The CELTA Experience:
A Small Step towards a Learner-centered English Language Teaching

Mari TANADA

Introduction

In this globalized age, foreign language education has become a necessary commodity. In order to keep up economically and politically with the rest of the world, Japan has been stressing the importance of English as a foreign language (EFL) education in recent years. However, there seems to be a gap between the ideal and reality of English as a lingua franca in Japan (Yamada, 2015: 4). As Japan has opened itself to embrace multiculturalism, many foreigners have come to live in Japan, but not all of them are necessarily from the inner circle countries (ibid.). It is therefore important for these people with varying mother tongues to have a common language which they could use as a tool to communicate with each other. Unfortunately, although I was aware of it to a certain extent, I have never truly been exposed to a multicultural and multilinguistic community before. Growing up in the Philippines, I was aware that it was ethnically diverse, but there was not really a chance to feel it was so because I was surrounded by educated people in the city who speak the same languages I do: Tagalog and English. The same thing happened in Japan. Initially, I used English as an auxiliary language to help me learn the Japanese language. It was only through taking the CELTA course in Bangkok, Thailand that I finally realized the importance of English as a lingua franca in a setting such as theirs with immigrants and refugees speaking different languages and having trouble surviving without a means to communicate with others.

Despite the benefits of knowing how to communicate in English, researchers such as Nakamura (1993) and Hashimoto (2000) interpret the dominance of the English language as less a necessity due to globalization, but more of an extension of colonialism[1]. Still, even with the looming presence of English imperialism in the minds of researchers and teachers, it is also a fact that a majority of the youth in Japan see English as a tool to be used for success in their future career paths (Matsuda, 2011: 44-45). This idea is most likely shaped by the advances in technology, specifically the Internet and various social network services in this digital era. This is further emphasized in the Japanese government's documented "Action plan to cultivate 'Japanese with English abilities'" in 2003– which in part states that in order to be on par with other developed countries economically and politically, the Japanese need to assert communicative competence, including conversational skills in English (Kubota, 2011: 104-105). This action plan also included providing more opportunities for students to study English abroad annually, introducing English as a subject in elementary schools, gauging the students'

English abilities via standardized proficiency measures such as the TOEIC test, and nurturing teachers' professional development through teacher training programs (MEXT, 2003). In 2011, the action plan has partially come into fruition with regards at least to the policy of teaching English as a foreign language in class starting as early as fifth grade in elementary schools (MEXT, 2010).

However, there are many who remain skeptical about the success rate of the plans pushed forth by the government with regards to foreign language education. For example, Kikuchi and Browne (2009) allude to a gap between the ideal English education in Japan as outlined in the Course of Study (the teaching guidelines) released in 2008, and the actual reality of the high school English lessons taught in schools. Despite the efforts to change the way English should be taught in classrooms, the task may be too difficult an endeavor largely due to four factors[2] pointed out by Loveday (1996): (1) the system of education, (2) the teachers, (3) the institutions, and (4) the socio-linguistic environment. Certain points in the action plan, in fact, addressed the first three factors mentioned above, but the actual transition from theory to practice in the classroom is proving to be difficult for most teachers (Kikuchi & Browne, 2009: 190). First of all, the policy strongly encourages teachers to change their teaching style from the old-fashioned grammar-translation method (GTM) into a more communicative approach that would ensure students are given more chances to practice their communication skills in the classroom. Secondly, MEXT funded a five-year-in-service teacher training program to support junior and senior high school teachers' professional development (ibid.: 175). The problem was after that initial five-year program, there seemed to be no more forthcoming plans to implement a similar program in the near future. Thus, many teachers remain clueless as to how to implement the changes MEXT wants done in the classroom setting. Lastly, following on the same thread as the communicative approach mentioned above, instead of a teacher-centered, lecture-style of teaching that most institutions have shown preference to, a student-centered, interactive-style of teaching that would nurture critical thinking known as 'active learning' has been given much attention recently.

Taking into consideration the aforementioned information with regards to the recent shift in the English education in Japan, I decided to take my thesis supervisor's advice to look into applying and participating in a teacher training program abroad. As an aspiring teacher, I took the 'teacher employment examinations' this year for Yokohama City. In spite of not having any guarantee that I would pass and be able to teach as soon as I graduate, I set my mind into the task of applying and preparing for one of the hardest and yet also globally recognized teacher training programs, known as the CELTA course. Other than the fact that this program came highly recommended by one of the people I have the most respect for, I, myself felt that I was severely lacking in practical teaching experience. I was consumed by the desire to better myself before actually standing in front of my (future) students in a sink-or-swim classroom setting. It was this desire and my extreme aversion to the idea of doing a disservice to my (future) students by not being a good enough teacher, which led to my decision to take the course.

About the CELTA Course

CELTA stands for the Certificate in English Language Teaching to Adults. It is an initial teacher training qualification for people with little or no previous experience in teaching English as a second language and/or a foreign language, and is awarded by Cambridge ESOL, part of the University of Cambridge (Thornbury & Watkins, 2007: 4).

The CELTA course, as the name suggests, focuses on teaching adult learners. Although the context and specific details in classroom management and instruction may differ, many of the skills and techniques in this course are also applicable to young learners. For example, during the course, in the language analysis and awareness unit, we were taught the importance of considering and preparing how we would clarify the meaning, form and pronunciation of the target features (grammar and/or vocabulary) to be covered in the lesson in advance, through the use of language analysis sheets. This type of preparation technique had been a very helpful tool in ensuring that the clarification stage(s) during our teaching practices would go smoothly, and enabled us trainees to focus on the learners' needs, as we already have the necessary information in hand (language analysis sheets) to answer their questions we anticipated. Through observations and practices, we were also encouraged to develop good monitoring skills fundamental in determining learner differences and catering to their individual needs during the lessons.

What makes the CELTA course so attractive to many aspiring teachers includes the possible opportunities it can open up when one is looking to start a career in teaching. Candidates who successfully complete the course can start working in a variety of English language teaching contexts in many different countries around the globe. For both new and experienced teachers, having completed the CELTA can be proof that they have the knowledge of the principles of English teaching (e.g. the order of acquisition of the four skills: starting with prioritizing the sounds, having the metalinguistic knowledge on how language fundamentally works, etc.), and the practical skills to effectively teach English in a real teaching context (UCLES, 2016).

Course Content

The CELTA training course I took was the 4-week-full-time course at International House Bangkok, one of the branches of the International House World Organization (one of the largest and oldest groups of language schools in the world). The course I applied to started on the 5th of September and ended on the 30th of the same month. The maximum number of trainees for every CELTA course is 24, but this time, there were only 22 trainees. We were separated into two groups: the morning and afternoon groups. I was part of the morning group (10 people), meaning we had teaching practices in the morning and the input lessons later on in the afternoon. Furthermore, within this group, we were divided into two level-groups. For the first

two weeks, my group was in charge of the elementary class and the intermediate class in the last two weeks. We had two 45-minute lessons every week, totaling to eight lessons assessed by our tutors for the whole month.

In the duration of this course, the trainees were required to fulfill the following criteria: (1) have complete attendance, (2) conduct six hours of assessed teaching practice,(3) observe six hours of lessons taught by experienced teachers, (4) submit and get a passing grade in all four written assignments, and (5) maintain and submit a portfolio of course work (i.e. lesson plans, self-evaluation sheets, etc.).

Our daily schedule consisted of assisted lesson planning, teaching practice, feedback sessions, input lessons, and more lesson planning (done independently in the evening), as presented in Table 1.

Table 1.The Daily Schedule of the Morning Group

Time	Activities
9:00 – 9:40	Assisted Lesson Planning (only for TPs 1-6)
9:45 – 12:15	Teaching Practice (45 minutes/person)
12:15 – 13:00	TP Feedback (from tutor: Gary Steven or Tim Brown)
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch Break
14:00 – 15:30	Input Lessons (Gary or Tim)
15:30 – 15:45	Break Time
15:45 – 17:00	Input Lessons (Gary or Tim)
17:00 – 19:00	Independent Lesson Planning

The input lessons in the duration of the course covered five main topics: (1) learners and teachers, and the teaching and learning context; (2) language analysis and awareness; (3) language skills: reading, listening, speaking and writing; (4) planning and resources for different contexts; and (5) developing teaching skills and professionalism (Thornbury & Watkins, 2007: 4).

For the first week of the input lessons, the focus was on the learners and getting to know them; gauging their purposes, goals and expectations in learning English. On the first day, we observed one of our tutors, Tim, as he taught a 135-minute lesson (with a 15-minute break) to the elementary students. At the last 45-minute session in his lesson, we were given the chance to interact with and interview the students regarding their cultural and linguistic backgrounds. In turn, they were also given the time to ask us trainees about ourselves and our reasons for teaching English.

On the second week, we covered two of the topics, starting with analyzing our language use during the lessons and then, covering the language skills individually. We were given examples of how to write analysis sheets (grammar, functions and vocabulary), which we were expected to submit with every lesson plan on the days we were assigned to conduct a lesson (TP).

These analysis sheets helped us consider any problems and solutions we could anticipate before our lessons, so that we could be ready for these scenarios and react accordingly to answer the students' questions and/or fulfill their needs in the lessons. The main aims of this input lesson were to confirm and reaffirm our understanding of key terminologies used in English language teaching, and also to check whether we could apply these terminologies in planning and teaching. Following this, the input lessons regarding the four skills enabled us to understand how approaches to texts may vary depending on the purpose of the lessons. Later on, the tutors assessed our teaching practices critically on the account of our application of the knowledge we gained from the input lessons.

The third week focused on the materials we could use in order to make our lessons easier to understand for the students, and also to make them more communicative and engaging. We were not only given ideas on what kind of activities we could use for warm-ups and language tasks at the end of lessons, but the tutors themselves showed us how to conduct some of these tasks. The main aim of this input lesson was to give us the opportunity to select, plan, evaluate and reflect on how we prepare for and plan our lessons according to the needs of the class as a whole and also for particular students who needed more guidance than others. The reason why we covered this issue this late in the course was because for the last two TPs we were not allowed to ask for assistance from our tutors during our lesson planning. We needed to come up with our whole lesson plan on our own, while consulting the other trainees teaching on the same day to make all three TP lessons on that day linear.

Finally, on the last week, the tutors conducted one-on-one interview sessions with us trainees, where they asked us about our future plans, including not only what kind of teaching job we were looking for, but also what we will be doing as soon as the course is over. I talked about my graduate thesis (corrective feedback) and my plans to continue participating in teaching workshops (if time permits).

The Learners

To a certain extent I was prepared to face a slightly different classroom context upon taking the course, expecting students to at the very least have different mother-tongues. However, at the very first class we had to observe on the first day, it became clear just how vastly different the contexts we had to consider while planning our lessons and teaching our classes for the duration of the course was.

As was mentioned previously, we, the trainees were separated into the morning and afternoon groups, and furthermore into elementary and intermediate groups. My group of five trainees was assigned to teach the classes for the elementary group for the first two weeks. We were all expecting as the name stereotypically suggested that the students would not be very active in class participation. However, we were proven wrong right away as the 14 students blew us away with their persistence and motivation to learn and succeed. The youngest of

the class who preferred to be called 'Isaac' was 16 years old; while the oldest were an elderly couple, 'Ari' and 'Pornchai' who were in their 60s. There was of course a certain amount of difficulty in teaching a class full of learners whose age gap and life experiences were vastly different from each other. However, despite that small, glaring detail, the students' enthusiasm towards learning English shined brightly. It was enough to overshadow the initial discomfort I felt in teaching people who were older and wiser than I am when it comes to the subject of life. Upon interviewing the students regarding their cultural and linguistic backgrounds, we found that a third of them were Thai people studying English in order to ensure a brighter future for themselves. The rest were either immigrants or refugees from Vietnam, China, Africa (specifically, Somali) and Pakistan, also looking for better opportunities for themselves and their families with the help of acquiring English language skills. Some of the students had been taking the English classes for free for two years, while some had barely started attending (i.e. two months or less).

On the last two weeks, we taught the intermediate class which had a slightly smaller number of students (12), and surprisingly less talkative than the elementary class. Same with the previous class, the students came from different backgrounds, but their age gap was not as great. Other than three students in their teens (16-18 years old), most of the students were in their 40s, already working but aspiring to either find a better job or get a promotion by improving their English conversational skills. Upon observation, I inferred that most of the students were less talkative than our previous class because they already had a quiet confidence that they could produce utterances that would get what they mean across others (with or without considering grammatical accuracy in some cases). Thus, at first glance they seemed less active, but in fact, they were thinking hard about the input they were receiving from us teacher trainees, and also carefully taking notes of anything important in their notebooks (without prompting). Other than their levels of English abilities, the habit of 'note-taking' was the most noticeable difference between the elementary and intermediate classes.

Overall, it was a pleasant surprise for us trainees to realize how willing the students were to learn from us despite our obvious inexperience in teaching. One day, my co-trainees and I were discussing the students' high-level motivation. We realized that most of their reasons for studying English would be categorized as extrinsic motivation (e.g. to find a good job). Nevertheless, the fact that the success of their studies affected not only their life but also their families' gave them a sense of drive and thirst for education that was incomparable to Japanese students.

Classroom Teaching

It goes without saying that the most important part of the CELTA course had been the teaching practices we needed to complete. All trainees had to conduct six hours of teaching practice, that is, eight 45-minute lessons in four weeks.

In order to get us familiar with the CELTA way of teaching methods, we had the input lessons starting on the second day of the first week dedicated not only on getting to know the learners, but also learning about the key terminologies used throughout the course. We were taught that other than the four skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing; they also covered three systems: grammar, functions, and vocabulary as the seven different types of lesson focus in IH Bangkok. In relation, we were also recommended a guide on which type of lesson was most effective depending on the focus of the lesson. There were four lesson types introduced to us, namely: (1) text-based lesson for grammar and functions; (2) test-teach-test for vocabulary; (3) receptive skills lesson for reading and listening; and (4) task-based lesson for the productive skills, speaking and writing, as presented in Table 2.

Table 2. An Overview of the Staging of Different Lesson Types (Ss = students)

Lesson Type	Lesson Stages	
Text-based	Lead-in	To stimulate interest and get Ss talking
	Pre-text task	To activate Ss' passive knowledge related to the text
	Gist reading/ listening	To ensure Ss understand the context provided by the text
	Clarification	To clarify the meaning, form and pronunciation of the target language
	Controlled practice	To enable Ss to try and improve their accuracy using the target language
	Freer practice	To give Ss the opportunity to produce the target language in real communication
Test-Teach-Test	Lead-in	(same as above)
	Diagnostic test	To diagnose Ss' areas of misunderstanding or gaps in knowledge with regards to the target language
	Teach	(same as 'clarification')
	Consolidation test	To enable Ss to consolidate their accuracy using the target language
	Freer practice	(same as above)
Receptive skills	Lead-in	(same as above)
	Pre-text discussion	To orientate Ss to the content of the material before reading/listening
	Gist reading/ listening	To give Ss a manageable task that will help them gain preliminary understanding of the material
	Reading/Listening for specific information	To develop Ss' sub-skills in scanning and help them better understand the material
	Reading/Listening for detailed information	To give Ss the chance to develop more advance sub-skills such as inferencing or guessing meaning from the context
	Post-text discussion	To confirm Ss' understanding of the material through the use of discussion questions
	Productive skills extension task	To provide Ss with the opportunity to produce the target language using similar themes/ideas from the material covered
Task-based	Pre-task	To activate pre-existing knowledge about the topic
	Task preparation	To give Ss time to rehearse individually and then in groups as to how they will perform/ present the task given
	Performance/ Report	To provide Ss the opportunity to use the target language in their presentation
	Language focus	To point out not only the Ss' examples of good language use during the performance, but also correct any errors in their utterances

(Source: CELTA Handbook, 2016: 34-44)

After learning about the necessary key terminologies for conducting our CELTA-approved teaching practices, we were given instructions on what were required of us before, during and after the teaching practices every day. For the preparation stage before our own teaching practices, we were required to complete and submit three types of documentation: the cover sheet, the lesson plan, and the analysis sheets. Then, during the teaching practice of other trainees, we were required to fill up observation task sheets in our CELTA Handbook, and to take personal notes on the strengths and weaknesses of the lessons our co-trainees conducted. Finally, after each teaching practice we conducted, we were required to fill up a self-evaluation sheet regarding the strengths and weaknesses we had noticed in our own lessons and how we should improve on the next lessons to follow. It was also necessary for us to submit these self-evaluation sheets every lesson before we could move on to our feedback sessions. In these sessions, everyone was given the chance to share with the tutor and our co-trainees about what we thought of both our own and others' lessons. These were all carried out in a free discussion format where we offered any praise or constructive criticisms to help each other improve.

Written Assignments

Although the teaching practices were the most vital in ensuring that our overall performance in the CELTA course was satisfactory, in truth, the completion of the written assignments were the most nerve-wracking and difficult part of the course. The teaching practices themselves made us nervous and anxious, but the support and kindness of our students helped us a great deal, whereas working on our written assignments were mainly based on our individual knowledge of English language learning and teaching.

There were four written assignments in total, and we needed to get a passing grade in at least three of them in order to pass the course. We were given one chance to rewrite a failed assignment with specific help from our tutors as to which reference would be most helpful to pass it. The first assignment, the 'Language-related task' tested our overall linguistic awareness (not only our knowledge of certain target language features, but also our ability to apply this knowledge in order to write an effective lesson plan). We were required to complete two grammar analysis sheets, one functions analysis sheet, and a lexis analysis sheet. The second assignment was known as 'Focus on the learner,' which as the name suggests, encouraged us to find out about our students' personal and educational backgrounds, needs and purposes in learning. In addition, we were required to design two language tasks for grammar and pronunciation that would solve the learner errors we took notes of during our lessons. The third assignment, the 'Skills-related task' examined how well we would use an authentic text in the classroom to plan a reading lesson without assistance from the tutors. Lastly, the fourth assignment checked whether we could recognize our own strengths and weaknesses, and think of ways to further improve our teaching in the future.

In order to complete the first assignment, which was the most technically difficult of

the four assignments, I conducted a study group with three other trainees whom I grew close to throughout the course. Two of them have had experience teaching online to Chinese children, while one of them has no teaching experience and has not even taken English education related courses in his college days. With the four of us working together, we managed to finish our first assignment faster than anyone else. We continued in that vein for the rest of the assignments, mainly asking each other for advice or confirmation about certain points in them.

Reflection

Looking back, I remember being very nervous and unsure of myself during the first day. However, I gradually realized how lucky I had been with the group I ended up with. In our group, a third of the trainees had experience teaching in a professional setting, while some had some experience teaching online, and the rest have no experience at all. In comparison to the afternoon group, I felt that our group had a more pleasant group dynamic, less competitive but more cooperative. I felt that I was able to really give my all to the course because I did not feel any unnecessary pressure to be the best in the group.

Throughout the course, I discovered my own strengths and weaknesses as a teacher. I was often commended on the procedural detail of my lesson plans; my design, presentation and sourcing of materials; and my careful monitoring of the learners. However, I struggled a lot with maintaining appropriate pace and managing the time for the stages of my lessons. I had a lot of ideas in my head, and I wanted to give them all a try to make my lessons not only communicative, but also fun for my students. I was warned not to be overly ambitious as to what activities could be done in a 45-minute lesson. It was a gradual transition from bad to good. I learned how to reign in my creativity, making it a secondary consideration and made sure to prioritize the completion of my lesson aims first. In this regard, I was very grateful to my co-trainee, Zach Johnson's suggestions, for he was especially good at timing and pacing. Also, one of my other co-trainees, Leonardo 'Lenny' Cavaluzzi served as a good example for me to observe when it comes to giving out brief but precise instructions in the classroom. He was good at drawing in the students' attention with either eye contact or hand-clap signals. Finally, I was most disappointed in myself that despite the focus of my MA thesis being corrective feedback, I struggled a lot with error correction. I had problems with timing my corrections at first, and so heavily relied on the delayed error correction method which was recommended by our tutors for task-based lessons focusing on fluency first and accuracy second. I am still working on this shortcoming at present, and hope that by the time I start teaching next year, I will have improved in this area.

The experiences I had in this course are something that I know would help me become a better teacher. I learned a lot from my tutors by watching their examples and from my co-trainees by listening to their constructive criticisms and paying attention to what they say and how they teach in their own teaching practices. The students themselves taught me many things

while I was teaching them English. Through the students I learned how to be more attentive, and to have confidence in the way I carry myself in the classroom so that I could be a good role model to them: both as an English-speaker and as a person.

Closing Remarks

With the changes made in the Course of Study (the teaching guidelines) for elementary schools and lower secondary schools (MEXT, 2008; 2011), it has become more and more important for teachers to consider how English could be used as an effective medium in the classroom to increase students' proficiency level. It is possible that the use of English as the primary language of instruction in the classroom could help in the students' language development via exposure. Based on my personal experience, I realized that the more students are provided opportunities to interact in the target language, the more it would boost their confidence and help them get accustomed to using English during English lessons.

In addition, an increase in the number of foreigners coming into Japan in recent years follows a significant increase in the number of students with culturally mixed backgrounds. I believe that in order to accommodate such cultural and linguistic diversity, the use of English as a lingua franca in the classroom and in the school setting as a whole would play an important role in helping these students adapt to school life. In fact, one of my personal reasons for applying as a teacher in Yokohama City was this multicultural factor. As of October 2016, the number of foreign residents in Yokohama has climbed up to more than 86,000 people (Statistical Information Division, Policy Bureau, 2016). Forty-five percent of these foreigners are Chinese, fifteen percent are Korean and almost ten percent are Filipinos. Being of Filipino descent on the maternal side of my family, I believe that I could help these students via the use of English as a lingua franca to communicate with them. At the same time, I could help Japanese students have a better grasp of the importance of English in this context to enable them to communicate with and understand the cultural differences between them and students of foreign descent.

All things considered, I believe that I benefited a lot from my CELTA experience. As I mentioned above, by having the rare experience of teaching students from various cultural and linguistic backgrounds, I realized the real meaning and significance of using English as a medium in language instruction and overall communication. Furthermore, not only did I manage to embrace my strengths, but also realized that continuous hard work is necessary to keep my strengths sharp. For example, despite the commendable procedural detail of my lesson plans, the fact that my execution in actual practice needs work (i.e. issues on time management and providing brief but clear instructions) is something I need to improve on for the sake of my future students. I also learned the importance of carefully monitoring my students to cater to their needs, but I still lack the experience in giving successful output-prompting corrections. At the very least, these are some of the areas in my teaching that needs improvement which I was made aware of via taking this teacher training course. I plan to make this experience worthwhile

by bettering myself through practice and continuing my studies in the field of English language learning and teaching.

Notes

1 Although Nakamura (1993) and Hashimoto (2000) are of the same opinion that the dominance of English in Japan's language education is more a continuum of colonialism their interpretations differ greatly. In one hand, Nakamura (1993, cited in Yamada, 2015: 21) views the dominance of English brought about by the internationalization of Japan as almost equal to Americanization since the Western influence in Japan mainly comes from American culture (e.g. media, film, textbooks, etc.). On the other hand, Hashimoto (2000) interprets it as Japanisation due to the reality that Japan maintains its cultural independence despite the growing demand for English across the globe. Instead of being swallowed up by the Western culture entirely, Japan is in fact merely absorbing the economic and politic powers brought by the English language (ibid.: 25).

2 Loveday (1996, cited in Horiguchi et al., 2015: 6) points out that there are four factors that contribute to 'foreign language education failure' in Japan: (1) the system of education, (2) the teachers, (3) the institution, and (4) the socio-linguistic environment. He criticizes the education system failing due to its reliance on outdated methods such as the GTM. Institutions also contribute to the problem by inhibiting language learning due to teacher-centered lecturing and the use of university entrance exams as an extrinsic motivation tool. He adds blame to the teachers for their limited proficiency and lack of overseas experience as well as practical training. Finally, Loveday enumerates five things about the socio-linguistic environment that leads to failure in language acquisition: (1) linguistic distance between English and Japanese, (2) the difference in the cultural style of expression (i.e. Japanese is a visual language while English is a language reliant on sound, thus, the Japanese way of focusing on the written text over verbal communication makes learning ineffective), (3) Japanese speakers' tendency to isolate and treat the minority as outsiders, (4) a lack of perceived and actual need for foreign languages, and (5) the atrocious state of language skills' maintenance support after learners finish their schooling, that is to say, it is non-existent.

Acknowledgements

Second, I would like to extend my profound gratitude to two of my professors: Ms. Sachiko Miura, my thesis supervisor, who has supported me every step of the way through this teacher training course and the editing of this paper for the 'Tsuru University Graduate School Review;' and Dr. Sachi Nakachi for making it possible for graduate students to be eligible for the Tsuru University Scholarship for Global Education.

Third, I must express my deepest gratitude to Gary Stevens and Tim Brown, the amazing tutors my group had at the CELTA course; Sarai, Lenny and Zach, my co-trainees and the closest friends I had throughout the course; and my other co-trainees who had been really nice to me: Will, Ilyah, Jonny, Chuck, Brian, Benjamin, Yalmer, Kyla, Elri and Scott.

Fourth, I would like to offer my heartfelt thanks to my students at IH Bangkok during the four weeks of the course. (My elementary students: Abdi, Ari, Pornchai, Areeya, Viktor, Ahmed, Nhi, Qin, Tihn, Thuong, Suleman, Hong, Isaac and Ubah. My intermediate students: Joy, Thuy, Joe, Kee, Tomoko, Miho, Mew, Aeh, David, Hiba, Hao and Huang.)

Fifth, I would also like to thank the administrative staff from International House Bangkok who were very informative during both the application process and the whole course period. I really appreciated their kindness throughout my stay at the school.

Last but not the least, I thank my parents from the bottom of my heart for allowing me the chance to go outside the country on my own, despite their overprotective feelings; and for their unfailing support through morning calls on days where I had teaching practices and I feared not waking up on time with only an hour of sleep.

References

Hashimoto, Kayoko. (2000). 'Internationalisation' is 'Japanisation': Japan's foreign language education and national identity. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 21(1), 39-51.

Horiguchi, Sachiko, Imoto, Yuki, & Poole, Gregory S. (Eds.). (2015). *Foreign language education in Japan: Exploring qualitative approaches*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

International House Bangkok. (n.d.). "CELTA: Course Content." *IH Bangkok*. Retrieved November 12, 2016 from http://www.ihbangkok.com/teacher-training/celta/course-content/

Kikuchi, Keita, & Browne, Charles. (2009). "English education policy for high schools in Japan: Ideal vs. reality." *Regional Language Centre*, 40(2), 172-191.

Kubota, Ryuko. (2011). "Immigration, diversity and language education in Japan: toward a glocal approach to teaching English." In Philip Seargeant (Ed.), *English in Japan in the era of globalization*. pp. 101-122. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Loveday, Leo J. (1996). *Language contact in Japan: A socio-linguistic history*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Matsuda, Aya. (2011). 'Not everyone can be a star': Students' and teachers' beliefs about English teaching in Japan. In Philip Seargeant (Ed.), *English in Japan in the era of globalization*. pp. 38-59. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (2003). *Regarding the establishment of an action plan to cultivate "Japanese with English abilities."* Retrieved November 13, 2016 from http://www.mext.go.jp/english/topics/03072801.htm

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (2008). *"Chuugakkou gakushuu shidou youryou kaisetsu: gaikokugohen"* [Guidance for the course of study for lower secondary schools: Foreign languages]. Retrieved November 13, 2016 from http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/micro_detail/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2011/01/05/1234912_010_1.pdf

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). (2010). "*Shougakkou gakushuu shidou youryou, eiyaku*" [The course of study for elementary schools, English translation].Retrieved November 13, 2016 from http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/micro_detail/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2010/10/20/1261037_12.pdf

Nakamura, Kei. (1993). *Gaikokugo kyouiku to ideorogi: haneigokyouikuron* [Foreign language education and ideology: Theory of anti-English language education]. Tokyo: Sangen-sha.

Statistical Information Division, Policy Bureau. (2016). *A statistical look at Yokohama: Foreign residents*. Retrieved November 25, 2016 from http://www.city.yokohama.lg.jp/ex/stat/jinko/non-jp/1610-e.html

Thornbury, Scott, & Watkins, Peter. (2007). T*he CELTA Course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate. (2016). "Teaching English qualifications and resources." *Cambridge English Language Assessment*. Retrieved November 12, 2016 from http://www.cambridgeenglish.org/teaching-english/teaching-qualifications/celta/

Yamada, Mieko. (2015). *The role of English teaching in modern Japan: Diversity and multiculturalism through English language education in a globalized era*. New York: Routledge.