



Reflection on a Teacher's English Language Teaching Workshop 2019

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: 公開日: 2020-11-10 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: Simon, Thomas, Damien, Healy メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	https://doi.org/10.24729/00017134

Reflection on a Teacher's English Language Teaching

Workshop 2019

Simon Thomas

Damien Healy

Abstract

This study follows an action research process of reflection, resulting from the first of what is a series of English language teaching workshops provided by the two authors to junior high school and high school teachers. Adhering to the flow of action research, a look back at the activities of the 2019 workshop will be provided along with a rationale for their initial inclusion. The data collected after the workshop in a survey tool utilizing both quantitative and qualitative methods will be presented, and this along with their personal reflective thoughts assists the authors in evaluating the workshop and contemplating the approaches to alterations and improvements that can be made. It will be illustrated that both authors consider changes to be necessary and appropriate for the 2020 workshop, and this paper will begin the action research process of considering these changes.

The Workshop

In August 2019 the two authors facilitated a one-day English language teaching workshop for 28 Japanese junior high school (JHS) and high school (HS) teachers of English. The extrinsic motivation of these JHS and HS teachers to take part was to renew their teaching licenses. Their 'graduating' through the workshop was dependent on attendance and participation in the day's activities. A short quiz was to be given at the end of the day but this would not affect the participant's ability to successfully graduate. This was meant more as an incentive to remember the salient points of the day. This was the first time for these authors to facilitate this workshop.

The guidelines and recommendations that were passed along by both the administrators of this workshop and the previous year's facilitators were to

introduce concepts and methods of teaching, including those that are applied to university level English language classes. The rationale behind these instructions was that the participants may be able to adopt these concepts and methods into their own schools and classes to increase levels of language teaching, learning ability and motivation.

The aim of this paper is to begin a reflective action research cycle for the authors by reviewing what took place in the workshop and the feedback that was given by participants. This is in order to prepare for the August 2020 workshop that will take place for the same purpose and with different participants.

The six-hour workshop was divided into one opening activity and three distinct themes and activities of focus. While the first author led the opening activity and first theme in the morning session the second author acted as support, to assist with facilitating the activities, and to answer any questions that participants might have. This role was then reversed for the afternoon session and the remaining two themes when the second author led the activities.

The following section of this paper will provide an outline of the day's activities. Subsequent to this a brief literature review on the reflection process within the action research cycle will be presented. A methodology of how the feedback was collected and will be presented and analyzed will then be given. Following the data presentation, an analysis of this feedback and then comments by each of the authors on the activities that they led will be provided, with the purpose of making suggestions as to how the workshop in August 2020 will be approached.

Workshop Opening

The workshop opened with a short introduction to the model conditions and purposes of professional development and some of the benefits that can be gained from teacher workshops. The model that was used was the INSPIRE acronym that is presented by Richardson and Díaz Maggioli (2018).

The seven INSPIRE foundations to professional development and brief definitions of each are:

Impactful – addressing the diverse needs of teachers and learners to enhance learning,

- Needs-based** – determining what works in each context for the learners and teachers,
- Sustained** – taking a long-term approach, mixed with the right activities and support,
- Peer-collaborative** - building in support and feedback from colleagues and experts,
- In-practice** – learning from doing and tackling real issues and developing practical solutions,
- Reflective** – reflecting critically and systematically on practice and improving it while developing new ideas and skills,
- Evaluated** – gathering feedback to assess the impact of the teaching and learning.

(Richardson and Díaz Maggioli, 2018)

Further detailed examples of factors that ideally need to be addressed for professional development are provided by Galaczi, Nye, Poulter and Allen (2018) and Wei, Darling-Hammond, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos (2009).

Understanding and pursuing these conditions of teacher engagement in continuous professional development is said to be able to positively affect teacher identity, enthusiasm, and self-confidence leading to increased autonomous decision making and the use of varied methods adopted into the classroom. This can then lead to greater understanding of learners and their classroom needs, which in turn can enable fine tuning of classroom instruction and activities to meet learner's needs for grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic competence (Atay, 2008).

The purpose of this first activity was twofold. Firstly, to enable smaller groups of 5-6 participants to begin the day with a discussion exercise to define these seven conditions and recognize what could be gained from this workshop. Secondly, to make the authors aware of the language abilities of the participants so that any last-minute adjustments could be made to the plan of activities for the day in terms of the level of language that was to be used, the groups that would be formed in the later activities, and the activities that participants would be asked to take part in.

ARCS

The first proper theme of the morning session was designed to increase the

participant's awareness of a process method of instructional design to increase learner motivation. This theme was chosen to be included due to comments that had been received from the participants prior to the one-day workshop, which identified a need to stimulate the learning motivation of students. The method that was illustrated was the ARCS Model (Keller, 1987, 2010).

ARCS Explained

The ARCS Model defines four conditions that Keller (1987, 2010) suggests have to be met in all aspects of classroom teaching and learning in order for learners to become, and remain motivated. This includes the environment, materials, resources, instructions, procedures, and tasks. These conditions are:

1. **Attention:** Arousing and sustaining learner's curiosity and interest in the topic through appropriate stimuli.
2. **Relevance:** Making the topic and teaching methods relevant to learner's lives and increasing their perception of this relevance.
3. **Confidence:** Developing learner's understanding that if effort is exerted there can be an expectancy of success giving them feelings of being in control.
4. **Satisfaction:** Encouraging and producing feelings of satisfaction in learners about accomplishments leading to the outcome.

Each of these four conditions contain a further three sub-categories that feature questions that each teacher should answer using their personal knowledge of their own specific teaching environment. The answers should then be employed as strategies in order to increase student and learning motivation. These sub-categories and questions are:

Attention

Subcategories

1. Perception Arousal
2. Inquiry arousal
3. Variability

Questions

- What can I do to capture student's interest?
How can I stimulate an attitude of inquiry?
How can I maintain student's attention?

Relevance

Subcategories

1. Goal orientation

Questions

- How can I best meet my student's needs?

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| 2. Motive matching | How and when can I link my instruction to the learning styles and personal interests of the students? |
| 3. Familiarity | How can I tie the instruction to the student's experiences? |

Confidence

Subcategories

1. Learning requirements
2. Success opportunities
3. Personal control

Questions

- How can I assist in building a positive expectation for success?
- How will the learning experience support or enhance the student's beliefs in their competence?
- How will the students clearly know their success is based on their efforts and abilities?

Satisfaction

Subcategories

1. Intrinsic reinforcement
2. Extrinsic rewards
3. Equity

Questions

- How can I encourage and support student's intrinsic enjoyment of the learning experience?
- What will provide rewarding consequences to the student's success?
- What can I do to build student's perceptions of fair treatment?

ARCS Demonstrated

Following illustration and explanation of these subcategories and questions, the task set to groups of 5-6 workshop participants was to answer the questions and identify multiple answers/strategies that could be initiated in JHS and HS English language class settings to improve levels of student and learning motivation. The answers/strategies that were generated were then shared among the other groups, providing all participants with all the ideas. Participants were also provided with ideas that the first author had generated. At the end of this activity participants were given the opportunity to ask questions to the first author, but there were none at this time.

In a follow up to this, the participants were then led through a writing task that the first author uses in his Academic English classes. The purpose of this was to

highlight the use of strategies generated from the ARCS subcategory questions that the first author employs in the classroom. The task carried participants through multiple stages of building a 3-sentence excerpt of a report – the thesis statement. The importance of this 3-sentence excerpt to the structure and content of a report was illustrated, along with ideas and models demonstrating how the first author’s model thesis statement was constructed. The groups of participants were then given the opportunity to use the same particular grammar structure provided in one sentence by applying their own ideas to alternative topics. The purpose of this was to check participant’s understanding of this particular structure, and to identify whether they had understood it enough to apply it. The group’s ideas were written on to the whiteboard, after which feedback was provided to the whole class on each, to enable all participants to receive the benefit of hearing and understanding how these ideas had been applied, if they worked within the structure that was provided, and whether or not they could be improved in any way.

Following this tightly controlled exercise, participants were then given the opportunity to apply this grammatical structure, their understanding of the models previously demonstrated and also their existing knowledge of English to create their own 3 sentence thesis statement, which all groups tackled using the same theme. The aim was to use and develop the knowledge of the group in application, exploration and negotiation to socially construct their group’s one best attempt (E.g. Brown, 2007, Vygotsky, 1978). Once again, a very similar feedback process was utilized in which all groups wrote their 2-3 sentence excerpt on to the whiteboard, were able to view other group’s compositions, and watched and listened while written and verbal feedback was provided on composition, grammar, vocabulary and suitability of the excerpts. Throughout this process reference was continually made to the ARCS Model and how each of the attention, relevance, confidence and satisfaction factors could be positively affected through the teacher’s use of the teaching environment, materials, methods, and instructions.

In a question and answer opportunity following this, one participant asked how much time it took for university students to be taken through the process that the participants themselves had been taken through. It was replied that one 90-minute class would be given to this process, that the university students invariably finished within 60 minutes, and that this allowed the remaining time for students to then apply what they had learned to writing excerpts that would be used within their

own reports. It was commented that JHS and HS teachers conduct 45-minute classes.

Due to time constraints and the need to give participants the allocated time for lunch the group question and answer session was stopped. Despite this, several participants did stay to ask several questions about their own personal teaching environments.

A package of printouts of the slides that were used throughout the morning were provided to all participants so they were able to follow along easily and make personal notes so that they would have a tangible reminder of what they had carried out after the workshop had concluded.

Following the lunch break the second author introduced the two complementary and student orientated themes of Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT) and Differentiation.

Task Based Language Teaching

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology Japan (2019) informs us that children need three competencies for living. Two of these, *chi* 知 and *toku* 徳 relate to task completion. *Chi* which means solid academic ability, requires students to “*take the initiative to find issues learn and think; decide and act independently; and to better solve problems*”, all of which are an intricate part of a task. *Toku* which translates to richness of mind, encompasses “*self-discipline and cooperation with others*”. Both of these attributes are necessary for students to successfully complete a task.

Task Based Language Teaching Explained

A deductive approach where students infer rules from contextualized practice is the basis of TBLT. Ellis (1992) referred to this as “discovery learning”. This deductive approach is similar to the way people learn a language in a communicative way outside the classroom, discovering facts and relationships in the language for themselves.

Prabhu (1987:17) suggests that “*an activity which requires learners to arrive at an outcome from given information through some process of thought, and which*

allows teachers to control and regulate that process” is regarded as a task. As can be seen from this definition a task is a communicative activity which has a clear goal (Breen, 1987). This can lead to an improvement in students’ receptive and productive skills. As tasks are activities that students will encounter in the real world outside the confines of the classroom, this can motivate them to succeed. A task is not just using grammatical structures but an exercise where students are searching for a certain outcome. Crookes (1986) posits that this outcome, which he calls *‘a specific objective’*, is one of the main features of a task. Nunan (2004) informs us that how this specific objective is reached depends more on the meaning than the grammar which is used to reach it.

Richards and Rogers (2001) explain that tasks can be “unfocused” or “focused”. An unfocused task uses any language in a communicative way to reach the goal. Whereas, focused tasks use specific grammar and vocabulary to achieve success. A task might be input-providing such as listening or reading, or output-prompting which could be writing or speaking. Tasks often are both input-providing and output-prompting, and Table 1 illustrates the kinds of activities that have the potential to become tasks.

Table 1. Types of activities that have the potential to become tasks.

1 Listing	Brainstorming and fact finding
2 Ordering, sorting, classifying	Sequencing, ranking, categorizing, classifying
3 Comparing and matching	Finding similarities and differences
4 Creative	Project work
5 Problem solving	Analyzing situations, reasoning and decision making
6 Sharing personal experiences	Explaining attitudes, opinions and reactions

The goal of a task is to reach a successful outcome through exchanging information. This goal is only accomplished when students exchange accurate information which their partner can understand and follow. Due to the rigidity of this single outcome students often must rephrase or expand their answers. Through this interaction students attend to the meaning of the information and the form in which it is encoded (Varonis & Gass, 1985). Tasks can be used for beginner to advanced students and from elementary students to university graduates (Shintani, 2016).

Willis (1998) advises that a TBLT lesson should be broken into three sections, the pre-task stage, the task cycle and the language focus. During the pre-task

stage, the topic is introduced, at which stage students are asked to brainstorm about it. Vocabulary can be taught and useful words or phrases can be introduced. The instructions on how to complete the task are explained. After this, Japanese students should be offered a brief Focus-on-Form (FonF), which Richards and Rogers (2001:236) contend should include “*a variety of form-focusing techniques*”. These might include attention-focusing activities, such as hearing a recording of others doing a similar task, or guided exposure to parallel tasks, for example, reading a text related to the task.

In the task cycle, the teacher monitors the students’ performance helping when the students reach an impasse. After students have completed the task, pairs or groups of students then compare results, and report what they decided or discovered.

Within the language focus, the class examines features of the pre-task FonF, which as stated above could be a reading text or transcript of a recording. The teacher helps the students to notice what forms of grammar and vocabulary were used to complete the task and then helps the students practice these new language structures. Although TBLT is primarily a meaning-based exercise as Nunan (2004) states, Skehan (2003) tells us that there is still a need and a concern for a focus on form.

It is suggested that TBLT is relatively easy for teachers to implement in their classrooms without an excessive amount of preparation time needed. However, possible issues which might relate to using TBLT in the Japanese class are that students are used to the teacher-centered approach, as opposed to the student-centered approach which is necessary in completing a task. Burrows (2008) posits that students are often confused about what they are being asked to do in completing a task. Therefore, teachers need to explain clearly in the pre-task stage what the goal of the exercise is and what they should try to do to reach that goal. Also, Japanese students are very concerned about correct grammatical usage, therefore, the teacher needs to explain that this is not necessarily the most important issue in completing the task. Instead, achieving the goal is the most important part of the exercise.

Task Based Language Teaching Demonstrated

In the following activities participants were partnered together with others teaching at the same level. JHS teachers were grouped with JHS teachers, and HS teachers

with HS teachers. Participants were first introduced to the six activities in Table 1 that tasks can be made for. The second author then demonstrated an example task where the participants were given two identical street maps but with different locations on them. Each map had four locations, of which the directions for the first one were written in the correct order. Individually the participants had to read the directions and decide which location the directions were leading them to. The second and third directions were given but the words were not in order. Here the participants had to correct the order of the words and then follow the directions to the correct locations. The final direction was not given. Only the location on the map was provided, therefore, participants had to look at the map and use previous model sentences to make directions to the final location.

After both participants had finished and connected the directions to the four locations on their own maps, they then gave their directions to their partners. The partners listened, followed the directions and finally wrote the locations on their maps. When both participants had finished giving four directions to their locations they compared their maps to see if they were similar. Where differences occurred, they tried to give the directions again to see how the mistake was made and how they could correct it.

After the partnered participants were finished with the example task, they were given one of the six activities from Table 1 and asked to make an example task for that type which would suit their second-grade students.

When they had completed the design of their tasks, the partnered participants were split up and four larger groups were made. In these groups the participants explained to the other group members the kind of task they had designed and the other participants made comments related to the design and activities necessary for the task to be completed successfully. This part of the workshop helped participants gain different teaching ideas that they could use in their TBLT lessons in the future. All lesson plans made were photocopied and distributed to all participants giving them a wide range of tasks and ideas they could use in their own classrooms.

Differentiation Explained

When one class of students includes abilities that range from beginner to advanced, differentiation can help to accommodate these differing abilities and can contribute

to the running of an inclusive class. Gadzikowski (2016:12) defines differentiation as “*adjusting or changing instructional practices, plans, or materials to meet the individual needs of each learner*”. By tiering or differentiating tasks a teacher can add extra challenge or support, thus helping all students have a higher level of engagement in the task. Smith and Throne (2009:220) define tiering as “[*b*]uilding on students’ prior knowledge [*by*] varying the depth of a lesson”. Gadzikowski contends that using differentiation in the regular class “*results in a richer and deeper learning experience for all*” (2016:12), and this variation will help to incorporate the students’ diverse interests, learning profiles and levels of readiness. Kingore (2006) warns us that by not using tiering some students may be not be learning anything new. If students are not progressing, then motivation levels will diminish. Turville, Allen and Nickelson (2013:7) state that tiering motivates students by helping make the lesson “[*e*]qually engaging and challenging for all students”.

Based on Turville, Allen and Nickelson’s (2013) advice, tasks should be tiered into three levels. The first tier should be regarded as the grade-level tier task. This is the standard that is required, or the objective of the lesson. This is the level most of the students should be at. The second tier is the basic tier task, which is for students who have not acquired the skills to complete the required objective successfully. The third tier is an advanced tier task for students who have previously mastered the required objective of the lesson. This tier provides students with opportunities to work in more depth and with more open-endedness allowing them to incorporate more advanced vocabulary and structures.

Differentiation Demonstrated

The differentiation activity utilized the maps and directions activity that was used in the previous TBLT demonstration. Differentiation was explained as changing the original task to one which is easier for students who are struggling with the concepts being taught, and also making it more difficult to incorporate the students who have already mastered the structures being practiced.

To illustrate an easier task, participants were given the same map with four locations including full descriptions to these locations. Participants followed their directions choosing the most appropriate locations. They then read these directions to their partners who also chose the most appropriate locations on their own maps.

After eight locations were exchanged participants looked at their maps to see if the locations were the same.

For the higher-level task, participants were given the same map but this time it only contained directions to one location. Using this as a model, the participants had to write the directions to the three other locations themselves. They then read their directions to their partner who made a note of the final locations, and when all directions were given, they checked for similarity.

Finally, with the same partners for the TBLT task, participants were asked to differentiate/tier the task that they had made to both a lower and higher ability task. These partners were then split up into the four larger groups where participants had the opportunity to share and discuss their ideas with other members. Similarly, copies of all tasks were made and distributed to all participants to adapt and use in their own classrooms.

A package of materials providing details on the theory and activities carried out in both the TBLT and Differentiation sessions were provided to all participants.

Conclusion of the Workshop

After the conclusion of the fourth and final theme a six-question paper-based quiz was distributed. Two questions each focused on the discussion and activities carried out in each of the ARCS Model, TBLT, and Differentiation themes - the three themes of the day that were designed to provide ideas that could be taken into the participant's classrooms. As previously mentioned, the quiz was carried out in order to stimulate thoughts of the themes of the day and recollection of the significant points.

Finally, participants were distributed with a questionnaire written by the university administrators of this day workshop. This tool presented participants with two sets of three questions. For each set of three questions participants were asked to provide one closed response answer on a Likert scale of four choices – six questions, two answers in total. Following this, a paper copy of the survey tool designed by the authors (Appendix 1) was distributed with a URL. Due to the time constraints on the day, the participants were asked to complete this survey online within three days after reflecting on the workshop's activities.

Reflection

From an educational perspective reflection can be viewed as an exploration, or critical analysis of experiences and conditions which can lead to transformative learning and a consciousness growth to a new level of critical transitivity, where new understandings and appreciations and action for positive change is made (Boud, Keogh & Walker, 1985; Kitchenham, 2008; Mezirow, 1991).

The benefits of undertaking reflective activities are associated with the facilitation of a deeper understanding of the scope of practice, to influence learning through critical thinking, and the development of evaluation skills to induce a growth of implicit and theoretical change of knowledge. This awareness and understanding can then be transferred to visible action for positive change and improvement of practice in later similar tasks (Huang, 2010; Porto, 2007; Scanlan & Chernomas, 1997; Strampel & Oliver, 2007).

The process of reflection commonly occurs in four stages (E.g. Fernsten & Fernsten, 2005; Huang, 2010; Kitchenham, 2008). In the first, a purposeful look back at, or return to activities and experiences of the past is made. The second involves thinking about the performance in these activities in terms of an evaluation against factors including the needs, goals, strengths, weaknesses and performances of individuals involved in relation to the standards and requirements. In the third stage, a contemplation of strategies that can be used to enhance the success of future similar activities takes place, which affects the consciousness growth and influences deeper learnings and new understandings. The fourth and final stage involves a re-enactment of the initial task or a similar task incorporating the transformations and changed perspectives that were gained in stage three.

These four stages are similarly found in other educational and research methodologies, namely Kolb's (1984) model of experiential learning, and action research (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011; Gilbert, 2008; Gray, 2009).

The aim of this paper is to carry out a reflection on the one-day teacher training workshop with JHS and HS English language teachers to determine if, and what changes can be made for the following year. Within the process of this study the four stages of reflection can be identified firstly as the initial 2019 August workshop, while the second stage is the first part of this paper recounting the

events of the 2019 workshop. The third stage is identified in the latter half of this paper including the analysis of the data collected, the two authors personal reflective narratives, and the later activities that will be carried out in preparation for the 2020 workshop. The fourth and final stage will be the re-enactment of the workshop in 2020. This will complete one cycle of the reflection/action learning process, after which the second cycle will begin.

Methodology and Methods

This study takes the form of a case study within an action research cycle. Case study can be defined as *“a process of conducting systematic, critical inquiry into a phenomenon of choice and generating understanding to contribute to cumulative public knowledge of the topic”* (Simons, 2009:18). It can be applied to a variety of situations due to its flexibility concerning timescale and the methods that can be adopted for data collection (Simons, 2009). Cases can enable researchers to critically analyze and understand the dynamics present in real world contexts (Yin, 2014). The results can provide evaluative feedback which can enable self-development and movement towards positive action for change (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, 2011). The aim of applying an action research methodology (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011; Gilbert, 2008; Gray, 2009) within the case study is to highlight the reflective and cyclic systems in place for the authors as they seek to improve the previous year’s workshop for the next.

For the ease of the participants and with a view to not putting off participants from responding to an extensive open-ended qualitative questionnaire, a largely quantitative survey tool was used that featured a small number of open-ended qualitative questions. Six closed response questions were asked about each of the three workshop themes. The closed response quantitative questions utilized a Likert scale of five responses – strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree. One open-ended question was asked about each workshop theme. Open ended responses were analyzed and organized into themes. A final open-ended question asked respondents for any final comments. A hard copy, paper version of this tool (Appendix 1) featuring the URL to the online tool Survey Monkey and instructions on how to complete it was distributed at the completion of the 2019 workshop, and due to the time limitations participants were asked to complete it online within the next couple of days. The data collected in the administration administered questionnaire was not used in this study.

Presentation of Data

From the 28 workshop participants the online survey received ten respondents. Of these ten, nine completed all the closed response questions. One respondent completed only the first eight questions. The closed response quantitative data will be presented here.

Of the ten respondents seven taught at High School, two at Junior High School, and one at Elementary School. Six participants were between the ages of 30 and 39, two were between 50 and 59 years old, and two were above 60 years old.

Participants were asked the same six closed response questions about each of the three themes. These questions are as follows, where XXX can be replaced with either ARCS, TBLT, or Differentiation, depending on the question number. The relevant question numbers are detailed after each question.

- The aim and purpose of the XXX workshop was clear and understandable.
Question 3 - ARCS, 10 - TBLT, 17 - Differentiation
- The explanations of XXX and how it can be used were clear and understandable.
Question 4 - ARCS, 11 - TBLT, 18 - Differentiation
- The materials that were used for the XXX workshop were clear and understandable.
Question 5 - ARCS, 12 - TBLT, 19 - Differentiation
- Using XXX will assist me in improving my lesson planning and teaching.
Question 6 - ARCS, 13 - TBLT, 20 - Differentiation
- Using XXX in my classroom will help me to improve my student's motivation.
Question 7 - ARCS, 14 - TBLT, 21 - Differentiation
- Learning about XXX was an appropriate topic for this teacher workshop.
Question 8 - ARCS, 15 - TBLT, 22 - Differentiation

For the ease of data presentation, the quantitative results for these questions will be presented in tabular form according to the themes. The data for the six questions used for each theme will be presented in one table with the numbers three to eight referring to the ARCS theme of the workshop (Table 2), ten to fifteen referring to the TBLT theme of the workshop (Table 3), and seventeen to twenty-two referring

to the Differentiation theme of the workshop (Table 4).

Table 2. Results of the questions asked about the ARCS theme of the workshop

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Average
3	6 (60.0%)	4 (40.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10	1.40
4	5 (50.0%)	5 (50.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10	1.50
5	4 (40.0%)	5 (50.0%)	1 (10.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10	1.70
6	5 (50.0%)	5 (50.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10	1.50
7	5 (50.0%)	4 (40.0%)	1 (10.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10	1.60
8	7 (70.0%)	3 (30.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10	1.30

Table 3. Results of the questions asked about the TBLT theme of the workshop

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Average
10	6 (66.7%)	3 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9	1.33
11	4 (44.4%)	5 (55.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9	1.56
12	4 (44.4%)	4 (44.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (11.1%)	0 (0%)	9	1.78
13	5 (55.6%)	4 (44.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9	1.44
14	5 (55.6%)	4 (44.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9	1.44
15	6 (66.7%)	3 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9	1.33

Table 4. Results of the questions asked about the Differentiation theme of the workshop

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Average
17	4 (44.4%)	5 (55.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9	1.56
18	4 (44.4%)	5 (55.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9	1.56
19	6 (66.7%)	3 (33.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9	1.33
20	4 (44.4%)	5 (55.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9	1.56
21	4 (44.4%)	5 (55.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9	1.56
22	5 (55.6%)	4 (44.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9	1.44

Following the six closed response quantitative questions for each theme participants were asked one open ended response question in which they were asked to provide any further information about that particular theme, or to support an answer that they had provided to a previous closed response question. Eight responses were provided for ARCS, seven for TBLT, and four for Differentiation. The responses that were received revealed prominent themes through word repetition and key words in context. These themes will be presented in the next section to support the quantitative data.

Finally, participants were asked to give any final comments, of which seven were received. The themes that these comments illustrated will also be revealed in the next section.

Data Analysis

ARCS

The case for reusing the ARCS theme in 2020 was given 100% support, and strengthened by 70% of respondents who strongly agreed, and 30% who agreed that it was an appropriate topic for inclusion in this workshop. Respondents commented that *“It was good to learn the theory of the “ARCS.”*, *“This kind of workshop tend to give teachers only the specific teaching plan or examples without any theory. So it was effective for me,”* and *“I was able to understand how important to motivate students to learn. Discussing a specific topic in a group, I deeply understood about ARCS.”* This sentiment of the ARCS theme being useful was also reflected by four of the other eight responses.

There was a 50%/50% split between respondents strongly agreeing and agreeing that they would incorporate ARCS into their lesson planning and teaching. From the qualitative remarks this theme was supported by four participants, with one example comment being *“It will be useful for me to plan my lesson. Before starting the class, I’ll check how much ARCS I put in my lesson.”* This comment identifies that this respondent considers ARCS to be able to positively affect their teaching and their students.

The facilitation of the ARCS theme in this workshop was clear and understandable to all respondents, with 60% strongly agreeing and 40% agreeing to this. The explanations of how ARCS can be used were also judged to be clear and understandable by all respondents, with a 50/50 split between those strongly agreeing and those agreeing. Two qualitative comments supported this, with an example being *“What you wanted to tell us was quite clear.”* and *“The class was really interesting and easy to understand.”*

The areas in which the ARCS theme of this workshop could possibly improve were identified by one respondent each, showing indecision as to whether the materials were clear and understandable (40% strongly agreed and 50% agreed), and whether employment of ARCS in the classroom would positively affect student’s motivation (50% strongly agreed and 40% agree). While there were no comments

pertaining to the materials in this ARCS theme, four respondents observed that the theme would be useful to them in class as it had provided them with ideas that they could use. *“I enjoyed your workshop and could get many things to make my class attractive.”* and *“... you provided with tremendous ideas and chances to learn through activities.”* were representative of this impression.

Finally, not related to the questions asked, four respondents commented about the quiz that was given at the conclusion of the workshop. These respondents expressed a desire for more time to be made available to review the themes of the workshop before the quiz. *“I wanted to review the materials before the quiz.”*

TBLT

All respondents agreed with the two questions asking whether the TBLT topic was appropriate for this workshop, and if the aim and purpose of this particular session was clear and understandable. For both of these questions 66.7% strongly agreed and 33.3% agreed. One respondent stated that *“It was worthwhile”*. Despite these positive results, one respondent commented that *“I was a little confused with the difference among PPP, TBLT and FOF, because what I had learned before was a little different from this lesson or I misunderstood what they are.”* while another remarked that *“I wanted to see more examples.”*

That the TBLT method would produce worthwhile results in the classroom by assisting in improving respondent’s lesson planning and teaching, and in improving student’s motivation was seen by 55.6% who strongly agreed, and 44.4% who agreed with both these two questions. Comments that supported these views were *“... this works very well. I believe, so I’ll try to do in my lesson.”*, *“We will be able to improve our class by using (TBLT).”*, *“It’s a good way for the students to enjoy learning.”*, and *“I was able to understand that Task-Based Learning had a great power to motivate students.”*

The explanations given about TBLT were clear and understandable for all respondents (44.4% strongly agreed and 55.6% agreed). Two of the three qualitative comments supporting these opinions illustrated that *“I could deepen my knowledge about task-based learning.”*, and *“Everything was clear to understand.”*

Finally, providing constructive criticism, 11.1% of respondents disagreed that the materials used in the TBLT workshop were clear and understandable. Although there were no qualitative comments directly corresponding to this, two comments provided positive opinions that materials were appreciated, supporting the 44.4% each who strongly agreed and agreed; *“It was very kind of you to make a lot of handouts for us. They will be very useful to review the workshop”*.

Differentiation

This theme was very well received by respondents to the survey. As a topic appropriate for this teacher’s workshop it was strongly agreed to by 55.6%, and agreed to by 44.4%. One comment was given in support of this. *“The concept of the use of tiered tasks is so basic yet I tend to forget to provide in daily classrooms. I appreciate you for pointing out its importance and letting us actually practice (...).”*

The aim and purpose of differentiation, and the explanations of how it can be used were all clear and understandable, and 44.4% strongly agreed and 55.6% agreed to this. One comment also provided an insight into a respondent’s thoughts. *“The example of DIFFERENTIATION was very clear (in the workshop on directions), so I could learn how I made different ways to achieve student goals.”*

The same numbers (44.4% strongly agreed and 55.6% agreed) also stated that using differentiation would assist them in improving lesson planning and teaching, and help in improving student’s motivation. Despite this, two comments were given to show that this method did not come easily. *“It was hard for me to think of good ways to differentiate.”*; *“To be honest, it is not easy to prepare different ways to learn.”*

Finally, the materials used to explain this theme were strongly agreed to be clear and understandable by 66.7% of the respondents, and agreed to by 33.3%. There were no qualitative comments provided to support this.

Final comments provided by respondents

Amongst the final comments provided by respondents at the end of the survey, one comment was made about the materials that were provided throughout the workshop. *“You gave us a lot of paper, but I’d like to save paper.”*

Besides this, all other comments provided by respondents at the end of the survey expressed gratitude for the opportunity to have been able to attend the workshop. Several examples will be illustrated here.

“Thank you very much for your nice lecture. It was a good chance for me to improve my way of teaching.”

“You guys have provided us with much higher standard and more plentiful contents than I had expected. Your students are lucky to have you as teachers. I had a similar opinion on the Global History workshop yesterday. These two workshops have given me a much higher opinion of Osaka Prefecture University.”

“I felt that you motivated ME throughout the training. The training was impactful to me and Needs-based to our needs. I was glad to take your class. I want to keep trying to motivate my students, as you did to me.”

Personal reflection by author one on the morning session

On reflection of the two themes that I facilitated in the morning session and the data that was collected there were several areas in which changes and improvements can be made for the 2020 workshop.

Firstly, although the opening activity served a clear purpose in allowing the participants to begin the day with a relevant discussion into the benefits that could be gained through the workshop, which also allowed the two authors to judge the level of the participant’s English language abilities and make suitable plans for the day’s activities I now consider this time could be better spent.

Based on the positive perceptions of the relevance and usefulness of ARCS to the survey respondents I believe that it would be worthwhile to retain this theme, and to assist the participants to be able to discuss amongst themselves and share ideas about how they can apply the ARCS model and its theory to their own particular teaching environments. In the 2019 workshop there was no time available for this. Secondly, there was very little time for participants to ask questions to the two authors about the application of ARCS, or any other language teaching related themes. This made the morning session feel rushed and tight for time.

In order to create time to include these activities in the morning session, first, I propose cutting out the discussions around the INSPIRE aspect of professional development. The goal of the workshop is to provide the participants with ideas that they will find helpful in their own teaching. Discussing aspects and benefits of professional development is not necessary.

Secondly, I consider that providing a demonstration of how ARCS can be utilized in a language lesson is useful in assisting participants to generate their own ideas on its application and so this should be retained in 2020. However, after finding out that JHS and HS teachers have 45 minutes for each class, I propose altering the writing task that was demonstrated with the workshop participants to a much shorter activity that fits well within this 45-minute time frame.

Making these two changes, the workshop could begin directly with an introduction to the ARCS Model. Following this introduction, as with 2019, the participants could then work in groups to identify and then share multiple strategies that could be introduced into JHS and HS English language classes around the ARCS themes to improve student learning and motivation. A shorter demonstration illustrating how ARCS is utilized in a university level language class could then be demonstrated. Following this, participants could be grouped according to the level at which they teach in order to discuss and share ideas about how ARCS can be adapted in to JHS and HS English lessons, after which these ideas can then be shared amongst the other participants. Finally, there should be an opportunity for questions to be asked in and amongst the group regarding the activities of the morning.

The advantages of this proposed approach compared to the 2019 workshop are that one theme can be covered extensively within a less time pressured atmosphere, and will also allow for greater discussion and sharing of ideas.

Personal reflection by author two on the afternoon session

After finishing the workshop I realized the difficulties that non-native English teachers would have with my workshop exercises. Needless to say, if the English teachers were having difficulty with the example class exercises, then their students will find them impossible to complete and thus will negate the sole purpose of this workshop which was to show teachers activities they can perform in their English

lessons to help students progress, and at the same time to motivate students to try harder and persist in their English studies.

I explained that I found the traditional style of TBLT too difficult for my Japanese university students and therefore, I considered Japanese junior and senior high school students would also find it difficult to complete without losing motivation. Hence, I suggested a short Focus on Form in the pre-task stage which is not used in a traditional style TBLT lesson. Through the questionnaire results it seems that some teachers did not understand this point and therefore were confused with the way I was explaining how to use TBLT in their lessons which supports the students in successfully completing the task. In hindsight I would consider giving the teachers a handout as well as a PowerPoint slide showing them the traditional style of TBLT and comparing it to my style. This might help the teachers realize that my style is slightly closer to a presentation-practice-production style lesson which is usually taught in Japanese schools.

For participants who were not familiar with TBLT style lessons I designed one which required the participants to decipher directions to 4 places on their map and then orally give the directions to their partner. Each pair were given the same map but the four directions one of the members had were different from their partner's. This exercise confused the participants and a majority of them couldn't complete the activity in the allotted time. I feel that it would have been easier if I had given the directions to each participant and they only had to orally give them to their partner. Although this is still quite a difficult task involving listening and map reading I suggest that participants would have been able to complete it in the required time. Deciphering a direction is very difficult and I posit this exercise be left out.

I gave the students different kinds of exercises to make tasks for. Some of these exercises are easy to make tasks for such as listing; ordering, sorting, classifying; or comparing and matching. Most of the students with these exercises successfully made a task which their students would be able to complete in their English lessons. However, other participants were given creative; problem solving, or sharing personal experiences exercises which are technically harder to make tasks for. Some of the participants with these exercises did produce good tasks but there were a small minority which could not imagine tasks they could make for their

students. As I was monitoring the class I had to give suggestions to some of these participants to help them think of a possible task. I contend that these students will feel that TBLT could be too time consuming or difficult to implement in their English lessons and therefore, the purpose of this workshop has failed. It might be better to explain all six kinds of activities that can be used to make tasks but actually get all the participants to make tasks for the easier lower-level exercises.

As was mentioned earlier this workshop was designed to help teachers use TBLT and differentiation in their lessons. Due to the time spent on TBLT two hours five minutes, there was very little time for the participants to design a differentiated lesson from their TBLT task they had designed. Differentiation is tweaking the lesson to make it easier for the less able students or harder to make it more challenging for the students who are capable of performing the activity with ease. If there had have been more time available, I feel the participants could have produced better differentiated tasks. Also, the participants who had the higher-level activities which they had made tasks for struggled to differentiate their original task. Again, as was mentioned above, such students will feel that differentiation is impossible to implement in their classrooms.

I acknowledge that by making an example task for the students to complete easier and by setting the easier activities for them to make a task for should require less time and therefore, more time can be spent on differentiation thus encouraging all the participants to experiment with both teaching styles in their English lessons.

Reflection on the workshop conclusion

At the end of the 2019 workshop a quiz was carried out in order to stimulate thoughts of the themes of the day and recollection of the significant points. However, the results of the quiz had no significant bearing on the participant's 'graduation' through the workshop. Due to this, in the 2020 workshop a quiz will not be distributed. This will create time in which participants can further discuss the salient points of the day's activities, and complete a post-workshop survey for the authors on site. This strategy can assure the authors that a greater number of participants will respond than in 2019, and the authors are optimistic that this will provide a greater amount of valuable feedback that can be used in the reflection process to plan for the following year's workshop.

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to reflect on the August 2019, one-day English language teaching workshop for Japanese junior high school (JHS) and high school (HS) teachers of English facilitated by the two authors. The first stage of the reflection process took a purposeful look back at the activities of the workshop and the reasoning behind their inclusion. Assisted by the data that was collected, the second stage involved an evaluation of the workshop, which determined that the themes from 2019 should be retained, but can be improved in how they are presented. The third stage has begun within this study with a contemplation of strategies that can be employed to enhance future similar activities, and this examination and strategization will continue in the run up to the 2020 workshop. The fourth and final stage of the reflection process is the re-enactment of the workshop incorporating the transformations and altered perspectives that this study has begun to reveal. In order to lead to transformative learning and a growth in consciousness of the authors to new levels of critical transitivity this process of reflection and action research should be on-going and so similarly repeated after the 2020 workshop.

References

- Atay, D. (2008). Teacher research for professional development. *ELT Journal*, 62 (2), 139–147.
- Breen, M. (1987). Contemporary paradigms in syllabus design (Parts 1 and 2) *Language Teaching*, 20, 91–92 and 157–174.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching: Fifth edition*. New York: Pearson Longman.
- Boud, D., Keogh, R. & Walker, D. (1985). Promoting reflection in learning: a model. In: Boud, D., Keogh, R. & Walker, D. (Eds) *Reflection: turning experience into learning*, pp. 18–40, London, Kogan Page.
- Burrows, C. (2008). Socio-cultural barriers facing TBL in Japan. *The Language Teacher*, 32(8), 15–19.
- Cambridge University Press (2018). *Effective professional development: Principles and best practice*. Part of the Cambridge Papers in ELT series, April 2018. Retrieved

from https://languageresearch.cambridge.org/images/Language_Research/CambridgePapers/CambridgePapersinELT_Teacher_Development_2018.pdf

Canagarajah, A. S. (2012). Teacher Development in a Global Profession: An autoethnography. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46 (2), 258–279.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education: 7th Edition*. UK: Routledge.

Crookes, G. (1986). *Task Classification: A Cross-disciplinary Review Technical Report No.4*. Honolulu: Center for Second Language Classroom Research.

Ellis, R. (1992). Learning to Communicate in the Classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 1–23.

Fernsten, L. & Fernsten, J. (2005). Portfolio assessment and reflection: Enhancing learning through effective practice. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 6 (2), 303–309.

Gadzickowski, A. (2016). Everyday differentiation: How administrators support differentiation of curriculum and instruction in early childhood classrooms. *Differentiation Strategies*, January/February 2016, 12–16.

Galaczi, E., Nye, A., Poulter, M. & Allen, H. (2018). *Cambridge Assessment English Perspectives Teacher Professional Development*. Cambridge Assessment English. Retrieved from <https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/Images/539683-perspectives-teacher-professional-development.pdf>

Gilbert, N. (2008). *Researching Social Life: Third edition*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Gray, D. E. (2009). *Doing research in the real world: Second Edition*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Huang, L-S. (2010). Do different modalities of reflection matter? An exploration of adult second language learners' reported strategy use and oral language production.

System, 38, 245–261.

Keller, J. M. (1987). Development and use of the ARCS model of motivational design. *Journal of Instructional Development*, 10(3), 2–10.

Keller, J. M. (2010). *Motivational design for learning and performance: The ARCS model approach*. New York, NY: Springer.

Kingore, B. (2006). *Tiered Instruction: Beginning the Process*. Retrieved from <http://www.bertiekingore.com/tieredinstruct.htm>.

Kitchenham, A. (2008). The evolution of John Mezirow's transformative learning theory. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 6, 104–123.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology Japan (2019). *Basic Education in Japan chi 知 toku 徳 tai 体*. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/en/policy/education/brochure/title01/detail01/___icsFiles/afieldfile/2018/10/09/1409899-01.pdf.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-Based Language Teaching* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Porto, M. (2007). Learning diaries in the English as a foreign language classroom: A tool for accessing learners' perceptions of lessons and developing learner autonomy and reflection. *Foreign Language Annals*, 4 (4), 672–696.

Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language*

Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Richardson, S. & Díaz Maggioli, G. (2018). *Effective professional development: Principles and best practice*. Part of the Cambridge Papers in ELT series. [pdf] Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://languageresearch.cambridge.org/images/Language_Research/CambridgePapers/CambridgePapersinELT_Teacher_Development_2018.pdf

Scanlan, J. M. & Chernomas, W. M. (1997). Developing the reflective teacher. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 25, 1138–1143.

Shintani, N. (2016). *Input-based tasks in foreign language instruction for young learners*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Benjamins.

Simons, H. (2009). *Case Study Research in Practice*. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.

Skehan, P. (2003). Task-based instruction *Language Teaching*, 36, 1–14.

Smith, G. E. & Throne, S. (2009). *Differentiating Instruction with Technology in Middle School Classrooms* Eugene: International Society for Technology in Education.

Strampel, K. & Oliver, R. (2007). *Using technology to foster reflection in higher education*. In ICT: Providing choices for learners and learning. Proceedings ascilite Singapore 2007. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/singapore07/procs/strampel.pdf>

Turville, J., Allen, L. & Nickelson, L. (2013). *Differentiating by Readiness: Strategies and Lesson Plans for Tiered Instruction Grades K–8* New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Varonis, E. M. & Gass, S. (1985). Non-native / Non-native Conversations: A Model for Negotiation of Meaning *Applied Linguistics*, 6 (1), 71–90.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind and Society: The Development of Higher*

Psychological Processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wei, R. C., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N., Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad*. Dallas, TX: National Staff Development Council.


Willis, J. (1998). Task-Based Learning: What kind of adventure? *The Language Teacher*, July 1998, Retrieved from <http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/files/98/jul/willis.html>

Wyatt, M. & Oncevska Ager, E. (2017). Teachers' cognitions regarding continuing professional development. *ELT Journal*, 71 (2), 171–185.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research design and methods (4th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Appendix 1.

Post 2019 workshop questionnaire provided to participants.



公立大学法人
大阪府立大学
OSAKA PREFECTURE UNIVERSITY

Teacher Training Workshop Questionnaire

Thank you for taking part in the teacher training workshop. Simon and Damien would like you to provide more detailed feedback on your opinions of each part of the workshop so they can understand how it can be improved.

Please use this handout to prepare your answers to the following questions. Where asked, please answer in English with as much detail as possible.

After you have read and prepared your answers, then open the online version of this questionnaire using a personal computer, tablet smartphone.

Type the following URL into an Internet web browser:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Y8VB99V>

Then click and type your answers into the online version. When you have finished, click "Finished" and your answers will be submitted.

Please complete this questionnaire by Sunday August 11th at 12:00 midnight.

Thank you very much for your help.

1. Which level of education do you teach at?

Elementary School Junior High School High School
Other (please give details)

2. What is your age?

20 - 29 years old 30 - 39 years old 40 - 49 years old 50 - 59 years old 60 + years old

2. The morning ARCS workshop with Simon.

For these questions, only answer with your opinions about the morning ARCS workshop with Simon. Read the statements from 3 to 8, then show the level to which you agree or disagree. For question 9, please write your ideas and opinions with as much detail as possible.

3. "The aim and purpose of the ARCS workshop was clear and understandable".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

4. "The explanations of ARCS and how it can be used were clear and understandable".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

5. "The materials that were used for the ARCS workshop were clear and understandable".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

6. "Using ARCS will assist me in improving my lesson planning and teaching".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

7. "Using ARCS in my classroom will help me to improve my student's motivation".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

8. "Learning about ARCS and the different ways to change student motivation was an appropriate topic for this teacher workshop".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

9. What comments would you like to pass on to Simon about the ARCS part of this teacher workshop?

For example,
a. If you showed disagreement with any of the statements above, please explain why.
b. If you found particular benefit from the ARCS part of the workshop, please explain what the benefits are.

3. The afternoon Task Based Learning workshop with Damien.

For these questions, only answer with your opinions about the afternoon Task Based Learning workshop with Damien. Read the statements from 10 to 15, then show the level to which you agree or disagree. For question 16, please write your ideas and opinions with as much detail as possible.

10. "The aim and purpose of the Task Based Learning workshop was clear and understandable".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

11. "The explanations of Task Based Learning and how it can be used were clear and understandable".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

12. "The materials that were used for the Task Based Learning workshop were clear and understandable".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

13. "Using Task Based Learning will assist me in improving my lesson planning and teaching".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

14. "Using Task Based Learning in my classroom will help me to improve my student's motivation".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

15. "Learning about Task Based Learning was an appropriate topic for this teacher workshop".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

16. What comments would you like to pass on to Damien about the Task Based Learning part of this teacher workshop?

For example,
a. If you showed disagreement with any of the statements above, please explain why.
b. If you found particular benefit from the Task Based Learning part of the workshop, please explain what the benefits are.

4. The afternoon Differentiation workshop with Damien.

For these questions, only answer with your opinions about the afternoon Differentiation workshop with Damien. Read the statements from 17 to 22, then show the level to which you agree or disagree. For question 23, please write your ideas and opinions with as much detail as possible.

17. "The aim and purpose of the Differentiation workshop was clear and understandable".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

18. "The explanations of Differentiation and how it can be used were clear and understandable".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

19. "The materials that were used for the Differentiation workshop were clear and understandable".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

20. "Using Differentiation will assist me in improving my lesson planning and teaching".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

21. "Using Differentiation in my classroom will help me to improve my student's use of English".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

22. "Learning about Differentiation was an appropriate topic for this teacher workshop".

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

23. What comments would you like to pass on to Damien about the Differentiation part of this teacher workshop?

For example,
a. If you showed disagreement with any of the statements above, please explain why.
b. If you found particular benefit from the Differentiation part of the workshop, please explain what the benefits are.

5. Final Comments

24. Do you have any final comments that you would like to give about the workshop that will help Simon and Damien to provide high quality teacher training opportunities?