W. I. GRIFFITH
The University of Texas at Austin

HYE-YEON LIM
*Defense Language Institute Foreign
Language Center, Monterey*

A Teacher-Development Program for Mexican English Teachers: Factors Related to Success

This article examines a 1-month US-based teacher training/ development program for Mexican teachers of English. Three sets of survey data were collected from 20 teachers—on the first day of the program, the last day of the program, and 6 weeks after the teachers returned to their classrooms. Feedback and assessments from program trainers were also examined. The data suggest that there were important changes in teachers' attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors during the course of the 1-month program and that these changes persisted some weeks after the end of the program. The authors conclude by discussing features necessary for effective development programs. These include assessing the needs of the teachers and their schools' expectations, providing practice opportunities for teaching, and including a language component for the teachers.

Introduction

It is not an overstatement to say that training or development programs for teachers of English as a Second/Foreign Language (ESL/EFL) have long generated discussion and debate (cf. Bax, 1997, 2003; Carrier, 2004; Ellis, 1986; Fergeson & Donno, 2003; Halbach, 2000; Liu, 1999; Murdoch, 1994; Richards, 1998). These discussions and debates focus on such issues as the difference between teacher *training* and teacher *development*, "best practices," and the needs of native-speaker versus nonnative-speaker (NNS) teachers. However, in all of these discussions the overarching interest is to find programs that enhance the performance of both native-speaking and nonnative-speaking teachers. The purpose of this article is to examine a teacher training program for nonnative speakers of English and show how teacher survey data can be used to draw preliminary conclusions about effectiveness of the program.

An Outline of the Program

Each summer, a large southwestern university provides a 1-month intensive program for in-service teachers of English from Mexico. The teachers come from all over Mexico, have significant variation in their own English-

language proficiency, have classroom experience ranging from 2 years to more than 25 years, and vary in age from approximately 22 to 57. They teach in numerous venues, including private elementary schools, secondary schools, high schools, technological schools and universities, and private programs for special populations such as secretaries or company staff.

These teachers are provided complete funding for a 1-month teacher-training institute in conjunction with the participation and direct involvement of the office of the Secretary of Public Education of Mexico and the Fulbright Program. The purpose of this program is to provide teacher training and development to enhance teaching effectiveness and to encourage a more communicative approach in concert with the efforts of the nation to move away from audio-lingual or grammar-translation techniques. Each summer, 20 teachers are sent to this program.

The program consists of 25 hours of classroom instruction each week for 4 weeks, one or two social or cultural activities during each week, and weekend field trips outside the city. All official activities and lectures are conducted in English. Students must complete a project in which they develop classroom lessons directly applicable to the courses they are teaching and reflecting the strategies and techniques they have been studying.

The general content of the classroom instruction includes some pronunciation workshops especially designed for Spanish speakers of English, discussions on second language acquisition theory, classroom management, motivation, lesson design, use of technology, and creating or modifying activities for the classroom. In addition, the teachers observe ESL courses taught at the host institution. These observations are followed by a discussion about what they noted and how they felt about the classes. Program participants also discuss ways in which the university ESL classes are different from classes at their own situations and how the teaching strategies might be adapted to fit their own particular educational institutions in Mexico.

Teachers are instructed in the use of technology in foreign-language instruction. This varies from introducing them to the Internet and the wide range of materials available to making and editing DVD video in classes. Teachers spend at least 3 full days in the computer and technology labs at the university.

Each teacher also conducts a microteaching demonstration for his or her peers. In this demonstration, teachers have 30 minutes to teach a lesson of their choice using the strategies and techniques they have been studying. All teachers receive specific feedback on their lessons and a general critique of all performances is given in class. In addition to this peer microteaching demonstration, teachers are asked to microteach, using only Spanish, to a group of preservice ESL teachers from the Republic of Korea.

Rationale for the Program Elements

The Secretary of Public Education in Mexico and the Fulbright agency list several goals for this program:

- To help teachers become more comfortable with a communicative and experiential approach to language teaching;

- To give teachers techniques for helping their students become more proficient in the use of English in a variety of contexts;
- To improve the linguistic abilities of the participants;
- To familiarize teachers with life and culture in the US.

Since the first goal is to move away from more traditional approaches to language teaching that are based on grammar-translation or audio-lingual methods, one key question is how to move teachers in the desired direction of more communicative types of instruction. Bax (2003) has argued that a focus on and a rigid adherence to communicative language teaching (CLT) can actually prevent teachers from becoming excellent at their craft. He argues that it is ineffective to give teacher trainees the message that the communicative approach is universally the "best" way to teach in all educational settings. He suggests that to be effective, teacher-training programs should not follow one universal training approach. Instead, trainers should enable program participants to interpret, apply, and adjust teachings strategies so that these strategies are applicable to the teachers' local educational settings. He points out that a typical shortcoming of training courses lies in their lack of emphasis on reflective teaching, which would enable teachers to apply strategies locally.

With that in mind, the program broadly discusses "communicative teaching" as a student-centered approach to learning in which students are taught the language rather than being taught *about* the language. The program does not advocate a rigid adherence to any particular strategy beyond the need to let students practice and produce the language in context. This is crucial because the reality of the Mexican public secondary system is that typical classrooms contain 45-50 students and may contain as many as 60. Using strategies best suited to classes of 10-15 students would likely have been rejected by the participants as untenable in their own circumstances.

The participants experience instruction in what it means to have a student-centered lesson. They see the difference between teaching the language and teaching about the language. They receive instruction and examples of practices varying from more structured to less structured lessons and learn how to help students create their own activities and use the language in context. After discussing student-centered classes, teaching methodology, and theory, the teachers observe classes taught by ESL Services at the university. They fill out an observation form as they watch the classes. Later, they write a report on what they saw, assess the communicative nature of the lessons they observed, note the strengths and weaknesses of the lessons, evaluate how well these might work in their classrooms, discuss how they might have to change the lessons to make them work in their classrooms, and analyze how similar these were to lessons that they often gave in terms of form and not content. After they turn in their reports, 2 hours are devoted to discussing the issues related to their ability to import these teaching strategies into their situations.

One of the most important features of the program is that teachers are encouraged to find ways to make enhancements or modifications to the teaching techniques that they are acquiring. This phase deals with reflection and requires the participants to begin to link theory with practice, a central part of the experiential learning approach. It further pays attention to the

realities of the situations in which these participants teach and helps them to find ways to modify the activities and strategies they saw to fit their Mexican classrooms.

After having lectures about and observing student-centered classes, all teachers give a 30-minute microteaching demonstration to their peers. Each teacher receives detailed feedback from a facilitator on all elements of the lesson. As a class, the general points of the lessons' strengths and weaknesses are discussed and related, as much as possible, to the theoretical points discussed earlier in the course.

The purpose of these activities is to move the teachers along a continuum from learning about teaching strategies, to observing classes using those strategies, to reflecting and evaluating those strategies, and then to modifying these strategies for their own classes. This is crucial because if one wishes to change the behaviors of these teachers in their own classrooms, it is necessary to change their attitudes.

Teachers also do a second microteaching demonstration but this time to preservice ESL teachers from South Korea. The Mexican teachers teach their native Spanish language to the South Korean preservice teachers. Later, they reverse roles and learn Korean language taught by Koreans. The only requirement of this demonstration is that no English is to be spoken at all during the teaching or the learning. The purpose of this demonstration is twofold: first to give teachers another opportunity to teach a lesson after having received feedback on their first attempt and second to encourage teachers to rely less on "talking" (thus showing that words are not the only way to impart information). This exchange of teaching without the use of English shows teachers that beginning-level classes, at least, can be taught without a lot of "teacher talk."

The training program also addresses teachers' language proficiency. Most participants have intermediate to high proficiency in English. Yet teachers often come to this program with a sense that they cannot really teach in more communicative ways because they do not have the capacity to use the language. They are embarrassed and afraid of making mistakes in front of their students. Because of this self-perception of inadequate language proficiency, the Mexican teachers report that it is easier to rely on a purely grammar-based approach to teaching in which they can lecture (often in Spanish) about the particular grammatical points each day.

Rather than teaching English explicitly in the form of "English lessons," the program provides exposure to and immersion in English. The sole medium of instruction is English. In addition, teachers are given strategies for teaching pronunciation (i.e., phonetics, prosodic and sentence-level aspects of correct intonation, and cadence) to their students. However, trainers also tacitly give teachers opportunities to work on their own pronunciation. Program participants express great interest in these pronunciation lessons because in Mexico, English classes spend very little time on phonetics and pronunciation. The most common reasons cited include lack of knowledge as to how to produce the sounds of English, unfamiliarity with and lack of confidence in their ability to deal with suprasegmentals (those sentence-level aspects of speech including prosody, cadence, and intonation), and a lack of time. Therefore,

the pronunciation classes are designed to show the teachers how they could introduce phonics, suprasegmentals, and other elements of pronunciation into the classroom in integrated ways. Teachers learn activities and strategies for working on these skills in tandem with other salient language points of the lessons. Because this is such a new subject for the teachers, they actually become pronunciation students themselves, though they may not be aware of it. As they practice the activities to learn how to use them, they are actually practicing their own speech. In this way, they are able to avoid problems associated with loss of face. The main purpose, therefore, is to create confidence in their own abilities to teach pronunciation and language.

Having now studied, observed, and practiced the elements of student-centered language teaching, all teachers are required to create a series of lessons that they will use in their classes. These lessons have to be relatively student centered and communicative. Lessons have to include various strategies and techniques including songs, pronunciation components, exercises modified from a text, original exercises, and activities found on the Internet. These projects are evaluated with respect to how well they demonstrate an understanding of and an ability to use the theoretical ideas discussed throughout the course. The rationale for this activity is that it encourages the teachers to try to put together all of the things they have been studying and learning throughout their 1-month course. It also allows them to have a number of prepared lessons they can take home and use immediately. This should help to set the stage for a more communicative teaching environment and help to make the effects of the workshop more long lasting.

The Data

To examine this program in more detail, we collected data from several sources. Participants were given three questionnaires: one on the first day of the program (Appendix A), another on the last day of the program (Appendix B), and another 6 weeks after returning to their teaching duties in Mexico (Appendix C). Trainer ratings, observations, and evaluations of the final project provided additional information about teacher performance.

The Findings

On the first day of their arrival at the course, participants were asked to list which three things they most wanted to work on during the month. The most frequently mentioned responses were

- Methodology/teaching strategies (24 mentions);
- Motivation (9 mentions);
- Evaluation and assessment of student skills (7 mentions); and
- Lesson planning (6 mentions).

All of these issues were covered during the 1-month training. One would suspect that at the end of the training, teachers would find these items the most useful. However, when asked on the last day of the course what they found most useful, they noted the following:

- Pronunciation (6);
- Teaching strategies/methodology (6);
- Classroom observations (4);
- Lesson planning (4);
- Peer/microteaching (3);
- Motivation (3); and
- Technology (3).

Interestingly, even if not most useful, the item that *every* teacher found to be useful or very useful was the pronunciation component of the course. This is particularly interesting because at the beginning of the training, teachers had expressed the belief that pronunciation was not an important feature to which they should devote much time in their classes. A follow-up questionnaire sent approximately 6 weeks after they had resumed their regular teaching duties showed all of the respondents noted that they had spent more time teaching pronunciation and using the activities that they had learned. Much to their surprise, their students responded with great enthusiasm and teachers gained confidence in their ability to teach. More important, from the program's point of view, the students' opinions of the teachers' ability in the language also increased.

This increase in teacher confidence is particularly important. Although the teachers' improvements in linguistic proficiency would certainly be limited (because of the short duration of the training), their perceptions of their *ability to teach pronunciation* changed, perhaps leading to greater confidence in all aspects of the language. This suggests that we should modify Liu's (1998) claim that teachers need to have a strong grasp of a language to teach it. In this case, teachers needed merely to have a good grasp of ways in which they could teach the skill and to believe that they could teach it, despite any weaknesses in their own abilities. Part of this increased confidence clearly came from having more resources at their disposal (e.g., Internet pronunciation sites and word- or sentence-stress activities).

When asked in the first-day questionnaire how much they realistically expected to change their teaching style based on their experience in this program, most teachers said that they thought that they would change it only "somewhat." However, since most claimed that they already taught "communicative" classes, they believed that the training program would merely give them *additional* activities that they could use in their courses at home.

However, the last-day and follow-up questionnaires revealed changes in their perspectives. First, teachers claimed that they would henceforth organize their English lessons much differently from how they had before. This referred not to the "lesson-plan format" but to the way in which they thought about and approached lessons, for example, lesson planning as a way to create opportunities for communicative language learning. They reported that by having a chance to create lesson plans and conduct a microteaching lesson, they were able to operationalize the knowledge. This served the purpose of moving the theoretical to the practical for them. Further, they claimed that 6 weeks after the training, their lessons had become much less teacher centered and far more student centered. Teachers were using the lessons that they had

created while in the summer program and using those as models for creating additional lessons. Teachers thought that having a set of sample lessons that they knew were "good" was important and useful for them. The process of creating the lessons helped to demonstrate to the teachers that they were capable of producing student-centered lessons and that they understood the information they had been presented.

Upon their arrival at the program, the teachers were asked to list the three to five most important features of the communicative approach and to identify any weaknesses that they saw in the approach for their classes. The teacher conceptions of "communicative language teacher" varied greatly. For example, teachers offered descriptions such as the following:

- I would describe a communicative lesson as the one that uses the four basic skills or most of them in one class. All of them are balanced, not only reading or writing.
- I think that a communicative lesson is an opportunity to develop the listening and speaking abilities in our students.
- A communicative lesson is when everyone in the class interact with each other, it is when people talk, make questions, give answers and understand everything that is spoken.

Teachers believed that the communicative approach emphasized speaking over all skills, with listening a close second. They thought that this was not a reasonable possibility for their classes because the class size was typically between 45 and 55 students. Only one teacher noted that the main feature was that the lessons were student centered.

The final-day questionnaire again asked the teachers to talk about their perceptions of the communicative approach to teaching. All teachers said that they had come to a new understanding of communicative language teaching. They identified the major characteristic as being student centered with a focus on the use of language in context. They viewed communicative language teaching as an approach strictly (or primarily) aimed at speaking. In the 6-week follow-up survey all teachers described more student-centered lessons and more student participation in their classes. It thus appears that this new perspective about communicative language teaching affected their actual teaching practice.

The first-day questionnaire also asked teachers to identify major problems they had in using a communicative approach in their specific classes. In general, these responses focused on the problems of class size, on the lack of time, and on the severe lack of motivation in their students leading to disciplinary problems or to apathy regarding English. The last-day survey asked them if they thought that they would have the same problems as they perceived on the first day given the new tools they had learned in the course. Again, all teachers reported that they believed that they would not have as many problems and certainly not the same ones if they used the techniques and strategies they had been learning and practicing.

The 6-week follow-up yielded some very encouraging comments from teachers. They reported that their students had become more motivated and,

as one teacher said, "apologized when they missed a class." Others reported that the levels of motivation and excitement in their classes were far greater than they had ever experienced and more than they had expected upon their return. This also seemed to be accompanied by greater rates of learning on the part of the students. It is hard to discount these effects since one might reasonably expect that the excitement of a new school year and a new course might have been dulled after 6 weeks.

The first-day questionnaire asked teachers to identify the average frequency with which they used certain activities in their classrooms in a week's time. These included such items as pair/group work, individual work (such as workbooks or silent reading), pattern drills, quizzes and tests, video, music, role-play, translation activities, and use of authentic materials. The most frequently used activities were reported as being pair/group work (most days of the week), use of authentic materials (three times a week), individual work (between two and three days a week), review previous lessons (one to two times a week), and use of Total Physical Response activities (one to two times a week). A review and follow-up discussion of the first-day questionnaire revealed that in a typical 45-minute class, the teacher was actually lecturing or speaking more than 70% of the time with most of the student "practice" coming in the form of written homework or filling in workbook pages.

The follow-up survey showed that, on average, teacher talk time had been significantly reduced. Further, teachers were relying much more on practice in the classroom and using homework as a more supplementary strategy. Almost no one reported relying on translation as a classroom technique and pattern drills had been relegated to a less significant role. All of this points to more active and dynamic classrooms where students are able to practice and use the language in more meaningful and less rote contexts.

Teachers reported feeling that they were better teachers. They indicated that being able to practice these new strategies and techniques had made them feel more confident. This confidence was not only in their own abilities but in the idea that such lessons could work. Teachers reported that doing lesson plans actually made their classes run better, be more organized, and took them less preparation time.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This 1-month program appears to have had an important effect on the beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors of participating teachers. Within the period of 1 month, teachers' perceptions of how they could create more interesting and effective lessons changed. Teachers gained more confidence in their own ability to teach and in their language abilities. After returning to their home classrooms, teachers reported that students appeared more motivated and that students exhibited fewer discipline problems than previously. Finally, the teachers reported that the students were learning more language and were able to produce more language than in the past.

What does this brief examination of a single program tell us?

As suggested by previous studies (cf. Bax, 1997; Cullen, 1994; Halbach, 2000; Leather, 2001; Liu, 1998; Murdoch, 1994), the language-proficiency

component is very important. However, this does not necessarily mean that the actual proficiency levels or functional levels of the teachers need to improve. It can not reasonably be expected that radical changes will occur in language proficiency in a month, yet the results show that there are ways to increase teachers' confidence in their ability to teach the language and even to teach what is arguably the most problematic part of the language—pronunciation. These teachers were inspired by learning how important these fundamentals are and by learning that they did not have to be perfect to be able to help their students. Further, they were shown how to create activities and where to find pronunciation materials that relied less on their abilities and more on the students. It is not possible to overstate how significant the teachers found this and how much more confident they became. This implies two things to be kept in mind for future programs.

The first is that it may be necessary only to increase confidence rather than ability. This is critical because in short, focused programs, confidence is more likely to be changed than actual levels of language proficiency. Ways to increase confidence are many but in this case included providing a series of Internet-based resources to supplement the teachers' own skills. The second is that teaching not explicitly directed at language enhancement but rather implicitly as strategies for teaching may lower barriers and allow teachers to save face. This lack of focus on their own weaknesses can lead to more effective learning. This result supports Murdoch's (1994) findings that it may not be the level of English proficiency that is really the key factor but rather the perceived level of confidence in the ability to use and to teach the language that is central.

The second implication is that teachers need to be able to practice the new skills they receive. This supports the findings of Halbach (2000), whose work showed that it was important for teachers to be able to put into practice what they had learned. Learning about something was not sufficient. It needed to be coupled with application. Although most teachers reported on the first day of the program that they already taught communicative classes, they realized that the classes were not really learner centered. As noted on the last-day questionnaire, the teachers had come to a new understanding of what learner-centered classes meant. Teachers needed to actually try to create such a class in order to more fully understand how to use the information they were receiving. Again, this appears to be related to a matter of confidence. When teachers have a chance to create and teach lessons in a relatively controlled context, and when they get specific feedback on their performance, they come to feel that they actually understand what they can do to make better classes.

The teachers saw lesson planning and making a set of plans as useful. There may be three reasons for this. First, the teachers were able to get feedback on the lessons and to work with their trainers to create lessons for their own classes. This advice made them understand better the process of planning. The fact that the lessons had been critiqued by a trainer may have made the teachers feel more confident in the quality of the lessons. A second reason may be that teacher progress was easy to track. Seeing the progress they had made could have contributed to their feelings of confidence in their abilities to teach. A third reason is that the lessons created by the participants had

direct relevance to their specific situations. This means that teachers were able to put their new knowledge and skills into a specific context. Previous research has argued that a problem with TESOL programs for NNS teachers is the failure to recognize the different needs and contexts of the NNS teacher trainees (Bax, 1997; Liu,1999). Allowing the teachers to create and execute lessons provides the opportunity to make the modifications necessary for effective use in their specific contexts.

In summary, in what direction does this information point us? This study suggests some features that are likely to be necessary for an effective training/development program. One of these is assessing the needs of the teachers and the expectations of their schools. This is important because it creates a perception that the material will actually be directed at the specific needs of the participants. This could lead to a perception of increased relevance.

Another feature concerns providing practice opportunities for teaching, including a language component that boosts teacher confidence if not their actual proficiency level. The teachers need to have a chance to practice the new strategies and to get feedback. This feedback is simultaneously corrective and reinforcing. Teachers can learn immediately the weaknesses in their activation of the strategies. They can also find out what they are doing well and can gain confidence that they are doing well. This confidence in their abilities, and an understanding that they have some specific weaknesses that need attention, may be more likely to lead to the actual implementation of these strategies once the teachers have returned home.

A final feature is creating an actual product that the teachers can take home and use to reinforce what they learned in the teacher training/development course. By creating lesson plans, the teachers were able to take home something that they could use in their classes without modification. Having a product developed by the trainee for his or her specific situation can serve to provide a model that the teacher can use to build additional lessons.

Whatever the needs of the teachers, an effective program can be developed that meets their needs, inspires confidence, motivates students, and provides an arsenal of tools designed to help them accomplish their jobs with higher levels of success. Effective programs will find ways to let the teachers use and apply the information they are being taught. They will allow for a variety of modifications to a standard model to fit the specific needs of individual teachers. The most important feature seems to be that the programs find ways to increase perceptions of confidence. It is this belief that one can improve and that one has the tools to do so that seems to have been the most critical. In the case of this program, whether one is talking about the increase in language skills, the ability to create good lessons, or the ability to carry out good lessons, it was not the actual change that seemed to carry the most influence. Rather, the knowledge that there could be some improvement and that through time they would get better seemed to be the biggest motivating factor.

Further research needs to examine the effects of timely follow-up with the teachers. Contacting the teachers after some time has passed may make the teachers believe that they have a support structure or may serve as a tacit reminder to try to use the skills they learned. Having access to trainers or training materials after the end of the program may be an important component.

The relationship between language competence and language ability should also be examined in more detail. The relationship between these remains unclear. Future work should try to determine if there are minimum standards of proficiency necessary to see the effects observed in this study. Additionally, if proficiency is actually increased, do perceptions of confidence also go up commensurately?

As more and more nonnative English speakers seek training in TESOL methods, it behooves us to understand how to deliver the best and most effective programs possible. Understanding which factors lead to increased understanding and actual implementation of the methods once teachers have returned to their classrooms will lead to better results for students and teachers alike.

The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policy of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, Department of Army, Department of Defense, or U.S. government.

Authors

W. I. Griffith, PhD, is an instructor with ESL Services at the University of Texas at Austin. She specializes in accent modification and teacher training for nonnative speakers of English. Her research interests include technology in accent reduction and cultural factors related to second language acquisition.

Hye-Yeon Lim, PhD, is an associate professor at the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center. She has a PhD in foreign language education from the University of Texas at Austin. Her research interests include individual learner variables (i.e., motivation, anxiety) in foreign language acquisition, teacher development, and CALL.

References

Bax, S. (1997). Roles for a teacher educator in context-sensitive teacher education. *ELT Journal, 51*, 223-241.

Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal, 57*, 278-287.

Carrier, K. A. (2004). NNS teacher trainees in Western-based TESOL programs. *ELT Journal, 57*, 242-250.

Cullen, R. (1994). Incorporating a language improvement component in teacher training programmes. *ELT Journal, 48*, 162-172.

Ellis, R. (1986). Activities and procedures for teacher training. *ELT Journal, 40*, 91-99.

Ferguson, G., & Donno, S. (2003). One month teacher training course: Time for a change? *ELT Journal, 57*, 26-33.

Halbach, A. (2000). Trainee change through teacher training: A case study in training English language teachers in Spain. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 26*, 139-146.

Liu, D. (1998). Ethnocentrism in TESOL: Teacher education and the neglected needs of international TESOL students. *ELT Journal, 52*, 3-9.

Liu, D. (1999). Training non-native TESOL students: Challenges for TESOL teacher education in the West. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 197-210). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Murdoch, G. (1994). Language development provision in teacher training curricula. *ELT Journal, 48,* 253-265.

Leather, S. (2001). Teaching across cultures: Content, process, and dialogue. *ELT Journal, 55,* 228-237.

Richards, J. C. (1998). *Beyond training: Perspectives on language teacher education.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix A[1]
First-Day Questionnaire

I would like to get your opinion and views on a number of issues related to teaching English. Please take time to answer these questions as carefully and completely as you can. This will help me to create more useful and informative materials for you. This information will NOT be reported to either SEP or to COMEXUS. Your responses will be confidential and your identity and responses will not be revealed.

This first section consists of questions about your teaching experience and responsibilities.

1. What state do you currently teach in? _____
2. Have many years have you taught English? _____
3. Do you teach in _____ public schools _____ private schools
   (Please check all that apply)
4. How many hours each week do you teach English to:
   first grade   _____
   second grade _____
   third grade   _____

   Please specify where and at what level you teach if it is not middle school.
   _____

5. What is the average number of students in your classes? _____

This section is about your expectations for your teacher training course here at *[institution name goes here].* _____

6. Please list the three things you would most like to work on during this month?
   1.
   2.
   3.
7. What do you want to accomplish during your time in Austin? Please be as specific as possible.
8. Realistically, how much do you expect to change your approach to teaching based on your experience here? Please explain in some detail.

This final section concerns your views of teaching methods and approaches. Please answer as honestly as you can. There are no right or wrong answers.

_____

9. How would you describe a communicative lesson? What do you think a communicative lesson is?
10. What do you see as the most important features of communicative language teaching? Please list at least five features.
    •
    •
    •
    •
    •
11. What do you see as the major obstacle to using a communicative approach in your classroom?
12. How has your approach to teaching changed, if at all, since the government instituted its new curriculum in English using the communicative approach?
13. What do you see as the major problems in your classrooms making it difficult to teach English?
14. Do you see any weaknesses in the communicative approach? If yes, please list them briefly.
15. Please describe a typical week in your classes. Try to describe the kinds of activities you use, how you present material, and so on.
16. How frequently do you use the following activities in your classes? Please write the number corresponding to the following responses next to the items below.
    5 = every day 4 = most days 3 = 1-2 times a week 2 = rarely 1= never

    _____ pair or group work
    _____ individual work (workbook, silent reading, etc.)
    _____ drill work or pattern drills
    _____ quizzes or tests
    _____ review materials from previous lessons
    _____ students work online with Internet activities
    _____ use computer software in computer labs or rooms
    _____ use video in the classroom
    _____ use music in the classroom
    _____ use Total Physical Response (TPR) activities
    _____ use role-play
    _____ have students translate materials
    _____ use authentic materials in English
    _____ other, please specify

Endnote

[1] Space was provided in the actual questionnaires so that participants had space to write additional comments and to write their opinions.

Appendix B
Last-Day Questionnaire

Please take a few minutes to answer these questions as completely and meaningfully as you can. This will help us to revise the program and to make an even better program in the future. Your feedback is essential to us.

1. Have you changed your understanding of what a communicative lesson is? If so, in what ways has it changed?
2. Has your own confidence in your ability to teach English effectively changed over the summer? In what ways?
3. What was the most useful aspect of the program to you? Please tell us why you think it was the most useful.
4. What was the least useful aspect of the program to you? Please tell us why you think it was not useful for you.
5. Do you think that you have a clearer understanding of how to create more communicative lessons? What are the main ways in which you might change your lessons based on this workshop?
6. How much do you think you will change your approach to teaching English based on the things you have learned here?
7. What do you now think are the most important features of communicative language teaching? Please list at least five things.
8. Do you still feel that you will have the same problems with your classes as you listed when you first came here? Why or why not?

Appendix C
Postprogram Follow-Up Questionnaire

Now that you all have been back and teaching for about a month, I would really appreciate it if you could answer one final set of questions for me. I know you are all beyond busy but this will be very useful to me in the planning and implementation of the next program. As always, your answers will be kept in the strictest confidence and no one will ever be able to attach a name to the answers. Please, answer as completely and honestly as you can. As always, feel free to use either English or Spanish.

1. When you left Texas, most of you indicated that you felt that you would change your approach to teaching English in some significant ways. Have you been able to do that? If so, please tell me the major things you have changed. If not, tell me why you haven't been able to implement those changes.
2. Many of you felt that you would not have the same problems with your classes when you returned home because you had learned some new classroom-management skills. To what extent would you say that you STILL have the SAME problems with your classes now compared to before you came to *[institution name goes here]*?

3. To what extent have you been able to implement the ideas and strategies we discussed during the training sessions? How are your students responding to any changes you have made? Please be as specific as possible.
4. Overall, now that you have had a month to reflect on the things we worked on during the summer training sessions, can you see any differences in your classes, in your students, in your teaching, or in the mood of your classes? Could you please elaborate on any differences you see?
5. Finally, after having been back to work, how would you rate the *[institution name goes here]* Teacher Training Program now?
6. Please feel free to add any additional observations or comments about any aspect of the program that you think will be helpful for future groups.