

Applying Theory and Practice of TESOL in a Japanese Private Elementary School Setting

Rajib Ali

Department of International Communications, Toho High School, Japan

* Corresponding Author E-mail Address: rajibaligb@gmail.com

Citation: Ali, R. (2026). Applying Theory and Practice of TESOL in a Japanese Private Elementary School Setting. *International Journal of Childhood Education*, 7(1), 29-39. <https://doi.org/10.33422/ijce.v7i1.1430>

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the design and rationale of a syllabus for Grade 5 learners (aged 10-11) in a Japanese private elementary school context. The proposed syllabus aims to support learners at approximately CEFR A1 level in progressing towards A2, while addressing the expectations of key stakeholders, including the Ministry of Education, schools, and parents. To achieve this, a multi-layered syllabus is adopted, combining structural, notional-functional, and task-based approaches. The structural component provides a systematic foundation in grammar, which aligns with stakeholder expectations and supports accuracy. This is complemented by a notional-functional approach, which emphasises meaningful communication through real-life language use. In addition, task-based learning is incorporated to promote interaction, learner engagement, and the development of communicative competence through authentic and pedagogical tasks. A sample sequence of lessons is presented to demonstrate how these approaches can be integrated in practice. The paper argues that combining multiple syllabus types allows for a balanced approach to language teaching, supporting both form-focused instruction and meaningful communication. This approach is particularly suited to young learners in EFL contexts, where motivation, clarity, and practical language use are essential.

Keywords: TESOL, Curriculum Design, Task-Based Syllabus, Teaching English to Young Learners, EFL

1. Introduction

This paper presents the design and rationale of a syllabus for 5th grade Japanese private elementary school students, aged 10-11. It is standard practice in Japan for elementary school students to enter school from age 6 and graduate at age 12, giving a total of 6 grades. For public Japanese elementary schools, English was formalised as a core assessed subject for grades 5 and 6 under the revised MEXT curriculum implemented in April 2020, significantly increasing lesson hours and introducing basic literacy skills alongside the existing communicative focus (Nemoto, 2018). In the case of this specific Japanese private elementary school, by the start of the academic year, 5th grade learners would have received approximately 300 hours of English lessons, well above the minimum lesson hours in the revised 2020 MEXT curriculum. Classes contain on average 30 students, with 3 classes within 5th grade, and the overall English ability of these students vary from weak to strong. These differences in ability will be addressed through a balance of structured support and communicative activities. While weaker learners benefit from the staged and grammar-focused elements of the syllabus, stronger learners are able to extend their language use through more open-ended, task-based work.

Based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), the learners' median ability is assigned at the level of A1, with the capability and aim of achieving the level of A2 (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 24). The goals of the learners are essentially determined

between the learners themselves and the key stakeholders; Japan's Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), the school itself and the learners' parents. MEXT provides a detailed description of the methods and aims of foreign language teaching, but the overall objective is "developing the understanding of languages and cultures through various experiences, fostering a positive attitude toward communication, and familiarizing pupils with the sounds and basic expressions of foreign languages" (MEXT, 2011, p. 1).

There is, however, an expectation that grammatically correct English usage is observable, usually represented by grade scores. The aim of the proposed syllabus is therefore to ensure that grammatically sound language teaching takes place, satisfy parental and school stakeholder concerns, whilst presenting language material in a communicative and enjoyable manner, thereby satisfying MEXT requirements of foreign (English) language teaching.

The grade 5 learners themselves may not necessarily have clearly expressed goals, since in reality the choice to learn is not theirs. However, in general, it is hoped that learners enjoy and are successful in their learning. They should demonstrate a good or strong grasp of reading, writing, listening and speaking English in accordance with the levels outlined in CEFR A1 and CEFR A2 (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 24) by the time they leave school.

2. Learner Needs Analysis

A thorough needs analysis (NA) is fundamental for effective syllabus design (Brown, 2009). Given the practical constraints of a year-long curriculum covering diverse content, a single lesson dedicated to form a needs assessment is not feasible. Instead, NA data will be gathered on an ongoing basis through multiple sources. At the start of the academic year, learners will complete a short task in order to gauge productive spoken ability. This can take form in a simple, communicative activity requiring them to talk about a familiar place or person in their family. The speaking task will use structured prompts such as 'Where do you live?' and 'Tell me about someone in your family' to elicit oral language.

This task will be supplemented by a CEFR A1-aligned checklist (Council of Europe, 2001, 2020) administered by the teacher through structured observation in the first two lessons, noting learners' ability to understand and produce basic greetings, simple instructions, and familiar vocabulary. The observation checklist will include points such as: 'Can greet and respond to greetings (Yes/No/Partially)', 'Can follow one-step instructions (Yes/No/Partially)', and 'Can name familiar objects or places (Yes/No/Partially)'. The findings will be reviewed after the first two lessons. If significant gaps are identified, additional scaffolding will be incorporated into lessons 1 to 4, and extra teacher modelling will be implemented before the task cycle in lessons 9 to 12. Should learners demonstrate solid CEFR A1 ability, pacing will be maintained and stronger learners will be provided with additional vocabulary targets.

Mixed ability within the classroom will be addressed through differentiated scaffolding. Weaker learners will receive additional support through visual aids, sentence frames, and teacher-modelled examples. Stronger learners will be challenged through open-ended tasks and extended opportunities to use a wider range of vocabulary and more complex structures. Ongoing formative assessment through teacher observation will allow for the continuous adaptation of support strategies throughout the year. To illustrate this differentiation in practical terms; for the directions role play in lessons 3 and 4, weaker learners will be provided with a partially complete map with key phrases and words (e.g. 'Go straight'. 'Turn ...at the...'), while stronger learners will have a map without key phrases and words, and instead rely on their own knowledge to complete the task. For lessons 7 and 8, where there will be gap-fill activities, weaker learners will be provided with a full word bank to aid them, whereas stronger

learners will receive either a reduced word bank, or, should they request as such, no word bank at all.

3. Suitable Syllabus Types

Given the needs of the learners and the desired objectives of MEXT and stakeholders, a multi-layered syllabus is considered appropriate. The core of this syllabus is in the form of a structural syllabus, supplemented by both a notional-functional syllabus and a task-based syllabus.

3.1. Structural Syllabus

Since there is an expectation that grammar forms the basis of teaching, the structural syllabus is proposed as the foundation of this particular syllabus. It is one of the most commonly used syllabus types in a variety of learning contexts (Sabbah, 2018). Language instruction is based on the grammatical structures of a language, organised into an order for which they are then taught to learners (Ellis, 1993). It is systematic and traditional whilst normally following a format of teaching grammar from simple to more complex. These points should satisfy school stakeholders and Japanese parents' expectations of how content is presented and taught.

A structural syllabus is described as synthetic; Wilkins (1976, p. 2) states that “the learner’s task is to resynthesise the language that has been broken down into a large number of small pieces with the aim of making the learning task easier”. This approach feels suitable for young learners in this context; by breaking down language learning into manageable ‘chunks’ and reducing the cognitive load, it should be easier for them to understand and remember material (Nation & Macalister, 2010). Learners are at CEFR A1/A2 level, making this syllabus type appropriate for presenting grammar material in an easy-to-understand manner.

However, there are several shortcomings, chief among which is that this type of syllabus focuses on form rather than function. Language is commonly learnt through exercise drills and in isolation, rather than through real social contexts and experiences. Learners may be able to speak English in a grammatically correct manner, but lack natural, real-world application of the language learnt, which risks the possibility of boredom or lack of motivation, since learners can feel that there is no real use for the language they are learning outside of the classroom. The following syllabus types are therefore intended to address these shortcomings.

3.2. Notional-Functional Syllabus

Associated with Wilkins (1976), a notional-functional syllabus is an approach where, rather than the focus on form that a structured syllabus emphasises, it is an effort to move away from form and towards meaning as the organizing principle. In this context, language can be broken down into ‘notions’, such as time, quantities and location; and ‘functions’, such as making requests, apologising and making offers or suggestions. Adopting a notional-functional syllabus has several benefits distinct from the structured syllabus; it provides opportunities to teach practical, real-world English; emphasises receptive (listening and reading) activities that are not necessarily encouraged in a structured syllabus; and creates an authentic use and a reason for speaking (Finocchiaro & Brumfit 1983, cited in Nunan, 1988, p. 36).

In the context of the young learners, the opportunity to use real-life situational English should allow them to see practical applications of the language outside the classroom; they are simply not learning for passing a test but engaging in authentic language use. A notional-functional syllabus allows for the kind of activities that allow for spoken communication between classmates, rather than grammar drills that elicit synthetic and unnatural responses. This approach should satisfy MEXT’s desire that grade 5 (and 6) learners “experience the joy of

communication” and “actively listen to and speak in the foreign language” (MEXT, 2011, p. 1).

3.3. Task-Based Syllabus

This syllabus focuses on the use of tasks to facilitate meaningful language learning rather than form-focused learning. There are several definitions of ‘task’ in an educational context. For the purpose of this paper, Nunan (1989, p. 10) states that a task is “a piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than on form”. This definition is quite open and allows for many kinds of task-based learning (TBL) to be planned, so long as the primary focus is on meaning.

TBL is considered a strong form of communicative language teaching (CLT), unlike Presentation Practice Production (PPP), which is a weak form of CLT, and is a prevalent means of teaching grammar in a structural syllabus. PPP has its place in the proposed syllabus because it focuses on pre-selected elements of grammar, and can help support weak learners. The TBL approach, however, allows for language to emerge through interaction between learners performing meaningful tasks. Depending on the needs of the learners, an appropriate task cycle, in a form such as Willis’ (1996) 3 stage cycle, can be created and implemented. Both ‘real world’ tasks and pedagogic tasks (Nunan, 1989) can be used, providing many opportunities to practice language learning through a variety of means. There is much support for the value of TBL in an English as a foreign language (EFL) context broadly, and with young learners in particular (Ellis et al., 2019; Pinter, 2017; Zhu, 2022).

Incorporating a task-based syllabus should allow for more meaningful and authentic language use through interaction between the learners themselves in a more authentic learning context, which differentiates from the other two syllabuses. Nunan (2004, p. 1) talks of the strengthening of principles and practices such as understanding that classroom language can take place outside the classroom, and that the learner’s own experiences are important elements of learning, which are not necessarily evident in a structural or notional-functional syllabus.

The combination of the three syllabus types should lead to a comprehensive, balanced and enjoyable L2 learning experience for the learners. They will be exposed to grammatically sound and structured English through the structured syllabus, satisfying stakeholder expectations, whilst having the opportunity to learn and use language in communicative and meaningful ways through notional-functional and task-based components.

4. Clarification of the Presented Syllabus

The 5th grade learners receive three 45-minute lessons a week for 40 weeks, totalling 120 lessons. The 45-minute lessons represent an expansion from the 20-minute lessons that learners previously received in their first three years at school. The syllabus table below (see Table 2) represents the first 12 lessons of the first semester, or approximately first four to five weeks.

Table 1: Syllabus Table

Lesson	Syllabus Type	Lesson Focus	Aims and Outcomes of each Lesson
1	Structural	Prepositions	Aim: Learners are introduced to new prepositions and building types in order to explain where buildings are on a map. Measurable outcome: Learners will identify and use new prepositions related to location in a controlled map activity.

Lesson	Syllabus Type	Lesson Focus	Aims and Outcomes of each Lesson
2	Structural	Prepositions	Aim: As above (teacher-led reinforcement of the grammar point). Measurable outcome: Learners will produce location sentences using taught prepositions with accuracy in a teacher-led drill.
3	Notional-functional	Directions	Aim: Using the previously taught language, learners role-play as people looking for certain buildings, such as a restaurant. Measurable outcome: Learners will give and follow simple directions using previously taught vocabulary in a role-play.
4	Notional-functional	Directions	Aim: As above (learner-led role-play). Measurable outcome: Learners will independently perform a directions role-play without the aid of a teacher.
5	Notional-functional	Ordering a meal	Aim: Learners are introduced to the concept of ordering a meal at a restaurant. Measurable outcome: Learners will use expressions to order food and drink in a restaurant scenario.
6	Structural	Countable/Uncountable nouns	Aim: Learners are introduced to countable and uncountable nouns for the purposes of ordering food and drink, with a quiz activity. Measurable outcome: Learners will correctly categorise several items as countable or uncountable and apply the correct quantifiers
7	Structural	Going + to-infinitive	Aim: Ordering items at a restaurant (“What are you going to have?” “I’m going to have...”) Measurable outcome: Learners will construct grammatically correct restaurant dialogues using the ‘going to + infinitive’ grammar point.
8	Structural	Going + to-infinitive	Aim: As above (activities). Measurable outcome: Learners will reproduce restaurant dialogue accurately through the use of gap-fill activities.
9	Task-based	Let’s make a plan	Aim: Combining all previous lessons to present a dialogue making a plan to go and eat somewhere with a friend. Measurable outcome: Learners will understand the task, brainstorm ideas, and begin drafting a suitable dialogue with a partner, using vocabulary and structures from lesson 1 to 8.
10	Task-based	Let’s make a plan	Aim: As above (learner-led preparation). Measurable outcome: Learners will have completed and rehearse their dialogue.
11	Task-based	Let’s make a plan	Aim: As above (learner-led role-play presentation and peer assessment/feedback). Measurable outcome: Learners will perform their dialogue in front of the class and both receive and provide structured feedback.
12	Task-based	Let’s make a plan	Aim: As above (learner-led role-play presentation and peer assessment/feedback). Measurable outcome: Learners will perform their dialogue in front of the class and both receive and provide structured feedback. In addition, time for reflection will be provided

5. General Summary of the Syllabus

This syllabus follows a backward designed approach; the learner needs and end-goal objectives are determined first, from which the content and method or process is planned (Richards, 2013). The learners are studying English as a foreign language (EFL), and so the focus is to develop basic listening, speaking, writing and reading skills towards CEFR A2, as well as cementing the skills from CEFR A1. Throughout the syllabus, explicit reading, writing, listening and speaking activities will take place, though not all four of the activities will occur in every lesson. In addition, there is also a focus on developing grammar and vocabulary. The proposed syllabus attempts to cover these goals.

Recycling language is a key theme throughout the lessons, with opportunities to reuse language ranging from implicit (lessons 9-12) to explicit (lessons 3 and 4). Recycling language has been shown to improve understanding and retention (Brown et. al, 2008). Another aim is to provide variety in content and presentation of language learning. Providing variety, so long as they are kept interesting, helps maintain motivation and interest in lessons (Dörnyei, 2001; Lena & Nikolov, 2025).

6. Lesson Content Choices

Lessons 1 and 2 are built on simple prepositions that were taught to learners when they were in the 2nd grade (in, on, under, next to). There should be some familiarity for the learners while learning the new prepositions (such as across from, above, beside etc). Since this is the beginning of the academic year; familiar content but with new language should put learners at ease.

Lessons 3 and 4 build on the previous lessons by using the same vocabulary, but within the context of giving directions. Learners can now use language taught in a more communicative manner rather than through the fixed grammar structure of the previous lessons.

Lesson 5 introduces a restaurant scenario, which children should be familiar with, but not necessarily the concept of ordering food themselves, which is the main focus of the lesson. It should provide an engaging scenario for them when they are given the opportunity to substitute food items with their own preferences.

Lesson 6 focuses on countable and uncountable nouns. In the Japanese language, there is no plural 's' form; instead, specific counter words are used for specific shapes and objects (1 apple = ringo ik-ko, 2 apples = ringo nik-ko; 1 car = kuruma ichi-dai, 2 cars = kuruma ni-dai). Learners also have to contend with the many irregular plural forms that English has, but this can make for an engaging lesson, especially in conjunction with an interactive quiz such as Kahoot.

Lessons 7 and 8 aim to combine language from the previous four lessons to create grammatically correct dialogue on ordering food in a restaurant. Gap-fill activities will provide some sense of variation to the learners, but the aim is to ensure they can repeat the dialogue accurately.

Finally, lessons 9, 10, 11 and 12 represent a culmination of all previous lessons, where the learners will be given a task that allows them to use language in a more meaningful manner rather than the form-focus of earlier lessons. Lesson 9 is an introduction to the topic and the task, or a pre-task, will be presented in form of a skit, but after this, learners will be simply told to try and make a plan to meet a friend and eat out. They will perform a task cycle, where they attempt to complete the task in pairs and create an original dialogue or skit, with minimal teacher interference, during lessons 9 and 10, to then present and perform in front of their

classmates during lessons 11 and 12. In addition to teacher feedback, learners will be given the opportunity to also provide feedback, since it has been shown that they can learn from their peers and share ideas and strategies (Double et al., 2019).

7. Sequencing

As demonstrated above, the sequencing is designed so that there is a gradual increase in difficulty, but with regular opportunities to recycle previous language so that learners do not feel overwhelmed with new material, and that they do not fall behind in lessons. The mix between form and function should also allow learners to feel confident in their grammatical ability and technically correct usage of English, whilst applying what they have learnt in real-world activities (lessons 3 and 4, and lessons 9, 10, 11 and 12), giving them a genuine sense that they are learning something that can be used beyond the classroom.

8. CEFR and MEXT Alignment

To ensure coherence between lesson content, learner proficiency targets, and institutional expectations, Table 2 provides a mapping of the sample lesson sequence against relevant CEFR A1/A2 descriptors and MEXT competencies. The 2020 CEFR Companion Volume, which extends the original framework with updated descriptors for mediation and online interaction, has also been consulted to ensure alignment with current proficiency expectations (Council of Europe, 2020).

Table 2: Alignment of Lesson Sequence with CEFR Descriptors and MEXT Competencies

Lessons	Key Outcomes	CEFR Descriptor	MEXT Competency
1–2	Understand and use prepositions to describe locations on a map.	A1: Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases.	Familiarise pupils with basic expressions; understand simple instructions.
3–4	Give and follow simple directions using taught vocabulary.	A1/A2: Can ask for and give simple directions referring to a map or plan.	Experience the joy of communication; actively listen and speak in the foreign language.
5–8	Order food and drink in a restaurant using structured dialogue.	A1/A2: Can make simple purchases; can interact in a simple way if the other person speaks slowly.	Use English in familiar situations; develop basic speaking skills.
9–12	Create and perform an original dialogue making plans to eat out.	A2: Can use a series of phrases and sentences to describe plans and arrangements in simple terms.	Experience communicating meaningfully; develop a positive attitude toward communication.

9. Assessment

Assessment plays a crucial role in this syllabus for young learners as it provides information on their progress, achievements, strengths and weaknesses. Everyone involved in the learning experience, learners, teachers and parents, can gain valuable insight, though the interpretation of the data depends on who is reading it. It is therefore an integral part of both teaching and learning (Pinter, 2017).

Assessment refers to the “variety of ways of collecting information on a learner’s language ability or achievement” (Brindley, 2001, p. 137). Throughout this syllabus, there will be some tests, which is a form of assessment, and is expected and necessary at this level. In addition, formative types of assessment, such as observation, and providing both ‘comfort’ feedback, which provides reassurance to the learner or make them feel better without explicitly explaining

errors, and ‘strategic’ feedback, where areas of improvement are noted and learners provided the tools to improve, will be prioritized. The opportunity for learners to also provide feedback during the task-based activity will also give them a sense of participation and responsibility in the assessment process. In sum, feedback is essential for young learners, and it should be “corrective and meaningful” (Boyd, 2020, p. 17).

Table 3: Analytic Assessment Rubric for Task-Based Role-Play (Lessons 9–12)

Criterion	4 - Excellent	3 - Good	2 - Developing	1 - Limited
Communicative Fluency	Speaks smoothly with minimal hesitation; message is very clear.	Some hesitation but message is mostly clear.	Frequent hesitation; message is partially clear.	Very hesitant; message is unclear.
Grammatical Accuracy	Uses target structures accurately throughout.	Mostly accurate with minor errors.	Several errors but communication maintained.	Frequent errors that impede understanding.
Vocabulary Range	Uses a wide range of lesson vocabulary accurately.	Uses most target vocabulary correctly.	Uses some vocabulary; limited range.	Very limited vocabulary; relies heavily on L1.
Interaction / Turn-taking	Natural, balanced exchange with clear turn-taking.	Generally balanced; occasional overlap.	Some difficulty in managing turns.	Little interaction; one partner dominates.
Task Completion	Task fully completed; plan is clear and detailed.	Task mostly completed; plan is mostly clear.	Task partially completed.	Task not completed.

Formative assessment, which comprises teacher observation notes, targeted oral feedback and peer assessment, serves as the primary ongoing measure of learner progress and is weighted more heavily than summative assessment in the overall evaluation of learner achievement. The summative role-play rubric in Table 3 provides a structured endpoint assessment for the syllabus. Reading and writing, though not the primary focus at this stage, are assessed formatively through accuracy in gap-fill activities (lessons 7 and 8) and the written planning component of the task preparation phase in lesson 9. CEFR progress between A1 and A2 will be monitored through a brief end of unit checklist that aligns with CEFR A1 and A2 descriptors. This allows for the teacher to identify if learners are progressing in line with expected outcomes, and to adjust accordingly in subsequent units if there are issues with progression.

As for the peer assessment during lessons 11 and 12, learners will be guided by the following simplified criteria: Did the pair speak clearly? Did they complete the task? In other words, did they successfully make a plan to go out and eat together? Did they use language from the previous lessons?

The following sample formative feedback stems may be used by the teacher to ensure feedback is both supportive and constructive: “I understood what you said. Well done!/Good job! Next time, try...”; “Good use of (target phrase). Can you also try...?”; “Let’s practise (grammar point) again together.”

The opportunity for learners to provide feedback during the task-based activity will give them a sense of participation and responsibility in the assessment process (Double et al., 2019).

10. Classroom Management and Feasibility

Teaching a class of 30 young learners presents management challenges, particularly during communicative and task-based activities. Several strategies are suggested to ensure smooth lesson delivery and effective use of instructional time.

With regard to assigning groups, pair work will be the default mode for most of the communicative activities, including the directions role-play in lessons 3 and 4, and the task cycle in lessons 9 to 12. Ideally pairs would be assigned strategically by the teacher to balance level abilities, but due to classroom dynamics and homeroom teacher requests, where this is not possible, pairs will be formed by assigning learners with their nearest partner. For lessons that require more complex interactions, groups of three to four students will be used, with clearly defined roles (e.g., speakers, listeners) to ensure everyone participates equally.

With regard to time management or time-on-task, each 45-minute lesson will be structured into clear phases: a brief warm-up (5 minutes), input and instruction (10-15 minutes), structured practice (15 minutes), and a communicative activity or task (10-15 minutes). This structure ensures that learners spend a substantial portion of each lesson actively using language, while also allowing for whole-class instruction and monitoring. It should be made clear, however, that teachers should be fluid with time management, since the possibility of phases taking too long or finishing quickly can frequently occur.

Regarding the use of L1 (Japanese) and L2 (English), a general English-medium approach will be maintained, in line with MEXT guidelines and best practices for young EFL learners (Butler, 2015; Nemoto, 2018; Zein & Butler, 2022). However, strategic use of Japanese will be permitted to clarify complex instructions, or to support comprehension, particularly for weaker learners.

11. Syllabus Evaluation

Ideally, evaluation and reflection of lesson content, method and delivery would occur continuously, but at the very least after every unit. No matter how experienced a teacher is, unexpected situations frequently occur, and are even more likely in a class of 30 ten-year-olds. While in one sense, obtaining perfect learner scores could be considered success of a syllabus; determining overall syllabus effectiveness also depends on being able to identify both what components have worked, so those lesson components can be fine-tuned; and what parts of the syllabus are less successful, so that adjustments can be made to better serve learner needs. This can be determined through assessment data, focused observation of the lessons, and through learner feedback gathered at the end of every unit.

12. Limitations

One limitation of this paper is that the proposed syllabus is based on a generalised understanding of the learner context rather than extensive empirical data. While classroom experience and reference to existing literature have informed the design, a more detailed needs analysis involving learner input and performance data would allow for a more tailored and context-specific syllabus. Future work could also draw on Japanese EFL-specific studies (Butler, 2015; Nemoto, 2018; Zein & Butler, 2022) to ground syllabus decisions more firmly in evidence from comparable contexts.

This limitation is partly due to the nature of the paper, which is intended as a context-specific syllabus design rather than a fully generalisable or replicable model. As such, the aim is not to present a universal solution, but to demonstrate how theoretical approaches can be applied

within a particular teaching context. Future research could involve the practical implementation of the syllabus, with data collected on learner performance, engagement, and feedback, in order to evaluate its effectiveness and inform further refinement (Ellis et al., 2019).

13. Conclusion

This paper has presented the design and rationale of a multi-layered syllabus for Grade 5 learners in a Japanese private elementary school context. By combining structural, notional-functional, and task-based approaches, the syllabus aims to balance the development of grammatical accuracy with meaningful communicative use of language. This balance is particularly important in contexts where stakeholder expectations emphasise both correct language use and the development of positive attitudes towards communication.

The proposed syllabus also highlights the importance of variety, recycling, and learner engagement in supporting young learners' language development. By integrating different syllabus types, learners are provided with opportunities to encounter, practise, and apply language in both controlled and more authentic contexts. Attention has also been given to the practical challenges of implementing the syllabus with a class of 30 learners, including strategies for differentiated support, grouping, and the use of L1.

While the syllabus is designed to meet the needs of the learners and stakeholders, its effectiveness ultimately depends on ongoing evaluation and adaptation. Future implementation would require continuous reflection to ensure that it remains responsive to learner needs and classroom realities.

References

- Boyd, E. (2020). *Assessment for Young Learners in the English Language Classroom*. Part of the Cambridge Papers in ELT series. [pdf] Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Brindley, G. (2001). Assessment. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages* (The Cambridge Guides, pp. 137-143). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511667206.021
- Brown, J.D. (2009). Foreign and Second Language Needs Analysis. In Long, M. H., & Doughty, C. J. (Eds.). (2009). *The handbook of language teaching*. John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated. <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/portsmouth-ebooks/reader.action?docID=454334&ppg=291>
- Brown, R., Waring, R., & Donkaewbua, S. (2008). Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition from Reading, Reading-While-Listening, and Listening to Stories. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 20(2), 136–163.
- Butler, Y. G. (2015). English language education among young learners in East Asia: A review of current research (2004–2014). *Language Teaching*, 48(3), 303–342. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444815000105>
- Council of Europe (2001). *The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge University Press. <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4>

- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom* (Cambridge Language Teaching Library). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667343>
- Double, K.S., McGrane, J.A. & Hopfenbeck, T.N. (2019) ‘The impact of peer assessment on academic performance: A meta-analysis of control group studies’, *Educational Psychology Review*. 32 (481–509).
- Ellis, R. (1993). The Structural Syllabus and Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 91–113. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586953>
- Ellis, R., Skehan, P., Li, S., Shintani, N., & Lambert, C. (2019). *Task-Based Language Teaching: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108643689>
- Lena, M. S., & Nikolov, M. (2025). A Systematic Review of Empirical Studies on Young EFL Learners’ Motivation and Task Engagement. *Sage Open*, 15(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251386566>
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (2011) *Chapter 4 Foreign Language Activities*. https://www.mext.go.jp/component/english/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2011/03/17/1303755_011.pdf
- Nation, I. S. P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design*. Routledge.
- Nemoto, A. K. (2018). Getting ready for 2020: Changes and challenges for English education in public primary schools in Japan. *The Language Teacher*, 42(4). <https://jalt-publications.org/articles/24344-getting-ready-2020-changes-and-challenges-english-education-public-primary-schools>
- Nunan, D. (1988) *Syllabus Design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Nunan, D. (1989) *Designing tasks for a communicative classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. [electronic resource]. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667336>
- Pinter, A. (2017). *Teaching young language learners*. Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2013). Curriculum Approaches in Language Teaching: Forward, Central, and Backward Design. *RELJ Journal: A Journal of Language Teaching and Research in Southeast Asia*, 44(1), 5–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212473293>
- Sabbah, S. S. (2018). *English language syllabuses: Definition, types, design, and selection*. *Arab World English Journal*, 9 (2), 127-142.
- Wilkins, D. (1976). *Notional Syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Willis, J. (1996) *A framework for task-based learning*. Longman.
- Zein, S., & Butler, Y.G. (Eds.). (2022). *English for Young Learners in Asia: Challenges and Directions for Teacher Education* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003016977>
- Zhu, Y. (2022). Implementing tasks in young learners’ language classrooms: A collaborative teacher education initiative through task evaluation. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(3), 530-551. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819894706>