as the specific training element for this study because it had been one of the most typical skills required in English classes at the elementary school level (MEXT, 2009a). The same two games were chosen for both pre- and post-tests in which the participants were evaluated on their skills in giving game instructions in English as if to elementary school students. The two games were chosen from a revised list of games for elementary school students, which had been developed by the author and examined for its content validity and level of difficulty (easy, medium, and difficult) by two experts on teacher training for elementary school teachers (Matsunaga, 2009b). The two games in the present study were the *secret word game* and the *can you ---? game* (see test cards for the two games in Appendix A). These two games were chosen based on their level of difficulty so that the test included both easy (the secret word game) and difficult (the can you ---? game) sets of game instructions. The can you ---? game was evaluated difficult since the game activity is more complicated than the other, and its English instructions require a larger variety of English expressions.

Rating scales

For the purpose of evaluating teaching skill requirements for elementary school English teachers, the author developed her own level description (rating scale) in order to evaluate a teachers' current level of teaching skills (Matsunaga, 2009a). The rubric was also examined for its content validity by the above experts. The participants' performance in giving game instructions in English in this study was evaluated based on this rating scale.

In the process of creating the level description of teaching skills, the rubric employed three categories introduced in a test, EPTI (the English Proficiency Test for

Indonesia), developed by the SEAMEO -RELC, NLLIA LTRC, and IKIPS (The South East Asian Ministers of Education Organization, Regional Language Center, The National Language and Literacy Institute of Australia, Language Testing Research Center, & Institut Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan) (1997). The EPTI was developed for the purpose of creating an English proficiency test that was relevant to high school teachers of English in Indonesia. Although the main purpose of this test was to measure the English proficiency of teachers, the test was also used to evaluate their teaching skills in English. For instance, the test materials included topics such as gathering and preparing teaching materials, communicating in English in the classroom with students, and participating in professional training and development activities. Therefore, the author found the content of the test relevant to the testing of teaching skills of Japanese elementary school teachers, and referred to the EPTI's evaluation categories on teaching skills when creating her own rubric. The test introduced the following three evaluation categories for teaching skills: (a) overall task fulfillment and completeness of instructions; (b) identification of participants, and use of instructive language; and (c) fluency.

The author reconfigured these three categories into four categories as follows: (a) overall task fulfillment, (b) recognition of students' level, (c) use of instructional language, and (d) fluency. The first element, overall task fulfillment, evaluates participants' skills in conducting activities in a comprehensible manner for their students, using appropriate English expressions, intonation, and pronunciation. The second element, recognition of students' level, evaluates participants' skills in adjusting their level and speed of English to those of their students. The third element, use of instructional language, evaluates participants' skills in employing appropriate classroom English. And the last element, fluency, evaluates participants' skills in conducting activities with a smooth and even tempo. The rating scale employed four levels within the range of 0% to 100%: (a) Level one (0% to 59%), insufficient level to assess; (b) level two (60 to 69%), limited professional competence; (c) level three (70 to 79%), minimum professional competence; and (d) level four (80 to 100%), professional competence, with level three being set as a satisfactory level. In addition, each of the four evaluation categories accounted for the following allotment for a total of 100%: (a) overall task fulfillment, 70%; (b) recognition of students' level, 10%; (c) use of instructional language, 10%; and (d) fluency, 10%. Utilizing this rating scale, the participants' performance in

giving instructions of game 1 and 2 was separately assessed based on the four levels in the range of 0% to 100%. Furthermore, since the SEAMEO -RELC, NLLIA LTRC, and IKIPS revealed only the categories but did not reveal level descriptions, the author created her own level descriptions of the four categories (Matsunaga, 2009a). Due to limitations of space, only level descriptions of overall task fulfillment are shown in Appendix B (see Matsunaga, 2009a for more information on the rubric of teaching skills).

Procedures

Instructional materials

Although taught by two different instructors, the two *Methodology of Teaching English I* classes, i.e., groups A and B, shared the same syllabus and were conducted in virtually identical ways. The only difference between the classes was that group A received three, approximately 30-minute receptive training sessions on giving game instructions in English, where their instructor gave the group game instructions as demonstrations, while group B received three, approximately 30-minute productive training sessions, where they themselves had to act out game instructions. These two styles and procedures of training sessions were chosen in this study since the former (group A) is one of the typical training styles that has been employed in training sessions for in-service elementary school teachers. The latter (group B), on the other hand, is a training style that the author considered potentially effective since this style focuses on pre-service teachers' actual practice giving game instructions, in comparison to that of group A. The author wanted to examine the effectiveness of both styles, and also which of the two styles would be more effective in helping pre-service teachers improve their game instruction skills. Even though more practice time, i.e., more than three times, would have obviously been better in order to improve their game instruction skills, offering the pre-service teachers more than three training sessions was not a feasible option, considering the fact that the instructors had to cover other topics and materials required in the methodology class syllabus. In other words, the practice time for this study was set in a minimal and feasible way so that any instructor of a future methodology class could easily incorporate the training sessions into his/her syllabus.

Both groups received approximately 30-minute training sessions in three classes

from weeks seven to nine of the academic semester (total of 14 weeks). Three different games were chosen for each of the three sessions. The three games were selected on a frequency basis from the textbooks, *English Notebook 1 and 2* (*Eigo nouto 1, 2*), which were distributed by the Ministry (2009a) and have been used regularly at most public elementary schools. The three games were: (a) a bingo game, (b) a finger pointing game (*Yubisashi-gemu*), and (c) a Japanese card game (*Karuta-gemu*). In each session, the participants in both groups received a practice card, which included the information: the name, objectives, procedures, and sample English instructions of the game. In creating three practice cards, the author referred to the teacher's manuals for the textbooks (MEXT, 2009b). Then, the instructors of both groups explained the contents and procedures of the game to the participants by reading through the practice card (about 10 minutes). After the explanation of the game, the instructor of group A demonstrated the game instructions to the participants as if they were elementary school students. The instructor not only demonstrated the instructions but also carried out the whole game activity to the end (about 15 minutes). The participants in group A were expected to learn how to properly give game instructions through experiencing the activity as students, but they did not have a chance to demonstrate the instructions themselves. In addition, the model performances given to group A by their instructor followed the procedures that the author had developed for this study. On the other hand, after the instructor's explanation (about 10 minutes), the participants in group B were given four minutes to prepare to act out the game instructions in English, referring to the sample English instructions on the practice card. Then, after the four minutes, each participant acted out the game instructions for two minutes to other members of a group of three to four people. Each participant acted out the instructions but did not carry out the whole activity to the end. After this group practice (about eight minutes), the instructor (author) gave feedback to the participants as a class on their instructional language and interaction with students (about three minutes). However, the instructor did not demonstrate the game instructions. Therefore, the participants in group B were expected to learn how to properly give game instructions through actually giving instructions themselves and receiving feedback from the instructor.

Pre- and post-tests

The participants in both groups took an interview-style practical pre-test in the second or third week of the class. The practical test consisted of the two games and was given individually by an interviewer (instructor) in his/her office for 15 minutes. In the practical test, a participant was given a test card for each game which included the information: the name, objectives, procedures, and Japanese instructions of the game; then, after five minutes of preparation time, the participant had to act out giving the game instructions in English as if to elementary school students (two minutes). In addition, all practical tests were video-recorded with permission by the participants. In order to evaluate the tests, the interviewer (the instructor) of each group served both as an interviewer and a rater. After the initial practical test, the original interviewer reviewed the video-recording and rated it based on the rating scale described in the above section, *Rating scales*. Then, on a different day, the other interviewer reviewed the same video-recording and re-rated it in order to confirm the reliability of the first rating. In order to confirm the reliability of the first rating, inter-rater reliability of the two raters on the ratings of game 1 and 2 in the pre-test was separately examined through computing Pearson correlation coefficients. The results of the correlational analyses showed that the correlations on the ratings of both games between the two raters were statistically significant and were greater than .85, $r(29) = .86$, $p < .01$ for game 1, and $r(29) = .88$, $p < .01$ for game 2. These results indicated that the two raters agreed on the ratings on the pre-test to an extent which confirmed the reliability of the first rating. The participants in both groups took the same interview-style practical post-test with the same procedures in the 12th or 13th week of the class. In terms of the reliability of the first rating on the post-test, it was again confirmed by the results of the correlational analyses ($r(29) = .92$, $p < .01$ for game 1, and $r(29) = .95$, $p < .01$ for game 2). Furthermore, the practice schedule in this study was organized in such a way that it created a one-month period with no practice for the participants before the post-test. This was done intentionally because the author planned to examine the lasting effects of offering the participants training sessions. Persistence of practice effects is essential since pre-service teachers in training sessions do not immediately apply the skills they learn in those sessions into actual teaching situations.

Results

Research question 1: Improvements in game instruction skills of group A (instructor's demonstration group)

In order to evaluate the effects and ascertain whether pre-service teachers in group A were able to improve their skills to give game instructions, two paired-samples t tests were conducted. For game 1, the results indicated that the mean score for the post-test was significantly greater than the mean score for the pre-test, $t(15) = 5.93$, $p = .00$. For game 2, the results also indicated that the mean score for the post-test was significantly greater than the mean score for the pre-test, $t(15) = 7.00$, $p = .00$. These results indicated that group A improved their skills in giving game instructions through participating in their instructor's three demonstrations.

In addition, the average post-test scores of the group in Table 1 indicated that the group on average reached the satisfactory level (level three, 70%) in game 1 ($M = 74.50$). To be more precise, 13 participants (81.25%) out of 16 participants reached the satisfactory level in game 1 on the post- test, compared to only one participant (6.25%) on the pre-test. However, the group on average did not reach the satisfactory level in game 2 ($M = 59.56$), where they had to act out more complicated game instructions. More precisely, four participants (25%) out of 16 participants reached the satisfactory level in game 2 on the post-test, compared to zero (0%) on the pre-test. These results suggested that the three training sessions in which the pre-service teachers observed their instructor's demonstrations helped to improve their game instruction skills to a certain extent, but did not help to improve their skills to a completely satisfactory level in the study. The means and standard deviations for the pre- and post-test scores of the two groups are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Means and standard deviations of pre- and post-test scores of two groups*

		Group A (n = 16)		Group B (n = 13)	
		M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Game 1	Pre	62.19	10.51	60.92	10.94
	Post	74.50	5.83	68.54	7.24
Game 2	Pre	45.13	10.02	43.23	7.45
	Post	59.56	16.69	50.69	10.46

Research question 2: Improvements in game instruction skills of group B (participants' demonstration group)

In order to evaluate the effects and ascertain whether pre-service teachers in group B were able to improve their skills to give game instructions, two paired-samples t tests were conducted. For game 1, the results indicated that the mean score for the post-test was significantly greater than the mean score for the pre-test, $t(12) = 4.38$, $p = .01$. For game 2, the results also indicated that the mean score for the post-test was significantly greater than the mean score for the pre-test, $t(12) = 4.39$, $p = .01$. These results indicated that group B improved their skills in giving game instructions through acting out three sets of game instructions.

On the other hand, the average post-test scores of the group in Table 1 indicated that the group on average did not reach the satisfactory level (level three, 70%) in either game 1 ($M = 68.54$) or 2 ($M = 50.69$). To be more precise, six participants (46.15%) out of 13 participants reached the satisfactory level in game 1 on the post-test, compared to one participant (7.69%) on the pre-test. Regarding game 2, two participants (15.38%) reached the satisfactory level on the post-test, compared to zero (0%) on the pre-test. In sum, the three training sessions in which the pre-service teachers acted out game instructions helped to improve their game instruction skills to a certain extent, but did not help to improve their skills to the satisfactory level in the study.

Research question 3: Difference in test scores between two groups

In order to ascertain whether there is a significant difference in the improvements of pre-service teachers' skills to give game instructions between groups A and B, two independent t tests were conducted on the gain scores from the pre- to post-tests on games 1 and 2. The t tests on both games 1 and 2 were significant, $t(27) = 6.04$, $p = .00$, $\eta^2 = .57$ for game 1, and $t(27) = 6.45$, $p = .00$, $\eta^2 = .61$ for game 2. The participants in group A ($M = 11.20$, $SD = 2.76$ for game 1, and $M = 13.13$, $SD = 2.50$ for game 2) on average had higher gains than those in group B ($M = 5.54$, $SD = .26$ for game 1, and $M = 6.77$, $SD = .48$ for game 2). These results indicated that offering receptive style training sessions (group A), in which the instructor demonstrated game instructions, was more effective in improving the pre-service teachers' skills than offering productive style training sessions (group B), in which the pre-service teachers themselves had to act out game instructions.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study examined the effectiveness of receptive (instructor's demonstration) and productive (participants' demonstration) styles of practical training sessions on giving game instructions. Specifically, this study attempted to answer the following research questions: 1) whether the instructor's demonstration group (group A) significantly improves participants' game instruction skills after three training sessions, in which their instructor demonstrates game instructions, 2) whether the participants' demonstration group (group B) significantly improves participants' game instruction skills after three training sessions, in which they themselves act out game instructions, and 3) whether there is a significant difference in the improvements of game instruction skills between groups A and B.

The results of statistical analyses implied that offering the participants either receptive (group A) or productive (group B) style training sessions helped to significantly improve their skills in giving game instructions. The positive results obtained from this study suggested that training sessions as part of class contents in a methodology class would help pre-service teachers improve their teaching skills to a practical extent, and therefore, future classes should consider incorporating more practical training sessions into their syllabi. The results also implied that offering receptive style training sessions (group A), in which the instructor demonstrated game instructions and the participants experienced those instructions as students, was more effective in improving the participants' skills than offering productive style training sessions (group B), in which the participants themselves had to act out game instructions as teachers without observing the instructor's model performance. This result was not consistent with the author's original hypothesis since the author had hypothesized that actual practice giving instructions (group B) would help participants improve their skills as much as, or even more than mere participation in model performances (group A). However, as the author more thoroughly observed and analyzed the performances of both groups A and B on the post-test, she realized that observing model game instructions (group A) may have led the pre-service teachers to learn how to properly give game instructions themselves. In other words, learning through observing a proper model performance may be essential especially for inexperienced teachers, for example, pre-service teachers in this study, since a proper model can guide them to the right direction in acquiring teaching skills such as game

instruction skills. On the other hand, experiencing giving game instructions without observing the instructor's model performance (group B) may have left the pre-service teachers uncertain about a proper way of giving game instructions. The results may imply that any teaching skill is initially learned through imitating model performances, and therefore, giving pre-service teachers proper model performances is crucial in practical training sessions. It is often said that teachers teach the way they were taught as students. The results of this study reconfirmed the responsibility of instructors in teaching certificate programs to be proper models for pre-service teachers.

At the same time, the fact that even group A's average post-test scores of game 2 (59.56) did not reach the required professional level (level three, 70%) in this study suggested that it would be necessary to further explore a way for pre-service teachers to reach that level through revising the contents of training sessions. One way may be a combination of the above two styles, receptive and productive styles. In this combined style, pre-service teachers will first observe their instructor's model performance and then experience giving game instructions themselves based on their observation. A possible problem of this method, however, may be that the method will require more time, but instructors can spend only a limited amount of time on these training sessions in a course.

The following limitations should also be considered when interpreting the data in this study. First, this study had only a limited number of participants (a total of 29), and therefore, the data may not be statistically valid. However, the author believes that the data can show an overall tendency of the effectiveness of practical training sessions on giving game instructions in English. Second, this study covered only one typical element regarding teaching skills, giving game instructions, and resulted in restricting positive effects of practice only to this area. Finally, testing effects may have influenced the post-test scores of both groups since the same interview-style practical test was employed on the pre-test, and the post-test which was given about 10 weeks after the pre-test. However, the author considers the testing effects rather unlikely since the majority of the participants poorly acted out the designated two games on the pre-test (see the Results section), resulting in an incompletion of the activities. Therefore, the testing effects may have had a small part in the improvements of the post-test scores, but it is not logical to assume that the testing effects considerably affected the post-test scores. In addition, it was thought by the author that a 10-week interval between the pre- and post-tests would not allow for participants' recollection of the details of the pre-test. With

these limitations, however, this study still offers valuable implications for future research on effective training sessions for pre-service elementary school teachers. For instance, the research method in this study can be applied to different areas of training sessions. In other words, future research on effective contents of classes offered in teaching certificate programs should examine different areas related to English ability or teaching skills such as classroom English for their effectiveness on improving skills of pre-service teachers. And the author hopes that an accumulation of more empirical data of this kind will help improve the development of classes in teaching certificate programs, making program contents more practical and effective for pre-service elementary school teachers.

Note

This study was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (# 23720298) from 2011 to 2012.

References

Butler, Y. G. (2005). *English language education in Japanese elementary schools: Analyses and suggestions based on East Asian perspectives.* Tokyo: Sanseido.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences* (2nd edition). NY: Academic Press.

Egawa, M. (2008). The development of university teacher training programs for elementary school English teachers. *JASTEC Journal*, 27, 53-65.

Higuchi, T., Kanamori, T., & Kunikata, T. (Eds.). (2005). *Korekara no shogakko eigokyoiku riron to jissen* [Future English education in elementary schools: Theories and practices]. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

Hojo, R. & Matsuzaki, K. (2010). A survey of university freshmen's hopes for English teaching classes conducted by the university students on a voluntary basis: For the purpose of nurturing student-teachers. *Bulletin of Joetsu University of Education, 29*, 231-240.

Ito, M. (2010). Raising awareness of prospective secondary school English teachers about elementary school English: Toward coherent English education in

Japan. *Aoyamagakuin University Kyoikugakai Kiyo Kyoikukenkyu, 54,* 149-168.

Izumi, E. (2007). Kyoikudaigaku niokeru shogakkoeigo eno torikumi kyoinyosei to genshokukyoinkenshu no jyujitsu wo mezashite [Elementary school English education at teachers colleges: Toward better teacher training for pre- and in-service teachers]. *JES Journal, 8,* 75-82.

Koda, A. (2009). A model course for pre-service teacher training research on Tokohagakuen University's "Bridge course" for elementary school English teacher training. *Tokohagakuen University Journal, 25,* 65-80.

Matsumiya, N. (2010). Changes in attitudes toward teaching English on the part of university students studying to be elementary school teachers: The effect of a relevant teaching methods course, *Journal of Quality Education, 3,* 111-134.

Matsunaga, M. (2009a). A rubric of competence levels of Japanese English teachers in elementary schools. *Kinki University English Journal, 3,*1-18.

Matsunaga, M. (2009b). Tests to measure competencies of Japanese English teachers at the elementary school level. *Kinki University English Journal, 4,*13-29.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2008a). *Shogakko gakushu shido yoryo* [A course of study for elementary schools]. Tokyo; Tokyoshoseki.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2008b). *Shogakkoeigokatsudo jishijyokyochosa no omona kekkagaiyo heisei 19 nendo* [A Report on current situation of English education in public elementary schools, 2007]. Retrieved July 5, 2010, from http://www.mext.go.jp/ b_menu/ houdou/20/03/08031920/001.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2009a). *Eigo noto 1 & 2* [English notebook 1 & 2]. Tokyo: Kyoikushuppan.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2009b). *Eigo noto 1 & 2- Shido handobukku 1 & 2* [English notebook 1 & 2: Teacher's manuals 1 & 2]. Tokyo: Kairyudo.

Saito, E. & Takeuchi, O. (Eds.). (2007). *Shogakko eigo gakkyutannin no tameno katsudou aidiashuu gorokunensei yo* [Teaching English at the elementary school level: Example activities for homeroom teachers (fifth & sixth graders)].

Tokyo: Sanseido.

SEAMEO Regional Language Centre, NLLIA Language Testing Research Centre, & IKIPS Semarang and Malang. (1997). *The English proficiency test for Indonesia: EPTI Manual*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Yoshida, H., Kodera, S., Terada, H., & Honda, K. (2006). Shogakkoeigokyoiku no kyoinyo seikarikyuramukaihatsu [Developing a teacher training curriculum for elementary school English education]. *The Bulletin of the English Society Osaka Kyoiku University, 51*, 105-122.

Appendix A

Test Cards in Japanese

Secret Word Game

ゲーム概要（受験者用カード）

ゲーム名：シークレットワード・ゲーム

指導目標：職業を表す単語を再確認し、聞いて理解でき、後について発音できる。（職業単語は以前一度練習したこととします。）小学校５～６年生対象。

形態：リスニングゲーム、ペア

準備されている道具：職業絵カード（黒板掲示用）１セット、消しゴム１個

ゲームの内容：

① 児童はペアになり、中央に消しゴムをおいた机をはさんで向き合って座る。
（今回は試験官１人ですが児童役としてペアのふりをします）

② 教師は絵カードの職業を表す英語を発音し、児童はそれをリピートするが、あらかじめ決めておいた「シークレットワード」を発音したとき、児童はリピートせずに消しゴムを取る。早く消しゴムを取ったほうが１ポイントをもらえる。

ゲームの流れとテスト内容：

① 単語の復習（黒板の絵カードを使いながら、職業単語を復習する。）
→今回はすでに行ったこととします。

② **ゲームのやり方の説明→今回のテスト内容**

（注意）「ゲームのやり方の説明」は、**実際の授業のように、児童に向かってゲームのやり方を実演する形で行って下さい。その際、児童役（試験官）を必ず使ってやり方を実演して下さい。**実演の際は、以下の「英語での指示（必ず含む内容）」を中心としますが、それ以外の指示、準備されている道具（黒板の絵カード、消しゴム）、ジェスチャーなども使って児童に伝わるよう心がけて下さい。

③ ゲーム開始
→今回は行いません。

英語での指示（必ず含む内容）：1. は準備されている英文を使用しても構いません。

1．**“Let’s play the Secret Word game!”**（ゲームの開始を伝える。）
2．ペアで行うこと。
3．ペアで向かい合って座り、消しゴムを真ん中に置くこと。
4．教師が発音した単語をリピートすること。
5．ただし、教師がシークレットワード“**carpenter**”を発音したときは、リピートせずに消しゴムをとること。

（テストはここで終了です）

6．“You get the eraser, and you get one point.”（ペアのうち消しゴムを取った方が１ポイントもらえること。）
7．“You get more points, and you are the winner.”（ポイントの多い方が勝ちであること。）

Can You ---? Game

ゲーム概要　**（受験者用カード）**

ゲーム名：できる、できない、だれのこと？
指導目標：Can you ～？ ---Yes, I can. / No, I can’t. を使って質問したり答えたりできる。小学校５～６年生対象。
形態：インタビューゲーム、ペア
準備されている道具：ワークシート

ゲームの内容：
相手がワークシートの誰になりきっているのかを当てるインタビューゲーム
① 児童はペアになり、一人ずつワークシートの中の誰になるかを相手に内緒で決める。（今回は試験官１人ですが児童役としてペアのふりをします）
② ペアでお互いにワークシートの質問をする。答える方は選んだ人になりきって答える。質問する方は相手が誰になりきっているのか考えながら質問する。
③ ペアでできたら今度はクラス全体で同じゲームを行う。児童一人が前に出て他の児童はその児童が誰なのかを当てる。

ゲームの流れとテスト内容：

① ワークシートの動作を表す単語（動詞）の発音と意味を絵カードを使いながら復習する（これらの単語は以前学習したこととします）。
→今回はもうすでに行ったこととします。

② **ゲームのやり方の説明→今回のテスト内容**
（注意）「ゲームのやり方の説明」は、**実際の授業のように、児童に向かってゲームのやり方を実演する形で行って下さい。その際、児童役（試験官）を必ず使ってやり方を実演して下さい。**実演の際は、以下の「英語での指示（必ず含む内容）」を中心としますが、それ以外の指示、準備されている道具（ワークシート）、ジェスチャーなども使って児童に伝わるよう心がけて下さい。

③ ゲーム開始
→今回は行いません。

英語での指示（必ず含む内容）：1. は準備されている英文を使用しても構いません。

1．**"Let's play a game!"**（ゲームの開始を伝える。）
2．ペアで行うこと。
3．ワークシートをみて誰になるかを決めること。
4．相手には誰になるかを内緒にすること。
5．**Can you ～？**を使って質問をして相手が誰なのかを当てること。
6．相手が誰なのか分かったら **Are you ～？**を使って質問すること。

（テストはここで終了です）

7．"You ask fewer questions, and you are the winner."
（少ない質問数で相手が誰かを当てた方が勝ちであること。）

A Translation of the Test Cards

Secret Word Game

Giving instructions for a game (for the interviewee)

Game: Secret word game

Objectives: Students (5th or 6th graders) will learn names of occupations, and will be able to repeat them after the teacher.

Style: listening game, conducted in pairs

Prepared materials: Picture cards of various jobs, an eraser

Procedures:

1. Students work in pairs, sitting face to face. Each pair puts an eraser between them.
2. The teacher says one of the occupation names on the board, and the students repeat it after the teacher. However, when the teacher says the secret word, students should not repeat the word. Instead, they have to pick up the eraser. Those who grab the eraser, earn 1 point.

Test criteria for giving instructions: An interviewee must include the following instructions. He/ she is also expected to effectively use the prepared materials and appropriate gestures.

Required instructions: (the following instructions are given in Japanese except for 1, 6, & 7.)

1. Let's play the Secret Word game!
2. Work in pairs.
3. Sit face to face with your partner. Then, put an eraser between the two of you.
4. Repeat the word after me.
5. But, when I say the secret word, "carpenter," do not repeat it. You must pick up the eraser!

(end of the test)

6. You get the eraser, and you get one point.
7. You get more points, and you are the winner.

Can You---? Game

Giving instructions for a game (for the interviewee)

Game: Can you ---? game

Objectives: Students (5th or 6th graders) will be able to ask and answer questions, using "Can you ---?" "Yes, I can. / No, I can't."

Style: interview game, conducted in pairs

Prepared materials: a worksheet, which details five people and six things each person can/cannot do

Procedures:

1. Students work in pairs, sitting face to face. Each student chooses who he or she will become from the five people on the worksheet, but does not tell the partner his or her choice.
2. The students in pairs ask and answer questions, using "Can you ---?" "Yes, I can. / No, I can't." The student who can guess who his or her partner is with fewer questions will be the winner.

Test criteria for giving instructions: An interviewee must include the following instructions. He/ she is also expected to effectively use the prepared materials and appropriate gestures.

Required instructions : (the following instructions are given in Japanese, except for 1 & 7.)

1. Let's play the Can You ---? Game!
2. Work in pairs, and sit face to face with your partner.
3. Look at your worksheet. Choose one person you want to be.
4. But, do not tell your partner who you are.
5. Ask and answer questions, using "Can you ---?" "Yes, I can. / No, I can't."
6. When you know who your partner is, ask your partner "Are you ---?"

(end of the test)

7. Ask fewer questions, and you are the winner.

Note

In the process of creating the above two test cards, the author referred to the game activities introduced in Saito, E. & Takeuchi, O. (Eds.) (2007) in references.

Appendix B

Level Descriptions on Overall Task Fulfillment

Teaching skills: Overall task fulfillment	
Levels	Descriptions
4	Very competent in teaching English. When explaining how to perform a game, can briefly explain it, effectively using picture prompts or gestures, including all the necessary information. When performing a model dialogue, can explain the situation well, effectively using picture prompts or gestures, with appropriate intonation and pronunciation.
3	Competent in teaching English. When explaining how to perform a game, some pausing or hesitation is evident, but can explain it well enough for students to carry out the game, using picture prompts or gestures, including most of the necessary information. When performing a model dialogue, some pausing or hesitation is evident, but can explain the situation, using picture prompts or gestures, and use acceptable intonation and pronunciation well enough for students to follow.
2	Only marginally competent in teaching English. When explaining how to perform a game, pausing or hesitation is evident. Trouble explaining the game instructions well enough for students to carry out the game, missing some necessary information. When performing a model dialogue, pausing or hesitation is evident, and trouble explaining the situation. Errors in intonation and pronunciation in a dialogue are evident. Cannot be a good model for students.
1	Not competent in teaching English. When explaining how to perform a game, pausing or hesitation is evident, and it is almost impossible to explain the instructions well enough for students to carry out the game, missing much of the necessary information. When performing a model dialogue, pausing or hesitation is evident, and almost impossible to explain the situation. Difficult to read a dialogue aloud, with many errors in intonation and pronunciation. Impossible to be a model for students.

Note. The teaching skills rubric consists of four categories: Overall task fulfillment, recognition of students' level, use of instructional language, and fluency. Each category consists of four levels: Level 1, insufficient level to assess; level 2, limited professional competence; level 3, minimum professional competence; and level 4, professional competence.