

etc. because I believe the pairs of opposites might actually each be counted as a “chunk”: an item and the reverse of the item. In review though, I am glad that I limited myself. In a fifteen minute time period, six terms were plenty.

I was stymied for a context: following Hall (1995) “input is a necessary but insufficient condition for acquisition to occur, input must also occur within meaningful contexts.” Is the context of manipulatives in a box enough? They did function to offer the students an interactive classroom environment; the students were able to present “situations” with real items. I think it works with this topic. In a longer lesson plan, though, I think an overarching context could be easily denoted: “at the store”, “wrapping a present”, or “where are my keys?” to suggest a few.

I started the lesson by greeting the students and by informing them of the objective which was written on the board. During my first microteaching, I felt awkward using the technology. Going back and forth to the computer was making it hard to give the students as much attention as they deserved. I’m not proposing that I’d avoid technology in the future by any means. I just feel that the amount of time spent in a microteaching is very small and I wanted to have that time devoted to the students. I think in my first microteaching I had missed cues from the students while I was adjusting to the set up. Also, I felt this lesson was one where the use of technology could easily be limited.

Using TPR I demonstrated the terms. I had the students rise so they could comfortably repeat and imitate the actions, and I could tell I had their attention. After the TPR exercises, I then wrote the words on the board so the students could “attend to form and meaning.” After another TPR review, this time using the boxes instead of gestures, I passed out the first set of word cards, which included all six terms. The students were then asked to sort the words into

++
Good