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ABSTRACT
The present research examines the verb usage of non-native and native English instructors in elementary schools in Japan. The authors have been developing English classroom spoken corpora annotated with speaker turn and language tags. We annotated the transcriptions using the extended markup language (XML). The authors' tag set was designed to extract specific parts of transcription in the corpora such as language use, i.e., Japanese (L1), English (L2), and the mixture of the L1 and the L2 (Mix). We extracted the instructors' L2 from our corpora and pinpointed the verbs by using CLAWS (the Constituent Likelihood Automatic Word-tagging System), a parts-of-speech tagger. We obtained 12 types of verbs. The dominant verb types were marked with “_VV0” tags (38.7%), signifying the base form of lexical verbs such as see and start, while verbs in the past tense or the past participle forms were hardly observed or non-existent. Scrutinizing the concordance lines of the frequently used verbs revealed that the instructors' use of the verbs appeared to be constrained by the materials in the elementary school English classes, and that the roles of the instructors were somewhat exclusive, depending on whether they were native speakers of the English language who interact with the students in the target language or non-native speakers who manage the class. The findings imply that the non-native instructors should learn from the native instructors how to interact with the students in English.
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INTRODUCTION
This paper will aim at finding lexical materials, especially verbs, for teacher training programs for elementary school English education by examining classroom corpora compiled by the authors. The first section of this paper will discuss the background of this research by overviewing brief descriptions of introducing English language education at the primary level followed by the literature review, and research questions that we will be working on in this paper.

Background
Since the current course of study for primary education was implemented in 2011, English teaching has been going on under the name of “foreign language activities.” Teaching English to
elementary school students stared in 1886. However, after 26 years, it was eradicated from the elementary school curriculum in Japan (Erikawa, 2009, pp. 2-4). Teaching English at elementary schools has long been absent, since 1912.

In 2013, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology-Japan (MEXT) announced an English education reform plan corresponding to globalization. The reform plan stipulated that teaching English at primary level would start at Year 3. The next new course of study will lower the starting year of teaching English from Year 5 by two years. Under the current system, which was enacted in 2011, elementary school students start to learn English in Year 5 as part of their foreign language activities. The present course of study requires elementary school homeroom teachers (HRTs) to teach English, and this constraint will remain unchanged in the next course of study in 2020. The educational reform plan aims to “empower teachers in elementary school” (MEXT, 2013, p. 1) in its necessary procedure to realize the goals of its plan. As expected, the MEXT is now training in-service teachers in elementary schools to “empower” them with English teaching skills as well as English language proficiency.

In examining developing teacher training programs for foreign language activities, the progress report on English education by the MEXT (2014) gives us an overview of how well the teacher training programs have been going. The progress report said in its survey results that (1) 67.3% of elementary school HRTs were not good at English and that (2) 34.6% of the elementary school teachers said they taught English confidently. The results from other questionnaire items revealed that 74.6% of elementary school HRTs needed to share actual in-class activities and experience them, but 63.5% of them had not participated in such training programs. The survey also revealed that 48% of the elementary school teachers desired teacher training for elementary school foreign language activities so that they could share how they should teach English to elementary school students. It seems that having well-organized teacher training programs are still on their way. As Takanashi and Takahashi (2013, p. 167) stated, no nationwide teacher training programs have yet to be planned.

THE LITERATURE
This section will discuss the grounds for conducting this research by giving a review of the literature, focusing on classroom interactions. After that, the section will show how the focus could be achieved by reviewing the literature in the corpus linguistics.

When elementary school students learn English in the classroom, it is their HRTs that conduct the lessons. Just as the HRTs teach every subject in the elementary school curriculum, they also teach English, without exception. Since foreign language activities in elementary schools involve many interactions among teachers and students, it is HRTs that should teach English to their students (Takanashi & Takahashi, 2013, p. 167). Through these interactions in foreign language activities, elementary school students learn the English language. The students seem to enjoy these interactions. The survey by the MEXT (2014) reflected the enjoyment of the elementary school students. In the survey, 70.9% of the elementary school students answered that they liked
English, and 71.4% said that they were willing to participate in English lessons, i.e., the foreign language activities. Elementary school teachers also enjoy classroom interactions with their students, and 91.5% of them said in the same survey (MEXT, 2014) that they enjoyed English lessons with their students. However, as we quoted in the preceding background section, 67.3% of the elementary school teachers surveyed confessed that they were weak at English, and the survey also revealed that only 34.6% of the elementary school teachers taught English with confidence. This showed the need for creating measures to improve the HRTs' English teaching skills. This need was mentioned by 51.7% of the elementary school teachers, while 48.7% of the teachers called for training in teaching foreign language activity lessons.

To enable elementary school teachers to achieve the goal of acquiring a better command of classroom English, using classroom corpora may be one possible approach. According to O'Keeffe and Farr (2003), the use of classroom corpora is beneficial in initial teacher education. If we assume that the in-service elementary school teachers are novice teachers with respect to teaching the English language, the use of corpora would be of interest to them as well as teacher trainers, administrators, and educators. The need for building elementary school classroom corpora can be justified in this sense as O'Keeffe, McCarthy, and Carter (2007) put it: “By building up classroom extracts, a teacher can reflect closely on classroom practice (p. 220).” It can become a tool for improving teacher-student interactions. O'Keeffe and Farr (2003) argued that one of the beneficial ways of employing classroom corpora for training teachers is using concordance lines. The concordance lines visualize the key words in the center of each line extracted from the corpora, so that the teachers can examine the context in which the key words, for example, action verbs, are highlighted. They will be able to understand how to use the key words they intend to learn if they are elementary school teachers or to teach how to use them if they are educators. Using concordance lines from the classroom corpora is one good option to educate elementary school teachers.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

Based upon the literature reviews in the previous section, we will conclude Section 1 by stating research questions. Elementary school teachers need professional development for teaching English to their students. Since the elementary school teachers must teach English through classroom interactions, it would be of great help for them to learn classroom English that will assist them in having teacher-student discourse. Classroom spoken corpora could provide such linguistic resources by, for example, displaying concordance lines that have key words as their core elements. Therefore, we seek to find such helpful lexical materials in the spoken corpora by answering the following two research questions:

1. What L2 (English) verbs do elementary school teachers use in English lessons (Foreign language activities)?
2. Do elementary school teachers use L2 verbs in interactions in English lessons?
METHODOLOGY

This section describes the classroom spoken corpus that we built and the research procedure through which we aim to find answers to the research questions we posed.

The elementary school English classroom corpus

We videotaped four English classes in a public elementary school in Japan and compiled a spoken corpus of elementary school English classroom (a pilot elementary school English spoken corpus, not for open access). Table 1 gives a brief description of the spoken corpus.

Table 1: Summary of the Elementary School Classroom Spoken Corpus of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Number of tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRT</td>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39(^c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. HRT = Japanese homeroom teacher, ALT = English-native assistant language teacher. *Year 5 and Year 6, each including two classes, the number of classes amounting to four. *The value 47 represents the combined number of 29 boy students and 18 girl students enrolled in two classes. The value 39 represents 18 boy students, and 21 girl students enrolled in two classes.

We transcribed the videotaped recordings and annotated speaker tags and language use tags in an XML format, and parsed the transcripts with parts of speech (POS) tags using the Constituent Likelihood Automatic Word-tagging System (CLAWS). Table 2 displays the speaker tags and the language use tags. The language use tags are nested in the speaker turn tags in the corpus design to display who says what in which language.

Table 2: Speaker and Language Use Tags in the Elementary School Classroom Spoken Corpus of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag name</th>
<th>XML representation with text content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeroom teacher</td>
<td><code>&lt;hrt&gt; Ohayo. [Good morning.] &lt;/hrt&gt;</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant language teacher</td>
<td><code>&lt;alt&gt; Good morning. &lt;/alt&gt;</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single student</td>
<td><code>&lt;st&gt; Hello. &lt;/st&gt;</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple students</td>
<td><code>&lt;sts&gt; Good morning. &lt;/sts&gt;</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td><code>&lt;j&gt; Ohayo. [Good morning.] &lt;/j&gt;</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td><code>&lt;eng&gt; Good morning. &lt;/eng&gt;</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture of Japanese and English</td>
<td><code>&lt;mix&gt;</code></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Speaker turn tag sets consist of a start tag, `<tag name>` and its corresponding end tag, `</tag name>`. `XML tags in this table include text such as “Hello.” as its content. Language use tags are embedded within the speaker turn tags. d. A mixture tag (`<mix>`)</mix>) entail at least one set of a Japanese tag (<j>)</j>) and an English tag (<eng></eng>) in its nature.

This spoken corpus schema enables us to extract transcripts specified by the speaker and to show in what language the utterances were spoken. Figure 1 shows the annotated classroom spoken corpus sample.
Figure 1: Corpus excerpt.

**Procedure**

This section displays how we processed the data in the elementary school classroom spoken corpus of English to display concordance lines. We took three steps to extract the intended data, i.e., L2 verbs in the instructors’ utterances in the corpus; (1) extracting English utterances of ALT and HRT based on speaker tags, (2) extracting verbs by POS tagging, and (3) locating verbs in concordances. We will describe the steps and expected outcome in this section.

Figure 2 shows the detailed procedure in the first step. We based our extraction process on speaker and language tags. By using the extensible stylesheet language transformation (XSLT), we extracted from the corpus the plain texts that instructors uttered. In the XSLT process, XML path language (XPath) were described in the stylesheets (See the XSLT sample in Appendix). The stylesheets enabled us to distinguish instructors from the students, and English utterances from Japanese ones from the corpus. The XSLT stylesheets were executed on an XML editor.

---

**Extract utterances of instructors.**
- Homeroom teachers, `<hrt>` → XPath: `root/hrt`
- Assistant language teachers, `<alt>` → XPath: `root/alt`

**Extract English utterances.**
- English, `<eng>` → XPath sample: `root/alt/eng`
- English in mixed utterances, `<mix>` → XPath sample: `root/hrt/mix/eng`

**Make plain transcripts.**
- `→Delete/Hide tags through XSLT stylesheets.`

Figure 2: The process of extracting English utterances of instructors from the corpus.
The second step is to extract verbs from the plain texts we obtained in the first step. We used the Constituent Likelihood Automatic Word-tagging System (CLAWS) to complete this step. We used tag set C7 that listed 32 verb tags. Table 3 shows these verb tags.

Figure 3 displays a result sample from the POS tagging. It illustrates how POS tags are attached to the plain text. In Figure 3, the POS tags are shown in boldface for clarity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Tag name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VB0</td>
<td>be, base form (finite, i.e., imperative, subjunctive)</td>
<td>VHD</td>
<td>had (past tense)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBDR</td>
<td>were</td>
<td>VHG</td>
<td>having</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBDZ</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>VHI</td>
<td>have, infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBG</td>
<td>being</td>
<td>VHN</td>
<td>had (past participle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBI</td>
<td>be, infinitive (To be or not... It will be ..)</td>
<td>VHZ</td>
<td>has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBM</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>VM</td>
<td>modal auxiliary (such as can, will, and would)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBN</td>
<td>been</td>
<td>VM21</td>
<td>Let's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBR</td>
<td>are</td>
<td>VMK</td>
<td>modal catenative (ought, used)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBZ</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>VV0</td>
<td>the base form of lexical verb (e.g., give, work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VD0</td>
<td>do, base form (finite)</td>
<td>VVD</td>
<td>past tense of the lexical verb (e.g., gave, worked)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDD</td>
<td>did</td>
<td>VVG</td>
<td>-ing participle of the lexical verb (e.g., giving, working)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDG</td>
<td>doing</td>
<td>VVGK</td>
<td>-ing participle catenative (going in be going to)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDI</td>
<td>do, infinitive (I may do... To do...)</td>
<td>VVI</td>
<td>infinitive (e.g., to give... It will work...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDN</td>
<td>done</td>
<td>VVN</td>
<td>past participle of the lexical verb (e.g., given, worked)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDZ</td>
<td>does</td>
<td>VVNK</td>
<td>past participle catenative (e.g., bound in be bound to)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VH0</td>
<td>have, base form (finite)</td>
<td>VVZ</td>
<td>-s form of lexical verb (e.g., gives, works)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plain text of the instructor

Good morning class.
Okay, so, how is weather today?
Yeah, okay?
What is the date today?

Text annotated with POS tags using CLAWS

Good JJ morning NNT1 class NN1 .
Okay RR , so RR , how RRQ is VBZ weather NN1 today RT ? ?
Yeah UH , okay RR ? ?
What DDQ is VBZ the AT date NN1 today RT ? ?

Figure 3: POS tagging sample.
In the final step, we located the verb tags that start with “_V” in the POS tag representation, for example, “is_VBZ” in Figure 3. Then we made concordance lines (concordances hereafter). In the concordances, the verbs (words that are annotated with “_Vxx” tags) are recognized as key words in context (KWIC) in making concordances. We deleted the tags when we displayed the concordances. We will show the results in the following section.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
This section describes the results obtained from the corpus after following the procedure discussed in the previous section. We will discuss the quantitative summary of English words, and will then focus on the verbs that instructors uttered by displaying types of verbs as shown in Table 3, concordances where such verbs played the KWIC roles in the instructor utterances in English.

Quantitative summary
Table 4 shows the quantitative summary of the entire English tokens spoken by the instructors in the corpus. Instructors included one ALT and four HRTs who co-taught four different classes: Two of the four classes were from Year 5, and the other two were from Year 6. The ALT and the HRTs utilized the L2 and a mixture of the L1 and the L2. It might be impossible to generalize with such a small number of classes; however, it seems that the ALT spoke more English than the HRTs and that the HRTs spoke more English in the mixture of English and Japanese. These results may corroborate the literature review where the HRTs answered in the MEXT survey that they needed professional training to improve their English language skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class ID</th>
<th>Number of spoken English tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>1,037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Summary of English Tokens in the Spoken Corpus of Elementary School English Classroom

Note. ALT=English-native assistant language teacher, HRT=Japanese homeroom teacher.

The next section will discuss the verbs obtained through the research procedure explained in Section 2.2.

Verbs found in the complied corpus
We extracted verbs in the corpus and sorted them by the verb tag name. This process provided us with the frequency of the verb types and the actual verbs in the corpus. Table 5 shows the types of verbs, and their frequencies revealed in our research. The most frequently used verb type was
the base form of lexical verbs (frequency = 104) such as give and work, followed by are and is (combined frequency = 70). If we add am to this combined frequency, we will have the total frequency of the present form of be (are, is, and am) amounting to 79. Let's (frequency = 13) drew our attention because we could see that the instructors were trying to initiate in-class activities by using let's. The CLAWS annotated hardly any verbs in the transcripts with the past tense tags except for were (frequency=1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Verb tags</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>_VV0</td>
<td>the base form of lexical verb (e.g., give, work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>_VBR</td>
<td>are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>_VBZ</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>_VD0</td>
<td>do, base form (finite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>_VM2</td>
<td>Let's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>_VM</td>
<td>modal auxiliary (can, will, would, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>_VBM</td>
<td>am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>_VVZ</td>
<td>-s form of lexical verb (e.g., gives, works)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>_VH0</td>
<td>have, base form (finite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>_VVI</td>
<td>infinitive (e.g., to give... It will work...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>_VVG</td>
<td>-ing participle of the lexical verb (e.g., giving, working)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>_VBD</td>
<td>were</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our next focus is on the actual verb forms in the corpus. Table 6 displays the 22 most frequent verbs in the corpus. When we focus on the most frequent verb type, _VV0 (Table 5), we will have (frequency=8), thank (frequency=7), look (frequency=6), start, repeat, and go (frequency=5), stand, listen, have, and call (frequency=3). These verbs might be core verbs in elementary school English classes.

Finally, we will consider the KWIC, i.e., how these verbs behave in the concordances we obtained from the corpus.
Table 6: 22 Most Frequent Verbs in the Spoken Corpus of Elementary School English Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency^a</th>
<th>Verb^b</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>are</td>
<td>VBR</td>
<td>are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>VBZ</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>VD0</td>
<td>do, base form (finite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>s (is)</td>
<td>VBZ</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>stay</td>
<td>VV0</td>
<td>the base form of lexical verb (e.g., give, work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>See</td>
<td>VV0</td>
<td>the base form of lexical verb (e.g., give, work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Let</td>
<td>VM2</td>
<td>Let</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Take</td>
<td>VV0</td>
<td>the base form of lexical verb (e.g., give, work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Thank</td>
<td>VV0</td>
<td>the base form of lexical verb (e.g., give, work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>m (am)</td>
<td>VBM</td>
<td>am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Look</td>
<td>VV0</td>
<td>the base form of lexical verb (e.g., give, work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>start</td>
<td>VV0</td>
<td>the base form of lexical verb (e.g., give, work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Repeat</td>
<td>VV0</td>
<td>the base form of lexical verb (e.g., give, work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>VV0</td>
<td>the base form of lexical verb (e.g., give, work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>VM</td>
<td>modal auxiliary (can, will, would, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>can</td>
<td>VM</td>
<td>modal auxiliary (can, will, would, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>stand</td>
<td>VV0</td>
<td>the base form of lexical verb (e.g., give, work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>listen</td>
<td>VV0</td>
<td>the base form of lexical verb (e.g., give, work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>let</td>
<td>VM2</td>
<td>Let</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>VH0</td>
<td>have, base form (finite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>choose</td>
<td>VV0</td>
<td>base form of lexical verb (e.g. give, work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>call</td>
<td>VV0</td>
<td>base form of lexical verb (e.g. give, work)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *The number of verb tokens uttered by the instructors found in the compiled corpus was 256. The verb tokens of the students and the audio CD were excluded. bThe verb column includes verbs in both lower and upper cases due to the transcription raw data processed in the POS tagger. Forms such as Let in the fifth rank and let in the 17th rank can be rounded into one, yielding the combined frequency of 13.

Concordances (frequently used verbs in context)
Based on the findings in the previous sections, we made concordances, where key words, in this case relatively more frequently used verbs obtained from our extracting process, are used in the utterances of the instructors (the ALT and the HRTs). Figures 4 through 10 display concordance samples extracted from the compiled spoken corpus. The key words are shown in boldface for clarity.

Each form of be plays a distinctive role. In Figure 4, are is used in the casual classroom starting questions such as “How are you?” and “Are you ready?” In Figure 5, is is used rather broadly in questions such as “What is the date today?” and “How is the weather today?” and in declarative statements such as “Today’s song is strawberry stranger.” As for am, the concordances only show the model reading of the textbook materials. The example in the concordances (Figure 6) says “I am strong,” but this does not indicate that the instructors are saying that they are strong.
Okay, how are you today?

ALT: Okay, we are going to play not 31.

HRT: Okay, are you ready?

Okay, so, today we are going to start a new topic.

ALT: Start elementary when we are five.

ALT: When we are five years old.

ALT: We are strong.

ALT: Kibidango [A dumpling], here you are.

ALT: We are very happy.

ALT: Here you are.

Tekotode ima yitta ytsudesune. [So, this is what we did just now.] Here you are. Ato “Take care.” Koreha Yoku Tsukaunode Ano, shittokuto iideshoune. [Also, “Take care.” We had better learn this phrase because we use this a lot.]

Figure 4: Concordance sample: are.

ALT: Okay, so, how is weather today?

ALT: What is the date today?

ALT: Okay, how is the weather today?

Elementary school is six years, six years.

ALT: Junior high is two years.

HRT: What is lunch?

HRT: XXX, ah, what is brave mean?

HRT: What is strong mean?

ALT: Ok, how is the weather today?

ALT: Great. Ok, what is the date today?

HRT: Today’s song is strawberry stranger.

ALT: My boyfriend is strawberry.

HRT: Today is not 50.

“My name is” kara ikimasho ka. [Let’s begin with “My name is.”]

Today’s goal is jajan [the onomatopoeia of the alarm bell ringing], Momotaro wo eigod? [what do you say Momotaro in English?]

ALT: I am strong.

STs: I am strong.

CD: I am monkey strong and brave.

I am dog strong and brave.

Figure 6: Concordance sample: am.

The concordance simply recasts one of the textbook lines, where the main character in the story said, “I am strong” on the textbook CD. These concordances hardly seem to show teacher-student interactions.

Figures 7 though 9 show concordance samples of the three most frequent action verbs. Like be, these concordances do not seem to indicate teacher-student interactions very much, either. However, the ALT used action verbs to give descriptions to explain the topics in the lesson, as can be seen in the concordances “Then we go to intermediate [school]” (Figure 7) and “Okay, we have six years [in elementary school]” (Figure 8). On the other hand, the HRT concordances show commands to the students as seen in “Okay, ready go” and “Three, two, one, go” (Figure 7), and comprehension checks such as “Do you have any questions?” to manage the lesson procedure (Figure 8). These concordances may suggest the exclusive roles that the ALT and the HRTs play in the English lessons.

Figure 10 shows concordances of a different linguistic type because let’s is usually followed by other action verbs. In the sample concordances, verbs such as start, go, sing, and read follow the key verb Let’s. The HRTs seems to use let’s in a similar manner to the ALT’s. These verbs can be useful when conducting English lessons in English.
**CONCLUSION**

The final section of this paper will discuss answers to the two research questions, followed by implications for pedagogy and limitations. We will conclude the paper by stating our future research plans involving compiling and using the classroom spoken corpora.

**Answers to the research questions**

The first research question asked what L2 (English) verbs elementary school teachers use in English lessons, i.e., foreign language activities. We broadly asked this question assuming that elementary school teachers were engaged in a decent amount of teacher-student interactions that involved action verbs. The answer to this question can be found in Table 6. We found that present forms of *be* (*am, is, and are*) and *have* are more frequently used than lexical verbs, mostly action verbs in our results, such as *take, look, start,* and *go.* Instructors are more likely to use stative L2 expressions than those that require actions. Also, hardly any verbs in the past tense were observed. This may also indicate that instructor classroom discourse in English can be “here and now,” on-going interactions.

The second research question asked whether the elementary school teachers used L2 verbs to interact with the students in English lessons. The concordances did not seem to show many examples other than simple casual English classroom interactions such as “*How are you?”* and “*What is the date?”* The fact that both the ALT and the HRTs used *is* to ask *wh-* questions to elicit responses from the students might be possible support for the interactive use of the verbs. It
can be inferred that the instructors may have used relatively more L1 verbs for teacher-student interactions.

Examining the concordances revealed distinctive roles that the ALT and the HRTs played. The ALT was more likely to use verbs to explain things in English observed in the transcripts such as “Junior high is two years” (Figure 5) and “Then we go to intermediate” (Figure 7), and the HRTs were more likely to control the lesson using verbs, for example, “Today’s goal is . . .” (Figure 5) and “Let’s start” (Figure 10). It appears that the HRTs will benefit from the ALT utterances in interacting with the students when it comes to using English verbs in the class.

Implications for pedagogy
One of the purposes of this paper was to find verbs to help the in-service elementary school HRTs to have classroom interactions with the students focusing on English verbs. The findings of this research indicate at least two suggestions for educating elementary school HRTs. One is to have ALTs co-teach with HRTs because of the distinctive roles that ALTs and HRTs can play in English lessons. The ALTs can interact with the students in English, and the HRTs manage the English lesson. They can help organize and conduct English lessons in this manner. The other is to train HRTs to enable them to use more English verbs to interact with the students. They need to learn how to use more verbs in different types of interactions with the students. Learning interactions with the students in English, for example from the ALT, may be a good way to achieve this goal.

Another possibility to enable the HRTs to use more English verbs could be to reflect the Japanese utterances so that the HRTs can consider whether it would be possible for them to translate such Japanese interactions into English. In this way, the HRTs may gradually be able to incorporate more English utterances into their interactions with the students. Elaborating the use of stative expressions using be and have might also give benefits to the elementary school students because using such stative verbs designates the syntactic positions of compliments for be and those of objects for have. Exposing the students to the same syntactical patterns may help them recognize both the linguistic patterns and a variety of content words that follow such verbs.

Limitations
We are aware of at least two limitations to this research. One is the size of the spoken corpora. As can be seen in the quantitative summary (Table 4), the small-scale classroom spoken corpora may not be able to provide us with enough evidence to state generalizations about the verb usage of the elementary school instructors. We need to collect more elementary school English class spoken data. The other limitation we need to consider is that the English classes we recorded were in fact classified as “foreign language activities,” but not English as a subject. The nature of such English class spoken data might not be the same as that for English as an official subject in the elementary school curriculum that is being planned to be implemented in 2020. We need to collect data when elementary school English as a subject begins under the new course of study. The new data will provide us with more insightful data that will lead to the better interpretation of the English verb usage of the elementary school HRTs. This will eventually help create better
Further research proposals

We will conclude this paper by stating our future research plans. Our first plan is to collect more data on elementary school English classes. Corpus-based studies cannot be done without accumulating spoken data, although it takes a tremendous amount of time to transcribe the audio data. At the same time, it is essential for us to annotate the transcribed classroom spoken data with not only the tags we are already using but also a new set of tags that can describe classroom discourse, i.e., teacher-student interactions. In conducting such research, the four classroom interaction modes such as materials mode and classroom context modes proposed by Walsh (2006) and the three lesson goals such as the core goal and social goal proposed by Ellis (1985) would be of great assistance for us to describe the classroom discourse structure. Using these forms of meta-language will enable us to quantify classroom discourse patterns that will benefit the HRTs.

Furthermore, we plan to analyze the L1 (Japanese) verbs in transcriptions and compare them with the L2 (English) verbs. It would be of great interest to translate the L1 into the L2 and make parallel spoken corpora. We sincerely hope that such corpora will enhance the interactive English language skills of elementary school HRTs.

NOTES
1. The data set in this paper was presented at the 17th annual convention of the Hokkaido English language education society held in Sapporo in October, 2016.
3. We used “Editix 2015,” an XML editor that runs on Windows, LINUX, and OS X. This computer software is available on the web at the URL “http://www.editix.com.”
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APPENDIX:

XSLT Stylesheet Sample.

```xml
<xsl:stylesheet version="1.0" xmlns:xsl="http://www.w3.org/1999/XSL/Transform">
  <xsl:output method="text" indent="yes" encoding="UTF-8" omit-xml-declaration="yes"/>
  <xsl:template match="/">
    <xsl:copy-of select="root/body/alt/mix/eng"/>
  </xsl:template>
</xsl:stylesheet>
```