

An Integrated Approach to EFL Teacher Education: Learning through Tasks, Reflection, and Cooperation

NAKAI Motohiro

Abstract

The present paper reports an EFL (English as a foreign language) teacher education course that attempts to integrate communicative language learning/teaching into pre-service EFL teacher education. The course is especially designed for non-English-major college students as part of the requirements for the certificate of teaching English at secondary schools in Japan. During the one-year course, the students study not only the theories and practices of language learning/teaching but also improve their own linguistic skills by experiencing a variety of activities of using the language communicatively. Among their requirements of the course are in-class oral presentation, journal keeping, essay writing, textbook evaluation, and creating their own lesson plans. Most of the assignments and many other activities are performed in pairs or in small groups as well as individually. At the end of the year, the course evaluation by the students is conducted in written form.

1. Introduction

1.1. The purpose of study

The present study introduces an EFL (English as a foreign language) teacher education course which attempts to make pre-service teacher training in a formal setting more meaningful, more practical, and more motivating to non-native-English-speaking (NNES) college students with limited proficiency of the target language. The course aims at providing the students with more opportunities to develop their command of English as well as study the theories and practices of language pedagogy by integrating communicative language learning into traditional pre-service EFL teacher education. The paper focuses on such integration by analyzing the major assignments, *Show and Tell*, *Journal writing and Textbook evaluation*, and discussing task-based learning, reflective learning, and cooperative learning embedded in them.

1.2. Rationale

In its history of English education after World War II, Japan is now in one of the most drastically changing periods in terms of urgent societal demands for more effective language teaching and learning. Along with the rapid progress of globalization and information technology in late 20th century, the country has continuously revised its National Course of Study and shifted the emphasis more onto developing learners' communicative competence, especially oral skills, for cross-cultural communication. A large number of native-speakers of English, for example, are introduced to the classes as teaching assistants or team teaching

partners, and also elementary schools are allowed to teach English in newly created "*Periods for Integrated Study*" (MEXT, 2001). However, the majority of the in-service teachers at secondary schools in Japan were trained in more traditional manners focusing on understanding written language, and so they have only limited access to instructional resources to satisfy the new needs and demands. Moreover, there is virtually no formal training or qualification system, either pre-service or in-service, established for teaching English at elementary schools. Thus, the reality of English classes in Japan is not exactly what the new Course of Study expects. There is a seriously wide gap between the reality and the ideal.

To tackle the problem in pre-service EFL teacher education is what the present course intends to do. This could possibly be accomplished by integrating communicative language teaching/learning into English teacher training for the prospective elementary school teachers with limited experience in learning communicative language use. As mentioned earlier, the course is offered as part of the requirements for the teaching certificate of English at secondary schools and it is also a prerequisite to practice teaching. With a certificate of teaching English, the students are very likely to teach English at primary schools in the future. If they have learned to communicate in English and teach English communicatively, then their work might be a partial, at least, solution to the current problems in Japan. The primary goal of the course, therefore, is twofold: One is to have the students get prepared for the prospective teaching, and the other is to raise the levels of their communicative competence high enough as pre-service teachers. Integration could achieve the two objectives at one time.

1.3. Review of literature

1.3.1. Integration

In the field of second language teaching/learning, the term "integrated" or "integrative" was coined first by Carroll (1961, cited in Dennis & Shimaoka, 1986; Carroll, 1972) to refer to a more comprehensive approach to language teaching, especially testing, in contrast to the one which aims at teaching and testing discrete points or items.

Gardner & Lambert (1972) conduct a series of research studies on the individual learner's differences in foreign language learning and discuss the issues of socio-psychological variables such as motivation and orientation including integrative orientation more successful learners tend to have, as opposed to the term "instrumental" which means more utilitarian attitudes toward the language study.

After giving an overview of the history of second language teaching and learning, Dennis & Shimaoka (1986) discuss the ideal program as an integration of various factors and suggest that the relationship among language learners, teachers, and instructional materials be "positive, productive and pleasant" (p. 13).

Enright & McCloskey (1988) propose a model of integrated language teaching which puts "its emphasis on bringing together many already existing instructional and professional resources" (Introduction). Enright & McCloskey also discuss that their model includes

three types of integration: 1) integrating English language learning with content and subject-matter learning; 2) integrating the English language processes of reading, writing, listening and speaking; and 3) integrating students' home language and learning experiences with their school language and learning experiences.

Scarcella & Oxford (1992) propose an integration of language learning and learning strategy training to raise learners' awareness of their own learning styles and develop their autonomy for learning.

1.3.2. Cooperative learning

In addition to integrating mainstream subject matters and language learning, Enright (1991) also argues the positive effects of cooperative learning and peer interaction among ESL children, especially when they work on completing given tasks in pairs or small groups of people with heterogeneous or multicultural backgrounds. McGroarty (1989, 1991) also maintains that cooperative learning is more than a group work because it creates more needs or opportunities for learners to communicate, or practice the target language in a meaningful way, to complete their tasks through assigning individual learners specific roles and responsibilities, as well as helping build more secure learning environments.

1.3.3. Task-based learning

Prabhu (1987), based on the results of his research project of second language teaching and learning in India, argues that communicative competence, especially grammatical competence, is better acquired through a task-based procedural syllabus focusing on meaning than a linguistic syllabus focusing on form. Nunan (1989) provides a theoretical and practical framework for task-based learning and maintains that while completing a task, EFL and ESL learners have abundant opportunities to interact with each other, which facilitates learners' language acquisition. Willis (1996) also presents a guideline to the theory and practice of task-based language teaching and learning.

1.3.4. Reflective learning

As a research genre, studies on journals or diaries have two different objectives. One is to provide an introspective and self-observational first-person account of a second language learning experience (Bailey, 1978; Schumann, 1978; Bailey & Ochsner, 1983; Matsumoto, 1987; Bailey, 1990; Porter et al., 1990). Such a diary study leads "SLA researchers and teachers not only to realizing the complex nature of the classroom language learning process but also to recognizing various factors that facilitate or hinder second language learning in the classroom (Matsumoto, 1987, p. 28). The other type is a teaching diary employed in language teacher education to enable both pre-service and experienced teachers to reflect on their teaching and learning experiences (Bartlett, 1990; Porter et al. 1990; Numrich, 1996). Porter et al. (1990) maintain seven benefits of using journals in teacher preparation courses, among which is that "journals create interaction beyond the classroom, both between teacher and student, and among students" (p. 236).

With regard to reflective approach to teacher education and development, Bartlett (1990) also points out that teaching experience combined with critical reflection helps teachers'

professional growth through the process of challenging or self-inquiring their personal beliefs and practices of teaching in the social and historical perspective. (Zeichner & Liston, 1985, cited in Bartlett, 1990; Fanselow, 1987; Wallace, 1991; Fanselow, 1992/1999; Murphy, 2001)

2. Course description

The present course tries to integrate communicative language learning/teaching into EFL teacher education. It is a one-year, or two-semester, undergraduate course at a municipal university in a rural city in Japan. The course is specially designed for and offered to the students from outside the English language and literature program. The class meets once a week, officially 30 times a year. One lesson is 90 minutes long.

2.1. Goals and Principles

As an EFL teacher training course, the primary goal is to provide the students with enough knowledge and skills of English language pedagogy and have them prepared for the prospective teaching including practice teaching. As a communicative English lesson, the course helps students acquire communicative competence through ample exposure to authentic English use. In order to achieve the goal, the course follows three major principles. First, the class should be learner-centered. Second, the course should give students hands-on practices or teaching experiences. Third, the lesson should provide the state of art contents.

2.2. Students

The students are not English majors, but most of them are in an elementary school education program and a few are from other programs such as sociology and Japanese language and literature. The students are mostly juniors, including some sophomores and a few seniors, who all want to obtain a (minor) certificate of teaching English at secondary schools. The levels of English proficiency of the students are varied from high-beginner to upper-intermediate; roughly, average or below. This is partly because they do not have enough daily exposure to English in their major studies, and also partly because few of them have learned to use English for communication.

2.3. Syllabus

2.3.1. Textbooks & materials

The following textbooks are used in the course.

- a. Jacet educational-problem study group. (2001). *Basics and Practices in English Education, revised* (Eigokakyouiku no kiso to jissen, kaiteiban). Tokyo: Sanshuusha.
- b. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. 2nd Ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- c. Harmer, J. (1998). *How to Teach English*. Essex: Addison Wesley Longman.

The first textbook is written in Japanese and published especially for Japanese students by Japanese college professors in Japan. It deals with not only traditional ELT (English language teaching) related issues but also a number of problems specific to Japan including

the recent revision of National Course of Study.

The second and the third are textbooks written in English for ESL (English as a second language) teacher education, published in the USA and UK, respectively. Larsen-Freeman (2000) comprehensively covers the modern history of English teaching methods and approaches and is used mainly in the first semester. Harmer (1998) is the textbook for the second semester because it deals with a variety of classroom practices and their underlying assumptions related to four linguistic skills and other factors of classroom teaching and learning.

2.3.2. Contents of the first semester

The syllabus of the course is handed out at the beginning of each semester. The first semester starts with the issues regarding English as a global language or English language hegemony. Then, the course makes an overview of the history of language teaching methodologies, from the Grammar-Translation Method through the Audio-Lingual Method to Communicative Approach, including a variety of innovative methods and approaches. The lecture is given in an interactive fashion through a number of pair and small group works. It also incorporates various language learning/teaching skills and techniques into the study of pedagogical theories and practices. Among them are in-class *Show & Tell* presentation, note taking, and journal writing. A term-end test is given at the end of the first semester and, as a summer task, writing a critique paper on one of the books on the course reading list is also assigned. It is written basically in English, though Japanese is acceptable.

2.3.3. Contents of the second semester

The second semester places the major emphasis on studying four linguistic skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and other EFL related problems. The students study the latest theories and classroom practices of each skill, experiencing a variety of simulated activities incorporating the skills. They are always requested to see the activities from two viewpoints, as a language learner and a future instructor at the same time. It is supposed to give the students opportunities of experiences and reflection on their learning and teaching.

The students also work in study groups for textbook evaluation; each group specializes in one of the four skills, and they, as a group, create their own criteria for evaluation, evaluate the textbooks according to the criteria, and orally present the results to the class. Although the initial guidance for the group work was given in the class, most of the group works of textbook evaluation take place outside the class; the group members meet regularly for the assignments as well as peer-checking the weekly English journals they keep individually. In the class, the students study a variety of teaching related issues such as classroom management, testing/assessment, practice teaching, and Japan's National Course of Study.

As the final project of the course, they individually create a one-hour lesson plan, in English, focusing on the skill they have studied for the textbook evaluation. The planned lesson can be for either secondary schools or any other setting, but the plan should reflect all the students have studied during the course.

At the end of the second semester, the course evaluation by the students is conducted in a written form. See Appendix 1 for more details.

2.4. Assignments

The students are required to complete a number of assignments during the course. Among the major ones are an individual oral presentation, journal writing, textbook evaluation, a critique paper for summer, the final project (creating a lesson plan). Following is a detailed description of the first three.

2.4.1. Show & Tell.

Show & Tell is an activity frequently used in mainstream and ESL/EFL classrooms. Each student is assigned to give a presentation in the class; they show something visually and tell about it in the target language, English in this case. The activity not only provides both the speakers and the listeners with constant opportunities to speak English in a meaningful context but also with ample opportunities to listen to the language, every week during one semester. In addition, students practice writing in preparing the drafts and taking notes of the peer presentations, which eventually become the major topics of the weekly journal.

2.4.2. Journal writing.

All the students are required to keep journals for every class. The topics and contents are roughly limited to things related to the course, language learning and teaching, and cross-cultural communication. The journals are submitted on the teacher's request, mostly every or every other week. As McGroaty (1991, p.382) and other studies suggest, such journals enable the teacher to dialogue with his or her students, receiving their feedback on the course contents, as well as the students to reflect on their own learning and prospective teaching. (Bailey, 1980; Schumann, 1980; Bailey & Ochsner, 1983; Matsumoto, 1987; Bailey, 1990; McGroaty, 1991; Numrich, 1996)

The language used for journal writing is basically English, but in the first semester, students may use their first language until they feel ready for writing in English; in the second semester, writing in English is required. In terms of writing, the combination of *Show and Tell* presentation and *journal writing* is supposed to help students gradually develop fluency and confidence in the skill.

2.4.2. Textbook evaluation.

In the second semester, the students conduct textbook evaluation mainly in a group of four to six people who have chosen the same one of the four linguistic skills based on their interests. The textbook evaluation is designed to provide the pre-service teachers with opportunities to look critically at actual instructional materials according to the knowledge acquired during the assessing process, from book selection through criterion making to presentation. As a number of researchers and practitioners point out, although no textbook is perfect for any given course, teachers and students tend to heavily depend on their textbooks as a major source of guidance as well as a reference tool. They propose comprehensive checklists or a set of criteria for careful selection and judicious use of ESL/EFL textbooks. (Williams, 1983; Sheldon, 1988; Skierso, 1991; Harmer, 1998)

To evaluate a variety of English textbooks including those actually used in Japan, the group members meet regularly outside the class to create their own criteria for evaluating the textbooks of their choice. After revising the criteria according to the instructor's advice, every group evaluates their textbooks and reports the results to the class. This is an oral presentation conducted by all the members of each group, with their own-made handouts, in Japanese. Along with textbook evaluation, they peer-check their journals with one another and practice giving feedback to students as a teacher.

2.4.4. Other assignments

Among the other major assignments are writing a critique paper and creating a one-hour lesson plan. The purpose of the former assignment is to provide the students with an opportunity to explore one, or more, approach or method they have learned in the first semester more deeply without any time constraint. Students read a book on a reading list and write a critique on it. Another purpose of the assignment is to have the students practice typewriting or familiarize themselves with word-processing on the computers. They are strongly encouraged to get accustomed to using computers and word processors, which might seem very trivial but in reality, from my experience as a high school teacher, a common practice or a norm in most of the teaching situations in Japan. Two months of summer vacation and the following three months provide the students with enough time to practice typing and they demonstrate their expertise in Final Project, which is required to be typewritten.

For Final Project, every student creates his/her original one-hour lesson plan individually. It can be a lesson either for secondary school students or for elementary school students. This gives the students an opportunity not only to look back or reflect on their one year course study and make the best use of what they have learned during the course but also to have them prepared for the future practice teaching.

2.5. Course evaluation

The course evaluation is conducted at the end of the year. The students answer the questionnaire by rating all the principles and the contents of the course on a five-stage scale. The written answers to the questionnaire are analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. This is designed to receive the overall feedback of the one-year course from the course participants. For the evaluation sheet, see Appendix 1.

3. Issues and concerns

3.1. Integration of tasks, reflection, and cooperation

The main goal of this integrated approach is to improve the students' command of English as well as train them as pre-service EFL teacher. The required activities and assignments, therefore, are designed to achieve the binary goal in an interactive manner. In other words, each of them has different aspects and functions more effectively if it works in combination with some other tasks. As Table 3 shows, the students could have fair chances of developing different skills, using different linguistic modes, experiencing different learning

styles, and speculating on different problems through completing the three major assignments. In a technical sense, these assignments including the summer task, Final Project, and typewriting practice are all supposed to finally interact with and give scaffolding or support to each other. In other words, the course not only utilizes task-based learning, reflective learning, and cooperative learning independently but also incorporates them in an interdependent manner. Such integration invests the course with dynamism and solidarity, which contributes to making the course study more meaningful, more practical, and more motivating to the students.

3.2. Students' limited proficiency of English and low self-confidence.

Since the students' majors are not English, they do not have enough exposure to English in everyday college lives. Their proficiency levels are varied and relatively low. Although they are willing to learn the language more, they are not very confident in their competence, which is one of their major concerns. As Liu (1999) and other studies point out, one of the major issues and concerns of non-native speaking (NNS) teachers of English is their own limited proficiency of English, compared with those of their native-speaking (NS) colleagues, or the need to improve their command of the language. (Medgyes, 1994/2001, Norton, 1997; Tang, 1997; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999) In traditional language teacher education programs, however, the focus tends to be placed more on the study of pedagogical theories and practices. In order to provide more opportunities to expose the NNS students to the authentic language use and so raise their proficiency levels, a large number of communicative activities such as information gap work in pairs or in small groups are introduced into the class. They sometimes are part of the traditional study of English pedagogy and at other times are learning activities such as Show & Tell.

3.3. Results of course evaluation

The results of the course evaluation, as shown in Tables 1 and 2, demonstrate that the majority of the students have positive attitudes toward the course. They appreciate the practical and hands-on side of the course that provides them with opportunities to use English in some context and helps them raise their English proficiency levels. The most highly evaluated items are almost the same both in 2000 and 2001; the instructor's fairness to the students, Show & Tell, Textbook Evaluation, and simulated class activities. They are also positively referred to by a number of students in the Question 21. Most of the positively assessed components of the course are task-based; they are the things the course instructor brings into his EFL teacher education class in order to have the students directly experience authentic communicative activities in class, either individually or in pairs or small groups. The students enjoy and appreciate completing them, including weekly journal writing and Final Project of creating a lesson plan.

The least appreciated items, on the other hand, are the speed of the lecture delivery and English-written textbooks. The course has to cover so many fields and areas in its one-year period that it tends to progress at quite a high speed. Based on the insight from his prior experience of teaching, his observation of the class, and the students' feedback through

weekly journals and others, the instructor has made minor changes and revisions to the syllabus to adjust to the actual situations. However, quite a few students still feel that the class proceeds too fast to catch up. In addition, the English textbooks seem to be slightly too challenging for some non-English-major students. Two of the textbooks are all in English and evaluated lower than the other one in Japanese. According to the students' journals, quite a few students regard the weekly assignments of reading as too challenging and too time-consuming because it takes extremely long time to complete them. Their assessment of English language textbooks is mixed. See Tables 1 and 2 for more details.

4. Conclusion

The reported EFL teacher education course attempts to integrate communicative language learning/teaching into pre-service EFL teacher education. The purpose of the integration is to provide the non-English-major students with an opportunity to study the theories and practices of language pedagogy and improve their English competence at the same time. Along with traditional teacher training, the students experience and speculate on a variety of communicative activities as a language learner and pre-service teacher. The major assignments include in-class oral presentation, journal keeping, textbook evaluation, book report, and creating lesson plans, which are all designed to integrate different types of skills, tasks, linguistic modes, learning, and orientations. The results of the course evaluation conducted at the end of the course indicate that the course is quite positively received by the participants.

There are a number of limitations to this attempt. First, the development of the English proficiency of the students needs to be investigated quantitatively. The statistical data of the differences between before and after the course would reveal its real effects. Secondly, there is more room for improvement in the questionnaire for course evaluation. Follow-up interviews might be a device to collect more information from the participants. Thirdly, there is always a dilemma or conflict between language instruction and linguistic research on the effects on language acquisition in terms of data collection: How should we teacher-researchers investigate our students without giving any disadvantage to any of them.

In order to meet the various demands and needs of pre-service EFL teachers, teacher trainers should make every attempt to improve their courses. This will certainly lead to the improvement of Japan's English education for younger generations.

Note: This is a revised version of the paper orally presented at the annual conference of the English Language and Literature Society of Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan, on December 8th, 2001.

References

Bailey, K. M. (1980). An introspective analysis of an individual's language learning experience. In R. C. Scarcella & S. D. Krashen (Eds.), *Research in second language*

acquisition: Selected papers of the Los Angeles second language acquisition research forum (pp. 58-65). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Bailey, K. M. (1990). The use of diary studies in teacher education programs. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 215-226). NY: Cambridge University Press.

Bailey, K. M. & Ochsner, R. (1983). A methodological review of the diary studies: Windmill tilling or social science? In K. M. Bailey, M. H. Long, & S. Peck (Eds.), *Second language acquisition studies* (pp. 188-198). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Bartlett, L. (1990). Teacher development through reflective teaching. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 202-214). NY: Cambridge University Press.

Byrd, P. (2001). Textbooks: Evaluation for selection and analysis for implementation. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.) (pp. 415-427). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Carroll, J. B. (1972). *Lectures on English language testing and teaching*. Tokyo: Taishukan.

Dennis, J. & Shimaoka, T. (1986). *Integrated approach*. Tokyo: Taishukan.

Doff, A. (1988). *Teach English: A training course for teachers, Trainer's handbook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (1990). Activities and procedures for teacher preparation. In J. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 26-36). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Enright, D. S. (1991). Supporting children's English development in grade-level and language classrooms. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (2nd ed.) (pp. 386-402). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Enright, D. S. & McCloskey, M. L. (1988). *Integrating English: Developing English language and literacy in the multilingual classroom*. Reading, UK: Addison-Wesley.

Fanselow, J. F. (1987). *Breaking rules: Generating and exploring alternative in language teaching*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Fanselow, J. F. (1992/1999). *Try the opposite*. Tokyo: Simul Press.

Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach English*. Essex, UK: Addison Wesley Longman.

Jacet Educational-Problem Study Group. (2001). *Basics and practices in English education* [Eigokakyouiku no kiso to jissen] (Rev. ed.). Tokyo: Sanshusha.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Liu, D. (1999). Training non-native TESOL students: Challenges for TESOL teacher

education in the West. In G. Braine (Ed), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 197-210). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Matsumoto, K. (1987). Diary studies of second language acquisition: A critical overview. *JALT Journal*, 9 (1), 17-34.

McGroaty, M. (1989). The benefits of cooperative learning arrangements in second language instruction. *NABE Journal*, 13 (2), 127-143.

McGroaty, M. (1991). English instruction for linguistic minority groups; Different structures, different styles. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (2nd ed.), (pp. 372-385). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher*. London: MacMillan.

Medgyes, P. (2001). When the teacher is a non-native speaker. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.) (pp. 429-442). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Mext: Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2001). Public relation leaflet. Tokyo: Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology.

Murphy, J. (2001). Reflective teaching in ELT. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.) (pp. 499-514). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30 (3), 409-429.

Numrich, C. (1996). On becoming a language teacher: Insights from diary studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30 (1), 131-151.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Porter, R. A., Goldstein, L. M., Leatherman, J., & Conrad, S. (1990). An ongoing dialogue: Learning logs for teacher preparation. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 227-240). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Samimy, K. K. & Brutt-Griffler, J. (1999). To be a native or non-native speaker: Perception of "non-native" students in a graduate TESOL program. In Braines, G. (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 127-144). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Scarcella, R. C. & Oxford, R. L. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning: The individual in the communicative classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Schumann, F. M. (1980). Diary of a language learner: A further analysis. In R. C. Scarcella & S. D. Krashen (Eds.), *Research in second language acquisition: Selected papers of the Los Angeles second language acquisition research forum* (pp. 51-57). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Sheldon, L. E. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal*, 42(4), 237-246.

Shimaoka, T. (1980). Toward an integrated approach to EFL learning. *Gaikokugo kyoiku ronshu* [Studies in foreign language teaching], 1, 43-59. The Foreign Language Center, The University of Tsukuba.

Shimaoka, T. (1982). Tougouteki kyouzai sakusei no jikken houkoku. *ELEC Bulletin*, 77, 30-35.

Skierso, A. (1991). Textbook selection and evaluation. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (2nd ed.), (pp. 432-453). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Tang, C. (1997). On the power and status of nonnative ESL teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31 (3), 577-580.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallace, M. J. (1991). *Training foreign language teachers: A reflective approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, D. (1983). Developing criteria for textbook evaluation. *ELT Journal*, 37 (3), 251-255.

Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Essex, UK: Addison Wesley Longman.

Appendix 1

講義評価表

一年間、英語科教育法を受講して、どうでしたか。さらに良い講義にするために、以下の質問に答えて下さい。

解答欄の1（はい）～5（いいえ）の講義評価表スケールの該当部分を○で囲んで下さい。

講義：

1. 内容はわかりやすかったか？	1	2	3	4	5
2. 進度は適度だったか？	1	2	3	4	5
3. 説明は明瞭だったか？	1	2	3	4	5
4. learner-centeredだったか？	1	2	3	4	5
5. hands-on & practicalだったか？	1	2	3	4	5
6. state of the artの内容だったか？	1	2	3	4	5

教科書・ハンドアウト等：

7. 教科書はわかりやすかったか？					
・基礎と実践	1	2	3	4	5
・Larsen-Freeman	1	2	3	4	5
・Harmer	1	2	3	4	5
8. ハンドアウト/ワークシートは役に立ったか？	1	2	3	4	5
9. 資料/情報は十分だったか？	1	2	3	4	5

試験・課題：

10. 前期末試験は有益だったか？	1	2	3	4	5
11. show & tellは有益だったか？	1	2	3	4	5
12. journalは有益だったか？	1	2	3	4	5
13. summer task/critiqueは有益だったか？	1	2	3	4	5
14. material evaluationは有益だったか？	1	2	3	4	5
15. final projectは有益だったか？	1	2	3	4	5

方針・姿勢：

16. 均等な学習機会を与えられたか？	1	2	3	4	5
17. 講師は公正な態度で接したか？	1	2	3	4	5
18. 学習意欲を高める雰囲気だったか？	1	2	3	4	5
19. 物理的環境は良好だったか？	1	2	3	4	5
20. 他の人にこの授業を薦めるか？	1	2	3	4	5

21. 授業で、良い/分かりやすい/やりがいがあると思ったものをひとつ上げて下さい。

_____ 理由 _____

22. 授業で、良くない/分かりにくい/改善すべきと思ったものを上げて下さい。

_____ 理由 _____

その他、なんでも

さしつかえがなければ、次の質問に答えて下さい。

23. 年齢： 19以下 20 21 22 23 24 25以上

24. 性別： 女 男

25. 興味のある分野：listening speaking reading writing grammar その他

Appendix 2

Table 1. Results of Course Evaluation 2000

	1	2	3	4	5	No entry
Q 1	22	24	9	1	3	0
Q 2	9	12	19	17	2	0
Q 3	28	20	16	3	2	0
Q 4	21	23	10	2	2	1
Q 5	22	22	8	3	3	1
Q 6	8	23	19	4	1	4
Q 7-1	29	17	6	3	4	0
Q 7-2	9	20	19	7	4	0
Q 7-3	8	20	23	5	3	0
Q 8	31	14	9	2	3	0
Q 9	29	17	4	5	4	0
Q10	29	13	12	3	1	1
Q11	35	11	8	1	4	0
Q12	32	16	3	4	4	0
Q13	16	18	18	5	2	0
Q14	22	22	10	2	3	0
Q15	33	13	5	3	3	2
Q16	33	16	1	4	4	1
Q17	41	9	2	1	6	0
Q18	34	15	3	4	3	0
Q19	16	21	15	4	3	0
Q20	23	21	10	2	3	0
TOTAL	530	387	219	85	67	10

Key: 1=excellent; 2=good; 3=adequate; 4=weak; 5=totally lacking.

Q21 (1) show & tell-15 (2) textbook evaluation-13 (3) activity-6 (4) final project-5

(5) group work, handout/worksheet, journal -4

(6) critique, exam, etc.-1; no entry-4

Q22 (1) speed-12 (2) textbook-8 (3) handout/worksheet-6

(4) final project, journal,method/approach-3 (5) level, class size-2

(6) critique, group work, etc.-1; no entry-12

Table 2. Results of Course Evaluation 2001

	1	2	3	4	5	No entry
Q 1	18	12	8	2	0	0
Q 2	6	14	8	11	1	0
Q 3	17	16	4	3	0	0
Q 4	7	18	13	1	0	1
Q 5	10	20	9	1	0	0
Q 6	15	15	10	0	0	0
Q 7 – 1	17	16	5	2	0	0
Q 7 – 2	6	16	15	3	0	0
Q 7 – 3	2	15	18	3	2	0
Q 8	27	10	2	1	0	0
Q 9	19	15	4	2	0	0
Q10	16	14	9	0	1	0
Q11	32	5	2	0	1	0
Q12	18	10	8	3	1	0
Q13	11	16	10	2	0	1
Q14	17	14	9	0	0	0
Q15	15	12	8	0	1	4
Q16	25	10	4	0	1	0
Q17	34	5	0	0	1	0
Q18	24	10	5	1	0	0
Q19	14	13	10	3	0	0
Q20	22	11	6	1	0	0
TOTAL	372	287	167	39	9	6

Key: 1=excellent; 2=good; 3=adequate; 4=weak; 5=totally lacking.

Q21 (1) show & tell-16 (2) activity-9 (3) textbook evaluation-3

(4) method/approach, exams-2

(6) journal writing, group work, final project, handout/worksheet, etc.-1; no entry-4

Q22 (1) speed-14 (2) method/approach handout/worksheet-3

(4) journal writing, English textbook-2

(6) assignments, level, presentation, critique, T's feedback-1; no entry-12

Table 3. Components of Major Assignments

	Show & tell	Journal writing	Textbook evaluation
Setting	in-class	outside-class	outside-class to in-class
Linguistic mode	spoken English	written English (Japanese*)	written English spoken Japanese
Type of task	individual	individual to group	group
Focused skills	speaking, writing, listening	writing, reading	reading, writing (speaking,listening)**
Type of learning	experiential	reflective, experiential	cooperative
Orientation	product	process	process & product
Issues & concerns	Ss' prior knowledge strategy/study skills	peer checking , reaction & feedback	critical thinking, community building

Notes:

* Japanese is accepted only in the first semester.

** The language used in skill groups outside the class is not known.

Appendix 3

EFL Teacher Education C/D

Syllabus, 2000

Instructor : Motohiro Nakai

Class period : Tuesdays C) 10:40-12:10 ; D) 13:00-14:30

Textbooks :

- 1) 英語科教育法の基礎と実践 1998 Jacet 教育問題研究会編 (三修社)
- 2) Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language eaching*. Oxford.
- 3) Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach English*. Longman.

Requirements : 1) Attendance

- 2) In-class performance
- 3) Assignments
- 4) Exam & final project (lesson plan)
- 5) Out-of-class self-study

Assignments : 1) Self-introduction and/or Show & Tell (in class)

- 2) Journal writing (to be submitted on request) & peer checking (2nd semester)
- 3) Critique (summer task) * Due October 3
- 4) Group project - Material evaluation & oral presentation (in groups)
- 5) Final project *Due February 5

Dates, Topics & Assignments

1st semester

4/11 Orientation and Introduction to English Language Teaching

- 1) 基礎と実践 pp.2-8
- 4/18 Global language, Standard, and Variety
- 1) 基礎と実践 pp.9-15, 24-32
- 2) Crystal, D. (1985. January). How many millions? *English Today*, pp.7-9
- 3) Excerpts from *The Asahi*
- Optional reading (hereafter OP)
- ダグラス・ラミス 1975 「イデオロギーとしての英会話」 晶文社
- 津田幸男 1990 「英語支配の構造」 第三書館
- 4/25 Second Language Acquisition
- 1) 基礎と実践 pp.41-47, 61-68; 2) Larsen-Freeman, pp.xi-xiii, 1-3
- 5/9 The Grammar-Translation Method
- 1) 基礎と実践 pp.50-52; 2) Larsen-Freeman, pp.4-17
- 5/16 The Direct Method
- 1) 基礎と実践 pp.52-53; 2) Larsen-Freeman, pp.18-30
- 5/23 The Audio-Lingual Method
- 1) 基礎と実践 pp.52-53; 2) Larsen-Freeman, pp.31-50
- 5/30 *Chomsky and Transformational Generative grammar
- 1) To be announced
- 6/6 The Silent Way
- 1) Larsen-Freeman, pp.51-71
- OP Gattgno, C. (1963). *Teaching foreign languages in schools : The silent way*. New York : Educational Solutions.
- 6/13 Suggestopedia and humanistic approaches
- 1) Larsen-Freeman, pp.72-88
- 6/20 Counseling Learning/Community Language Learning
- 1) Larsen-Freeman, pp.89-108
- OP Rardin, J.P., Tranel, D.D., Tirone, P.L., & Green, B.D. (1988). *Education in a new dimension : the counseling-learning approach to community language learning*. East Dubuque, II : Counseling-Learning Publications.
- 6/27 The Total Physical Response & *Rassias Method
- 1) Larsen-Freeman, pp.109-122
- 2) *Clifford, H.C. (1993, December). (Lin · gual) gym-nas · tics. *Profiles*.
- 7/4 The Communicative Approach
- 1) 基礎と実践 pp.57-60, 69-76; 2) Larsen-Freeman, pp.123-140
- 7/11 The Natural Approach
- 1) 基礎と実践 pp.61-68; 2) To be announced
- OP Krashen, S.D. and Terrell, T.D. (1983). *The natura approach : Language acquisition in the classroom*. San Francisco : The Alemany Press.
- 7/18 *Review : Issues and trends in Classroom Practices
- 7/25 Term-end exam (index card test)

2nd Semester

- 10/3 History of English Teaching : The Communicative Approach *setup for grouping
1) 基礎と実践 pp.57-60, 69-76 ; 2) Larsen-Freeman, pp.123-140
- 10/10 History of English Teaching : The Natural Approach *grouping
1) 基礎と実践 pp.61-68 ; 2) To be announced
*OP Krashen, S.D. and Terrell, T.D. (1983) *The Natural Approach : Language acquisition in the classroom.* San Francisco : The Alemany Press.
- 10/17 Four Skills : Listening
1) 基礎と実践 pp.77-85 ; 2) Harmer, pp.97-110
- 10/24 Four Skills : Speaking
1) 基礎と実践 pp.86-94 ; 2) Harmer, pp.87-96
- 10/31 Four Skills : Reading
1) 基礎と実践 pp.95-105 ; 2) Harmer, pp.68-78
- 11/7 Four Skills : Writing
1) 基礎と実践 pp.106-115 ; 2) Harmer, pp.79-86
- 11/14 Materials : Written Textbooks
1) 基礎と実践 pp.148-156 ; 2) Harmer, pp.111-120
- 11/21 Materials : Audio-visual aids
1) 基礎と実践 pp.140-147 ; 2) To be announced
- 11/28 Lesson Plan 1 : Task-based, Thematic, and Content-based
1) 基礎と実践 pp.165-204 ; 2) Harmer, pp.52-67, pp.121-126
- 12/5 Learning Strategies, Team-teaching, and Crosscultural communication
1) 基礎と実践 pp.33-40, pp.116-122, 124-130 ; 2) Harmer, pp.1-6, 7-14
- 12/12 Testing and Assessment *Oral Presentation-Listening
1) 基礎と実践 pp.131-139 ; 2) To be announced
- 1/16 Classroom Management & Practice Teaching *Oral Presentation-Speaking
1) 基礎と実践 pp.33-40, pp.157-164 ; 2) Harmer, pp.127-134
- 1/23 National Guidelines of School Curricula *Oral Presentation-Reading
1) 基礎と実践 pp.16-23, pp.206-217 ; 2) To be announced.
- 1/30 National Guidelines of School Curricula *Oral Presentation-Writing
1) 基礎と実践 pp.218-232 ; 2) To be announced.
- 2/5 Final Project Due**