

## *Teacher Training Workshop - Exploring Ways for Japanese Teachers of English to Make Their Classes More Communicative*

教員養成ワークショップ：  
日本人英語教師による、よりコミュニカティブな授業展開を求めて

NABEI Toshiyo  
名部 井 敏 代  
Roger PALMER  
ロジャー・パーマー  
Chris CAMPBELL  
クリス・キャンベル

2005年度、関西大学大学院外国語教育学研究科は、文部科学省委嘱事業「英語指導力開発ワークショップ」を行った。ここでは、同ワークショップ第一フェイズで行われた、コミュニカティブな英語教育の展開に関する中学・高校英語教師の研修実践を報告する。

### キーワード

教員研修 (Teacher Training)、コミュニカティブな言語教育 (Communicative Language Teaching)、タスクを用いた言語教育 (Task Based Language Teaching)

### Introduction

In the summer of 2005, the Graduate School of Foreign Language Education and Research at Kansai University held a workshop for Japanese junior and senior high school English teachers who wanted to improve their teaching abilities. Funding was granted by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT), with the aim of training experienced English teachers and prospective leaders in English education to become more skilled at current communicative English teaching practices (MEXT, 2005).

The workshop consisted of three phases: a one-week summer retreat which dealt with

practical aspects of English teaching (Phase 1), a 12-week-long lecture-based workshop which dealt with theoretical aspects of English teaching (Phase 2), and a one-week winter retreat which showcased leading English educators and their teaching techniques (Phase 3). This report describes the Phase 1 workshop which focused on developing ways for Japanese teachers of English to make their classes more communicative.

The workshop took place at Kansai University's Takatsuki Campus during the last week of August. There were 11 participants: seven men and four women, five of whom were junior high school teachers. The participants had an average of 16.7 years of teaching experience. Four of them had more than 20 years of teaching experience while the least experienced teacher had only 3 years. The trainers were two native speakers of English who are very experienced in English teaching and teacher training. For the most part, the workshop sessions described in this report took place for 3 hours every afternoon.

## **I. Background and Assumptions**

The general goal of the workshop was to enable Japanese English teachers to conduct communicative English lessons using L2 in a manner that was in line with current ESL/EFL practices. Given that the trainees' teaching backgrounds, experiences and approaches were unknown to the trainers, a number of assumptions were made about them:

- 1) The trainees had a commitment to instructing their classes through the medium of English rather than through their mother tongue and viewed this goal as desirable and attainable.
- 2) They had, as a minimum, an upper-intermediate ability in English.
- 3) They were aware of the limits of making the teaching of vocabulary and grammar the priority of their courses.
- 4) They were primarily using a non-communicative approach in their classrooms.
- 5) They were aware of the existence of communicative language teaching (CLT), but had only limited experience employing a CLT approach.
- 6) They were essentially open to new ideas; however, they had some ingrained and possibly limiting beliefs about the nature of language teaching and their ability to conduct classes in English.

It was also assumed that the trainees' English classes were characterised by:

- 1) a high degree of teacher talking time,
- 2) extensive L1 usage in the class,
- 3) a teacher-centred approach,
- 4) low student autonomy,
- 5) limited variety of configurations (i.e., pairs, groups) when engaging in classroom tasks,
- 6) test-oriented instruction, and
- 7) limited spontaneous use of English.

With these assumptions in mind, it was thought necessary to divide the workshop loosely into two parts, firstly in order to give them sufficient background on methodology and issues surrounding CLT, and secondly to enable them to actually apply aspects of CLT to their contexts. The first part was essentially broad and theoretical and concerned establishing the place of CLT in current practice, introducing task-based learning (TBL) as the key way of making CLT work, providing trainees with a framework that would help them design communicative tasks, and finally exposing them to a rich bank of specific tasks and material that they could use in their classes. A request had also been made for the trainers to cover the teaching of discussion and presentation skills, and this was included in the workshop as an extension of the background on methodology and teaching issues

The second part was more specific and immediately practical in that it focused on the numerous components which comprise effective CLT. These components included establishing a framework for use of L2 within a monolingual Japanese classroom, teaching trainees how to use and give effective instructions in English, identifying and practising the staging of activities by instructors, refocusing the locus of interaction from the teacher to greater involvement and participation by the students, examining class management in relation to alternative teacher and learner roles, and reconstructing the English classroom in terms of a communicative zone for language acquisition. These parts were fairly closely integrated and were run concurrently by the respective teacher trainers.

## **II. Description of Workshop Content**

### **Methodology: CLT and TBL**

This part began with a discussion of methodology in order to put CLT and TBL into context. Trainees were required to read a primer on methodology extracted from *Practical English*

*Language Teaching* (Nunan, 2003, pp. 4-7) for homework and to reflect on their own approach to teaching. It was made clear that a non-communicative, grammar/vocabulary-heavy focus on teaching English was ineffective in encouraging communicative competence as it is now widely defined and accepted (Bachman, 1991, p. 87). After the opening discussion trainees were asked to consider redefining their measure of success as teachers **from** *the ability of students to produce grammatically correct sentences* **to** *the ability to pass a message successfully through the medium of English so that their communicative goal is achieved*. It was suggested that the best way of doing this was to introduce TBL into their classrooms.

TBL was then defined as involving students in performing tasks that have a communicative purpose and a definable outcome. Tasks were broadly presented as 'a range of work plans which have the overall purpose of facilitating language learning' (Breen, 1987, p. 23) and several task typologies were discussed in Nunan (1989, pp. 66-68), 3 types from Prahbu (1987, pp. 46-7), 7 types from Clark (1987, 238-9) and 7 types from Pattison (1987). These typologies were useful in helping trainees visualize and encapsulate the wide range of tasks that exist (e.g., Prahbu's (1987, pp.46-7) simple division of information, reasoning and opinion gap activity types). Trainees were exposed to examples of each task type, either through participation in tasks or discussion of sample tasks for illumination.

Following this introduction of TBL, trainees were furnished with two paradigms or work-cycles for applying CLT in their classrooms: Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) and TBL. Both paradigms were illustrated in a classroom situation by the teacher trainer using identical materials. Following this practical treatment, the components of PPP and TBL were compared and contrasted in order to clarify them as models for lesson planning.

### **Discussion and Presentation**

An additional focus of the course was how to teach discussion and presentation skills in the class. Discussion was defined in a very broad sense as spontaneous spoken communication between two or more students for a variety of purposes; for example, establishing and maintaining social relations, the exchange of personal information, the checking of language learning exercises, talking about personal likes and dislikes, expressing ideas and negotiating choices and communicating to get things done. In this sense, discussion as handled in the workshop was not viewed as a 'high-brow' exchange of ideas, as this would have made it almost impossible to actually realise in classes with students of very low English proficiency.

Trainees were advised to use the following guidelines to help in their teaching approach and materials development (Bygate, 2001, p. 18):

- 1) A range of different types of interaction need practicing.
- 2) The conditions of oral tasks need to differ from those for written skills.
- 3) Improvised speech needs practice, but around some content familiarity.
- 4) Overt oral editing skills need to be encouraged, including the use of communication strategies.
- 5) For learners' oral abilities to develop, there needs to be an emphasis on fluency, accuracy and complexity.

Given the focus on TBL, it was also suggested that any discussion activities, particularly at lower levels, should involve the students in the negotiation of meaning to complete a specific task so as to avoid discussions that were too open-ended. As for practically facilitating discussion in class, trainees were provided with additional guidelines:

- 1) Give students sufficient practice in pairs and groups with a minimum of teacher interference.
- 2) Establish a 'classroom culture' of communication from day 1.
- 3) Establish 'The English Zone' (an English-only time during the tasks) in the case that conducting a class fully in English was an impossibility.
- 4) Give learners a reason to communicate something by choosing tasks effectively and creating a gap that they need to bridge.
- 5) Vary groupings during discussion activities.
- 6) Balance teacher control and student independence.
- 7) Build a bank of discussion ideas/activities.
- 8) Choose activities that they are challenged by and they can succeed at.

Trainees were expected to consider these points while planning and teaching their final 15-minute teaching practice, which required a discussion component in their lesson taught using their peers as students.

Presentations were defined as a one-way transmission of information to an audience using a pre-determined format for a specific purpose: to inform, introduce, report on, convince or describe. It was hoped that the idea that presentations were, by definition, 'high-brow' could be

debunked so that teachers would feel comfortable doing simple ones with even low-level students.

It was also noted, however, that conceiving, preparing and doing presentations is a synthesis of a number of different skills and knowledge areas (e.g., vocabulary, discussion, research, note-taking, confidence-building, fluency, body language, to name but a few). This requires much planning, often over several classes and it was recommended that teachers use the following cycle for guidance:

- 1) Introducing and modelling the presentation (listening).
- 2) Deciding the topic (discussion).
- 3) Finding the information (research, discussion, note-taking).
- 4) Organizing the information and deciding on the presentation format (critical thinking).
- 5) Deciding what language is required (vocabulary).
- 6) Rehearsing the presentation (attention to presentation skills).
- 7) Giving the presentation (demonstration of presentation skills).
- 8) Getting and/or giving feedback (evaluation).

It was recommended that fairly high-level, sophisticated students would be able to decide and conduct themselves capably in all stages, with teacher support. For lower-level students, it was recommended that teachers fix numbers 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8. Item number 4 requires some comment. By the term 'presentation formats', the authors mean the shape or outline that the content of a presentation takes. For example, in a TV commercial, companies often show a situation (e.g., a rainy day), a problem (e.g., you catch a cold), a solution (e.g., you take their medicine) and a result (e.g., you feel better). This format is a SITUATION-PROBLEM-SOLUTION-RESULT type. The kinds of formats that can be adopted to guide students in organizing their content include the following:

- 1) Situation-Problem-Solution-Result (Commercial).
- 2) Problem-Solution-Future outlook (News report - Environmental problem).
- 3) Basic information-Family-Interests (Self-introduction).
- 4) Chronological order (Past events).
- 5) Foreground-Middle ground-Background (Spatial descriptions - Picture).
- 6) Survey question-General result-Interesting results-Opinion (Presenting survey results).

- 7) Good points-Bad Points (Comparing/Contrasting something).
- 8) Summary-Background-Problem-Resolution-Final Comment (Storytelling).
- 9) Main opinion-Supporting points-Conclusion (Opinion).
- 10) Description of object-Why it's good (Show and tell).
- 11) Geographical/Time description (Weather reports).
- 12) Introduction-Tools/Ingredients-Procedure (Recipes).
- 13) Introduction-Body-Conclusion (Speeches).
- 14) Destination-Sights-Activities-Accommodation (Travel plans/Tours).
- 15) Main point-Setting-Characters-Plot-Theme-Rating (Book report).

Following this treatment, trainees were briefly exposed to the factors that comprise effective delivery, although time constraints did not allow in-depth treatment and practice of all points. Trainees were, however, required to give a presentation of a teaching idea in class to their peers, which was evaluated as a part of their course mark.

### **Implementation in the Classroom**

This part of the workshop began with a discussion amongst the trainees about the issues and obstacles to conducting English-only instruction. Following that, the core concept of establishing a classroom culture of speaking English was introduced. Trainees were asked to consider ways of maintaining such a culture, and were provided with a contract of English-usage promises (Woodward, 2001, pp.40-41). Contracts can contain classroom instructions for convenient reference in any class, and can be specifically referred back to when students carry out self-evaluations at the end of their courses. Additionally, the need for thorough planning, including how it helped to support the English language confidence of non-native teachers, was shown to be a prerequisite when seeking greater target language use by students.

After establishing a classroom environment conducive to the aims of the workshop, the central idea of classroom expressions was presented, and a selection from student coursebooks was discussed and adapted. The expressions were expanded to include teacher expressions, meaning language tools the teacher requires to conduct a communicative class using the medium of English (Hughes, 1981, Ch.1). Trainees were shown ways of weaving instructions into the fabric of the class, for instance using a card game practising classroom language (Martin, 1997, pp. 76-77), or alternatively experimenting with 'read and respond' activities where students physically carry out instructions like "Shake hands" and "Write your name on the board" or "Smile

at the teacher". Total Physical Response (TPR) was also illustrated as a way to issue instructions, thereby stressing a variety of teacher styles to present, practice and reinforce new language, to take account of differing learning styles that exist amongst learners. Trainees then experimented with teacher-to-class instructions (i.e., input that their students would typically receive), as well as classmate-to-classmate instructions (i.e., output that their students need more practice in).

Though appropriate use of expressions makes for clearer instructions, if they are not founded on a series of procedures then class activities will fail to work. The list of procedures distributed to trainees included following example:

- 1) Arousing interest in the topic.
- 2) Eliciting.
- 3) Grading language.
- 4) Providing a natural framework or context.
- 5) Checking understanding e.g. using concept questions.

A set of procedures are constantly referred to in the literature when introducing tasks, whether following a PPP-type or TBL-type class plan (for a sample lesson plan, see Hedge, 2000, pp.32-33). Trainees were asked to consider more deeply the definitions of exercises and activities, and which ones tended to work in their context (Vale, et al, 1991, pp.23-27). They then considered a framework for assessing themselves and their peers when giving instructions, and reviewed their teaching on videotape. By being asked to 'grade' themselves and a colleague, they were offered a window to see the class both as a teacher and as an observer or learner, with a degree of detachment that aids reflection.

Yet knowing a set of procedures is still not enough, for even when they are wedded to sound concepts, a lack of awareness of pacing and staging can destroy learner motivation. The kinds of stages referred to in a PPP lesson included following example:

- 1) Making the meaning clear.
- 2) Making the form clear.
- 3) Checking students' understanding of the meaning.
- 4) Checking students' ability to pronounce and manipulate the form.
- 5) Giving students the opportunity to express the target item in a personalised way.



6) Consolidating the language item on the board.

Trainees were asked to justify what components to include in a 50-minute lesson using their school textbooks, and to provide language to link the stages together. They were also urged to make effective use of the board, realia and equipment as instruction tools, while noticing the effects on pacing of over-dependence and under-dependence on board work and props. Again, a combination of demonstration, observation, video review (of their own teaching practice) and reflection offered insight, especially when coupled with after-dinner discussion. Efficient use of class time was clarified in terms of what items to include, the time allocated to each stage, and the relative weight of each part of the lesson to the class as a whole.

Next, the locus was moved away from the trainees themselves, towards the participation, involvement, and interaction of their learners. Trainees were asked to rearrange the classroom as an adaptable space. English instructions now bound stages of the lesson together, without interfering with or constraining student-to-student interaction. Via demonstration on video and in class, it was shown how desks, unless bolted to the floor, could be cleared away to make a group speaking area where partners (once equipped with classroom expressions to initiate conversations) could start up, maintain and finish conversations with each other. Though there are times when the teacher-to-student pattern is necessary, learners using language in student-to-student groupings are key. The teacher can select partners directly (e.g., by pairing off using numbers for controlled practice); or by allowing random selection (e.g., by having students choose from a deck of cards prior to free practice); or by allowing students to decide for themselves who to work with (especially when a survey demands asking the same questions to a number of different partners). Through a more analytical approach to planning and critical approach to observation, instructions became precise and efficient, and the time allocated to setting up was reduced, leading to a projected increase in the quantity and quality of English used by all students in the class.

Building on a heightened awareness of the class as a space, trainees were asked about ways for learners to assume more control over their own learning. Teachers would no longer fulfil one fixed role, inherent in teacher-centred and student-centred paradigms, but would shift roles as needed. Learners needed to be shown how to learn, given autonomy as appropriate, and made accountable for their progress. Hence the details of classroom management returned to the initial overview, when trainees first considered a classroom contract and self-evaluations. Trainees

demonstrated their progress through this phase of the workshop, submitting their lesson plans and teaching sample mini-lessons for evaluation by the trainers, with their peer group acting as students.

### **III. Observations about Trainers, Trainees and the Workshop**

#### **Trainer Observations**

Trainees showed a high level of commitment to take on board what they learned, willingly watching and commenting on several hours of video footage of their entire group giving sample lessons, rather than just their own teaching and that of one fellow trainee. They made full use of the teaching assistants who were there to offer video and language support. They requested access to a fuller library of resource materials than had been provided, as well as classroom stationery to make realia. The interplay and rapport amongst themselves came across convincingly in their teaching practice, and it is clear that their dedication and professionalism surely benefits their students.

Understandably, trainees were sometimes less assured in precise, painstaking preparation of clear classroom instructions, which set up and link the items of lexis and grammar at which they are more adept. Indeed, a quick survey of attitudes at the beginning of the workshop indicated that many trainees habitually used the mother tongue for setting up activities, as if those instructions were incidental to the communicative focus of the class. Furthermore, the communicative component of the class, to which they assigned some minutes of the class when carrying out tasks, appeared at times to be truncated into little more than controlled practice exercises. By compartmentalising and reducing the importance of communication in the target language, they ran the risk of limiting their students' exposure to the very experience of using a foreign language for a communicative purpose. Difficulties witnessed may have been due to gaps in knowledge, but reflected genuine concerns of the trainees about their classes ('Students don't understand what to do in English'). In part, L1 usage among teachers creates some problems itself: a reliance on L1 instructions would mean students could not be expected to understand simple orders, could not use language themselves to organise their own groups and activities, and consequently would be unable to carry out simple tasks without directions from the teacher.

Besides problems associated with incomplete knowledge or inadequate usage of English classroom expressions, the trainees tended to struggle with clarity. A simple instruction to get

into pairs at times resulted in an explanation, rather than demonstration, and threatened to confuse students. It was therefore incumbent upon the trainees to know or have access to the English expressions necessary to conduct a class in English, to set an example of the interactive English-speaking class culture, and to expect their students to try to keep to English during tasks. Interestingly, expectations of students to converse in English seemed to be set relatively low, whereas expectations to absorb new vocabulary and structures, or comprehend written discourse, were set conversely high. It appeared to be a question of rethinking the class orientation to reflect the communicative aim inherent in learning a foreign language, and was certainly within the reach of the trainees.

An attempt to adjust the flow of the class does not necessarily undermine the teacher's authority. However, trainees tended to give too much explanation, and too little demonstration; more talking about how to do it than showing what needed to be done and allowing the students to do it themselves. Bridging the gap between leading and facilitating was accomplished by the majority of the trainees during their final 15-minute teaching demonstrations, when they embraced the workshop input and orchestrated a greater degree of student-to-student interaction with a corresponding reduction in teacher-to-student lecturing. This seemed to have no adverse repercussions for rapport or power-relations in the classroom; indeed, by taking the focus off the teacher and engaging the students more, it was likely to relieve the burden on the teacher in the twin roles of educator and disciplinarian.

### **Trainee Observations of the Workshop**

Some important suggestions gathered by a workshop questionnaire at the end of the course were compiled and presented below:

- 1) The course content was both broad and comprehensive; however, if the main themes had been more focused and restricted and more time allotted for discussion of the content, the workshop would have been more effective.
- 2) The course packet could have been organized more effectively. Many things were hard to find in it due to the sheer volume of material and the fact that the pages were not numbered. The course packet could also have been distributed to the trainees prior to the workshop.
- 3) It would have been useful if trainees had brought in videos of their own teaching for peer

review and trainer feedback.

- 4) It was preferable not to have TAs in the classrooms unless they were there for a specific purpose, such as videotaping the workshop. In addition, one or two trainees objected to being videotaped and photographed.
- 5) It would have been more effective if trainees had brought in the materials they typically use to the workshop so that they could make use of them in their lesson planning and teaching practice.
- 6) As the teacher trainers worked in a highly integrated fashion, it was not always clear when the homework was due and what was expected of the homework assignments.
- 7) The trainers might benefit from more exposure to the target teaching contexts so that they can more fully understand what it is like in the classrooms.
- 8) Photocopying facilities would be useful for trainees in doing their homework.

#### **IV. Recommendations**

According to the feedback from both trainees and observers, the trainees benefitted enormously from the hands-on nature of the workshop. For them, acquiring and practicing new and immediately applicable teaching ideas/techniques and getting extensive feedback through peer observation, trainer comments and self-reflection (using video) was a unique and valuable experience. This section presents various recommendations derived from a variety of observers: the trainers, trainees, TAs and workshop organisers. If followed, these recommendations are expected to result in the maintenance and improvement of the quality of the workshop and illuminate issues that will have to be tackled if the workshop is scaled-up to accommodate more participants in the future.

#### **Teaching issues**

By way of summarising the observations of trainees, a number of suggestions were drawn up as areas for teacher trainers to work on more extensively in future workshops:

- 1) *Use of the board* for purposes other than vocabulary and grammar explanations required consideration. Specifically, future areas for trainees to experiment with were board use by students asked to collaborate actively in teams, the use of colour for highlighting, and a board menu of activities for students to know the direction of the class.
- 2) *Planning of class stages and pacing* were suggested as areas where most trainees could benefit. A systematic approach, for example, would ensure a balance of communicative exercises and activities in every class. In a PPP type lesson, it would be sensible to use clear, simple language to get through early stages so that at least the main task of student-to-student interaction always takes place. By using TPR more in the instruction stage the class would be energised and student interaction could replace much of the teacher talk.
- 3) *The need to teach English through English*, establishing and maintaining a culture of English speaking, had to gain acceptance among trainees by being shown to work. Trainees can then apply it even when presenting grammar and vocabulary, by predicting before class the English words and phrases they will need. Eliciting, demonstrating, rephrasing and using pictures needed greater emphasis, as students would lack important skills if not exposed to them. Giving up and using the mother tongue creates a barrier to students feeling at ease in the target language and attaining communicative competence.
- 4) *Classroom interaction* tended not to reach a genuine student-to-student task stage, or else hit a plateau of interaction best described as controlled practice. It was suggested to the trainees to challenge their students more, for example, by having them listen to authentic discourse at natural speed, which would practice a variety of gist and detailed tasks offering top-down and bottom-up processing skills. After this comprehensible input stage, trainees would then be able to create a bridge or intake stage of controlled practice, moving more swiftly to freer practice or comprehensible output. Students appear to gain from more speaking time (quantity of interactions) as well as from meaningfully personalising experience and using language to achieve tasks with outcomes (quality of interactions). It may prove useful when videotaping trainees to time sequences and instructions to define the amount of teacher talk relative to student talk in pairs. It is also suggested to rearrange desks and create standing spaces to change the kinds of static interactions that can take place into active communication.

**Course materials: Content and organisation**

- 1) The way in which TBL could practically be applied by the trainees was not clearly understood. The concept of doing meaningful tasks was understood, however, more specific ideas on how to bring TBL into the trainees' existing English curriculum were missing, particularly for low-level classes. In the day-to-day conception and use of classroom activities, PPP emerged as the most readily adaptable approach, whereas TBL was viewed with some confusion. This shortcoming may be partially due to how it was presented, however, adopting TBL demands curriculum planning decisions as well as teaching decisions.
- 2) Time constraints require that teacher trainers be careful about selecting content and developing course materials so that the main concepts and their applications are covered in the most time-effective way without coming out 'half-baked'. Ideally, what is required for trainees to get sufficient grounding in current CLT practice is a course similar in length and content to a four week intensive RSA CELTA course for non-native teachers. Given that this is not possible, a review of materials is required before this course is run again to ensure the most salient points are being covered.
- 3) The main content of the workshop appeared in the body of the course packet and was, by necessity, quite text-heavy. In the interests of making the content of the workshop more accessible to trainees, it is recommended that the salient points or techniques be teased out of the main body of the course packet and placed in a new section in the appendix. This new appendix would consist of brief and succinct exercises or discussions that would allow the trainers and trainees to focus on discrete points or techniques in a way that would be less overwhelming for both.
- 4) Teaching practice was not sufficient in length for each trainee to demonstrate their mastery of all content in the course. Fifteen minutes can allow them to demonstrate a grasp on classroom management, for example, but not on other content areas. Perhaps the evaluation of trainees' performance needs to be rethought to more accurately reflect this.
- 5) It would be preferable in teaching practice to use actual high school and junior high school students. In the teaching practice, trainees functioned as students for each teacher, however, this is unrepresentative of the target teaching environment.

- 6) The section of the workshop dealing with the theory of TBL, presentations and discussions seems too unwieldy at present. It might be preferable to reduce the emphasis on presentation and discussion teaching and practice, as a separate topic and deal with them under the umbrella of 'tasks'.

### **Logistics and workshop organisation**

A few improvements in logistics and organisation are recommended:

- 1) Trainees should be required to bring in the teaching materials they commonly use as raw material for workshop homework assignments and teaching practice.
- 2) Trainees should be asked to bring in a video of their teaching which they can use for peer feedback outside class time.
- 3) A portable resource library should be assembled and made available to trainees for their homework assignments.
- 4) Stationery should also be made available to the trainers and trainees.
- 5) For a group of 15 participants, a minimum of two and ideally three classrooms will be required to rehearse and perform various tasks for evaluation.

For the success of larger workshops, it is critical that the unique approach with its high degree of individual attention given to the trainees in this pilot workshop not be undermined. In the event of a workshop scale-up, the following points should be considered:

- 1) If the same number of trainers is used to handle 30 trainees (2 classes), the result will be a more streamlined course with less personal attention, feedback and evaluation. If the course is run with 45 or more trainees, it will be impossible for two trainers to effectively handle the workshop. In the event that three classes of 15 trainees each participate in future workshops, an additional teacher trainer will be required to cope with the volume.
- 2) Individual trainer responsibilities and roles may have to change. In this workshop, the two trainers worked with a high degree of cooperation and the same group of 11 students. This

trainer staffing reflects typical TEFL courses such as the Cambridge RSA CELTA course with 15 trainees, in which the two trainers' roles are highly integrated. In the event that larger numbers of trainees join the workshop, the scheduling, trainer roles and degree of trainer cooperation will have to be considered carefully to ensure its quality and efficiency.

- 3) Teaching practice will have to be altered. Teams of 5 trainees will have to work together to teach a 75-minute lesson for final evaluation. The time allotted for rehearsing and performing teaching practice will have to expand.
- 4) The requirement for teaching assistants will increase. The role of teaching assistants will require clarification, especially given the reluctance of some trainees to have them present in class.

## Bibliography

- Bachman, L. (1991). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: OUP.
- Breen, M. (1987). Learner contributions to task design. In Candlin, C., & Murphy, D. (Eds.). 1987. *Language learning tasks*. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bygate, M. (2001) Speaking. In Carter & Nunan (Eds.). *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Clark, J. (1987). *Curriculum renewal in school foreign language learning*. Oxford: OUP.
- Hadley, A.O. (2001). *Teaching language in context* (3rd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The practice of English language teaching*. Middlesex: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the classroom*. Oxford: OUP.
- Hughes, G.S. (1981). *A handbook of classroom English*. Oxford: OUP.
- Martin, D. (1997). *Talk a lot: Starting out*. Saitama, Japan: EFL Press.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology. (2005). *Summary of workshop project for developing English teaching abilities*. Retrieved on November 28, 2005 from [http://www.mext.go.jp/b\\_menu/houdou/17/07/05071101/002.htm/](http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/17/07/05071101/002.htm/).
- Nunan, D. (1989) *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Nunan, D. (2003) *Practical English language teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pattison, P. (1987) *Developing communication skills*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Prahbu, N. (1987) *Second language pedagogy: A perspective*. Oxford: OUP.
- Vale, D., Scarino, A., & McKay, P. (1991). *Pocket ALL (Australian language levels guidelines): A users' guide to the teaching of language and ESL*. Carlton, S. Victoria: Curriculum Corporation.
- Woodward, T. (2001). *Planning lessons and courses*. Cambridge: CUP.