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投稿要領について
2014年TBLアジア学会プレビュー

編集委員 ハリス・ジャスティン、トンプソン・コリン & 豊田順子

昨年の最大のイベントは間違いなく第一回
TBLアジア学会でした。本学会ではアジア圏
やその他の国々から参加いただいた指導者や
研究者による60を超える発表やワークショップ
が開催されました。

2014年5月17日、18日には大阪府の近畿大学
にて第二回TBLアジア学会が開催されます。
メインスピーカーはTBLT 研究と認知言語学
で著名なビーター・スキーヌン 博士です。
本学会では発表やワークショップ、またはボスターシションの開催をご希望されるSIG会
員の方は提案書をご提出ください。

昨年同様、TBL SIG会員は学会への出席費に
割引が適用されます。週末にはTBLを通じて
多くの仲間と会うチャンスが数多くありま
す。とりわけ、土曜日のパーティーは大きな
社交の場となるでしょう。（2012年度このパ
ーティーは大阪のある建物の屋上で開かれ大
盛況に終わりました。）

本会入会や第二回アジア学会に関する詳細は
オンラインサイト
www.tblsig.org/conferenceをご参照くだ
さい。

前号同様、本号では様々な研究論文、授業実
践報告、ならびに授業プランを紹介します。
まず、ロバート・ストラウドが儒教思想に基
づく教室環境の指導者と学習者の役割とTBL
教室環境の指導者と学習者の役割の違いを比
較分析しています。タスク活動を行う上で指
導者と学習者のよりよい関係を築くための五
つのPower Sharing strategiesが紹介されて
います。

次はOnTask 設立以来初めての日本語の論
文です。我々の1つの目標は日英2国語
バイリンガルの要素をジャーナル乗りに
イベントなどに含むということです。要し
て、JALTのJは日本人の指導者と学習者が
関わる日本の英語教育を意味するという理
念を基に、ジャーナルなどのタイトルや
editorials には日英両方でご紹介させてい
ただいております。豊田順子の論文が日本
語での投稿募集を開始以来初の日本語論文
の掲載となります。豊田は日本の高等教育
の現場における帰納的な学習方法であるTBL
framework の効果を検証しています。

さらに今号ではTBL実践者の3つの授業プラ
ンを紹介します。まず、ベン・ハンフリー
ズは学習者が個人的な趣味や関心事を英語
で話すタスクの授業プランを紹介していま
す。次にマイケル・クロフォードがフルーエンジー伸長を主観としたミニスピーチ型
タスクを紹介しています。最後は、コリン
・トンプソン が関係代名詞という文法項
目に焦点を当てたフォーカスドタスクを紹
介しています。タスクの配列次第で、学習
者自身の形式を実践できる力を伸ばすことが
できるということが解説されています。

5月に大阪で皆様にお会いできることを楽
しみにしております。タスクベースドレスラ
ニングに関する論文、ならびに授業プラン
等を投稿される方は編集委員コリン・トン
プソン tbtinasia@gmail.comまでご連絡
ください。
One of the SIG highlights of last year was undoubtedly the first "TBL in Asia" conference that featured over 60 presentations and workshops from teachers and researchers throughout Asia and beyond.

In 2014 we are looking forward to an even better second conference to be held at Kinki University in Osaka, May 17th & 18th. The first Plenary speaker to be confirmed is Peter Skehan, well-known for his work in TBLT and cognitive approaches to language learning. We strongly encourage SIG members to send in proposals for presentations, workshops or poster presentations. As with last year, entry for TBL SIG members will be heavily discounted, and the weekend is a great chance to meet other teachers interested in TBL. Also, the Saturday night party promises to be a great social occasion (many 2012 attendees still talk fondly of the great Saturday night party on a rooftop in Osaka last year). More details can be found on our website, www.tblsig.org/conference

As for this issue, as usual we have a great mix of both research based and more practical articles and lesson plans. The first article is from Robert Stroud who discusses the role of the teacher and the student in Confucian-style classrooms compared to a TBL environment. Five power-sharing strategies are then provided to help establish clear and comfortable roles for both students and teachers when tasks are performed.

Our second article in this issue is the first ever article for OnTask in Japanese.

When the TBL SIG was established, one of our goals was to try to some extent to include a bilingual element to the journal and to SIG events. It is for this reason that we often include translations of titles and editorials, and also welcome contributions in Japanese. The rationale for this is that we want to recognize the "J" in JALT and acknowledge that Japanese plays a part of both teachers’ and learners’ journeys in English education in Japan. While we have always welcomed Japanese language articles, this edition, Volume 3, Issue 2, marks our first Japanese language article, from Junko Toyoda. She investigated how effective a TBL framework that used inductive language learning techniques would be for post-secondary English language learners in Japan.

Our three lesson plans this issue should again provide TBL practitioners with some good ideas for classes. Ben Humphreys provides an interesting lesson plan in which students perform tasks that enable them to speak about their personal hobbies and interests. Next, Michael Crawford provides a fluency building task where students perform short speeches on various topics. Finally, Colin Thompson’s lesson involves using focused tasks that attempt to elicit relative clauses. These tasks are then sequenced to develop learners’ use of the form.

We hope to see you in Osaka in May and as always should you have a good idea for a lesson plan, or wish to publish an article related to task-based learning, please contact our Publications Officer, Colin Thompson at tbltinasia@gmail.com. Finally, thanks to Peter Gobel for providing the cover image for this issue.
Power-sharing in the Asian TBL classroom: Switching from teacher to facilitator

Robert Stroud
Kwansei Gakuin University

Introduction

The suitability of task-based learning (TBL) in the context of Asian classrooms has been debated in recent years, based upon the expectations of the roles in learning of both the students and teacher. Burrows (2008) argued that giving students a more autonomous and independent role during tasks may create a sense of discomfort amongst classes. However, others have argued that TBL can be successfully incorporated into Asian classes in a hybrid form through tailoring tasks and teaching practices to suit the needs of the students at hand (Carless, 2012; Hogue, 2012).

One commonly reoccurring issue with Confucian-style classrooms in secondary and higher education in Asia (in Japan for example) is one related to the power attached to the roles of both the teacher and the students during tasks. Willis & Willis (2007) described the necessary roles of the teacher during tasks as ‘leader’, ‘manager’, ‘facilitator’, ‘motivator’, ‘knower’, ‘advisor’ and of course ‘teacher’ (p. 148-151). What was not explained however is how a teacher should effectively switch from leading a class in an authority wielding ‘teacher’ role (something Asian students can be very familiar with) to a more background and less dominating ‘facilitator’ role during tasks. A sudden shift in classroom power from teacher to students, through changes in roles and expectations of participants in a learning environment, will be confusing for learners and can potentially create great discomfort in learning for both the teacher and students. Ellis (2003) stated that ‘many students find it difficult to react to the teacher as a group member rather than as an instructor’ (p. 271) and this can be especially true for EFL classes in Asia. Making the successful transition from ‘lecturer to facilitator’ (Savin-Baden, 2003, p. 35) during tasks will take careful planning and execution and should not be assumed to be a smooth process.

A new approach to making the transition from ‘teacher’ to ‘facilitator’ as smooth as possible is through using strategies of power-sharing. Sharing power with students can give them the chance to become ‘more powerful and independent learners’ (Hyde, 1992, p. 67). This refers to the development of cooperation, discussion and negotiation skills of students with their peers during tasks. Rather than simply following directions from a teacher, students are given the chance to take charge of their own learning and develop such skills. A clear goal of TBL is to release students from a teacher-centered environment during tasks into a more empowered, autonomous and student-centered one.

Successfully shifting power towards students during tasks is thus an important pre-task stage of TBL, if learners are to accept their new more independent role. They can then receive the potential benefits which TBL can offer through autonomous learning. These benefits can best be summarized by what Skehan (1998, p. 276) called ‘arranging one’s own learning plan (AOLP), controlling attention (CA), and evaluation (E)’. These metacognitive skills refer to students developing the ability to analyze, manage and evaluate tasks at hand, as well as their own
strengths and weaknesses in learning. Therefore, power-sharing strategies should be used by the teacher to clarify the opportunity (and need) for students to do this independently during tasks. Students can then learn to focus their efforts appropriately to improve their learning without so much need for direction from a teacher to do so. This clearer understanding of expectations for students to take charge of what they do during tasks can help avoid confusion and discomfort when working without teacher supervision.

Five recommended power-sharing strategies to transfer power from teacher to students and get closer to clearly defined and comfortable roles during tasks are set out in table 1.

**Strategy 1 – Changes to task design**

There are several effective ways students can be empowered to become motivated and participate more during task work. One way in which power can be shifted towards students is by allowing them to make important decisions in the work they are undertaking. Examples could be giving freedom in the content of the task, the mode through which students communicate their outcome (a written outcome versus an oral one for example), and even the evaluating process of what is produced by themselves and peers. When students are involved in decision making the environment is more ‘purposeful’, ‘highly motivating’ and ‘conducive to deeper and receptive learning’ (Myers, 1990, p. 77). What a teacher should ultimately be aiming for during task time is to have groups which are in a state of ‘flow’ (Egbert, 2003), in which they are carrying out task work as teams without any hesitation or doubt about what their role is exactly or what is expected of them. Designing tasks which clearly give power to students to make decisions during tasks can be a key way to empower them to participate in a motivated and confident fashion.

A second task design related recommendation is to involve the teacher as more of a disempowered neutral participant, to better display their intended ‘facilitator’ role (as opposed to a powerful teacher role) to students. Knowles (1975, p. 33) said that a teacher needs to dispose of their ‘protective shield of an authority figure’ and reveal themselves as an ‘authentic human being, with feelings, hopes, aspirations, insecurities, worries, strengths and weaknesses.’ By allowing students to see the more personal side of a teacher (something they may not be accustomed to) it will be possible for students to become more confident about the power they have during tasks as active participants and become more active during tasks. A good approach to this would be to have students ask the teacher questions of a more personal nature as part of their tasks, or have the teacher perform a task as a ‘student’ themselves during task time (such as taking an interviewee role in a class interview activity involving personal questions).

A third (perhaps more alternative) approach to task design which can empower students is ‘peer teaching’ (Assinder, 1991; Ellis, 2003, p. 275) and peer evaluation. By allowing students to observe and evaluate one another, the role of the ‘teacher’ can be temporarily removed from the classroom. This will allow a class the chance to move from a teacher-centered environment to one of more student-centeredness, with power being shifted between different students as the figure of authority in the room. Incorporating instructions into tasks which give students the chance to act as an assessor to other students is a recommended method to empower them. This can potentially make students feel more comfortable and confident in the proactive role which is expected of them during task time. However, this may well be met with discomfort or resistance from students who are not familiar with having such a responsibility with regards to a peer’s work. It is advised that the teacher gains feedback on this stage (by observing student interactions, asking students directly about...
their feelings towards it, or from class surveys). This feedback can ensure the added responsibility of assessing a peer does not in fact prove counterproductive to learning through high levels of discomfort amongst students. If it is continuously met with resistance from the same group of students, the teacher sharing the evaluation workload with the students, or taking it back completely might in fact be a reasonable (but perhaps disappointing) alternative.

Table 1. Power sharing strategies for task based learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Desired effect</th>
<th>Example approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Changing the task design</td>
<td>To give students control over their own learning and to feel empowered</td>
<td>a) Students make decisions about task content, modes of output and the evaluation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Inclusion of the teacher in tasks as an equal participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Peer teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Altering the learning</td>
<td>To create a greater sense of understanding and comfort with student and teacher roles during tasks</td>
<td>a) Arranging seating into a student-centered style class (such as a circle or horseshoe shape)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Removal of both teacher and student desks from the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clarifying roles</td>
<td>To clarify expectations of students during task time prior to tasks</td>
<td>a) Pre-task explanation of both teacher and student roles during tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Giving a pre-task demonstration of a teacher-student interaction during tasks for clarity of roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Using discourse strategies</td>
<td>To empower students to participate more often and with more confidence during tasks</td>
<td>a) Eliciting question sentences from the teacher (“tell me about your thinking”, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Open-ended questions, metacognitive questions, revoicing and summarizing (Hmelo-Silver &amp; Barrows, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Error correction, content feedback, checking for confirmation, extended wait-time and scaffolding (Hosoki, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Using nonverbal strategies</td>
<td>To show students in a nonverbal way that they possess the power in the classroom to take control of their learning in tasks</td>
<td>a) Speaking with students at the same eye level (crouching down to them for example)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Walking towards and away from students when speaking to extract more confidence and focused dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Using hand gestures to show respect and offer power in turns to students when in dialogue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategy 2 - Altering the learning environment

The environment in which we are put to learn can deeply effect how we feel about ourselves and our situational relationship with others around us at that time. Teachers are generally familiar with rearranging seating plans and desk alignment in a classroom in order to counteract discipline or noise issues for example, but the same can be done to empower students to participate more in tasks. There has been recent discussion about moving away from the traditional teacher-centered seating arrangement of classrooms (with all the students typically facing a teacher) towards alternatives which allow for more open student-to-student and student-to-teacher interaction (Rates, 2009). There is also sometimes a call for by teachers for students to be empowered more (Manke, 2009, p. 64) in an ‘open’ learning environment (Nadeem, Iqbal & Rahman, 2012). By making the teacher much more of a neutral participant during tasks with seating arrangements such as horseshoes or semi-circles, or by removing desks altogether from the classroom, students can more clearly feel the more neutral role their teacher intends to take during task time. Students will thus have more of a chance to become empowered and confident to take control of their own learning without fear of overstepping any boundaries that don’t actually exist for them as proactive learners.

Strategy 3 - Clarifying roles

A somewhat obvious approach to making roles and the share of power between teacher and students in TBL informed lessons clearer is through the teacher taking time to explain it directly to students. Some students may perhaps simply need to be told what role they, their classmates and teacher are expected to have during tasks and it should not be assumed by the teacher that students will understand this. However, the act of telling students what to do could be seen as almost disempowering, which is contradictory to its intention of course. Despite this, the teacher taking control of the class at this point (prior to the task stage) can help students feel confident in what they will need to do independently during the class. Also, students may even feel they are being ‘neglected’ by the teacher rather than ‘empowered’ (Hoekje, 1994, p. 5) if they are simply put into groups and left alone to perform tasks. It is the responsibility of the teacher therefore to take time before tasks are begun to explain that the students are expected to be proactive, independent ‘teachers’ themselves during the task time and not wait to be lead or instructed on every step of their work. In addition, the teacher should ensure students are aware that the teacher is there to support them in the role of ‘facilitator’, rather than teacher, and should be approached as more of an advisor than authority figure.

Additionally, demonstrating an expected teacher-student interaction prior to tasks would make roles during the tasks even clearer. By doing so, students can feel more comfortable about what kind of decisions they should be making in tasks by themselves and about what they should be looking to the teacher for at certain times during the lesson. An example may be the teacher asking a student (in front of the rest of the class) how they intend to present their task’s output. The student should then be prepared to confidently state their intentions of presenting their findings as a speech by their group. The teacher should then show a clear visual and audial approval of this decision. By doing so in this pre-task demonstration, the teacher can strengthen the message to the class that the learners are fully supported by the teacher in making such independent decisions without the need for hesitation or discomfort.

Strategy 4 - Using discourse strategies

The way in which a teacher interacts verbally with their students during a TBL
lesson can have a very significant effect on
the power-sharing and ultimately, student
behavior in terms of motivation,
participation and confidence for example.
A direct way to interact with and influence
these aspects of student behavior during
task work is through the use of discourse
strategies.

One important aspect of teacher-to-
student feedback during task time is for the
teacher to remain 'neutral' (Pelly &
McMahon, 2008, p. 100) in their opinions and
reactions to students whilst they are
expressing their views for example, so as not
to discourage students from being confident
to speak out. The use of lines such as ‘tell me
about your thinking’ (p. 100), or ‘please, tell
me more’ (p. 100) can be used to elicit
student responses in a non-threatening,
supportive and encouraging role as
facilitator. Pelly and McMahon added, it is
important to 'resist offering the expert
opinion' (p. 100) to students and ensure that
they are given the chance to explain things
more deeply themselves.

An additional way to create a more
student-centered and openly interacting
environment in a classroom is through the
use open-ended questions, meta-cognitive
questions, pushing students for explanations,
revoicing and summarizing (Hmelo-
Silver & Barrows, 2006). This is very applicable to TBL,
where a teacher can take on a role of
‘questioner’ or ‘prompter’, to continue to
encourage student output through digging
for more and more answers from students
throughout tasks.

Expectations of students in their roles
during task time can be further clarified
through the use of strategies in pair work
(Hosoki, 2012). Error correction, content
feedback, checking for confirmation,
extended wait-time and scaffolding are
two examples of ways to encourage students in
the more appropriate facilitator role. This
should always be the approach at this stage
of TBL rather than simply expecting students
to find their own solutions to tasks, by limiting
their chance to speak through the use of
directives instead of questions (Verplaetse,
1998), or through turn completion, echoing
or interruptions from the teacher (Hosoki,
2012) for example.

On the whole, a teacher should be
aware that once students have had tasks
explained to them and they are tackling
them together with fellow students, the
teacher should no longer take a front role as
leader and should give students freedom to
work until the task is complete. The use of
discourse strategies, such as those
mentioned above, should be applied to
ensure students are clear about what is
expected of them. The role of students
during TBL is one of ‘risk taker and innovator’
(Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 235). This can
only be fairly expected of students if their
dialogue with the teacher during tasks is one
which encourages those risks to be taken
and innovation to occur. This needs to be
considered by teachers so that students can
understand the teacher’s expectations of
their behavior during tasks.

Strategy 5 - Using nonverbal strategies

A final strategy for influencing students'
perceptions of their own and teachers' roles
during tasks is through the more physical
aspect of nonverbal strategies. Body
language can be very powerful in
establishing power-relationships in our daily
lives and the classroom is no different. A
significant goal of a teacher during task time
should be to remove themselves as a figure
of authority and become more of an equal
to students (as perhaps a group member
themselves). Through doing so students can
envisage their more empowered role for
tasks and perhaps become comfortable
with the aid of further reinforcement from
the teacher (through nonverbal strategies).

The body language of the teacher on
approaching groups or pairs (in order to
facilitate) during task work is a strong source
of such nonverbal strategies. Standing over
groups, as a teacher might be used to
Doing, will create a sense of authority. A teacher could physically lower the height of their head to that of the students they are listening to or giving feedback to, so as to show a submission of power to the students. For a class to become more student-centered and empowered a teacher must give up their ‘throne’ of authority and physically lower themselves down to students who are sitting.

Another way a teacher can empower their students to speak out is through alterations in the distance between themselves and the student(s) they are in dialogue with. This includes techniques such as walking away slightly when a student is talking to you (to encourage them to speak up in a louder voice) and moving towards students to put more focus on them when they are talking (Pelly & McMahon, 2008, p. 101).

A final aspect of body language which can be used to empower students is the use of gestures with the teacher’s hands for example. One way to do this is using teacher gestures for controlling participation, signaling changes, indicating who is to respond and cuing choral response (Allen, 1999). Teachers should remain aware that they have a strong influence on power-sharing and roles in the classroom with things as simple as their hand movements. For example by a teacher constantly stopping their own speech and using an open hand gesture towards a student (who has indicated they wish to speak) they can show a classroom of students that they have the power to take the stage and add anything they wish during conversations without overstepping any boundaries.

Conclusions

The discomfort experienced by both teachers and students during TBL in Asian classrooms can often be connected to confusion about classroom roles. Also, the simple dismissal of TBL as a viable teaching methodology in Asia does not serve as a quick solution to this problem. Teachers and students used to a more Confucian learning environment may struggle with adjusting to power-sharing to create a more autonomous learning set-up. However, through using power-sharing strategies during task time a teacher can establish clearer and more comfortable roles for themselves and students in the classroom and help eliminate doubt about who can or should do what when tasks are performed. A teacher switching from ‘teaching’ in a teacher-centered environment to ‘facilitating’ in a student-centered one can adopt the five strategies discussed above to do so as confidently as possible. These are the clarification of roles, alterations to the design of the tasks themselves, adjustments to the learning environment, adoption of power-sharing body language and careful selection of wording of feedback by the teacher in discourse.

Implementing an approach such as TBL for the first time is indeed challenging and may initially be met with discomfort and resistance from students. One alternative would be to use the TBL approach with slightly less empowerment for students (with the teacher sharing the evaluation of and decision making on tasks for example), but benefits such as deeper metacognitive learning (Skehan, 1998) discussed in this paper are less likely to occur with this more teacher-centered approach. However, with careful thought and consideration prior to, during and after tasks in TBL, language teachers in Asia can give themselves and their students the best possible chance of finding comfort in their somewhat altered role of ‘facilitator’ and gain the benefits associated with TBL.
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Abstract in English:

Task-Based Learning Frameworks in EFL: Do favorable attitudes toward TBL affect learners’ confidence in communicative competence and motivation?

This paper investigates whether a task-based learning (TBL) framework, using inductive communicative language learning techniques, is appropriate for post-secondary-level English language learners in Japan, and if so, how effective it can be. The learners in this study were 46 false-beginner-level Japanese college students enrolled in a 30-week English-only course. The TBL framework implemented for this course was based on Jane Willis’ TBL framework (1996) which emphasizes top-down inductive language-learning over traditional, bottom-up deductive learning. Because the learners of this study were false beginners, some modifications, such as separating each task stage into smaller, more manageable steps, were made to the original TBL framework.

The primary aims of this study were to explore three research questions: (1) Whether false-beginner-level college students can develop favorable attitudes toward TBL; (2) Whether any differences exist between those learners with favorable attitudes toward TBL and those with less favorable attitudes with respect to the degrees of their confidence in using English and their motivation to learn; and (3) whether learners with more favorable attitudes toward TBL versus those with less favorable attitudes demonstrate any differences with respect to how they respond to genuine interactive tasks, such as communicating for a certain goal, purpose, or reward through negotiation of meaning.

A questionnaire was distributed at the end of the 30-week course, interrogating the learners about their communicative competence, motivation, and attitudes toward TBL. The survey consisted of items designed to measure the learners’ self-assessment of their communicative ability (as based on the four factors of Canale and Swain’s Communicative Competence [1980]), as well as their self-assessment of those emotional factors with the greatest potential influences on TBL (as based on Dörnyei’s Task-Processing Model [2003]). In addition, the survey included multiple-choice questions asking what type of devices of negotiation for meaning the learners most frequently use, and how the learners feel if they have a purpose, a goal, or a reward when performing an interactive task. The data on these factors was collected after 30 weeks of TBL instruction. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients confirmed the appropriateness of each item according to the scales of competence, motivation, and attitude. Based on the frequency distribution on the histogram of the samples in the learners’ favorable attitudes toward TBL, the whole group was divided into two sub-groups: G-Group, those learners with more favorable attitudes; and P-Group, those with less favorable attitudes. The variance of the results of the two groups was checked by a Non-Matched Sample t-test and found statistically significant. The variance of each scale between the two groups was contrasted and reported.

The results indicated that the two groups showed statistically-significant differences in the three factors of Communicative Competence (viz., Grammatical, Discourse, and Strategic Competence), as well as Motivation. The learners with more favorable attitudes toward TBL
showed greater confidence in using English in the three factors of Communicative Competence, plus they demonstrated higher motivation than those with less-favorable attitudes toward TBL.

Furthermore, an analysis of the results of a pairwise prop.test, administered to calculate comparisons between pairs of proportions with correction for multiple testing, revealed that the two groups demonstrated no significant differences in the use of negotiation devices, such as confirmation checks, clarification requests, repetition, rephrasing, and non-verbal language uses. However, the two groups did demonstrate significant differences in the learners’ motivation if they have a purpose, a goal, or a reward, when performing an interactive task. When performing an interactive task, the group with more favorable attitudes toward TBL demonstrated a tendency toward more intrinsic motivation, that is, motivation that deals with “behavior performed for its own sake in order to experience pleasure and satisfaction” (Dörnyei, 2001). On the other hand, the group with less-favorable attitudes toward TBL was more highly motivated by an Extrinsic Utility Value, i.e., the perceived usefulness of a task, which is a component of Extrinsic Motivation.

These results suggest that TBL has great pedagogical potential for Japanese false-beginner-level English-language learners if they can develop positive attitudes toward TBL. The paper concludes with some implications from the study and pedagogical suggestions for the use of TBL in English-language instruction in Japan.

1. はじめに

日本の大学英語教育を取り巻く状況は変わり始めている。1991年に文部科学省が出した大学設置基準の改訂を皮切りに、多くの大学が英語教育のカリキュラム改革に着手しはじめた（鳥飼・進藤，1996）。さらに2002年度より文部科学省は「英語教育の抜本的改善のための総合的・具体的アクションプラン」として「英語が使える日本人の育成のための戦略構想」を打ち立てた。その中で、小・中・高の外国語教育の充実を目指すことに加え、大学における英語教育の改革・改善も目標とされた。すなわち、大学も含む全教育課程において、グローバル時代にふさわしい英語による実践的コミュニケーション能力を育成していくことが大きく期待され始めた。

このような潮流を受けて、本稿の研究対象校（以下、対象校）である関西の女子大学も基礎英語カリキュラム改革に乗り出した。従来の基礎教養課程で行われてきた語学中心の英語教育とは異なる画期的な英語教育カリキュラムの構築を目指した。具体的な改革策として、対象校は、コミュニケーション・アプローチ（Communicative Approach）またはコミュニケーション・ラーニング・ティーチング（Communicative Language Teaching）の1つであるTask-Based Learning1（以下、TBL）を基礎教養課程の必修英語クラスの教授法として採用した。数名のTBL研究者により、カリキュラム、到達目標、教材、CALL（Computer-Assisted Language Learning）設備、教員養成、プレイスメントテストなどが設計され一貫したTBLプログラムが構築された。このプログラムの基、対象校ではほぼ全必修英語クラスで英語コミュニケーション実践能力育成が図られることになった。大学の基礎教養課程の必修英語の授業においてTBLを軸とするプログラム化された例は日本では極めて少ないであろう。対象校の学生・教員からTBLプログラムに関して肯定的な声が多いが、学習成果に関する検証や論考は未だない。

国外におけるTBLが学習者に与える影響に関する先行研究は盛んである。言語能力に与えるTBLの影響に関する研究結果が報告されている（Skehan, 1996b, p. 18；Leaver & Kaplan3, 2004；Long, 1996；Lightbown& Spada, 1999）。様々な国の第二外国語（以下、L2）教育現場でTBLを実施し、L2実践能力を測定した結果、調査対象者はgreater communicative output（コミュニケーションアウトプット増大）、greater fluency（フルエンシー向上）、higher proficiency results（資格試験結果向上）、promotion of expressing personal opinions（自己表現力促進）などの成果を収めたという報告がされている。

進)などの肯定的な作用がL2学習者にあったという結果が報告されている。また、情意面の肯定的な反応が言語学習の実践能力の伸長に影響を与えると言われている。学習者の情意面への肯定的な影響とTBLの学習成果は密接に関連する可能性が示唆されていると言える。

本調査研究の仮説として、中学校・高等学校で受けた授業と全く異なるTBLという教授方法に順応出来れば、学習者の情意面に肯定的な影響を与え、結果として国外先行研究と類似する言語学習の成果を生み出すことが可能ではないだろうかということが考えられた。

本調査研究の目的は、46名の対象大学生に対してCommunicative Competence (L2言語運用実践能力)を育成するために一貫してTBLのみで指導を行い、指導後質問紙調査を実施し、TBLに対する好意性の度合いと対象者のCommunicative Competenceへの自信や英語学習意欲との間に何らかの関連性があるのかどうかを調べ、それらの観点からTBL型授業に対する学習者の動機付けを検討することである。リサーチエクセッション(以下、RQ)は、RQ1: 日本人学習者が従来ある講義を聞き学び演繹的な授業スタイルではなく、自主的にタスクを行うことののみでL2を学び過程経のTBL授業スタイルに好意性を持てるのか、RQ2: TBLという教授法に好意性が高い群は相対してCommunicative Competenceへの自信や学習意欲において、好意性が高い群より高い数値を示すのか、RQ3: TBLへの好意性が高い群と低い群の2群間で、タスクに対する反応の仕方、意味交換の遂行強度・選択において違いがあるのか、である。これら3つの調査結果から成果と課題を明確にし、出来る限り効果的なTBL型授業実施のための基盤づくりを目指す。

2. 研究
2.1 対象者
本研究の対象者は大学1年生46名で、1年生を対象とした必修英語であるTBL授業週1回(90分)と外国人教員との必修ライティング授業週1回(90分)を受講している。対象者はコミュニケーション経験が殆どない再入門学習者であり、大学でも英語に関する分野を専攻していない。調査前半の授業観察では、基本的な文法や語彙を使って発話や筆記で文を作る事は極めて困難を感じる者数多かった。調査期間前に大学が実施するACEプレイスメントテストを受験しているが、対象者の得点は130点から180点の間であり、これらの得点をTOEICに換算するとおよそ250点前後である。総じて、調査前の対象者群は英語の能力が高いとは言えない学習者であった。

2.2 授業方法
本研究の対象者が再入門学習者である点を考慮し、ESL/EFLで活用されている標準的なウィリス・J(1996)のTBLフレームワークを改良した。再入門者向けに改良したTBL構成を表2.1に示す。表2.2で示すように、再入門者の学習負担を軽減させながら学習効果を上げるために、ウィルスのTBL構成に3つの改良点を加えた。まず、第一に、タスクを短い時間で完遂できるに細分化した。1つの短いタスクの成果を次のタスクに利用できるように扱う内容や言語に常に関連性を持たせることにより、学習者が各タスクで成功する確率を高めることを目指した。

次に、教科書の題材や言語活動(リーディング・リスニング・文法練習・スピーキング)を生徒個人の日常体験・背景・関心・身近な出来事・ニュースなどと関連づけることで、タスクに「正性」を持たせた。授業内容に正性を取り入れることは、特に再入門者の負担を含む初級者の学習にメリットをもたらす。言語材料の内容に馴染みがある場合、学習者の認知負担(cognitive load)が軽減され、より学びやすい状態となる(Skehan, 1996, p.54; 高島, 2005, p.47)。このような状態、つまり内容に対する認知負担がより少なくなる、学習者は言語形式に焦点を合わせる余裕も出てくる(Skehan, 1998, p.216)。また、学習者にとって正性が高い学習内容は学習動機を高める(ドルニエイ, 2005, pp.76-78)。

第三に、本研究では難易度の高い中間型タスクを複数の短いタスクに細分化することで難易度を下げた。表2.3で示すように、タスク活動は学習者に課される到達点・使用言語の自由度の度合いにより3つのタイプに分かれる。標準的なTBL構成では、1つのタスクステージで1つの中間型タスクを行なう。中間型タスクは、一定の到達点にたどり着くために使う言語も内容も学習者自身に任せていているため、タスクの難易度は高く、通常中級生以上向けのタスクといえる。しかし、自分で決めた内容と言語で成果が得られた場合、より深い達成感・満足感を味わえるというメリットがある。対象者のタスク完遂の成功
Table 2.1
再入門者向けに改良したTBL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>タスク種</th>
<th>ステージ</th>
<th>活動例</th>
<th>目的</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|           | Warm-up  | タスク活動のトリック導入として、指| タスク活動のテーマに親しむ。
|           |          | 導者がニュースや学校行事などの実| 生活に例した身近なテーマを紹介する。
|           | Pre-Task1| 同じテーマの下、教科書の言語素材を| 予めMain-Taskで必要な言語形式を活用して、Main-Taskリハーサル的タスクを行う。例えば、週末の予定について語る男女の会話の一部を聞き、残りの会話をペアで文章するタスクを行う。この時提示された文法や語彙を活用する。 |
|           |          | Main-Taskリハーサル的タスクを| 行う。例えば、予想やスケジュール制限がある日本に来ている外国人旅行者のための「最高の週末プラン」を旅行表に完成させる。
|           |          | 为例、おもに意味を達成する| 間違いを恐れずに、持っていく意志を発揮する。
|           |          | 例、発言の中心点には揃える| インタビューのイベント、得た情報のメモをしする。
|           | Semi-Open-Task | Main-Task Cycle | 発表の準備 | インタビューで得た情報を整理する。発表の準備を整えて、間違いを修正する。
|           |          |          | 発表 | 得た情報について、クラスまたはグループ内で発表する。
|           |          |          | 発表 | 発表により言語の正確さ・流暢さを磨きかける。
|           |          | Post-Task1 | 「発表」ステージで得た情報をライティングによって整理する。その際、言語形式(文法、語彙など)を参照しながらも発表する。例えば、「最もお勧めする外国人旅行者の週末ベスト3」について語る必要がある。
|           |          |          | Post-Task2 | ペアで報告書の言語形式を示して報告する。
|           | Open-Task |          |          | スキル形成の強化を行い。
|           |          |          |          | スキル形成の強化を行い。

Table 2.2
再入門者向けTBLの改良点

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>改良点</th>
<th>解説</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| タスクの細分化 | Pre-Taskは2段階で、Main-Task Cycleは3段階で、Post-Taskは2段階で行う7段階TBLにより、準備とフォローアップを重視的に行う。
| タスクのコンテンツ | タスクのテーマは教科書に準拠したものであるが、タスクのコンテンツは学習者にとって真正性が高く親近感がある素材を使う。
| タスクのタイプ | 中間型タスク(Semi-Open-Task)は難易度がやや高いが、細分化し段階的に進めることで難易度を調整する。 |
率を高めるために、1つの中間型タスクを細分化し、ある程度制限された完結型タスクから、より学習者が主体となる創造的かつ自由度の高い開放型タスクに段階的に発展していく構成とした。この構成の利点は、活動の難易度を下げ学習者の負担を減らしながら、より難易度の高いゴールに導けることである。難易度の高いゴールに到達できれば、学習者の自己達成感や自信も高まる（ドニエイ, 2005）。

このような中間型タスクには、テキストの言語材料とトピックに応じて、6種のタスク（1. リスト作り、2. 並べ替えと整理、3. 比較、4. 問題解決、5. 経験の共有、6. 創作、(ウィリス, 2006)）内のいくつかを組み込む。例えば、Pre-Task 1では、学習者は大阪・東京間往復などある特定の領域の交通手段と料金リストを読み、自分の予算に合う行き先の交通手段・料金リストを作成し、優先順位を決める（1. リスト作り、2. 並び替えと整理）。ここでは交通手段や料金に関する語彙を整理できる狙いもある。第2段階のPre-Task 2では、外国人留学生Aと日本人大学生Bのそれぞれの旅程と予算などについての情報を読み、AとBに相応しい交通手段と費用を設定し記入する（1. リスト作り、2. 並び替えと整理、4. 問題解決）。第3段階のMain-Taskでは、ベアーベ、片方が「大学生A」、もう片方が「交換留学生B」を演じ、大阪からある都市に観光に行くための交通手段、費用、観光名所などについてのアドバイスを与え合うインタラクションを行う（4. 問題解決、5. 経験の共有）。この時相手から聞いた情報をメモし、後の発表に使う。以上のように、正確性の高い内容を通して、学習者が様々なアダデミックススを習得できるタスクデザインとした。

さらに、Post-Task ステージにも改良を加えた。標準的なTBLでは、最後のステージでタスクサイクル中に学習者が使用した言語形式（文法・語彙・発音など）を整理する「分析活動」とそれらの正確な使用を練習する「定着活動」を行う。本研究の被験者は、中学高校で学習した知識を整理することも含めた長時間の「分析活動」と「定着活動」が必要であると感じたため、言語形式の強化は、テキスト附属のワークブックとオンラインホームワーキングの両方で言語形式の強化を行なった。このように再入門者向けに改良したTBLの授業を通じて学習者は前期15回、後期15回の計30回の授業で英語のコミュニケーション実践能力向上を目指した。

2.3 調査方法

質問紙の因子の設定方法は従来の先行研究重視型と因子分析型があるが、本研究ではTBLにおける対象者の反応を捉えるために先行研究の枠組みと授業内容を基に質問紙枠組みを設定した。研究対象校で設定されているTBLを軸としたシラバス・到達目標・授業内容に則した質問紙はより内容の妥当性が高いとみた。英語実践運用能力に関しては、Canale & Swain (1980) が定義したCommunicative Competence（英語実践運用能力）での枠組みでの調査が妥当であると判断した。質問紙は、Communicative Competenceの4要因：（文法能力3項目、読解能力5項目、社会言語学的能力1項目、略略的学習能力7項目）、Motivation 1要因（7項目）、TBLへの好感性1要因（2項目）の計6つの枠組みから成る。MotivationならびにTBLへの好感性に関する質問項目はドリュエイ (Dörnyei, 2002) の「L2教室における学習動機づけプロセス・モデル」の参考に作成した。Communicative Competence の 4 要因の1つである「社会言語学的能力」とは、目標言語圈に住むL2学習者を対象とした要因である。一方、調査対象の学生は教室内の社会で日常的にL2に接触する機会がない。しかし、今後社会人として日々ふるまいの社会的な場面で英語を使用することは十分想定できると判断し、教室外での社会の言語能力
が発揮できるかどうかの予想を立てさせました。つまり、社会の中で英語を使うことに対する肯定的または否定的意味を発揮し、学習者同士の語学実践能力への自信の1つの特性として扱うことにした。評定は、「回答1：そうだな」、「回答2：あまりそうではない」、「回答3：まあまあそうである」、「回答4：そうである」の4件で回答を求めた。さらに、上記の調査について、多肢選択問題により対象者が頻繁に使う意味伝達方法とタスク完遂目的に対する意味についても調査する。

データの分析方法として、まず、質問紙の枠組みが予め決まっているため、各要因の項目群の平均値の相関係数とクロノバックのα係数を用いて各下位尺度得点群の相関を確認した。次に、ヒストグラムにより、対象者の「TBLへの好意性得点」を上位群（G群）と下位群（P群）に分け、対応のないt検定によって有意差を確認した上で、再び対応のないt検定によって「TBLへの好意」得点の2水準：TBLへの好意性が高い群（G群）と好意性が低い群（P群）が下位尺度のCommunicative Competence得点とMotivation得点に対するどのような反応の違いを示すのか比較考察する。これにより、TBLへの好意性の度合いがどの程度英語のコミュニケーション実践運用能力への自信や学習意欲の変数に影響を及ぼすかを考察する。

さらに、2群の特性の違いを深く検証するために、頻繁に使用する意味伝達方法とタスク完遂目的に対する意義に関する多肢選択回答の2群の結果を比較調査する。

3. 結果

3.1 アンケート分析結果

表3.1に、Communicative Competenceの4要因、Motivation、TBLへの好意性についての各項目の基本統計数を示す。表3.2、3.3、3.4で示すように、共通質問要因でクロノバックのα係数が0.7から0.8であった。共通質問グループの内部一貫性が確認されて、各グループの命名はおむねまとまりがあり妥当であると認めたので各群の平均値を下位尺度得点とした。尚、Communicative Competence 4要因の1つSocio-linguistic Competence は質問が1つのためクロノバックαの対象としていない。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>質問項目</th>
<th>平均</th>
<th>標準偏差</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>初歩的な文法を実践で使える</td>
<td>3.196</td>
<td>0.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>初歩的な単語を実践で使える</td>
<td>3.196</td>
<td>0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>イントネーション・発音・抑揚に気をつけている</td>
<td>3.457</td>
<td>0.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>正確に単語・文法を使っている</td>
<td>2.630</td>
<td>0.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>先生の英語の指示を理解し行動できる</td>
<td>3.283</td>
<td>0.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>英語全体のフレーズシーケンスがいった</td>
<td>2.761</td>
<td>0.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>特に会話のフレーズシーケンスがいった</td>
<td>2.913</td>
<td>0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>特にリフレインフレーズシーケンスがいた</td>
<td>3.065</td>
<td>0.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>聞いたご質問に対して答弁し質問・意見を述べられる</td>
<td>3.087</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>社会で出るじつ知的な表現を持つ使用状況に応じて適切な表現を使うことができる</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>タスクを与えられたとき自分の意見やアイディアが浮かぶようになった</td>
<td>3.391</td>
<td>0.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>異なる言語の存在が実は心に伝えることができるようになった</td>
<td>3.413</td>
<td>0.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>受けた情報や意見に対して、自分なりの意見やアイディアをもつようになった</td>
<td>3.370</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>自分の意見やアイディアをスピーチを通じてまとめるようになった</td>
<td>2.957</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>自分の意見やアイディアをライフスタイルを通じてまとめるようになった</td>
<td>3.348</td>
<td>0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>相手の自分の意見やメッセージを伝えようと頑張るようになった</td>
<td>3.717</td>
<td>0.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>相手と会話して相手と構想したとき様々な方法を試し相手了解しようとした</td>
<td>3.587</td>
<td>0.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>英語を話す・聞く・書く・読むことに慣れた</td>
<td>3.174</td>
<td>0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>英語を使って問う答えるように英語が減った</td>
<td>3.304</td>
<td>0.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>以前より英語を使うことが簡単に感じた</td>
<td>2.913</td>
<td>0.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>以前より英語を使う自信が上がった</td>
<td>2.913</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>ペアワーク・グループワークに参加する興味がある</td>
<td>3.630</td>
<td>0.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>授業の英語活動が楽しい</td>
<td>3.304</td>
<td>0.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>英語学習に対して積極的に取り組んだ</td>
<td>3.435</td>
<td>0.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>タスクを与えられた授業が楽しい</td>
<td>3.196</td>
<td>0.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>従来の英語の授業よりタスク活動の方が効果的である</td>
<td>3.283</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

注：Q18の意味伝達方法に関する多肢選択問題とQ24の協働学習の利点に関する多肢選択問題は言語には記載していない。
### 表3. 2
TBLへの好意性のクロンバックα係数

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>尺度名</th>
<th>質問項目</th>
<th>クロンバックα係数</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBLへの好意性</td>
<td>27, 28</td>
<td>0.705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 表3. 3
Communicative Competence要因のクロンバックα係数

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicative Competence要因</th>
<th>質問項目</th>
<th>クロンバックα係数</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical Competence</td>
<td>1, 2, 4</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Competence</td>
<td>5, 6, 7, 8, 9</td>
<td>0.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Competence</td>
<td>11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 表3. 4
学習意欲要因のクロンバックα係数

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>尺度名</th>
<th>質問項目</th>
<th>クロンバックα係数</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26</td>
<td>0.739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

次に、ヒストグラム分布図により46名の生徒のTBLへの好意性得点（4点満点）を0.4点ラインで6群（20名）とP群（26名）の2群に分け、2群間を1%水準で有意差を確認した。有意差が確認されたので、TBLへの好意性得点の2群分けは妥当であると判断した。

調査結果は以下の通りである。対象者が持つTBLへの好意性の度合いがCommunicative Competenceへの自信やMotivationに及ぼす影響を考察するために、TBLへの好意性得点の高いG群と低いP群の2群間の下位尺度得点を対応のないt検定により有意差を検証した。その結果、目的変数と各下位尺度のGP群との間に1%水準で有意差が見られた（表3.5と表3.6）。Communicative Competence得点の2要因：Discourse Competence, Strategic CompetenceとMotivation得点において、TBL好意性の高い群と低い群の間の平均値に1%水準で有意差が見られた。しかし、Socio-linguistic Competence得点においては有意な差は見られなかった。したがって、集団の全体傾向として、タスクの好意性の高い群はCommunicative CompetenceのDiscourse Competenceにおいて自信を深め、同時にMotivationも高かった一方、Socio-linguistic Competenceにおいては、対象学習団体には大きな差がないことがわかった。

表3.7と3.8は、「学習者は活動目標を達成するために、必然的に意味伝達交渉を含む英語使用体験を行なう」というタスク活動の本質をGP両群がどう捉えているか調査するために、2つの多肢選択質問の回答を求めた結果である。表3.7は、Q17「（誰かと）通じ合えないとき様々な方法を試し相手理解しようと」として、「そうである」「まあまあそうである」と肯定的な回答した群に「どのような意味伝達交渉の方法を使用しましたか」について回答（複数選択可）を求めた。結果は、二群の母比率の差検定により両群の回答率の差を検定した。今回の調査ではコミュニケーションギャップを埋めようとして取った意味交渉方法において両群に有意な差は見られなかった。両群の等質性から、TBLの好意性が高い群も低い群も同様に様々な意味交渉方法を講じてタスクを遂行していると言える。

表3.8は、「インタラクション的タスクを行うとき目的（ゴールや報償）があると思うのか」というタスクを行う（複数選択可能）を求めた結果である。前述と同様の方法で、TBLへの好意性が高い群と低い群の二群を比較した結果、「コミュニケーションが楽しい」と「コミュニケーションがうまくいく」という項目において、有意水準1%未満で両群に有意な差が見られた。タスクを行うときにメッセージを伝える目的があるとTBLへの好意性が高い群は低い群より「コミュニケーションがうまくいく」と感じ、一方、TBLへの好意性が高い群は高い群より「コミュニケーションがうまくいく」と感じる傾向があることがわかった。
表3.5
GP2群のCommunicative Competence得点のt検定の結果

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2群</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical Competence</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.0886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.0028**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Competence</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-linguistic Competence</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.0004**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Competence</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.0004**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01  *p<.05

表3.6
GP2群のMotivation得点のt検定の結果

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2群</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.0004**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01  *p<.05

表3.7
意図交渉の方法に関する群間比較 (N=46: G=26, P=20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>選択項目</th>
<th>2群</th>
<th>肯定回答率(%)</th>
<th>検定</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>質問して聞き返す(Questioning)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>p=0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>p=0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>言い換える (Rephrasing)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>p=0.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>p=0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>相手の発言を繰り返す(Repetition)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>p=0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>p=0.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>自分の発言を繰り返す(Repetition)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>p=0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>表情やジェスチャーを使う(Body language)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>p=0.918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01  *p<.05

表3.8
タスク完成目的に対する意識の群間比較 (N=46: G=26, P=20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>選択項目</th>
<th>2群</th>
<th>肯定回答率(%)</th>
<th>検定</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>コミュニケーションが楽しい</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>p=0.008**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>コミュニケーション意欲が高まる</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>p=0.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>コミュニケーションがうまくいく</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>p=0.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>**p&lt;.01  *p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

思う」「まあまあそう思う」と回答し、13%が「あまりそう思わない」と回答した。「全くそう思わない」という回答者はいなかった。さらに、質問紙のQ28「タスク中心の授業が従来の英語の授業より効果的である」に対して、全体の87%が「そう思う」「まあまあそう思う」と回答し、10%が「あまりそう思わない」と回答した。3%（1人）が「全くそう思わない」と回答した。動機づけの研究者（Dörnyei, 1994; Gardner, 1985）などによれば、授業やタスクに対する好意性を持つことは学習者が動機づけられているということである。よって、全体傾向としてTBLで行われる授業に対して好意性を持ちながら動機づけも高まったと言える。

次にRQ2: TBLの好意性の度合いが英語学習成果や意欲に影響があるか、について結果から考察する。調査の結果、TBLへの好意性が高い群は、同時にCommunicative Competence得点群: Discourse Competence得点，Strategic Competence得点，ならびにMotivation得点の平均値が高い数値を示した。一方、TBLへの好意性が低い群は、同得点群において好意性が高い群より低い数値を示し，t検定の結果TBLへの好意性が高い群と低い群の得点差は有意であった。Grammatical Competence得点においても、好意性が高い群と低い群に有意差が見られた。しかし、授業外の社会での言語運用能力を問うSocio-linguistic Competence得点においてはTBLへの好意性が高い群と低い群の2群間に有意差はなかった。すなわち、TBLの授業スタイルを受容している学習者は、受容度が低い学習者より、授
業中実践を積んだ項目、特にインタラクションに欠かせない談話能力・方略的言語能力において深い自信を示し、学習意欲も増したと言える。授業で経験なかったSocio-linguistic Competenceに含まれる項目への自信については好意性の度合いは直接関係していないように思われる。この結果だと考えると、教室内、教室外にかかわらず、ある項目の実践を積んできれば、それに対する自信は深まらないと言える。

さらに、RQ3: TBLへの好意性が高い群と低い群の間で、タスクに対する反応の仕方、意味交渉の遂行強度・選択において違いあったのか、について結果から考察すると、TBLの好意性が高い学習者の方が低い学習者よりも、タスクとに対するメッセージを伝える目的があるとコミュニケーションを楽しみ傾向があった。一方、TBLの好意性が低い学習者は好意性よりも、メッセージを伝える目的があるとコミュニケーションが上手く進むと感じていた。TBLの好意性が高い学習者は目的達成を楽しむことができているが、低い学習者はコミュニケーション目的の有効性は認めているがタスク活動を楽しむ余裕でないのように見える。期待値理論からこの結果をみると、両群は共にタスクの「価値」を認める、すなわち、学習意欲が高まっている状態であるが、タスクに対する価値の認知の仕方が異なる（Eccles&Wigfield, 1995）。「楽し」と感じているTBLへの好意性が高い群は、Intrinsic Value: 内発的価値（その活動を行うことを純粋に楽しんでいる）が高まっている、すなわち内発的に動機づけられた理想的な学習状態であるよう何える。一方、有効性を認めているTBLへの好意性が低い群は、Extrinsic Utility Value: 外発的実用的価値（ある行為が役立つと感じている）を認めると言える。認識の違いそこがあるが、そのタスクを達成することに価値を置いている点で、両群は動機づけられていると言える。しかし、TBLへの好意性が高い群の方が低い群よりタスクに取り組むときより内発的動機づけが高まっていることから、両群はタスク遂行に対する動機づけの度合いが違うと言える。さらに、意味交渉の手段においては、TBLに対する好意性が高い学習者と低い学習者の間に有意差は見られなかったことから、意味交渉の遂行強度・選択において両群には違いがないと言える。両群は一様にコミュニケーションギャップを埋めるために、様々な意味交渉の方法を講じて英語でコミュニケーションをとっていたといえる。

5. 結論

本研究の目的は「日本人学習者が従来ある講義を開講学習者の授業スタイルではなく、自主的にタスクを行うことのみで第二外国語を学び取る帰納的なTBL授業に好意性が持てるのか」と「Communicative Competenceへの自信とMotivationの高揚に関して、TBL授業への好意性が高い群と低い群の比較を行い、差が生じるのか」という2つの仮説を検証することであった。本研究では、高等教育にいる再入門学習者と位置づけられる対象者のほほ過半数がTBL授業に好意性を示した。好意性が高い群と低い群の間にはCommunicative Competence得点群: Discourse Competence得点、Strategic Competence得点、ならびにMotivation得点において有意差が生じた。すなわち、TBLへの好意性を強く有している人ほど、TBLの授業で実践を積んだ項目、特に方略を駆使して話すことを自身の自信を強め、学習意欲、特に内発的動機づけが著に傾向にあった。従って、学習者がTBL授業に順応すれば、学習者の情意面に肯定的な作用をもたらし言語学習の成果を生み出すことが可能だという。また、英語学習の授業方法に対する好意性と自己のパフォーマンスに対する自己（自己有能感）や学習意欲は相互に関連し合っていると考えることができる。

6. 教育的示唆

今回の対象者は再入門者であり、高いコミュニケーション実践能力や道具的動機を持つ集団ではなかったが、ほかに同様に英語で自主的にタスクを行うことのみで英語実践能力を獲得していく帰納的な学びに肯定感を示した。しかし、TBLは1つの英語授業方法であり、どのように授業者が知識やレッスンをデザインするかによって、要素の程が変わる。今回の研究結果からTBLフレームワークデザインに関するいくつかの示唆を述べてみる。

第一に、指導者はタスクとTBLフレームワークの両方に関する知識と教育が必要となる。基礎から応用までの活用方法に関する知識を備えれば、様々なタスクの学習内容、クラスに合わせて柔軟にTBLをデザインし、教室で実践できる。例えば、今回の授業研究では高等教育にいる再入門者向
けにウィリス, JのTBLフレームワークを改良した。対象者の年齢に応じた認知レベル、知的興味、習熟度レベルなどを考慮した上で、教科書の内容を基に真正性や親密性があるトピックを選定すること、そして難易度調整のためタスクを細分化することなどを試みた。また、教科内容指導における物を合わせたければCBI(Content-based Instruction)との併用も改良方法の1つである。このような可変的なTBLの性質をうまく利用して自分の担当するクラスに柔軟にカスタマイズできるTBLデザインができれば、教育の効果は高まるであろう。

第二に、タスク選定やデザインの際、授業者は学習集団の動機付けを最大限に高めるTBLフレームワーク作りをすることが求められる。その鍵となるのが期待価値理論の「成功期待感」(Expectancy of Success)である。学習者は自分がタスク活動で成功するに及ぼす影響にもっとも真剣に取り組む、簡単なタスクには価値を見出さず意欲を示さない。ドルニェイ(2005)によれば、「成功期待感」はタスクの難易度のみに左右されるものではなく、学習者のタスクに対する価値、すなわちPre-Task活動に因るものがある。Pre-Taskステージでは、言語や作業の制限があなたからスタートし、徐々に自由度が高いSemi-Open-TaskやOpen-Taskで学習者が自ら言語やトピックの材料を取りながら難易度の高いタスクを完遂できたとき、学習者の自己有能感や自己効能感は高まる。難易度が段階的に進むTBLフレームワーク作りが学習者の動機づけと活動の成功率を高めるであろう。

第三に、Commins(1984)が提唱するように、大学英語教育では、基礎的な対人コミュニケーション能力であるBICS(Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills)を目指すのではなく、アカデミックな知的言語能力であるCALP(Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency)の養成を目指す必要がある。高等教育でTBLフレームワークを導入する場合、学生の習熟度に応じてより教育効果の高い内容に発展していくシラバスが望ましい。高等教育の再入門者は初年度TBLで初歩的な対人コミュニケーション能力BICSを身につけ、その力を生かし、2年次以降のセカンドステージではTBLフレームワークにCBIなどを融合させ、より大学生に相応しいCALPに移行することが理想的である。

本稿の実践研究を通じて、日本の高等教育現場でのTBLフレームワーク実践に役立てれば幸いである。

注
1. TBLT とはTask-based language teaching(タスク中心の言語指導法)である。学習者が目標言語で対話しのタスクに取り組む活動を通じてその言語の習得を目指す教授法である。
2. 本プログラムでは、ジェーン・ウィリスのTBL frameworkを統一した指導方法として取り入れている。TBL frameworkでは(1)Pre-Task(Task Cycleの準備タスク)、(2)Task Cycle(インタラクション的タスク、報告準備、他者への報告の一連の過程)、(3)Post-Task(言語形式の分析と強化のためのタスク)の3段階を授業の中で展開する。教員研修を通じて、統一された機能・概念シラバスとESLテキストの基本、各教員がTBL framework構成で指導する。
3. Leaver とKaplan (2004)によれば、TBL と真正性がある教材により、学習者は数カ月で、急速に実社会でL2を使えるレベルにまで達することが実証されている。
4. 調査前の質問肢によれば、調査対象者は中学校・高校でTBLや他者とインタラクションを行うコミュニケーション活動を一切行っていなかったと報告している。
6. 英語ではFalse Beginners。以前に英語学習経験があるが、身についていない大人の学習者を指す。
7. ELPA [Association for English Language Proficiency Assessment(英語運用能力評価協会)]が開発したプレイスメントテストを指す。
8. Moodleにより構築されたオンライン英語自主学習システム。
9. 学習者の選段における動機づけではなく、タス
ク遂行時の動機づけを概念的に表したもの。詳しくは、ドルナエイ (2005) を参照されたい。

10. ACTFL (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) が開発したコミュニケーション実践能力の採点用評価指標である
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Introduction

This lesson gives students an opportunity to speak about their interests or hobbies. By relating the subject matter to the student’s everyday experiences and backgrounds, teachers can help maintain student interest and motivation (Dornyei, 2012). Teachers and students can also learn more about each other and deepen their personal relationships.

Pre-task

Select a few students randomly to briefly tell the class about what they did last weekend. Ask the students if they have ever done a survey, e.g. at a restaurant to give their opinions on the food, service etc. Tell the students that you are now going to read a newspaper article called ‘Good night's sleep voted life's greatest little pleasure’ which is based on a survey of people living in England, and the activities they enjoy doing in their free time (The Telegraph, 31 December, 2009).

Task Cycle 1

Dictagloss

The teacher reads the article called ‘Good night’s sleep voted life’s greatest little pleasure’ (see Appendix) at natural speed. Instruct students to listen carefully and take notes. After you have finished, tell students to discuss and compare their notes in groups of 3 or 4. As students will each remember different things about the article, instruct them to work together to reconstruct the story as close to the original as possible (Willis & Willis, 2007, p.55). After students have discussed their notes, tell them you are going to read it a second time. Tell students that this article is a list of the ‘Top 20’ things that English people find most enjoyable in their lives. The teacher then reads the article a second time more slowly.
Planning

After the second reading, in the same groups, give the students a few minutes to discuss and compare notes again. Inform the students to work together to prepare a report for the class and to create a list of all activities mentioned. Tell them that the ranking is not important, but that the main goal is for the group to be able to report as many activities as possible.

Report

Students select one person from their group to report back to the class. As the student is reporting, the teacher writes down the twenty activities on the board or overhead. Activities should be written as they are reported, not necessarily in order of 1 to 20. The teacher may choose to ask questions or give feedback on errors, for example correct usage of verbs or prepositions. As each group gives their report, you might find that most of the answers are now written on the board. If this is the case, rather getting the remaining groups to repeat their entire lists, ask each of the remaining groups if they have anything else to add to the list.

Variation: If the students’ English levels are intermediate or above, tell them that their list of 20 must be in rank order from 1-20, before writing it on the board. You can make this into a friendly competition and get each group to write up their own lists in rank order. The first group to finish is the winner. In this article, the subject (the people who did the survey) is already known, and most phrases follow the typical subject–verb–object (SVO) pattern. This is also a good opportunity for the teacher to correct students’ language use of the SVO structure and prepositions.

Task Cycle 2

Firstly, get students to work individually to create their own list of what they think are life’s greatest pleasures. When students have finished their own lists, ask them to work together in the same groups of 3 or 4, to discuss their answers. Every student must give five examples of things they enjoy doing. Also make sure that students give a reason or an example to maximise their English speaking output. The teacher should give an example. E.g. 7. I enjoy getting a bargain. Last week I went shopping at ZARA and bought a new winter jacket for 50% off!

Planning

Have students discuss their choices and give reasons why, within their groups. Encourage the students who are listening to ask a minimum of two follow up questions in total. For example: 7. Getting a bargain. Did you get a bargain recently? What was it? How much was it? Where did you buy it from? Once students have finished discussing their ideas, tell them that they must now all agree on three pleasures that all members of the group have in common. The teacher should provide some scaffolding for lower level students. Write some phrases on the whiteboard such as ‘I think so too’ or ‘Yes, I agree’ for consensus and phrases such as ‘I don’t think so’ or ‘No I don’t agree’ for disagreement.

Report

In the traditional class fronted presentation format reporting phase, one student speaks and the rest of the class, listen often with little investment in the outcome. As an alternative, the use of Carousel mini-presentations as described by Toland & Crawford (2012), is suggested as a more inclusive task. Toland & Crawford assert that carousel mini-presentations have several advantages for students, including decreasing anxiety, increasing confidence and enjoyment,
improving listening and speaking abilities and involving all students in the task simultaneously, eliminating student inattentiveness and other non-productive behaviour such as texting or sleeping.

In a Carousel mini-presentation the class is divided into two groups: A and B. These groups then form A-B pairs (or teams of three or four), whereby student A presents to student B (or team B). Consequently, in a class of 30 students there may be 15 presentations happening at the same time. Students should report on the three pleasures that all members of the group enjoy (have in common). Once a student completes their report, all the A students move in one direction to the next B student. After repeating this a few times, students then switch roles with the B students presenting and the A learners listening (Toland & Crawford, 2012). This task is an interactive one, and students who are not presenting will be interacting with the speaker, rather than just listening passively. Encourage students to ask questions to clarify or elaborate on what they have heard. It is important to explain that follow up questions are very important, in the same way that people ask each other questions during normal conversation, e.g. student A says ‘Catching up with an old friend’. Possible questions for student B could be: Where do you usually go to catch up? What do you usually do? The teacher should circulate around the room while the task is in progress, providing any feedback and correction as appropriate.

Post-task 1

Now give out a copy of the article called ‘Good night’s sleep voted life’s greatest little pleasure’. Ask one student to read one sentence each aloud in turn, as a whole class. Once you are finished, ask students to turn the article face down so they can’t see it, and elicit which answers are missing on the list of 20 activities on the board (if any). Number each answer from 1-20 as the answers might be out of sequence. Next continue reading the rest of the article, including the rest of the list of pleasures from 21-50. Check if students have any questions about vocabulary or particular phrases as some of the examples of pleasures written in the article are culturally specific, or use informal language. For example, 28: Being chatted up; and 49: Getting tipsy are examples of informal language. Eating a Sunday roast with your family (Number 11) is an example of a tradition common in Western culture.

Post task 2

Give the students some time to review and attempt to memorize the phrases. As twenty phrases is quite a lot to memorize, in a class of 20 students, split the class into groups of 4 and give each group five phrases to remember as best they can. Ask the students to put away their handouts. Then, give the students a version of the text with selected phrases from above blocked out (cloze activity) and have them fill in the blanks with the phrases they have just tried to remember. Allow students to work in groups to complete this task, then check answers in plenary.

Post task 3 (for higher level students)

Finally, prepare about twenty individual phrase cards and pair the students. Choose any of the fifty available phrases according to difficulty level or those which you think need review or consolidation.

Have one student explain the phrase on the card and the other students guess the number of which greatest pleasure the student is talking about.

E.g. (Student A turns over the card that says ‘Get tipsy’. Student B can look at their list of the Top 50 greatest little pleasures in life, see Appendix).
Student A: This is when you have a little too much to drink.
Student B: Get tipsy?
Student A: Yes! Your turn.

**Post task 4 (optional)**

Now write these questions on the whiteboard.

- What did you think when you read the headline?
- How has your greatest pleasure changed since you were a child?
- What are the little things that brighten up your life?
- What things do you love that don’t require money?
- What’s the best way to cheer yourself up if you have a bad day? (Banville, 2010)

For additional conversation practice, get students again to talk in groups about these questions. The teacher monitors groups and offers feedback and corrections as required. You can get students to report their answers to the class using Carousel mini-presentations if you wish.

**Variation:** Use Post Task 4 as a writing task for homework.

**Conclusion**

This is a fun lesson where all students can participate and talk about their lives and personal interests. The activity gives students ample opportunity to practice speaking about a familiar topic which may increase their self-confidence. Additionally, teachers can further challenge students with listening, reading and vocabulary acquisition tasks to re-use and reinforce the target language.
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Good night's sleep voted life's greatest little pleasure

A good night's sleep has been voted life's 'greatest little pleasure'.

Getting a good night's sleep is one of the greatest pleasures in life according to the survey. Photo: GETTY

Curling up in bed after a long day and waking up feeling completely refreshed the following morning came top of the poll.

Second place in the study of 3,000 Brits was finding 10 pounds in your pocket followed by cuddling up to a loved-one in bed.

Laughing so hard you end up crying was at number four while having a lie-in completed the top ten.

Rob Stacey, spokesman for Bachelors Cup-a-Soup, which carried out the poll, said: "You can't beat the feeling of getting into bed after a long, hard day.

"And that feeling gets even better when you wake up feeling great and back to your normal self the following morning.

"We don't always need something major to happen to brighten up our day - sometimes the little things have just as much of an effect.

"Often the little gestures such as a quick cuddle or a compliment can really help to cheer someone up if they are having a bad day, and can even be more welcome than splashing out on expensive presents."

Getting into a bed with freshly-washed sheets was voted into sixth place in the list of life's greatest pleasures, followed by finding a bargain in the shops.

Making someone smile was at number eight while catching up with an old friend was ninth.

Laughing at past memories came tenth.

Going back home to eat one of your mum's Sunday dinners was at 11, followed by someone saying you look nice.
Curling up with a good book and a hot drink or soup was 13th while the ecstatic feeling of discovering you have lost a few pounds was at 14.

Fifteenth place went to being given a surprise breakfast in bed followed by waking up thinking it's a work day and realising it's the weekend.

A stranger smiling at you in the street, looking through old photo albums, eating a takeaway and having fun in the first snowfall of the year completed the top 20.

Other little pleasures to feature in the poll included the sound of a baby laughing, fitting into a pair of old jeans after losing some weight and watching a live band.

Cup-a-Soup spokesman Rob Stacey said: “People have been telling us what brightens up their day, and it’s often the smaller things that can make a big difference.

Appendix 2 - Top 50 greatest little pleasures in life

The top 50 greatest little pleasures in life

1. A good night's sleep
2. Finding a forgotten 10 pounds in your pocket
3. Cuddling up with a partner in bed
4. Crying with laughter
5. Having a lie-in
6. Sleeping in newly laundered bedding
7. Getting a bargain
8. Making someone smile
9. Catching up with an old friend
10. Laughing at things that have happened in the past
11. Eating a Sunday roast with your family
12. Someone saying you look nice (receiving a compliment)
13. Curling up on the sofa with a good book and a hot drink or soup
14. Discovering you've lost a few pounds
15. Breakfast in bed
16. Waking up thinking it's a work day and then realising it's the weekend
17. A random person smiling at you in the street
18. Looking through old photo albums
19. Eating a takeaway meal
20. First snowfall of the year
21. Singing your heart out to your favourite song in car
22. Having lunch with friends
23. Listening to a baby laughing
24. Having a massage
25. Reading a book or listening to your iPod on holiday by the pool
26. Playing in snow
27. Finding a pair of jeans that fit perfectly
28. Being chatted up
29. A girly-night in
30. A pampering session at home
31. The smell of freshly cut grass
32. Sitting in the pub with your friends
33. Looking at a baby asleep in a cot
34. Waking up in a room with an amazing view
35. Clothes shopping
36. Receiving a letter from a friend
37. Fitting into an old pair of jeans again after losing some weight
38. Staying up all night getting to know someone special
39. Your mum's cooking
40. Getting dressed up for a night out
41. Watching a live band
42. Drinking a cold beer after work
43. Browsing in a second-hand book shop
44. Going to the cinema
45. Getting a new hairstyle
46. Your queue being the quickest in the supermarket
47. The cold side of the pillow
48. Watching a DVD
49. Getting tipsy
50. Popping bubble wrap
Lesson Plan 2
Alphabet Speeches

Michael Crawford
Dokkyo University

- Key words: Fluency building, learner control, speeches, interaction
- Level: Pre-intermediate and up
- Age: High school / University level
- Preparation: 30 minutes
- Activity time: 40 to 60 minutes
- Materials: Handout (see appendix), dice

Introduction

In EFL contexts such as Japan, providing learners with opportunities to build their fluency is an important element in any program that includes oral communication. In one well-known fluency-building task, 4/3/2, learners talk about a given topic for 4 minutes, 3 minutes, and then 2 minutes to different partners, the idea being that their fluency will improve as they go along (Maurice, 1983).

I have used 4/3/2 in a number of different classes here in Japan, and have found that almost without fail it works very well. Like any task, however, overuse should be avoided, as learners may lose interest. The task described here provides the same kind of fluency-building opportunities as 4/3/2, but in a novel format. Like 4/3/2, it provides enough structure to keep things moving along, but at the same time allows for a good degree of learner control.

Preparation

You will need copies of the worksheet (see Appendix) for all of the students, and as many dice as there will be groups in the class.

Pre-task

Divide the class into groups of 3 students each, and give one die to each group. (Depending on the number of students, some groups of 2 or 4 may be necessary.) Explain to them that in this task they will be giving short speeches about various topics. Ask them to assign each member of the group two numbers (1&2, 3&4, 5&6) and have them write their names in the appropriate places on the worksheet (1&2 _________________, etc.). This can be adjusted if one or more groups have 2 or 4 students instead of 3.
Main task

Step 1: To begin the task, one student rolls the die. If a “3” comes up, for example, the student who is 3&4 must give a short speech on any topic that begins with the letter “A.” All of the students in the group should write this student’s choice of topic on their worksheets. Inevitably, some students will probably choose “apple,” but anything starting with “A” is fine (e.g., astronaut, alligator, Australia, etc.). For students who have done 4/3/2 or similar tasks a number of times, preparation time may not be necessary. However, with less-confident students it might be a good idea to give them 30 seconds to a minute to prepare their speech.

Step 2: As one student speaks, the other students should listen and write one question each on the worksheet to be asked when the speaker is finished. The speech should be timed, and in most cases it would probably be a good idea to set a time limit of 2 to 3 minutes. When the speech is over, the length of the speech should be recorded on the worksheet, and the students who listened can take turns asking their questions.

Step 3: After the questions have been asked, another student should roll the die and choose the next speaker. If the die comes up “3” again (or “4”), then Student 3&4 will have to give another speech on a topic starting with “B.” However, if this happens a third time, then the die should be rolled until a different classmate’s number comes up.

Step 4: The task continues like this until the time allotted for this part of the activity is over. Generally, about 40 minutes is recommended. After 40 minutes, each student will probably have spoken at least 3 or 4 times, and they will have gotten about halfway through the alphabet.

Step 5: In the final part of this task, students are provided with a chance to give one or two of their speeches another time to a different student. Students should be asked to stand up and find a new partner, forming pairs this time. Depending on how much time there is remaining, they can be instructed to choose one or two of the speeches they gave once and do them one more time.

Post-task

A possible follow-up to the main task is to have students write a summary of one of their own speeches, or one of their partner’s speeches. If teachers are working towards having their students give presentations in front of the class, another idea is to have some students stand up give their speeches to the class.

Issues and possible modifications

It is important to explain to the students that the goal of the activity is not necessarily to make it all the way through until the end of the alphabet. Nevertheless, some students will probably want to do this. In that case it is recommended that the teacher collect students worksheets and bring them to class again a few weeks later to continue and eventually complete the task. If time is limited, the task can be done in pairs instead of groups of 3. This will allow students to go faster through the alphabet.

Conclusion

Most teachers would eventually like to see their learners engaging in discussions in which they express their opinions and ask questions to each other. This can be quite challenging for many learners, and it is worthwhile to provide them with opportunities to build both their fluency and their confidence as they work towards this goal. This is where fluency-building activities such as Alphabet Speeches come in. By providing sufficient structure and some game-like elements, this activity will get your learners talking, and help them become more fluent communicators in the language.
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Appendix: Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEECHES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Student #</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Student #</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| QUESTIONS | | | | | |
|-----------| | | | | |
| A Q       | | | | | |
| A         | | | | | |
| B Q       | | | | | |
| A         | | | | | |
| C Q       | | | | | |
| A         | | | | | |
| Q         | | | | | |
| A         | | | | | |
Lesson Plan 3
Building fluency and accuracy through task sequencing

Colin Thompson
Shimonoseki City University

- Key words: Focused tasks, guided planning, task sequencing.
- Level: Low intermediate and above
- Age: University
- Preparation time: 20 minutes
- Activity time: Approx 90 mins
- Materials: Print outs of the narratives and guided planning note-sheets (see appendix)

Introduction
Story-telling narratives can be designed as focused tasks which serve to elicit specific language features that students can use in communication (Mochizuki & Ortega, 2008). Students’ attention can be drawn to the target forms through pre-task planning so they can use the target forms during tasks. Narratives can then be sequenced to develop learners’ speech in terms of fluency and accuracy of the target language. This methodology is referred to as task-supported language teaching as attention to form is introduced prior to performing tasks as opposed to focusing on form after tasks which is more commonly associated with task-based language teaching. Despite the difference in the two approaches, a claim can be made for either depending on the learning context (Ellis, 2009). The aim of this lesson is to develop learners’ use of a grammatical feature known for its difficulty in oral L2 production with Japanese learners, relative clauses, as well as the additional grammatical features that accompany them, in this case 3rd person singular and plural. The narratives used in this lesson plan involve characters going to buy something, for example, in a clothes shop, a pet shop, a toy shop, a car shop, and a garden centre. In doing so, the targeted forms can be elicited in order to describe what the characters want to buy.

Preparation
Print off one copy of the teacher pictures and cut them up into five individual pictures. Print off copies of the five narratives in the appendix. Half of the narratives need to be cut up into their eight respective pictures. Each student should receive two copies of each narrative: one uncut and one cut-up version. Finally, print off three copies of the guided planning note-sheets per student.
Pre-task

Step 1. Allocate ten minutes of the class for a teacher-led workshop.
Introduce examples of the target forms on the whiteboard:

Subject relative clauses: 1. “She wants the plant which has green leaves”
2. “She wants the plants which have blue leaves”

Elicit the phrases. Hold up picture A and elicit key vocabulary, for example ‘plant’, ‘leaves’ and then elicit phrase 1. Repeat until the class can pronounce the phrase accurately, then hold up picture B and elicit phrase 2 accurately. Make sure to highlight the difference between the phrases by emphasising singular and plural use of the head noun. For example:
“How many plants does the girl want in picture A?….One, so we say: the plant which has…”
“How many plants does the girl want in picture B?…Two, so we say: the plants which have…”

Step 2. Write the extended examples on the whiteboard:

1. “She thinks she likes the plant which has green leaves”
2. “She believes she likes the plants which have blue leaves”

Hold up picture C. Inform the class that pictures which have bubbles from a character’s head indicate that they are thinking, so verbs can be used such as “She thinks…, she believes…..”
Elicit phrase 1. Then hold up picture D and elicit phrase 2. Again, highlight the difference between which has and which have.

Step 3. Write the final relative clause type (object of a preposition) on the whiteboard:

“She likes the plant which the boy is looking at”

Hold up picture E, highlight the boy in the picture, then elicit the phrase accurately.

Step 4: Guided pre-task planning.

Put students in pairs. Student A receives narrative one. Student B is given the cut-up version of narrative one. Student B then receives narrative two and student A receives the cut-up version of it. Students must not see each other’s story. Provide each student with one copy of the guided planning note-sheet. Allocate ten minutes planning time and instruct the A students to make notes about narrative one and to try to use the grammar guidance during their narration whilst the B students do the same for narrative two. Inform the students that they cannot use their notes during the task.

Task performance

Step 1: Students take turns performing each narrative in pairs. Student A performs narrative one and student B acts as the listener. Inform the B students to place each of the cut-up pictures on the desk according to the speaker’s narration. After the task, swap roles so student B performs narrative two in the same fashion.

Pre-task planning and task performance

Allocate two copies of narrative three to each student (one uncut and one cut-up version). Inform the students that this is a different story and it contains more information so they should
use more English to describe the story. In addition, they will only be allocated seven minutes planning time. All the students then plan for task three and then take turns performing the task as a speaker and a listener in pairs.

**Pre-task planning and task performance**
Hand out two copies of narrative four to each student (one uncut and one cut-up version). Inform the students that this is a different story and it contains even more information than the last story so they should use more English to describe it. In addition, they will be allocated only four minutes planning time. All the students then plan for task four, then act as speaker and listener.

**Task performance**
Hand out two copies of narrative five to each student (one uncut and one cut-up version). Inform the students that this is a different story and this time they have no planning time. The aim of this task is for students to try to use the target grammar during the narration under natural speaking conditions i.e. no planning time.

**Conclusion**
Most Japanese University learners have previously learnt relative clauses but generally have had little opportunity to use them in communication. Sequencing tasks such as above provides one way to help automatize their use of the forms. However, rather than just repeating the same task which can be de-motivating for students, sequencing tasks so that they increase in complexity provides a greater linguistic challenge for students (Robinson, 2001). For example, changing and increasing the content within tasks encourages students to use more complex and accurate language in order to describe the additional details of the story, in this case, using more relative clauses. In addition, using sequencing tasks with a reduction in planning time serves to prime learners to perform tasks under real-world speaking conditions that often involve spontaneous speech, for example, giving directions. Finally, for alternative grammar practice, instruct the students to perform the sequence of narratives in the present tense by starting each story with ‘Today,.....’ Students can then repeat the task sequence by starting with ‘Yesterday,....’ in order to practice past test forms.
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Appendix 1 – Teacher Pictures
Appendix 2 - Guided planning note-sheet (adapted from Mochizuki & Ortega, 2008)

1. Try to use these grammar rules when planning. For example:

*Kate thinks that* she likes the cat which has blue eyes

She wants the cat which the teacher is looking at

*James believes that* he likes the cat which has a long tail

He wants the cat which the teacher is talking about
Appendix 3 – Narrative 1 (adapted from Mochizuki & Ortega, 2008)
Appendix 4 – Narrative 2 (adapted from Mochizuki & Ortega, 2008)
Appendix 5 – Narrative 3 (adapted from Mochizuki & Ortega, 2008)
Appendix 6 – Narrative 4 (adapted from Mochizuki & Ortega, 2008)
Appendix 7 – Narrative 5 (adapted from Mochizuki & Ortega, 2008)
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