

Research Project, Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (19320086)
English Edition 2010

Developing English Teacher Competencies

*An Integrated Study of Pre-service Training,
Professional Development,
Teacher Evaluation, and Certification Systems*

Edited by

Hisatake Jimbo
Ken Hisamura
Leonid Yoffe

July 2010

JACET SIG on English Education

Research Project, Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (19320086)
English Edition 2010

Developing English Teacher Competencies

*An Integrated Study of Pre-service Training,
Professional Development,
Teacher Evaluation, and Certification Systems*

Edited by

Hisatake Jimbo
Ken Hisamura
Leonid Yoffe

July 2010

JACET SIG on English Education

The English edition of the grant-in-aid for scientific research report

Published by the Special Interest Group of the Japan Association of College English
Teachers on English Education

c/o Hisatake Jimbo, School of Commerce, Waseda University

1-6-1 Nishi-Waseda, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 169-8050

© JACET SIG on English Education 2010

No part of this report may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing
from JACET SIG on English Education.

Printed by Tobunsha for the JACET SIG in Japan.

Acknowledgements

The undertaking of this project would not have been possible without the support and assistance of many people, both in Japan and overseas. Space constraints do not allow us to thank every individual who contributed to the making of this report. First, we would like to extend our sincere thanks to the following teachers who took the time to do surveys among student teachers in a timely and highly professional manner.

Inoi, Shinich (Ibaraki University), Ushiro, Yuji (Tsukkuba University), Oda, Masaki (Tamagawa University), Onoda, Sakae (Kanda Gaigo University), Kimura Matsuo (Aoyama Gakuin University), Shimizu, Uriko (Dokkyo University), Taguchi, Atsushi (Chikushi Gakuen University), Nakamura, Tomoko (Hiroshima Kokusai University), Nishikawa, Eiki (Daito Bunka University), Hayama, Megumi (Dokkyo University), Harada, Sonoko (Kobe Jyogakuin University), Miura, Seishin (Wayo University), Yamaguchi, Masafumi (Chigasaki City Nakajima Junior High School), Yokota, Hideki (Kanazawa Gakuin University)

We are also grateful to the following teachers and superintendents who took the time to conduct surveys among novice teachers. They demonstrated a strong interest in improving English teacher education in Japan and we thank them for their dedication.

Karino, Hiroomi (Nagasaki Prefectural Education Department), Iwasaki, Nobuteru (Nagoya City Education Center), Endo, Hiroyuki (Saitama City Institute of Education), Takasaka, Hitomi (Okayama City Education Center), Sugawara, Fumie (Morioka City Board of Education), Nakahara, Yasuo (Gifu Prefectural Board of Education)

The data collected by our two research teams dispatched to the United States, and France was extremely valuable, and we want to acknowledge the guidance and insights provided by the policy makers, academics, education administrators and teachers listed below.

United States

Patty J. Horn, College of Education, Northern Arizona University (NAU)

Fredricka Stoller and William Grabe, English Department, NAU

Jean Boreen, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Letters, NAU

France

Ross Wright,	President of France TESOL
Philia Thalgott,	Project Manager, Language Policy Div. Council of Europe
Sergey Khrychikov	Chief Administrator, Migration Div. Council of Europe
Claire Extramiana	Responsible for French Language Ed., French Ministry of Culture and Communication
Cecile Cochy-Faure	Section Chief, Immigration Processing and Linguistic Integration Section, French Ministry of Immigration
Jean-Claude Beacco	Department of French as a Foreign Language, L'Universite de Sorbonne Nouvelle Paris III

July 25, 2010

Hisatake Jimbo, Leader, Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research Project
Ken Hisamura, Head, JACET SIG on English Education

Contributors to the English Edition

Editors:

Jimbo, Hisatake. Professor, Waseda University
Hisamura, Ken. Professor, Den-en Chofu University
Yoffe, Leonid. Full-time Lecturer, Waseda University

Co-authored by:

Asaoka, Chitose. Associate Professor, Dokkyo University
Endo, Yukie. Full-time Lecturer, Seisen University
Hisamura, Ken. Professor, Den-en Chofu University
Imamura, Hiromi. Professor, Chubu University
Ito, Mika. Associate Professor, Tokai University
Jimbo, Hisatake. Professor, Waseda University
Kiyota, Yoichi. Associate Professor, Meisei University
Nakayama, Natsue. Associate Professor, Maebashi Kyoai Gakuen College
Osaki, Satsuki. Full-time Lecturer, Soka University
Sakai, Shien. Professor, Chiba University of Commerce
Takagi, Akiko. Associate Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University
Yoffe, Leonid. Full-time Lecturer, Waseda University

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	1
Contributors to the English Edition	2
Executive Summary	5
Chapter 1 Adapting EPOSTL to the Japanese Educational Context	
Section 1: Research Background and Objectives	16
I Background	16
II Major findings in previous research surveys	23
III Research Project and Objectives	30
Section 2: Making the first adaptation of EPOSTL Self-Assessment	
Descriptors	31
I Procedure for Developing the First Adaptation of the EPOSTL	
Descriptors in the Japanese Educational Context	31
II First Adaptation with Comments	33
Section 3: Contextualization of EPOSTL within Japanese Teacher	
Education Systems (1)	48
I The Objective of the Present Study	48
II Results	48
III Discussion	54
Section 4: A Study on Contextualization of EPOSTL in Japanese	
Teacher Education (2)	56
I Background, Objectives, and Questionnaire	56
II Major Findings	57
III Discussion	58
IV Conclusion	59
Section 5: Challenges and prospects for further research	60
Chapter 2 Mentoring Programs Developed at Northern Arizona	
University: Implications for Japanese Teacher Education	
I Background	66
II Teacher Induction Program at Northern Arizona University	70
III Summary of mentor training program@ NAU	75
IV Implications for Japanese Teacher Education	76

Chapter 3 Training English Teachers in France: The Role of the	
<i>Concours</i>	
Introduction	80
Education System in France	81
Pre-service Training of Secondary School Teachers.....	81
<i>Concours</i>	81
Criticism of the <i>Concours</i>	82
CAPES Examination	83
Agregation Examination	83
Discussion and Conclusion	85
Attachment	89
Chapter 1	
Self-Assessment Descriptors for Student Teachers of English in Japan	89
Section 2: Making an Adaptation of the Self-Assessment Section in the EPOSTL	
1. The deleted descriptors and the reason for deletion in the process of	
developing first adaptation	95
2. A List of Descriptor Numbers with Modification	104
Section 3: A Study of Contextualization of EPOSYL in Japanese Teacher	
Education (1): New list of descriptors (example)	106

Executive Summary

Chapter 1 Adapting EPOSTL to the Japanese Educational Context

Section 1: Research Background and Objectives

I Background

1. EPOSTL: the concept and goals

The European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL: Newby et al, 2007) was developed by an international team of teacher educators in EU. It consists of three main sections: a personal statement, a self-assessment, and a dossier. This research project focuses on a self-assessment section. The 193 ‘can-do’ descriptors in the self-assessment section were elaborated not as a fixed qualification profile, but as competences for both student teachers and practicing teachers to strive to attain throughout their teaching career.

2. An overview of the recent trends of education reform in Japan

The political, social and educational background of this research project is provided under the following headings:

2.1 Teacher education reform

2.2 Changes of the perceptions of the teaching profession

2.3 English language teacher education reform

2.3.1 Expectations of competences of EFL teachers

2.3.2 Re-training programs for all the secondary-school EFL teachers

3. An overview of recent trends in EFL teacher education

This section looks at the present social and professional standing of EFL teachers first, and then, focuses on the current status of reflection-oriented EFL teacher education. The headings are as follows:

3.1 Present perceptions of EFL teachers

3.2. Reflection-oriented EFL teacher education

3.2.1 Reflective approach

3.2.2 Action research

(1) Task-exploring type of action research

(2) A successful example of action research

3.2.3 Reflective practice

(1) Rationale for reflective practice

(2) Limitations of reflective practice

II Major findings in previous research surveys

This section provides an overview of major findings of the surveys conducted by the JACET SIG on English Education (hereafter SIG) between 1998 and 2009 and by the Teacher Education Research Group (hereafter TERG) between 2001 and 2004. They are categorized and summarized under the following headings.

1. Pre-service teacher education

1.1 A major change in English teaching methodology courses

1.2 Competences required of student teachers in the teacher training programs

1.2.1 English ability

1.2.2 Didactic competences

1.2.3 Professional aptitude

2. Qualities of student teachers necessary for employment

3. Professional competences of practicing EFL teachers

3.1 English ability

3.1.1 Desirable English proficiency for EFL teachers based on the standardized tests

3.1.2 Benchmarks of English ability

3.2 Pedagogical competences

3.2.1 Qualities of pedagogical competences

3.2.2 Benchmarks for pedagogical competences

3.3 Competence stages of English teachers

III Research Project and Objectives

1. Rationale

The present teacher education paradigm in Japan should be shifted to the one in which teachers could take ownership of their professional development and promote autonomy. Therefore, the research focuses on learning profiles for reflection, and teacher evaluation from the viewpoint of continuing professional development (CPD).

MEXT (2008) has proposed to introduce a self-assessment checklist composed of four dimensions into teacher training programs. However, the government has not provided any specific descriptors for each dimension. This has been left to the discretion of individual institutions.

Teacher evaluation conducted by boards of education, on the other hand, is generally based on self-assessment and job performance appraisal. Professional development (PD) activities are not included in assessment because professional

standards, competences, or motivational tools for CPD have not been developed.

Thus, it was decided by the SIG members to make an adaptation of the EPOSTL as an educational and motivational instrument for the Japanese educational setting.

2. Objectives

- The ultimate goal of this research project is to develop and disseminate Japanese portfolio for pre-service as well as in-service teachers of languages including self-assessment descriptors which may be regarded as a set of core competences language teachers should strive to attain.
- In order to accomplish this goal, this year's project aims to make the first draft of adaptation of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors within the context of Japanese EFL teacher education.

Section 2: Making an Adaptation of the Self-Assessment Section in the EPOSTL

I Procedure for Developing the First Adaptation of the EPOSTL Descriptors

1. Procedure

The first adaptation of the self-assessment section was elaborated as follows:

- 193 descriptors in EPOSTL were translated into Japanese,
- the descriptors apparently incompatible with the Japanese educational context were deleted, modified, or integrated,
- 144 descriptors left after the treatment above were examined by English teacher trainers at several universities,

As a result of these three steps, 100 descriptors were found appropriate.

2. Criteria for developing the first adaptation

- (1) Modify descriptors which do not match curricular content or pedagogical methods adopted in Japanese secondary schools.
- (2) Modify or delete descriptors which require English language or pedagogical competences that exceed those required of the English language teachers in Japan.
- (3) Basically delete or modify descriptors if substantial modification will be needed to match the reality of Japanese students in a teacher training course.
- (4) Use terms or expressions that would be understandable to Japanese students in a teacher training course.
- (5) Combine descriptors if their contents overlap within the parameters of the Japanese educational settings.

3. Some adjustments made at the third step

For the third step, 144 descriptors left after the second treatment were examined by 33 English teacher trainers at several universities.

If the majority of the reviewers judged the descriptor to:

- ① be appropriate: it was adopted without modification.
- ④ be not appropriate: it was removed from the list.
- ②③ require slight or significant change, the wording and the content was elaborated to match the Japanese educational context. However, if a significant modification was required but no acceptable substitute could be found to reflect the needs of the Japanese teacher training context, the item was deleted.

II The First Adaptation of the EPOSTL Descriptors in Japanese Educational Context

The 100 descriptors are listed in Attachment.

Section 3: A Study on Contextualization of EPOSTL in Japanese Teacher Education (1)

I Objective and Procedure

1. Objective

The study sought to identify which EPOSTL descriptors would conform to the realities of the Japanese educational context based on the responses of the student teachers who have completed their practicum.

2. Respondents

One hundred and seventy eight undergraduate and graduate students from sixteen universities who had completed their teaching practicum participated in this survey conducted from July, 2009 to January, 2010

II Results

Some common perceptions were identified among student teachers. They were categorized as follows: 1) “basic instruction”, 2) “individual instruction and assessment”, 3) “advanced instruction of communicative English”.

Category 1 was composed of seven factors: “improving classroom teaching”, “understanding of educational environment”, “lesson planning”, “conducting communicative lessons”, “selecting appropriate instructional materials”, “flexible treatment to situations”, and “adjustment by reflection.”

Category 2 was composed of “judgment of learner’s ability”, and “individual

instruction for learners.”

Category 3 was composed of “advanced instruction of communicative English”, and “preparation for instruction.”

III Discussion

While the author recognizes that all descriptors have relevance in the educational settings the objective of the present study was to examine the data from all respondents as a whole. Thus, factors exhibiting a low overlapping value were deleted from the document. Deleted descriptors are six descriptors with the ceiling effect, seventeen descriptors with the overlapping value of less than 0.35, and three descriptors from Factor four. As for the deletion of the descriptors with a low overlapping value, all of them are necessary in real educational settings and it is understandable all of them are important. Consequently, a reexamination is warranted. As the objective of the present study is the analysis of respondents’ data as a whole, the descriptors with a perceived low overlapping value were deleted.

Section 4: A Study on Contextualization of EPOSTL in Japanese Teacher Education (2)

I Objective and Procedure

1. Objective

The objective of the trial was to carefully screen the 100 survey questions and explore the understanding of the novice teachers, in order to make EPOSTL applicable to the Japanese educational setting.

2. Respondents

Thirty-three novice teachers at local education boards of six prefectures were requested to answer 100 questions from July 2009 to January 2010. Some of the wording in the survey questions for student teachers was changed. For example, the phrase “other trainees” was changed to “my peers.”

II Results

- Internal scale reliability (α): 0.971
- After the factor-analysis, only one factor was extracted. It was found that some activities had a low rate of implementation.
- Several descriptors showed a significant difference, either high or low, as compared with the data obtained from prospective teachers.

III Discussion

Compared with the data of the student teachers, the seven descriptors that indicated a ceiling effect also showed a high significant difference or tendency of significance. Most novice teachers take it for granted that the activities presented in those seven descriptors will be carried out. These may be fostered by the on-the-job experience of novice teachers, in the local community and at the junior and senior high school.

The seven descriptors with a low rate of implementation are thought to require novice teachers to have advanced practical competence.

Considering that none of the analyzed descriptors indicated a floor effect, that the internal scale reliability of the responses was extremely high (0.971), and that the analysis yielded only one factor, it is possible to conclude the novice teachers had very common notions of education. The commonality of perceptions is likely to be the by-product of the similarity in their teaching practice.

IV Conclusion

Except for the seven descriptors that indicated a ceiling effect and the seven descriptors that showed a low rate of implementation, the remaining eighty six descriptors can be regarded as activities that novice teachers are able to implement, and as appropriate descriptors to use in a checklist for measuring the awareness of novice teachers who have been working in the classroom for more than six months.

Since the seven descriptors showing a low rate of implementation are considered to require novice teachers to have applied advanced pedagogical techniques, they can be included in a checklist for in-service teachers with more than one-year experience.

Section 5: Challenges and prospects for further research

1. Defining the purpose of the self-assessment descriptors

This first adaptation was developed as a set of competences which EFL teachers should strive to attain. However, to ensure the effectiveness of this instrument in the Japanese context, it is imperative to provide a clear definition of the purpose of self-assessment descriptors, namely role will they serve for teacher education. The purpose of the list can be defined in several ways. The organization, contents, and numbers of the descriptors will be contingent upon its purpose. The present adaptation is just the first step in the process which should be examined and improved through action research and consultations with stakeholders.

2. Identifying the areas of professional competences

The EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors are sub-divided into seven categories which “represent areas in which teachers require a variety of competences and need to make decisions related to teaching (Newby et al, 2007).” As far as English language teaching is concerned, these seven categories can be adapted to the Japanese context. However, teachers’ responsibilities in Japan extend well beyond the realm of the classroom. In order to perform various important duties, teachers have to possess certain qualities and aptitudes. These aspects are not included in the EPOSTL descriptors. Therefore, it would be necessary to broaden the checklist in order to include personal qualities necessary to cope with the professional demands on language teachers outside the classroom.

3. Establishing standards for language teacher education

Developing EPOSTL in the Japanese context was a challenging endeavor as, there are no standards or benchmarks for professional competences except for English literacy level of EFL teachers, namely STEP pre-1st grade. Therefore, it is expected that the development and dissemination of this adaptation will help researchers, teacher educators, teachers, supervisors, and other stakeholders become aware of the importance of standards for language teacher education. If we identify the descriptors appropriate for prospective teachers as well as define the purpose of the EPOSTL adaptation, it will help establish standards of language teacher education. The adaptation of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors will support the policy of MEXT not only to enhance and define professional competences of language teachers, but also to create a new system of continuing professional development. This project will hopefully become a stepping stone in this complex but vital process.

4. Action plan for 2010-2012

To refine this adaptation and to advance this project further, the following activities have been organized or are currently contemplated:

- workshop in the context of the JACET-Kanto Chapter Conference , June 20, 2010,
- presentation at the Asia TEFL Conference, Hanoi, Vietnam, August 6-8, 2010,
- inviting Professor D. Newby, EPOSTL chief coordinator, both to the joint symposium of JACET, Japanese Association of German Literature, and Japanese Society of French Language Education on August 20, and to the JACET Summer Seminar in Kusatsu, August 22-25, 2010,
- symposium on the development and the ultimate objective of the EPOSTL adaptation in the Japanese context at the 2010 JACET Annual Conference in Miyagi, September 7-9, 2010,

- the second joint symposium of JACET, Japanese Association of German Literature, Japanese Society of French Language Education, and Society of Japanese Language Education on March 18, 2011.
- national surveys among prospective teachers mainly at private universities which offer teacher training courses in 2010-2012.
- national surveys among practicing teachers taking the mandatory re-training programs under the auspices of local boards of education in 2010-2012.

Chapter 2 Mentoring Programs Developed at Northern Arizona University: Implications for Japanese Teacher Education

I Background

1. Teacher's professional development and standards

The Commission of the European Communities (2007) explains that the quality of teaching is one key factor that can increase its competitiveness. Teacher quality is significantly and positively correlated with pupil attainment and that it is the most important within-school aspect explaining student performance. Furthermore, it states an in-service training program raised children's achievement and suggests that teacher training may provide a less costly means of increasing test scores than reducing class size or adding school hours. In fact, the current education policy trend in developed countries is to set professional teacher standards depending on teachers' stages of development. However, the Japanese educational context lacks clearly defined standards which individual teachers should follow in their career paths. At least for the public in-service training, it is clear that setting realistic and progressive standards depending on teachers' developmental pathway to enhance their career-long professional development would be necessary because their chosen occupation requires teachers to develop professionally throughout their career. However, it remains to be seen whether the creation of these standards will be in itself a sufficient measure to resolve a myriad of problems related to the issue of quality of public school educators in Japan.

2. Teacher development and mentoring system

By reviewing research or through visits to Canada, the United States, and the UK, the authors came to understand that training and competency standards should be understood within the framework of professional development and in promoting professional development mentors play a central role. Also, we found that mentoring

is not equivalent to that in Japanese who also plays a central role in induction training because a coach to a novice teacher in Japan is often appointed mostly because of his / her teaching experience and recommendation by the supervisor. Usually, mentors in some jurisdictions in the United States were trying to promote teachers' professional development on the basis of with various educational standards or benchmarks set. There was also systematic mentor training provided

3. The difference between expert and novice teachers

According to Westerman (1991, cited in Boreen et al. 2008), there are four differences between expert and novice teachers in terms of their decision-making process.

- 1) Experienced teachers integrated present learning with past and future learning and drew connections to other disciplines.
- 2) Veteran teachers tended to use proactive strategies to prevent management problems.
- 3) Experienced teachers were more likely to see the “big picture”.
- 4) Experienced teachers evaluated their lessons according to their students' needs and growth in understanding.

II Teacher Induction Program at Northern Arizona University

The authors decided to visit Northern Arizona University (NAU) in March, 2009 to investigate how mentoring worked in a real educational context. In this report, we will also provide a brief literature review, and then, we will offer policy and recommendations to improve teacher education system in Japan.

1. Characteristic and Goals of Teacher Induction Program at NAU

- 1) The Teacher Induction Program at Northern Arizona University is based on nine common elements for effective teacher induction identified by the Arizona K-12 Center's Teacher Induction Research Project. These are as follows: (1) Orientation (2) Time (3) Adjusting (4) Formal Mentoring (5) Professional Development (6) Opportunities for Collegial Interaction (7) Teacher Assessment (8) Program Evaluation (9) Induction Continuum
- 2) There are seven goals in this Program: (1) Accelerate Beginning Teachers' practice as defined by the Arizona Professional Teacher Standards. (2) Develop full-time Mentors who employ a variety of formative assessment tools and strategies. (3) Build Beginning Teacher capacity to analyze student work to improve student achievement. (4) Assist Beginning Teachers in demonstrating ongoing self-assessment and reflection. (5) Develop a professional learning community

among Beginning Teachers and Mentors. (6) Increase the Beginning Teacher retention rate. (7) Implement the Nine Common Elements of a Teacher Induction Program.

3) Three key principles of mentor-mentee relationship: (1) Mentor should not assess his/her mentee (2) Mentor should not instruct his/her mentee (3) Mentor and mentee should build a trusting relationship.

4) Assessment cycle that promotes mentor development: How is mentor development assessed? TIP supports life long learning through implementing individual “mentor’s growth plan”. The center for life long learning develops a formative assessment cycle for the mentor and this cycle is used for mentor’s professional growth. This formative assessment cycle consists of three major components: Setting goals, Data collection, and Reflection.

III Discussion

1. Characteristics of the mentor training program

The above mentioned characteristics of the mentor training program can be summarized as follows:

(1) Very clear training policy is necessary to make mentoring successful (2) “Goal setting Data collection and Reflection cycle” forms the basis for professional development. (3) Mentor-mentee relationship should not be hierarchical. Rather, the relationship should be equal and generate mutual trust.

IV Implications for teacher education in Japan

1. A need to establish a cohesive set of standards for teacher education.
2. A need of meta-cognitive training.
3. A needs to promote cooperation between secondary and tertiary level institutions.

Chapter 3 Training English Teachers in France: The Role of the *Concours*

At present virtually all French students (approx. 97%) study English as a foreign language, most starting in grade two or three of primary school and continuing for over a decade. This clearly represents a significant investment of time and resources by the French educational authorities and underscores the importance the government of France accords to making students proficient in English. Yet, despite this national effort, the English skills of French students, as measured by the results of

international assessments, have showed a marked decline. The disappointing results put the spotlight on the quality of English education, and more specifically on the issue of *concours*, or highly competitive civil service examinations. The present paper offers some basic information about the education system in France, provides an overview of the teacher training system, and describes the challenges posed by the *concours*.

The critics attack the validity of the tests, claiming that the rigorous recruitment examinations do not test skills applicable in the classroom and, further, require little production in English. The analysis of the two instruments, however, reveals that test-takers do need to demonstrate proficiency in spoken and written English at a relatively high level. Similarly, the accusations of the overuse of French seem out of place. Half of the examinations is arguably conducted in English in either a spoken or a written form..

While *concours* have their limitations, they should not be singularly blamed for the declining English proficiency of French pupils. *Concours* represent a legitimate barrier to the entry into the teaching profession and should be viewed as a barometer of potential, rather than actual, teaching ability. Prospective teachers take the exams normally during their first year of study at a teacher-training college and, whether successful or not, spend one more year on learning classroom management and other practical skills.

Perhaps where the *concours* system does fail both students and teachers is in the area of practical training. Pre-service educators are given a class to teach at the very start of their teaching practicum, while simultaneously they need to learn about the theory and practice of teaching. The system needs to be revised to allow for a more flexible curriculum in which practical classroom teaching is built not only on the intensive preparation for (relevant) recruitment exams, but also on the periods of classroom observation, discussions with in-service professionals, and incremental increases in teaching and administrative responsibilities.

Chapter 1

Adapting EPOSTL to the Japanese Educational Context

Section 1: Research Background and Objectives

Ken Hisamura

I Background

1. EPOSTL: the concept and goals

The European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL: Newby et al, 2007) was developed for the European Centre for Modern Languages of the Council of Europe by an international team of teacher educators. It was built on basis of three documents: *Common European Framework of Reference* for Languages (CEFR), the European Language Portfolio (ELP), and the European Profile for Language Teacher Education—A Frame of Reference (Profile). The EPOSTL is “intended for students undergoing their initial teacher education which encourages them to reflect on the didactic knowledge and skills necessary to teach languages, helps them to assess their own didactic competences and enables them to monitor their progress and to record their experiences of teaching during the course of their teacher education (p.83).” It consists of three main sections: a personal statement, a self-assessment, and a dossier. This research project focuses on a self-assessment section.

The self-assessment section containing 193 ‘can-do’ descriptors somewhat similar to the CEFR statements is designed to “facilitate reflection and self-assessment by student teachers (p.84).” The descriptors were elaborated not as a fixed qualification profile, but as competences for both student teachers and practicing teachers to strive to attain throughout their teaching career. They are grouped into seven general categories—Context, Methodology, Resources, Lesson Planning, Conducting a Lesson, Independent Learning, and Assessment of Learning, most of which are divided into several subcategories

As of November 2008, the EPOSTL “is being translated into 11 languages, according to David Newby, EPOSTL coordinator (Jimbo & Yoffe, 2009).”

2. An overview of the recent trends of education reform in Japan

2.1 Teacher education reform

Over the past 10 years, education reform has been one of the crucial, social, and political issues in Japan. Media attention has focused on suicides committed by school students because of bullying, the decline in academic standards of students (e.g. the results of OECD Programme for International Student Assessment: PISA), a series of scandals caused by school teachers, or misguidance conducted by under-performing teachers. The Japanese government has taken a number of measures to address these problems including setting up advisory committees and initiating relevant legislations (e.g. the Fundamental Law on Education amended in 2006 for the first time in 60 years). Among them, teacher education has been a focal point of education reform agenda.

In 1998, the Education Personnel Certification Act was partly amended. This amendment has proved directly applicable to the programs of pre-service teacher education. The number of credits required for the acquisition of teaching qualification has increased: for example, lengthening the period of practicum at junior high school from two to four weeks and adding a new subject which requires universities to develop a learning profile with a self-assessment checklist of individual students. Subsequently, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (hereafter MEXT) undertook inspections of teacher education programs at universities to ascertain whether they have abided by this amendment.

Regarding mandatory re-training of practicing teachers, MEXT stipulated that teachers should attend re-training programs every ten years, and requested local boards of education to implement the teacher evaluation system in 2003-2005. In addition, in 2009, MEXT launched the teacher certification renewal system which obliges practicing teachers to follow 30 hour training programs provided by universities every ten years.

2.2 Changes of the perceptions of the teaching profession

After World War II, teaching has been defined in three different ways in the Japanese political and social context (Ayabe, 2009). During the Cold War period, combined with the collision of ideology, teaching was considered as a vocation on one hand, and on the other hand, as a job. In other words, the image of teachers was

two-fold: teachers as priest-like figures and teachers as laborers. Since the end of the Cold War, however, the third concept has become dominant: that is, teaching as a profession.

This concept is based on the idea that just like doctors or lawyers, teachers are professionals who have or should have every aspect of professionalism such as high-quality of professional knowledge and skills, qualifications necessary for education, good personality, self-devotion, commitment to learning community, etc. Thus, there has been a sequence of policy developments through which the quality and professional competences of teachers should be constantly reviewed or assessed to maintain and enhance standards of education. Implementations of the teacher certification renewal system, revision of the wage system for teachers, pilot external reviews, teacher evaluation systems, etc. are some of the examples of the mechanisms implemented to sustain a required level of professionalism in the teaching industry.

2.3 English language teacher education reform

2.3.1 Expectations of competences of EFL teachers

The rationale behind the recent reform of English language education is to develop the student communicative ability in English at each stage of school education. An advisory committee organized in 2001 for the purpose of improving English language education points out that English education in Japan has so far failed in producing English users who can work in today's globalized world (MEXT, 2001). Therefore, it is considered necessary to change the English education paradigm to the one in which learners can acquire communicative competence in English.

The advisory committee suggests the guidelines for EFL teachers' competences: how to develop English proficiency required of Japanese people living in the 21st century. They are not itemized, but the main points are as follows (Hisamura & Jimbo, 2008):

- to strengthen learners' motivation,
- to employ teaching materials and methods appropriate for each grade,
- to get learners to recognize the roles of Japan and Japanese people in the international society,
- to get learners to master grammar, structures, functions, and vocabulary stipulated in the Course of Study,
- to generate learners' incentives to communicate in English,
- to develop learners' English competences as their communication skill,

- to acquire comprehensive teaching skills to harness in various classroom situations,
- to provide opportunities for learners to enhance their communicative ability by using ICT.

Based on the proposal submitted by the committee, MEXT stipulates in the Strategic Plan (2002) that all the teachers of English should possess English ability, equivalent to pre-1st Grade of the STEP (Society for Testing English Proficiency) test, TOEFL (PBT) 550, and TOEIC 730, and didactic competences. The latter, however, are not explained in any detail. However, it is evident that they are in line with the above guidelines suggested by the committee. Teachers of English are required to conduct communication-oriented lessons by utilizing various communication activities in English. This is the first time for the government to make a specific reference to English ability and to didactic competences of EFL teachers. After the publication of this strategic document, MEXT instructed local authorities to design and provide mandatory re-training programs for all their practicing EFL teachers.

2.3.2 Re-training programs for all the secondary-school EFL teachers

The Action Plan (2003) formulated by MEXT required every EFL teacher at a secondary school to follow a retraining program designed and provided by local authorities. The objective of this policy was to improve EFL teachers' English ability and teaching skills up to the levels suggested above. The re-training system started in 2002, and ended in 2007. More than 300,000 EFL teachers participated in the programs over five years. However, the effectiveness of the programs has never been monitored or assessed.

Meanwhile, in 2006, MEXT conducted a national survey among EFL teachers at secondary schools focusing on their English proficiency. It revealed that the percentage of junior-high-school EFL teachers who had passed STEP pre-1st grade, or obtained at least a score of 550 and 730 on TOEFL (PBT) and TOEIC, respectively, was 24.8 % whereas that of senior-high-school teachers 48.4 %.

The English language education policy outlined in the action plan is still continued. The new Course of Study to be implemented in 2013 describes clearly that as a rule English lessons should be conducted in English.

3. An overview of recent trends in EFL teacher education

3.1 Present perceptions of EFL teachers

Otani (2007) demonstrates, analyzing the changes of linguistic and cultural values of Japanese people since the Meiji Restoration, that the pendulum has swung three times in Japan, at about 20-year intervals, from ‘English-crazed’ to ‘anti-English’ attitudes. He also points out that this is the fourth ‘English-crazed’ age, saying that at no other period of time except for today have we witnessed an environment in which many laymen teach English and, thus, professionals and amateurs are hardly distinguishable in the world of English education in Japan today.

The estimated number of ordinary university students who teach junior high school students English as private tutors at home or at cram school part-time amounts to 700,000, one and half times the number of EFL practicing teachers. To illustrate this point further, some unemployed Ph.Ds. specializing in science applied for the full-time position of English instructors at a certain university in Kansai. Even though English was not their major, applicants emphasized their language skills.

Even MEXT has shown inadequate understanding of the needs of the teaching profession (Hisamura, 2009). English will be a compulsory subject for 5th and 6th graders at elementary schools from the 2011 academic year, although the number of elementary-school teachers with English teaching ability is obviously insufficient. The Action Plan formulated by MEXT regarding the incorporation of English teaching into elementary school curriculum contains the following sentence: “such as special part-time instructors, members of society who are proficient in English through overseas experiences and foreign students will be promoted.” This implies that no special training or professional qualification is necessary for the classroom instructors, which goes contrary to the spirit of professionalism.

To distinguish between professional and amateurs, as Otani (ibid) suggests, the paradigm of initial teacher education and teacher development should be drastically altered, and he concludes that an EFL teacher is a professional who can encourage learners to foster and raise cross-lingual and cultural awareness or understanding i.e. understanding of others from different cultures.

Much can be debated about Otani’s definition of professional EFL teachers; however, his suggestion on the paradigm shift of pre-and in-service teacher education is valuable and long-reaching.

3.2. Reflection-oriented EFL teacher education

Reflection is considered as a key word for paradigm shift of teacher education. EPOSTL itself is subtitled ‘A reflection tool for language teacher education.’ In order

to adapt the EPOSTL in the Japanese context, it will be necessary to look at how far the concept of reflection prevails in English teacher education in Japan.

3.2.1 Reflective approach

Reflective approach was first advocated by Hatta (2000), which attracted much attention of teacher educators. He argues that English language education in Japan has lacked systematic research into aspects of teacher development or growth and a methodological approach to analyzing teacher beliefs fostered in their classroom teaching experiences. He suggests incorporating theory and practice of reflection into the English teaching methodology syllabus, which will cause the paradigm shift of pre-service teacher education. The main points of his proposals are:

- students should experience observation and reflection through micro-teaching by using video tapes in English teaching methodology class at college, and, during their teaching practicum, they should experience on-site training in a reflective way under the guidance of mentors,
- evaluation of practice teaching should be made from the perspectives of class-observation, performance, and reflection. .

It is evident that Hatta played an important role in disseminating the concept of reflection in pre-service teacher education. We find few examples of reflective way of teaching in the results of a survey conducted by the JACET SIG on Teacher Education in 1998 and in 2002. Yet, according to the survey conducted in 2008, 92% of the respondents who were in charge of English teaching methodology classes claimed to provide micro-teaching, and 40% of them encouraged their students to engage in self-assessment and reflection using various media. Respondents also indicated that their students reflected on their teaching experiences in writing or through a discussion.

3.2.2 Action research

(1) Task-exploring type of action research

Yokomizo (2009) defines the concept of teacher development as a paradigm which aims to support and realize individual teacher's professional growth. He also points out that teachers themselves should be reflective practitioners as well as self-directed teachers. In order to shift teacher education paradigm from the concept of 'teacher training' to that of 'teacher development', teachers should change themselves by following a cycle of reflection, performance, observation, and improvement through non-critical dialogs on-site with their colleagues. He advocates a 'collaborative

task-exploring type of action research' for this paradigm shift on the assumption that it is easier to hold non-critical dialogs through this type of action research than through the hypothesis-testing type. In the task-exploring type of action research, the effectiveness of teaching strategies used in the classroom is assessed based on field-notes, teaching logs, or diaries from the teacher's viewpoints, not on quantitative data. The hypothesis-testing type, on the other hand, weighs scientific analyses and subjectivity through quantitative data, which leads to critical dialogs.

(2) A successful example of action research

The action research implementation project conducted by a group of secondary-school EFL teachers in Kochi Prefecture resulted in positive changes of teachers' attitudes (Nagasaki, 2009). It helped teachers be more reflective on their professional performance, become more positive in the classroom, realize the improvement of their classroom teaching, and become aware of the value of classroom management. Nagasaki points out that some factors responsible for these changes are ownership of their research, systematic reflection, explicit goals and a sense of achievement, supportive and collaborative learning environment, etc. He also suggests some future challenges such as reviewing of on-site training, training of mentors, and school-directed motivation management.

3.2.3 Reflective practice

(1) Rationale for reflective practice

Reflective practice has been advocated by Tamai (2009a, 2009b) who has taken this method in his graduate-school course for in-service teacher students for several years. Tamai defines reflective practice as a method of teacher research which motivates teachers to advance their professional development by reflecting on their classroom teaching experiences. Teacher development would not be possible with the acquisition of professional knowledge and skills only. It would also be impossible to make intelligent action plans for future teaching if observation were targeted only at students' reactions. Teachers should set a target of observation on their own teaching, and understand themselves more deeply as well as their students. In this process of self-observation, they could become aware of the value of supporting and understanding learners and of changing teacher beliefs, which leads to teacher development.

Tamai sets three pillars of theory and practice for his graduate course as follows: experiential learning through reflective cycle, KASA (knowledge, attitude, skill,

awareness) as a frame of reflection, and learner-centeredness. Reflective cycle consists of three elements: experiences occurring in the process of teaching, description of the specific junctures or experiences which more or less attract attention during classroom teaching, interpretation and analysis, and intelligent action which helps teachers create concrete teaching plans. Pedagogical instruments for this practice will be Teaching Journal, Interview, Reflective Video, and Focused Paper. Among them, Tamai has used Teaching Journal which he claimed to be effective.

(2) Limitations of reflective practice

Tamai points out challenges as well as the benefits of reflective practice for teacher education. In reflective practice, teacher trainers or mentors are required to act on an equal footing with their trainees. If a trainer is a university professor, as Tamai puts it, it is difficult to maintain an equal relationship with his/her trainees. At a conference for the improvement of teaching skills, for example, it is very likely that the comment made by a professor will dominate the whole conference just like a sermon at a religious ritual because it sounds very authoritative. Therefore, participants including teaching practitioners will likely listen to and accept the comment without any discussion. Tamai adds that there are both advantages and disadvantages in his graduate course in which he plays two different roles by himself: one as a teacher, the other as a mentor.

In teacher education courses, no professors, even if they are well trained teacher trainers, could avoid this challenge. Also, Tamai's graduate course is considered as limiting and individual because his class size is very small, most of his students are practicing teachers, and Teaching Journal is used as a pedagogical tool. In this context, reflective practice, although very effective, seems difficult to disseminate in the teacher training programs across the country. It will be necessary to develop a more practical educational tool like the EPOSTL and to train on-site as many mentors as possible.

II Major findings in previous research surveys

This section provides an overview of major findings of the surveys conducted by the JACET SIG on English Education (hereafter SIG) between 1998 and 2009 and by the Teacher Education Research Group (hereafter TERG) between 2001 and 2004. These findings will be helpful in understanding the present status of teacher education in Japan and will contribute to the development and dissemination of the EPOSTL

adaptation in the Japanese context.

1. Pre-service teacher education

1.1 A major change in English teaching methodology courses

The SIG conducted surveys about English teaching methodology courses among teacher educators at universities and colleges across the country in 1998, 2002, and 2008. In these past ten years, what has been most changed in the course is:

- more courses are conducted in a small, seminar-style class with ample opportunities for practical activities such as writing lesson plans, doing microteaching, video recording the microteaching for reflection (SIG, 2009).

1.2 Competences required of student teachers in the teacher training programs

1.2.1 English ability

The SIG has made two different proposals regarding English ability of student teachers. The first one is based on the survey results among teacher educators in 2002 as follows:

- prerequisites for a teaching methodology course and for teaching practicum should be passing STEP 2nd grade which corresponds to a score of 450 and 500 on TOEFL (PBT) and TOEIC 500, respectively
- English proficiency required of practicing teachers should tentatively be passing STEP pre-1st grade ,
- national criteria or standards of English proficiency for secondary-school EFL teachers should be established(SIG, 2003).

In addition, elements of English abilities required of student teachers for practice teaching are revealed in the surveys conducted among their trainers at secondary schools in 2004 and 2005. They are:

- basic requirement: to be able to read the textbook with appropriate pronunciation,
- oral English competences: to possess sufficient skills to teach English in English, and to communicate in English with ALTs (Assistant Language Teachers),
- English reading and grammatical competences: to be able to answer correctly questions on the English examinations set by the National Center for the University Entrance Examinations, and to explain school grammar systematically (SIG, 2006).

However, the reality has not been changed so much in these ten years as demonstrated by the fact that only a small number of the respondents make English proficiency a prerequisite for a teaching methodology course or practice teaching (SIG, 2009).

1.2.2 Didactic competences

The fundamental pedagogical skills most high school teachers desire student teachers to acquire before teaching practicum are found in the 2005 survey results:

Pre-service teachers should have the ability to:

- to write a general teaching plan, and
- to prepare teaching materials and devices.

As a result, the following proposal was made:

- fostering didactic competences should be the top priority in the university courses of English subjects: for example, to incorporate methodology courses in the teacher training curriculum; to revise the syllabi of core courses such as Materials Development, Assessment, and Multi-Media Education in order to make them more practical and relevant for classroom teaching (SIG, 2006).

1.2.3 Professional aptitude

The 2005 survey results also show that the appropriate attitude for student teachers is:

- to assign a high priority to becoming a teacher,
- to have eagerness and enthusiasm to teach,
- to be open to gaining a better understanding of learners,
- to have adequate common sense and social etiquette & manners, and
- to be aware of teachers' duties and responsibilities.

The 2006 SIG report suggests that universities and colleges should help their students develop these qualities before sending them to schools for practice teaching, adding that students should be trained to develop:

- problem-solving skills in the pedagogy courses, and
- leadership in classroom teaching through micro-teaching in the context of English teaching methodology courses (SIG, 2006).

2. Qualities of student teachers necessary for employment

The mandate of the system of teacher education and employment in Japan is to

provide teaching licenses to all eligible candidates and employ better license holders. Every year a large number of students obtain a teaching diploma; for example, in 2007, 191,165 students from pre-school to secondary school levels were newly certified (MEXT, 2009), but the estimated number employed by local authorities was considerably smaller.

The SIG conducted a survey among supervisors in charge of employment at local authorities in 2004 about the recruitment criteria. The respondents were asked to rank the six categories as well as several items in each category in the questionnaire. As a result, the ranking of the six categories is as follows: ①personal traits, ②aptitude for being a teacher, ③competence necessary for classroom teaching, ④English language ability, ⑤knowledge of English teaching pedagogy, and ⑥knowledge about education for international understanding.

However, the results of factor analysis show that there are no unified teacher quality standards for employment nationwide because teacher trainers failed to be consistent in weighing items as well as categories. Only three categories form a correlated group. The ranking of the 15 items in this group is as follows:

- ① enthusiasm for the profession
- ② ability to present material clearly in an accessible manner
- ③ ability to create effective communicative activities
- ④ teamwork
- ⑤ ability to understand students' needs
- ⑥ ability to provide clear instructions
- ⑦ ability to sustain interaction in class
- ⑧ ability to identify and develop topics of interest to students
- ⑨ linguistic knowledge of the English language
- ⑩ a clear and loud voice
- ⑪ knowledge of major English teaching methodologies and theories
- ⑫ knowledge of the "Course of Study"
- ⑬ knowledge of the linguistic and cultural differences between Japanese and English
- ⑭ familiarity with testing and evaluation formats
- ⑮ willing and active participation in extra-curricular activities

These 15 items and their ranking were generally considered as appropriate by 58 secondary-school EFL teachers in the 2007 SIG follow-up surveys (SIG, 2008).

3. Professional competences of practicing EFL teachers

3.1 English ability

3.1.1 Desirable English proficiency for EFL teachers based on the standardized tests

The 2002 TERG research report with the 1,278 responses from EFL teachers says that:

- more than half of the respondents agree that STEP pre-1st grade is desirable for secondary-school EFL teachers,
- senior high school teachers set desirable proficiency level higher (for example, STEP 1st grade) than junior high school teachers,
- majority of teachers in their twenties regard STEP pre-1st grade as desirable,
- some deviation is found among geographical groups, and
- most of respondents who have taken STEP test are 2nd grade holders. (TERG, 2002)

MEXT used this report (*Eigo Kyouiku*, 2002) when they stipulated in the Strategic Plans (2002) that English teachers should attain English proficiency equivalent to STEP pre-1st grade.

3.1.2 Benchmarks of English ability

In the 2007 SIG national survey, the EFL teachers were requested to divide the descriptors on their English ability into three competence stages—novice, veteran, and mentor: what stage do you think each descriptor is appropriate for? The major findings of this survey are as follows:

(1) Descriptors considered as appropriate for classroom English ability

- Two descriptors, “Ability to read English in textbooks with proper pronunciation” and “Ability to team-teach an English class with an ALT”, were considered by more than one-third of respondents as appropriate benchmarks for novice teachers.
- “Ability to teach English communicatively” was considered by more than one-third of respondents as an appropriate benchmark for veteran teachers.

(2) Descriptors for English literacy considered as necessary outside the classroom

- Two items were considered by a number of respondents as appropriate benchmarks for veteran teachers: “Ability to interact with an ALT professionally” and “Ability to assess correctly the scope of linguistic knowledge, as defined by the ‘Course of Study’.”
- “Ability to evaluate the English literacy level of other teachers accurately” was considered by a number of respondents as the benchmark for mentors (SIG, 2008).

3.2 Pedagogical competences

3.2.1 Qualities of pedagogical competences

Class observations conducted by members of the TERG helped conceptualize what abilities are necessary for effective classroom teaching and make a subsequent list of pedagogical competences. In the 2007 SIG follow-up surveys, most respondents considered the list valid.

(1) List of pedagogical competences considered essential for junior-high school teachers.

The ability:

- to use English effectively for providing classroom instructions
- to use English for daily interactions with students on familiar topics
- to engage students in communicative activities using taught grammar and vocabulary
- to utilize visual aids to introduce new material
- to teach reading by using English effectively
- to teach reading through memorization
- to activate students' self-expression by developing read-aloud skills

(2) List of pedagogical competences considered essential for senior-high school teachers.

The ability:

- to enhance students' communicative skills
- to activate students' background knowledge on topical content in the introduction of new material by mainly using English
- to use both English and Japanese according to the teaching content
- to plan and conduct effective read-aloud activities
- to activate students' self-expression by using newly acquired grammar and vocabulary (TERG, 2004)

3.2.2 Benchmarks for pedagogical competences

The 2007 SIG national survey found the following:

(1) Descriptors appropriate as benchmarks of pedagogical competence for veteran teachers:

- Can analyze students' needs to plan effective lessons
- Can select teaching materials and make supplementary materials which meet learners' needs
- Can assess lessons and make relevant improvements, when necessary
- Can conduct engaging and motivating lessons and maintain learners' motivation by

making use of well-grounded strategies

- Can support and guide learners so that they can reflect on their learning, identify the progress they have made, set positive targets for improvement and become successful independent learners
- Can have their classes open for class observations at all times

(2) Descriptors considered as appropriate benchmarks for novice teachers

- Can set appropriate class objectives
- Can design supplementary materials and tasks necessary for each class

The survey revealed there were few teachers who understood the duties and responsibilities of mentors (SIG, 2008).

3.3 Competence stages of English teachers

The 2008 SIG questionnaire survey conducted among supervisors at local boards of education, there is a list of 22 descriptors regarding EFL teacher competences. The respondents are asked to specify what stage each descriptor is most appropriate for on condition that English teachers are divided into four competence stages—novice, apprentice, practitioner, and expert or mentor. The results are as follows:

(1) Appropriate descriptors for novices

- I can understand the requirements set in the Course of Study.
- I can make use of my PD experiences, accept feedback from my peers, and incorporate it into my teaching.
- I can use English to deliver classroom instructions.
- I can help learners exchange information in English by writing letters and/or using the Internet.

(2) Appropriate descriptors for apprentices

- I can modify my teaching based on feedback from the learners.
- I can design and provide a range of listening activities appropriate to the needs and interests of the learners.
- I can demonstrate how to carry out tasks which require interaction.
- I can assess my teaching and improve it.
- I can play my role in team teaching with an ALT and control the class.

(3) Appropriate descriptors for practitioners

- I can observe my peers and offer them constructive feedback.
- I can help learners infer the content or ideas for today's lesson from their background knowledge of a lesson topic by using English.

- I can promote and facilitate independent learning.

(4) Appropriate descriptors for experts or mentors

Descriptors for experts or mentors were not sufficiently shared by the respondents. (SIG, 2009)

III Research Project and Objectives

1. Rationale

Members of JACET SIG on English Education came to realize, after a ten-year research period involving consultations at home and abroad, that the present teacher education paradigm should be shifted to the one in which teachers could take ownership of their professional development and promote autonomy. Therefore, the research focuses inevitably on learning profiles for reflection, and teacher evaluation from the viewpoint of continuing professional development (CPD).

MEXT (2008) has proposed that a self-assessment checklist for student teachers be composed of four dimensions as follows: ①vocation, responsibility, and enthusiasm for education, ②social skills and abilities to maintain mature interpersonal relations, ③understanding of students and class management, and ④knowledge of the subject matter. It is evident that MEXT aims to enhance the competences of prospective teachers and the quality of initial teacher education by introducing this system. However, it is not clear how these dimensions were elaborated, nor does the government provide specific descriptors for each category. This has been left to the discretion of individual institutions. Since there are no standards or definitions of professional competences to build on, learning profiles each university is required to develop will vary in quality and content, and it is unlikely that the resulting taxonomies will be adequate.

According to the information collected from the websites of local boards of education, teacher evaluation is generally based on self-assessment and job performance appraisal. Professional development (PD) activities conducted individually or collectively are not included in assessment as it is considered difficult to measure the effect of knowledge acquired through PD on classroom teaching and job performance. This is because professional standards, competences, or motivational tools for CPD have not been developed.

Thus, it was decided by the SIG members to make an adaptation of the self-assessment checklist in European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages

(EPOSTL) as an educational and motivational instrument for the Japanese educational setting.

2. Objectives

- The ultimate goal of this research project is to develop and disseminate Japanese portfolio for pre-service as well as in-service teachers of languages including self-assessment descriptors which may be regarded as a set of core competences language teachers should strive to attain.
- In order to accomplish this goal, this year's project aims to make the first draft of adaptation of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors within the context of Japanese EFL teacher education.

Section 2: Making the first adaptation of EPOSTL Self-Assessment Descriptors

I Procedure for Developing the First Adaptation of the EPOSTL Descriptors in the Japanese Educational Context

Natsue Nakayama, Satsuki Osaki

1 . Procedure for developing the first adaptation

The EPOSTL is intended for prospective foreign language teachers in the European setting. Therefore, it is not suitable for use in Japan. While the Japanese context is admittedly different both structurally and culturally, it is certainly worth it to consider this instrument carefully to identify which elements can be successfully emulated.

There are 193 descriptors of competences related to language teaching at the heart of the EPOSTL. The top priority must be to adapt these descriptors to the Japanese educational context. At present, competences required of secondary-school EFL teachers are:

- STEP (Society for Testing English Proficiency) Pre-1st Grade, TOEFL (PBT) 550, or TOEIC 730, and

- teaching English in English.

Another element which must be taken into consideration is the “Course of Study” formulated by MEXT. It stipulates objectives of foreign language learning, contents of English-related subjects, necessary language activities, essential language materials, etc. All main textbooks used at schools in Japan are screened to ensure compliance with the “Course of Study”.

With this context as well as the previous findings in mind, the first adaptation of the self-assessment section was elaborated as follows:

- 193 descriptors in EPOSTL were translated into Japanese,
- the descriptors apparently incompatible with the Japanese educational context were deleted, modified, or integrated,
- 144 descriptors left after the treatment above were examined by English teacher trainers at several universities,

As a result of these three steps, 100 descriptors were found appropriate.

2. Criteria for developing the first adaptation

In the process of elaborating the descriptors mentioned above, we have deleted, modified, or unified the descriptors to match the Japanese context depending on the following criteria. Deleted items could be seen in the appendix section as Attachment 1 together with the following information: 1) the deleted descriptors, 2) criteria for developing the first adaptation together with the procedure taken, and 3) the reasons for deletion. Attachment 2 in the appendix shows the finalized version together with the following information: 1) the criteria together with the procedure, and 2) whether the item was combined or modified.

- The criteria used for developing the first adaptation
 - (1) Modify items which do not match curricular content or pedagogical methods adopted in Japanese secondary schools.
 - (2) Modify or delete items which require English language or pedagogical competences that exceed those required of the Japanese English language teachers.
 - (3) Basically delete or modify items if substantial modification will be needed to match the reality of Japanese students in a teacher training course.
 - (4) Use terms or expression that would be understandable to Japanese students in a teacher training course.
 - (5) Combine items if their contents overlap within the parameters of the Japanese

(1) educational settings.

3. Some adjustments made at the third step

For the third step, 144 descriptors left after the second treatment were examined by 33 English teacher trainers at several universities. In the research, these teacher trainers were asked to judge using a four-point Likert Scale whether 144 descriptors were appropriate goals to be achieved for the Japanese students in a teacher training course. The four options are as follows: ① appropriate, ② slight modification needed but still could stand as a goal, ③ need significant change, and ④ not appropriate. As a result of the research, the following treatment was adopted.

- If the majority of the subjects judged the descriptor to:
- ① be appropriate: it was adopted without modification.
 - ④ be not appropriate: it was removed from the list.
- ②③ require slight or significant change, the wording and the content was elaborated to match the Japanese educational context. However, if a significant modification was required but no acceptable substitute could be found to reflect the needs of the Japanese teacher training context, the item was deleted.

II First Adaptation with Comments

■ Context	Akiko Takagi
A. Curriculum	
1. I can understand the requirements set in Course of Study.	
This subcategory consists of four descriptors in the original version. EU countries in many cases require familiarity with Common European Framework (CEFR) and European Language Portfolio (ELP) in addition to national and local curricula. Pre-service teachers in EU countries need to understand not only the curricula, but also the contents of CEFR and ELP. On the other hand, Japanese teachers need to understand only Course of Study As a result, we deleted two descriptors related to CEFR and ELP. We also deleted a descriptor about designing language courses around the requirements of the national and local curricula.	
B. Aims and Needs	

2. I can understand the value of learning a foreign language.
3. I can take into account attainment of target based on Course of Study and students' needs.
4. I can take into account students' motivation to learn a foreign language.
5. I can take into account students' intellectual interest.
6. I can take into account students' sense of achievement.

This subcategory consists of seven descriptors in the original version. (LY: this is obvious) We deleted one descriptor about taking into account and assessing the expectations and impact of educational stakeholders, such as employers and parents. We also integrated two descriptors, concerning attainment target into one. As a result, this section consists of five descriptors in our version.

C. The Role of the Language Teacher

7. I can explain the value and benefits of learning English to learners and parents.
8. I can take into account students' Japanese knowledge and make use of it when teaching English.
9. I can critically assess my teaching based on understanding theoretical principles.
10. I can critically assess, (based on learner feedback and learning outcomes) my teaching and adapt it accordingly.
11. I can accept feedback from my peers and mentors and build this into my teaching.
12. I can observe my peers and offer them constructive feedback.
13. I can identify specific pedagogical issues related to my learners or my teaching in the procedure of plan, act, and reflect.
14. I can locate information related to teaching and learning.

This subcategory consists of ten descriptors in the original version. It deals with the roles of the language teacher, such as responding to students and parents and self-evaluation of teaching. Almost all the descriptors can be applied in the Japanese context. However, we deleted one descriptor concerning learners with diverse cultural backgrounds because Japan is still largely a homogeneous country. We also deleted a descriptor including action research because it is too demanding for Japanese pre-service teachers to conduct action research during their practicum. As a result, eight descriptors were retained.

D. Institutional Resources and Constraints

15. I can recognize the resources and educational equipment available in school and adapt them to my teaching accordingly.

This subcategory consists of two descriptors in the original version. It concerns the resources available in school, such as the library and computers, as well as organizational constraints and resource limitations. Both descriptors can be applied in the Japanese context. We integrated the two descriptors into one because the content is

very similar.

■ Methodology	Mika Ito
A. Speaking/Spoken Interaction	
16. I can create a supportive atmosphere and provide a specific situation for language use that invites learners to actively take part in speaking activities.	
17. I can evaluate and select meaningful speaking and interactional activities to encourage learners to express their opinions, cultural backgrounds and identities, etc.	
18. I can evaluate and select meaningful speaking and interactional activities to help learners to develop competencies for presentation, discussion, etc.	
19. I can evaluate and select a variety of materials to stimulate speaking activities (visual aids, texts, authentic materials etc.).	
20. I can evaluate and select various activities to help learners to use typical features of spoken language (fillers, supportive responses, etc.) and engage in interaction with others.	
21. I can evaluate and select a variety of techniques to make learners aware of and help them to use stress, rhythm and intonation.	
22. I can evaluate and select a range of oral activities to develop accuracy (vocabulary, grammar, etc.).	

In the original English version, there are a total of 56 descriptors in seven areas in the category of Methodology. Methodology, based on principles derived from theories of language description, language learning and language use, is the implementation of learning objectives in two or more skills of speaking, writing, listening and reading being integrated and practiced linked to communication. The teaching of culture and its relationship with language is also thought to require specific methodological insights. The ‘Speaking / Spoken Interaction’ category consists of twelve competence descriptors focusing on how the speaking skill is learned through interactions in the classroom. For example, learners are expected to develop fluency through a range of meaningful speaking and interactional activities, such as role play and problem solving (Item 4 in the original). Students must also evaluate and select different activities to help learners become aware of and use different text types, such as telephone conversations, transactions, and speeches (Item 5 in the original). However, it was necessary to refine and combine some of the original descriptors by using more appropriate terms and expressions in order to adapt them for the Japanese and EFL educational context. One example of this was Item 8, which deals with typical

features of spoken language, like informal language and fillers. In addition, three descriptors, such as Item 9 for developing communication strategies and compensation strategies, were deleted since they were considered inappropriate in Japan due to the level of difficulty and time constraints. As a result, seven descriptors in the Speaking/Spoken Interaction category were translated into Japanese.

B. Writing/Written Interaction

- 23. I can evaluate and select meaningful activities to encourage learners to develop their creative potential.
- 24. I can evaluate and select activities which help learners to participate in written exchanges (emails, etc.) and to initiate or respond to text appropriately.
- 25. I can help learners to gather and share information for their writing tasks.
- 26. I can help learners to plan and structure written texts (e.g. by using mind maps, outlines etc.).
- 27. I can help learners to write a coherent paragraph or essay.
- 28. I can evaluate and select writing activities to consolidate learning (grammar, vocabulary, spelling etc.).

The Writing/Written Interaction subcategory in the original English version consists of twelve competence descriptors. Compared with the Speaking/Spoken Interaction descriptors, the written interactions were more feasible and adaptable in the EFL context, so the original Item 25 and Item 26 were directly translated into Japanese. As one of the objectives for Japanese upper secondary school students is to develop knowledge and skills for paragraph writing and essay writing in English; however, some of the original descriptors needed to be made more appropriate for Japan. For example, the translated version of Item 23, “I can evaluate and select meaningful language-use activities within the framework of language usage situations and/or language functions to encourage learners to develop their potential in writing” was changed according to survey results suggested by the JACET SIG (2009). Another example is Item 28, which is an integrated descriptor of two descriptors dealing with learners’ spelling awareness and consolidation of grammar, vocabulary and spelling in order to reduce overlap. Due to practicability and feasibility concerns in the Japanese educational context, five descriptors were deleted, including using different text types, selecting a variety of authentic materials and visual aids, monitoring one’s own writing, and using peer-assessment and feedback. As a result, six descriptors in the Writing/Written Interaction category were translated into Japanese.

C. Listening

- 29. I can select texts appropriate to the needs, interests and language level of the

learners.

- 30. I can provide a range of pre-listening activities which help learners to orient themselves to a text.
- 31. I can encourage learners to use their knowledge of a topic and their expectations about a text when listening.
- 32. I can design and select different activities in order to practice and develop different listening strategies (listening for gist, specific information etc.)
- 33. I can design and select different activities which help learners to recognize and interpret typical features of spoken language (tone of voice, intonation, style of speaking etc.)

The Listening subcategory in the original English version consists of eight competence descriptors dealing with pre-/while-/post listening activities and tasks, as well as listening strategies. As Item 29 and Item 30 were considered feasible and adaptable in Japan, they were directly translated from the original. For Item 31, Item 32 and Item 33, adjustments were made to make the descriptors more appropriate in the Japanese EFL context. In particular, the Course of Study for Upper Secondary Schools (MEXT, 2003) was referred to in order to elaborate Item 32 and Item 33, respectively, as follows:

[Item 32]

II Subjects: 3 English I

2. Contents (1) Language Activities

A. To understand information, the speaker's intentions, etc. and to grasp the outline and the main points by listening to English.

[Item 33]

II Subjects: 2 Aural/Oral Communication II

2. Contents (2) Treatment of the Language Activities

(a) To pronounce with due attention to rhythm, intonation, loudness, speed, etc. in order to transmit one's own intentions and feelings correctly.

[Item 33]

II Subjects: 3 English I

2. Contents (2) Treatment of the Language Activities

(a) To pronounce English with due attention to the basic characteristics of English speech such as rhythm and intonation.

Due to difficulties in curriculum design and time constraints in the Japanese educational context, three descriptors were deleted, including helping learners to apply strategies to cope with typical aspects of spoken language, such as background

noise and redundancy (Item 6 in the original), and difficult or unknown vocabulary in a text (Item 7 in the original), and evaluating and selecting a variety of post-listening tasks to provide a bridge between listening and other skills (Item 8 in the original). As a result, five Listening descriptors were translated into Japanese.

D. Reading

- 34. I can select texts appropriate to the needs, interests and language levels of learners.
- 35. I can provide a range of pre-reading activities to help learners to orient themselves to a text.
- 36. I can encourage learners to use their knowledge of a topic and their expectations about a text when reading.
- 37. I can apply appropriate ways of reading a text in class (ex. aloud, silently, in groups).
- 38. I can set different activities in order to practice and develop different reading strategies according to the purpose of reading (skimming, scanning).
- 39. I can evaluate and select a variety of post-reading tasks to provide a bridge between reading and other skills.
- 40. I can recommend books appropriate to the needs, interests, and language levels of the learners (for extensive reading).

The Reading subcategory consists of nine competence descriptors in the original English version, dealing with pre-/while-/post reading activities and tasks, and reading strategies. Items 34 and 37 were directly translated from the original English version because they were considered feasible and adaptable in Japan. Two descriptors, developing reading strategies to cope with difficult or unknown vocabulary in context (Item 6 in the original), and evaluating and selecting a variety of post-reading tasks to provide a bridge between reading and other skills (Item 7 in the original), were integrated to create Item 30, thus reducing overlap between the two. For Item 40, the expression “for extensive reading” was added to the original, “I can recommend books appropriate to the needs, interests and language level of the learner” because extensive reading as well as intensive reading has been a useful and popular activity for Japanese secondary school students. In the original version, critical reading skills like reflection, interpretation, and analysis are considered necessary for teaching languages, but the concept of critical thinking is still new and difficult to teach in Japan, so the descriptor developing critical reading skills (Item 9 in the original) was deleted for the Japanese version. As a result, seven Reading descriptors were translated into Japanese.

E. Grammar

41. I can deal with questions learners may ask about grammar and if necessary, help them to use appropriate grammar reference books and dictionaries.
42. I can evaluate and select grammatical exercises and activities that support learning and encourage oral and written communication.

The Grammar subcategory in the original English version consists of five competence descriptors. Refinement and translation of the original descriptors were conducted on the assumption that teaching grammar via communicative activities is still difficult in Japan. For example, two descriptors for helping students deal with new or unknown grammar (Item 2 in the original) and questions learners may ask about grammar (Item 3 in the original) were integrated and modified to create Item 41, reducing overlap and make it more appropriate in Japan.

For Item 42, the Japanese translation was further elaborated based on one of the questions used in the JACET SIG survey regarding competence stages of English teachers: “I can teach writing by keeping appropriateness in English functions and situations (JACET SIG, 2009: 108).” In addition, the Course of Study for Upper Secondary Schools (MEXT, 2009) was also referred to for making the Japanese version.

[Item 42]

III. Contents common to all courses in English

3. Language materials

B. Grammar should be taught as supporting communication, and should be integrated effectively with language activities.

Two descriptors, dealing with the introduction and practice of a grammatical items through meaningful context and appropriate texts (Item 1 in the original), and the use of grammatical metalanguage (Item 4 in the original), were deleted since they are unfeasible in the Japanese educational setting. As a result, two Grammar-related descriptors were translated into Japanese.

F. Vocabulary

43. I can evaluate and select a variety of activities which help learners to learn vocabulary in context.
44. I can understand Longman’s Basic 2000 Words, and evaluate and select a variety of activities with these words.
45. I can understand and use high and low frequency words, and receptive and productive vocabulary for my learners.

The Vocabulary subcategory in the original English version consists of three competence descriptors. Refinement and translation of the original descriptors were

conducted by using appropriate terms and expressions for the EFL context. For Item 44, the Japanese translation was further elaborated based on survey results about the competence stages of English teachers, which were collected and analyzed by the JACET SIG (2009). For this item, the expression “I can understand Longman’s Basic 2000 words” was also added to the original for the sake of Japanese secondary school students. Item 45 was created, not translated from the original, because upper secondary school students are expected to learn a minimum of 3000 basic words, according the new Course of Study 2009, so this new descriptor is believed to help student teachers facilitate reflection and self-assessment in their vocabulary teaching. The original Item 3, aimed at enhancing learners’ awareness of register differences, was deleted because it is difficult to teach in Japan. As a result, three Vocabulary descriptors were translated into Japanese.

G. Culture

46. I can evaluate and select a variety of activities which awaken learners’ interest in and help them to develop their knowledge and understanding of their own and the English language culture.

The Culture subcategory in the original English version consists of seven competence descriptors. Since language teaching is closely related to understanding cultures, including behaviors, attitudes, values, and norms, it is extremely important for language teachers in multicultural and multilingual Europe to make learners aware of the interrelationship between culture and language as well as the concept of self/others beyond one’s own country, ethnicity or religion. However, it is quite different from the situation in Japan. Thus, Item 46 was modified from the original on the premise that English is the second/foreign language to teach in Japan, and the first teaching objective is to awaken and develop knowledge and understanding in secondary school students about their own culture and the cultures of English-speaking communities. Other descriptors, such as creating opportunities for learners to explore the culture of target language communities out of class using the Internet, emails, etc. (Item 2 in the original), were deleted due to differences in teaching objectives and time constraints. As a result, Item 46 was the only translated descriptor and remains in the Culture subcategory.

■ Resources	Shien Sakai
47. I can identify and evaluate a range of coursebooks/materials appropriate for the age, interests and the English language level of the learners.	
48 I can select those texts and language activities from coursebooks appropriate for my	

learners.

49. I can locate and select listening and reading materials appropriate for the needs of my learners from a variety of sources, such as literature, mass media and the Internet.

50. I can make use of ideas, lesson plans and materials included in teachers' handbooks and resource books.

51. I can design learning materials and activities appropriate for my learners.

52. I can recommend dictionaries and other reference books useful for my learners.

53. I can guide learners to use the Internet for information retrieval.

This category, with no sub-categories and consisting of eleven descriptors, concerns various resources available to teachers when they seek, select, and reproduce ideas, sentences, activities, and references. In the first stage, descriptors concerning abilities to create teaching materials and use cutting-edge technology were deleted because student teachers are not required to possess such advanced skills for the teaching practicum in Japan. As a result, seven descriptors were retained in this category.

■ Lesson Planning

Yoichi Kiyota

A. Identification of Learning Objectives

54. I can identify the Course of Study requirements and set learning aims and objectives

55. I can plan specific learning objectives for individual lessons and/or for a period of teaching.

56. I can set objectives which challenge learners to reach their full potential.

57. I can set objectives which take into account the differing levels of ability and special educational needs of the learners.

58. I can set objectives for four main skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing respectively, according to the focus of individual lessons and/or period of teaching.

59. I can set objectives which encourage learners to reflect on their learning.

This subcategory is composed of six descriptors, which concern the understanding and practice of setting learning aims and objectives. The term "curriculum" is used in the original version and this provides the guideline on how to determine learning aims and objectives. However, in Japan, "the course of study" is actually used as the guideline. The following are key phrases in this category: 'curriculum, learners' needs and abilities, learning objectives for individual lessons and/ or for a period of teaching, respective learning objectives according to skills, and reflection'. All descriptors have been accepted because they could be applied to education system in Japan.

"Curriculum" as used in the original version as revised to "Course of Study" to match the Japanese model. "Objectives in terms of skills, topics, situations, linguistic systems (functions, notions, forms etc.)" used in the original version were revised to "objectives for the four main skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing respectively" (Descriptor No.58). As a result, six descriptors were considered appropriate.

B. Lesson Content

- 60. I can structure lesson plans and/or plan for periods of teaching in a coherent and varied sequence of content.
- 61. I can plan activities to ensure the interdependence of listening, reading, writing and speaking.
- 62. I can plan activities to emphasize the interdependence of language and culture.
- 63. I can plan activities which link grammar and vocabulary with communication.
- 64. I can identify time needed for specific topics and activities and plan work accordingly.
- 65. I can design activities to make the learners aware of and build on their existing knowledge.
- 66. I can vary and balance activities to enhance and sustain the learners' motivation and interest.
- 67. I can vary and balance activities in order to respond to individual learners' learning styles.
- 68. I can take account of learners' feedback and comments and incorporate this into future lessons.

This subcategory is composed of twelve descriptors related to the design and implementation of teaching plans. Key phrases in this category are t: 'a coherent and varied sequence of content, four skills (listening, reading, writing and speaking), language and culture, language materials, time allotment, making use of learners' existing knowledge, motivation, and the learners' comments'. Most of the descriptors could be applied to the Japanese education system except for the following two "I can plan to teach elements of other subjects using the target language" and "I can plan to involve learners in lesson planning". They were deleted because teaching elements of other subjects using the target language (i.e. content instruction) is conducted in only a limited number of schools in Japan, for example in Super English Language High Schools (SELHi), and involving learners in lesson planning is not feasible within the Japanese educational parameters. "I can vary and balance activities to include a variety of skills and competences" was integrated into "I can plan activities to ensure the interdependence of listening, reading, writing and speaking" (Descriptor No. 61).

Nine descriptors were judged appropriate in the Japanese context.

C. Lesson Organization

69. I can select from and plan a variety of organizational formats (frontal, individual, pair, group work) as appropriate.
70. I can plan for learner presentations and learner interaction.
71. I can plan when and how to use the target language, including meta-language I may need in the classroom.
72. I can plan lessons and periods of teaching with other teachers and/or assistant language teachers (team teaching, with other subject teachers etc.).

This subcategory is composed of four descriptors related to lesson organization. Key phrases in this category are: ‘organizing learning tasks, learners’ activities, when and how to use the target language, team teaching’. All descriptors are adopted because all of them could be applied to the education system in Japan. “I can plan lessons and periods of teaching with other teachers and/or student teachers (team teaching, with other subject teachers etc.)” used in the original version was revised to, “I can plan lessons and periods of teaching with other teachers and/or assistant language teachers (team teaching, with other subject teachers etc.)” (Descriptor No. 72). This was done to adapt it to Japanese educational parameters. Four descriptors were found appropriate

<hr/> ■ Conducting a Lesson <hr/>		Hiromi Imamura
<hr/> A. Using Lesson Plans <hr/>		
<div>73. I can start a lesson in an engaging way.</div> <div>74. I can be flexible when working from a lesson plan and respond to learners’ interests as the lesson progresses.</div> <div>75. I can adjust my time schedule when unforeseen situations occur.</div> <div>76. I can time classroom activities to reflect individual learners’ attention spans.</div>		
<p>This subcategory consists of six descriptors and focuses on the implementation of a lesson plan. It takes into account an ability to sequence activities in a coherent yet flexible way, while considering learners’ abilities and interests. As examined, the three descriptors about how to use lesson plans flexibly were judged as more important for Japanese student teachers, and were integrated into two descriptors after adapting some terms to the Japanese educational context. The last descriptor about how to finish the class was deleted because it was judged to be covered in the descriptor about adjusting the time schedule. As a result, four descriptors were found appropriate.</p>		
B. Content		
<div>77. I can relate what I teach to learners’ knowledge and the culture of those who speak</div>		

the language I am teaching.

This subcategory consists of four descriptors, which relate to class content. All four descriptors can be adapted to the Japanese educational context. Upon examination, these descriptors were integrated into one.

C. Interaction with Learners

78. I can keep and maximize the attention of learners during a lesson.

79. I can be responsive and react supportively to learner initiative and interaction.

80. I can cater for a range of learning styles.

81. I can make explicit and help learners to develop appropriate learning strategies.

This subcategory consists of six descriptors and identifies teachers' interactions with the class during teaching and learning as an important quality. Upon review, two descriptors about the attention of learners were integrated into one after adapting certain terms to the Japanese educational context. The other two descriptors about the support for learners were also integrated into one in the same way. As a result, four descriptors were found appropriate.

D. Classroom Management

82. I can create opportunities for and manage individual, partner, group and whole class work.

83. I can make and use resources (flashcards, charts etc.) and instructional media (ICT, video etc.) efficiently.

This subcategory consists of five descriptors and focuses on the teachers' ability to manage classroom work, and use a range of resources and instructional media. The first descriptor was deleted because the explanation about the activity was deemed quite long and subsequently integrated in the other descriptors. Three descriptors about resources and instructional media were regarded as important for Japanese student teachers, and were integrated into one descriptor after adapting terminology to the Japanese educational context. As a result, two descriptors were found appropriate.

E. Classroom Language

84. I can decide when it is appropriate to use the target language (English) and when not to.

85. I can encourage learners to use the target language (English) in their activities.

This subcategory consists of six descriptors and focuses on the teachers' use of the target language in class. After a review, three descriptors were deleted because they were judged incompatible with the Japanese educational context. The other two descriptors about the timing for use of the target language (English) were integrated

into one after adapting some terms to the Japanese educational context. As a result, two descriptors were found appropriate.

■ Independent Learning	Chitose Asaoka
A. Learner Autonomy	
86. I can guide and assist learners in setting their own aims and objectives and in planning their own learning.	
87. I can assist learners in choosing tasks and activities according to their individual needs and interests.	
88. I can help learners to evaluate their own learning processes and the outcomes.	
The category of Independent Learning is further divided into 6 subheadings. The first sub-category, learner autonomy, originally consists of 6 descriptors. Upon review, three descriptors were deleted on the grounds that it is difficult for learners to choose their own learning styles or learning strategies in a Japanese context.	
B. Homework	
89. I can select tasks most suited to be carried out by learners.	
90. I can provide necessary support for learners in order for them to do homework independently and assist them with time management.	
91. I can assess homework according to valid and transparent criteria.	
The subcategory of Homework is originally made up of 4 descriptors, focusing on learning opportunities beyond the classroom. In a case of schools in Japan, teachers usually control the content of homework; thus, a descriptor, “I can set homework in cooperation with learners” was deleted.	
C. Projects	
The subcategory of Projects is comprised of 6 descriptors, focusing on learner-centered project work. Projects can give a chance to individual learners to take charge of their own learning. However, this type of learning activities is not suitable for an English classroom in the Japanese context yet; thus, all descriptors were deleted.	
D. Portfolios	
This subcategory is comprised of 5 descriptors, focusing on portfolios which provide insight into each learner’s progress. Although portfolios can give a chance to individual learners to take charge of their own learning, they are not suitable for an English classroom in the Japanese context yet; thus, all descriptors were deleted.	
E. Virtual Learning Environments	
92. I can use various ICT resources such as internet and appropriately advise learners on how to use the resources	

The subcategory of Virtual Learning Environment is originally made up of 3 descriptors. The two individual descriptors regarding teachers' use of ICT as well as promoting learners' utilization of ICT were combined into one descriptor. The other descriptor regarding the use of learning platforms and discussion forums was deleted on the grounds that not many secondary school teachers utilize them yet in Japan

F. Extra-curricular Activities

The subcategory of Extra-curricular Activities consists of 4 descriptors, focusing on activities outside the classroom. All the descriptors in this subcategory were considered as too demanding for student teachers in a Japanese context; thus they were all deleted.

■ Assessment of Learning	Shien Sakai
<p>Assessment may consist of tests and examinations, which take a snapshot of the learner's competence or performance. They may focus on a student's knowledge of language or culture or on performance, the ability to use language in realistic contexts. When designing tests, teachers will need to consider how valid a particular test is in terms of the aims and objectives of learning a language and will need to pay attention to the reliability of grading procedures. It is also worth taking into account how practical a test is to design and administer and how to avoid a wash back effect, which may adversely influence teaching. Assessment procedures may be used mainly for the purpose of summative evaluation - for example, for end-of-term grading or certification – or for formative evaluation - for example, to provide information on the learner's strengths and weaknesses and to help the teacher and/or learner to plan further work.</p>	
A. Designing Assessment Tools	
<p>93. I can evaluate and select valid assessment procedures (written tests, performance tests, etc.) appropriate to learning aims and objectives.</p>	
<p>94. I can design and use in-class activities to monitor and assess a learner's participation and performance.</p>	
<p>This sub-category consists of three descriptors in the original version. However, to avoid overlap between two among them, one was deleted. Consequently, two descriptors were left in this category.</p>	
B. Evaluation	
<p>95. I can identify strengths and areas for improvement in a learner's performance.</p>	
<p>96. I can present my assessment of a learner's performance and progress in the form of a descriptive evaluation, which is transparent and comprehensible to the learner, parents and others.</p>	

97. I can use appropriate assessment procedures to chart and monitor a learner's progress (reports, checklist, grades, etc.).

This category originally has eight descriptors. However, as the period of teaching practicum is short in Japan, the following assessments of learners were judged to be unrealistic within the Japanese system: assessments of abilities to co-work with classmates, to make a study plan for individual work or a group work, and assessment by using CEFR and/or scales with international validity. Therefore, these descriptors were deleted.

C. Self-and Peer Assessment

This category has three descriptors in the original version. However, all of them were deleted because they were judged inappropriate for the Japanese context.

D. Language Performance

98. I can assess a learner's ability to engage in spoken and written interactions.

There are six descriptors in the original version. Assessment of abilities to understand and or interpret summaries and/or implicit meanings of spoken and /or written language was deleted because of the time constraints Japanese student teachers face.. Accordingly this category has only one descriptor.

E. Culture

99. I can assess learners' ability to make comparisons between their own and the culture of the English language communities.

This subcategory consists of three descriptors in the original version. Two descriptors to assess learners' knowledge about and reaction to cultures and events of target language areas were deleted because requiring student teachers to assess them was deemed unrealistic within the Japanese educational context. Consequently one descriptor remained in this category.

F. Error analysis

100. I can analyze learners' errors and provide constructive feedback to them.

This subcategory consists of four descriptors in the original version. The descriptors focusing on the learners' errors and teacher's ability to identify the processes causing them and to deal with errors occurring in spoken and written language were thought too demanding for student teachers in Japan. In addition, two descriptors concerning errors of feedback were accepted and integrated into one for brevity.

Section 3: A Study on Contextualization of EPOSTL in Japanese Teacher Education (1)

Shien Sakai

In order for EPOSTL to be contextualized in Japan, an analysis of student teachers' perceptions about English language teaching is vital. Therefore, a questionnaire consisting of 100 descriptors was sent to sixteen universities. One hundred and seventy eight undergraduate and graduate students who had finished educational practicum responded to the questionnaire.

After factor analysis, their perceptions were divided into three categories: 1) basic instruction, 2) individual instruction and evaluation, and 3) advanced instruction of communicative English. Some questionnaire descriptors were deleted after the analysis. The deleted descriptors were ones demonstrating ceiling effect or floor effect, outlayers, and ones which showed low internal scale reliability. As a result, the new questionnaire consisted of 74 descriptors.

I The Objective of the Present Study

1. Objective

The study sought to identify which EPOSTL descriptors would conform to the realities of the Japanese educational context based on the responses of the student teachers who have completed their practicum.

2. Procedure

One hundred and seventy eight undergraduate and graduate students from sixteen universities who had completed their teaching practicum participated in this survey conducted from July, 2009, to January, 2010

II Results

1. Descriptors with the ceiling effect

The following descriptors demonstrated ceiling effect ($M + SD \geq 5.0$) and were excluded from further analysis:

- (2) I can understand the value of learning other languages.
- (11) I can accept feedback from my peers and mentors and build it into my teaching.
- (14) I can locate useful information (articles, journals and research findings) relating to aspects of teaching and learning.

There were no descriptors with the floor effect. ($M - SD < = 1.0$).

Descriptors where the value was rounded off to 5.0:

- (12) I can observe my peers and offer them constructive feedback.
- (50) I can make use of ideas, lesson plans and materials included in teachers' handbooks and resource books.
- (83) I can make and use resources efficiently (flashcards, charts, pictures, etc.).

These three descriptors were considered descriptors with the ceiling effect. Therefore, these items were also excluded from further analysis.

2. Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was employed to identify what common perceptions about English language teaching pre-service teachers shared following the completion of their practicum.

2.1 In the first stage

The data of the respondents were analyzed using the Promax rotation, as it was assumed that there was co-relation between factors. Seventeen factors were found to be more than one point zero in their own value after the factor analysis. Four factors were executed. The first factor (Factor one) was the largest and consisted of 51 questionnaire descriptors: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 42, 43, 46, 49, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 82, 84, 85. The second factor (Factor two) consisted of twenty one descriptors: 17, 47, 52, 60, 67, 78, 80, 81, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100. The third factor (Factor three), fourteen descriptors: 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, 38, 39, 45. The fourth factor (Factor four), had only three descriptors: 40, 44, 48.

- Factor one was named "basic instruction" after the constituent descriptors were reviewed. In addition, it was possible to factor-analyze Factor one further.
- As the descriptors within Factor two were examined, it was assumed that Factor

two was “individual instruction and assessment” student teachers thought of because Factor two contained many descriptors concerning teaching practices, individual learning, and assessment from the questionnaire. Factor two had twenty one descriptors and it could be factor-analyzed further.

- The descriptors of Factor three were examined. Then, it was discovered that they featured advanced English communication instruction student teachers considered. In addition, it was possible to factor-analyze this factor further.
- Factor four could not be factor-analyzed any further. It included descriptors from two categories: Methodology and Resources in the questionnaire. Factor four’s internal scale reliability was 0.651 but if Item 44 was deleted from the factor, the new internal scale reliability would be 0.692. As these three descriptors within Factor four were considered to represent advanced instruction, the label should be “advanced instruction”

Table one Composition of Factor four

F	Mean	SD	α	Descriptors (Categories)
Four	9.75	2.460	0.651	40, 44 (Methodology) , 48 (Resources)

2.2 In the second stage

2.2.1 The case of Factor one (basic instruction)

Factor one was further factor-analyzed to identify what sub-factors constituted “basic instruction” in the minds of student teachers. As a result, seven sub-factors were executed.

- The first sub-factor of Factor one (henceforth, Factor Ia) consisted of the descriptors from three categories: Methodology (35, 36, 37, and 43), Lesson Planning (68), and Conducting a Lesson (77). Internal scale reliability was 0.899 and if Item 43 was deleted, the new internal scale reliability would be 0.902 but the deletion of any other factor would not impact the internal scale reliability. Ia was named “improving classroom teaching.”
- The second sub-factor of Factor one (henceforth, Factor Ib) consisted of the descriptors from two categories: Context (4, 5, 6, 7, and 8) and Conducting a Lesson (84). Internal scale reliability was 0.869. Five descriptors out of the six constituting Factor Ib were from the same category, so if Item 84 was deleted, its internal scale reliability would be 0.870. The name of Factor Ib was named “understanding of educational environment” because of its components.
- The third sub-factor of Factor one (henceforth, Factor Ic) consisted of the

descriptors from the same category: Planning Lesson (54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, and 63). Internal scale reliability was high (0.918) because all the descriptors were from the same category. The deletion of any item would not lead to improvement of the internal scale reliability. The Factor was named “lesson planning.”

- The fourth sub-factor of Factor one (henceforth, Factor Id) consisted of the descriptors from two categories: Lesson Planning (69, and 70) and Conducting a Lesson (82, and 85). Internal scale reliability was 0.898. If Item 85 was deleted, the new internal scale reliability would be 0.901. The factor was named “conducting communicative lessons.”
- The fifth sub-factor of Factor one (henceforth, Factor Ie) consisted of the descriptors from four categories: Context (1), Methodology (29 and 34), Resources (53) and Lesson Planning (65). Internal scale reliability was 0.817. The deletion of any item would not lead to improvement of the internal scale reliability. The factor was named “selecting appropriate instructional materials.”
- The sixth sub-factor of Factor one (henceforth, Factor If) consisted of the descriptors from three categories: Methodology (42), Resources (49), Conducting a Lesson (73, 74, and 75). Internal scale reliability was 0.840. The deletion of any item would not lead to improvement of the internal scale reliability. The factor was named “flexible treatment to situations.”
- The seventh sub-factor of Factor one (henceforth, Factor Ig) consisted of the descriptors from two categories: Context (9, 10, 13, and 15), and Conducting a Lesson (76). Internal scale reliability was 0.844. The deletion of any item would not lead to the improvement of the internal scale reliability. The factor was named “adjustment by reflection.”

Components of all the sub-factors of Factor one are listed in Table 2 below. Some factors contain items which make the internal scale reliability drop but the deletion of the item would not make a significant difference in the reliability value. In addition, internal scale reliabilities are consistently high without any alterations of the components. Therefore, all analyzed items were retained.

Table 2 Components of Sub-factors of Factor one

Factor	Mean	SD	α	Descriptors (Categories)
Ia	22.36	4.977	0.899	35,36, 37, 43 (Methodology), 68 (Lesson Planning), 77 (Conducting a Lesson)
Ib	22.52	4.709	0.869	4,5,6,7,8 (Context) ,84 (Conducting a Lesson)

Ic	28.14	6.084	0.918	54,55,56,57,58,59,61,63 (Lesson Planning)
Id	14.94	3.606	0.898	69,70(Lesson Planning), 82,85(Conducting a Lesson)
Ie	18.26	4.000	0.817	1 (Context) , 29, 34, (Methodology) , 53 (Resources), 65 (Lesson Planning)
If	17.97	3.844	0.840	42 (Methodology), 49 (Resources), 73, 74, 75 (Conducting a Lesson)
Ig	18.53	4.042	0.844	9, 10, 13, 15 (Context), 76 (Conducting a Lesson)

2.2.2.The case of Factor two

In order to identify the constituent sub-factors of “individual instruction and assessment” as perceived by pre-service teachers, Factor two was further factor-analyzed and two sub-factors were executed. (see Table 3 below).

- The first sub-factor of Factor two (henceforth, Factor IIa) consisted of the descriptors from six categories: Methodology (17), Resources (47, 52), Lesson Planning (60), Conducting a Lesson (78, 80), Independent Learning (89), and Assessment of Learning (95, 96, 97, 98, 99, and 100). Internal scale reliability was 0.899 and if Item 43 was excluded, internal scale reliability would be 0.902 but the deletion of any other factor would not make a significant difference in the value of internal scale reliability. IIa was named “judgment of learner’s ability.”
- The second sub-factor of Factor two (henceforth, Factor IIb) consisted of the descriptors from four categories: Lesson Planning (67), Conducting a Lesson (81), Independent Learning (86, 87, 88, 90) and Assessment of Learning (93). Internal scale reliability 0.913 and the deletion of any factor would not impact internal scale reliability significantly. The name of Factor IIb was “individual instruction for learners.”

Components of all the sub-factors of Factor two are listed in Table 3. Some factors contain items which make the internal scale reliability drop but the deletion of these items has insignificant impact on internal scale reliability. In addition, all the internal scale reliability values are high enough in the original analysis. Therefore, all items in the original analysis have been retained.

Table 3 Components of Sub-factors of Factor two

Factor	Mean	SD	α	Descriptors (Categories)
IIa	43.55	9.698	0.943	17 (Methodology), 47, 52 (Resources),

				60 (Lesson Planning), 78, 80 (Conducting a Lesson), 89 (Independent Learning), 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100 (Assessment of Learning)
I Ib	27.47	6.081	0.913	67 (Lesson Planning), 81 (Conducting a Lesson), 86, 87, 88, 90, 91 (Independent Learning), 93 (Assessment of Learning)

2.2.3 The case of Factor three

In order to identify the constituent sub-factors of “advanced instruction of communicative English” as perceived by prospective teachers, Factor three was further factor-analyzed and two sub-factors were executed. (see Table 4).

- The first sub-factor of Factor three (henceforth, Factor IIIa) consisted of the descriptors from one category: Methodology (21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 45). Internal scale reliability was 0.882 and if Item 45 was deleted from the factor, the new internal scale reliability would be 0.887 but the deletion of any other factor would not change the internal scale reliability significantly. Factor IIIa was named “instruction for sending a message in English.”
- The second sub-factor of Factor three (henceforth, Factor IIIb) also consisted of the descriptors from one category: Methodology (19, 32, 33, 38, and 39). Internal scale reliability was 0.816 and if Item 45 was excluded internal scale reliability would be 0.827 however the deletion of any other factor would not significantly change internal scale reliability. The name of Factor IIIb was “preparation for instruction” because most of the components were related to this heading.

Components of all the sub-factors of Factor three are listed in Table 4. Some factors contain items which make the internal scale reliability drop but the deletion of these items would not have a significant effect on internal scale reliability. In addition, all the internal scale reliability values were high enough in the original analysis. Therefore, all analyzed items have been retained.

Table 4 Components of Sub-factors of Factor three

Factor	Mean	SD	α	Descriptors (Categories)
IIIa	30.53	6.408	0.882	21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 45 (Methodology)
IIIb	16.46	3.800	0.816	19, 32, 33, 38, 39 (Methodology)

III Discussion

The length of teaching practicum in Japan is short compared to many other countries: two weeks for those seeking high school teaching credentials and four weeks in the case of those wanting to become teachers at elementary and junior high school levels. . In addition, according to JACET SIG's reports (1998, 2002, 2008), there are no cross-sectional standards of competences for student teachers among universities. Therefore, each university is allowed to establish its own arbitrary teaching practicum standards.

The results indicate that despite institutional variations prospective teachers share some common perceptions about English language teaching. In many cases, the importance student teachers attach to certain factors is not shared by veteran educators. It is natural that the two groups possess different perceptions because student teachers have a very limited classroom experience. For example, student teachers are hardly involved in assessment of the learners, and it is assumed that a short-term teaching practicum cannot provide them with appropriate assessment and evaluation skills. Therefore, in order to adapt EPOSTL to the Japanese educational context, it is necessary to allow more flexibility in the analysis of the data provided by student teachers than that generated by veteran educators.

The results of this research from student teachers were very useful for our efforts to advance the process of adaptation of EPOSTL to the Japanese context. As shown in Table 5, four major factors were identified: “basic instruction”, “individual instruction and assessment”, “advanced instruction of communicative English” and “advanced instruction.” In all, including sub-factors, twelve factors in all and the number of the questionnaire descriptors which consisted of the twelve factors was seventy seven.

However, as for Factor four, its internal scale reliability was much lower compared with that of other factors analyzed. The Factor comprised the following descriptors:

- Item 40 “I can recommend books appropriate to the needs, interests, language levels of the learners (for extensive reading).”
- Item 44 “I can understand Longman’s Basic 2000 Words, and evaluate and select a variety of activities with these words.”
- Item 48 “I can select those texts and language activities from course books appropriate for my learners.”

As we conducted factor analysis with the number fixed to four, it was probable that this factor represents a statistical aberration. Considering that there may be other elements for advanced instruction, the descriptors constituting Factor four were

deleted from the new list. Accordingly, the number of descriptors in the new questionnaire is seventy four. (See Attachment for the new list of descriptors p. 108)

Deleted descriptors are six descriptors with the ceiling effect, seventeen descriptors with the overlapping value of less than 0.35, and three descriptors from Factor four. As for the deletion of the descriptors with a low overlapping value, in real educational settings all of them are necessary and it is understandable all of them are important. Consequently, a reexamination is warranted. As the objective of the present study is the analysis of respondents' data as a whole, the descriptors with a perceived low overlapping value were deleted.

Table 5 All factors

	Factor'	descriptors	Internal scale reliability
I	Basic instruction		
Ia	Improving classroom teaching	35, 36, 37, 43, 68, 77	0.899
Ib	Understanding of educational environment	4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 84	0.869
Ic	Lesson planning	54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 63	0.918
Id	Conducting communicative lessons	69, 70, 82, 85	0.898
Ie	Selecting appropriate instructional materials	1, 29, 34, 53, 65	0.817
If	Flexible treatment to situations	42, 49, 73, 74, 75	0.840
Ig	Adjustment by reflection	9, 10, 13, 15, 76	0.844
II	Individual instruction and assessment		
IIa	Judgment of learner's ability	17, 47, 52, 60, 78, 80, 89, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100	0.943
IIb	Individual instruction for learners	67, 81, 86, 87, 88, 90, 91, 93	0.913
III	Advanced instruction of communicative English		
IIIa	Instruction for sending	21, 22, 23, 24, 25,	0.882

	a message in English	26, 27, 28, 45	
IIIb	Preparation for instruction	19, 32, 33, 38, 39	0.827
IV	Advanced instruction	40, 44, 48	0.651

Section 4: A Study on Contextualization of EPOSTL in Japanese Teacher Education (2)

Shien Sakai, Yukie Endo

I Background, Objectives, and Questionnaire

1. Background

An analysis of the attitudes of novice teachers who were employed by education boards and who have worked for over six months was considered necessary, in order to make the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) applicable to the Japanese educational setting.

Thirty-three novices at local education boards of six prefectures were asked to answer 100 questions. Some of the wording in the survey questions for student teachers was changed. For example, the phrase “other trainees” was changed to “my peers.”

2. Objectives

The objective of the trial was to carefully screen the 100 survey questions and note the novices’ understanding, in order to make EPOSTL applicable to the Japanese educational setting.

3. Questionnaire

- Participants: 33 novice teachers at local education boards of six prefectures
- Timeframe: July 2009 to January 2010
- Methodology of survey: Novices were asked to answer 100 questions (on a worksheet or Excel spreadsheet) during initial teacher training, and a supervisor

collected those sheets.

II Major Findings

The results of the analysis of the responses are as follows:

- Inner-reliability of the answers to the 100 questions (α): 0.971
- Descriptors indicating a ceiling effect (mean + standard deviation > 5.0):
 - (1) I can understand the requirements set in the Course of Study.
 - (2) I can understand the value of learning other languages.
 - (7) I can promote the value and benefits of English learning to learners, parents and others.
 - (11) I can accept feedback from my peers and mentors and build it into my teaching.
 - (21) I can evaluate and select a variety of techniques to make learners aware of and help them to use stress, rhythm and intonation.
 - (50) I can make use of ideas, lesson plans and materials included in teachers' handbooks and resource books.
 - (82) I can create opportunities for and manage individual, partner, group and whole class work.
- There were no descriptors indicating a floor effect.
- All of the descriptors, except seven descriptors indicating a ceiling effect, were tried in order to conduct factor analysis; however, only one factor was extracted.
- The following activities were considered to have a low rate of implementation. The following seven descriptors were below four points in the calculation of a ceiling effect:
 - (19) I can evaluate and select a variety of materials to stimulate speaking activities (visual aids, texts, authentic materials, etc.)
 - (40) I can recommend books appropriate to the needs, interests, language levels of the learners (for extensive reading).
 - (60) I can structure lesson plans and/or plan for periods of teaching in a coherent and varied sequence of content.
 - (78) I can keep and maximize the attention of learners during a lesson.
 - (86) I can guide and assist learners in setting their own aims and objectives and in planning their own learning.
 - (92) I can use various ICT resources (email, Web sites, computer programs, etc.), and guide learners appropriately to use them.

- (97) I can use appropriate assessment procedures to chart and monitor a learner's progress (reports, checklist, grades, etc.).
- As compared with the survey to student teachers, the descriptors that showed a high significant difference ($p < 0.05$) or high tendency of significance ($p < 0.10$) were the seven descriptors that indicated a ceiling effect, in addition to Descriptor 75: "I can adjust my time schedule when unforeseen situations occur."
 - As compared with the survey to student teachers, the descriptors that showed a low significant difference ($p < 0.05$) or low tendency of significance ($p < 0.10$) were Descriptor 15: "I can assess how I might use the resources available in my school (OHP, computers, library, etc.," Descriptor 62: "I can plan activities to emphasize the interdependence of language and culture," and Descriptor 99: "I can assess learners' ability to make comparisons between their own and the culture of the English language communities," in addition to Descriptors 40, 92 and 97, which were considered to have a low rate of implementation, as stated above.

III Discussion

Although there are inherent limitations when drawing conclusions from results that are taken from a sampling of only 33 respondents, a certain direction can be seen when observing the results of the analysis.

- The seven descriptors that indicated a ceiling effect also showed a high significant difference or tendency of significance. Most novice teachers take it for granted that the activities presented in those seven descriptors will be carried out. These may be fostered by the on-the-job experience of novice teachers, in the local community and at the junior and senior high school. In addition to the previously mentioned seven descriptors, Descriptor 75 also showed a high tendency of significance, as compared with the survey that was taken by student teachers. This may indicate the confidence gained by novice teachers through their actual teaching practice.
- The seven descriptors with a low rate of implementation are thought to require novice teachers to have advanced practical competence. These descriptors were as follows: to engage students in speaking activities (Descriptor 19), to recommend books appropriate to students' needs for extensive reading (Descriptor 40), to structure lesson plans using a coherent and varied sequence of content (Descriptor 60), to be able to keep students' attention during a lesson (Descriptor 78), to help students become autonomous learners (Descriptor 86), to use various ICT resources (Descriptor 92) and to be able to present students' progress using an

appropriate assessment (Descriptor 97). Three of these seven descriptors show a low rate of implementation as compared with the survey taken by student teachers. This might mean that there is a gap between what student teachers think they can do before becoming teachers and what they can actually do in the real educational setting. It might also indicate that teachers are unable to easily implement the activities they want to use in the classroom.

- Considering that none of the descriptors whose answers were analyzed indicated a floor effect, that the internal scale reliability of the answers was extremely high (0.971) and that we can extract only one factor in factor analysis, the novices' understanding of the 93 questions may indicate that the perceptions about education are very similar among various groups of novice teachers. These perceptions are created via their teaching practice in the Japanese educational context.

IV Conclusion

- Except for the seven descriptors that indicated a ceiling effect and the seven descriptors that showed a low rate of implementation, the remaining 86 descriptors can be regarded as activities that novice teachers are able to implement, and as appropriate descriptors to use in checklists for measuring the awareness of novice teachers who have been working in the classroom for more than six months. That is, the answers to these 86 descriptors can be effective instruments for measuring whether novices demonstrate appropriate professional development. They can be used by their mentors. Moreover, if these 86 descriptors are shown to novices soon after they are employed, it might help them better understand their objectives in becoming good teachers.
- Because the seven descriptors showing a low rate of implementation are thought to require novice teachers to have advance practical competence. They can be included in a checklist for in-service teachers with more than one-year experience. A further study of this kind might be useful in developing checklists that are appropriate for measuring the progress of teachers working in the classroom after four years, when most of teachers in Japan are required to attend a periodic in-service training.

Section 5: Challenges and prospects for further research

Ken Hisamura

This first adaptation of the EOSTL self-assessment descriptors is expected to be a springboard to the teacher education paradigm shift in Japan. Various qualitative and quantitative studies will be necessary to assess the validity and effectiveness, and improve the reliability of the list of descriptors. The list should be examined judiciously by all relevant stakeholders, including primarily language education researchers and teacher trainers. Also, large-scale surveys for collecting data from pre-and in-service teachers or supervisors at local boards of education are desirable to refine the checklist and render it more compliant with the constraints and priorities of the foreign language teacher education in Japan. Sections 3 and 4 underscore the importance of collecting and analyzing empirical evidence. Hopefully, these research activities will raise the visibility of this project among educators and education policy-makers.

1. Defining the purpose of the self-assessment descriptors

This first adaptation, following the purpose of the EPOSTL descriptors, was developed as a set of competences which EFL teachers should strive to attain. However, in the light of the Japanese policy of granting teacher's license to the largest pool of qualified applicants possible and offering the better ones permanent employment, it is not clear whether this will be a successful model in Japan. Academic levels and qualities of student teachers vary, and there are few universities which have set English literacy benchmark levels for the EFL teacher training courses. In the absence of national standards for teacher education, developing the list of descriptors which will satisfy the needs of every institution will be a significant challenge.

For example, 26 descriptors were deleted from the list in the pilot survey results described in Section 3 because they indicate a floor effect or they show insufficient correlation with factors obtained. We can speculate on whether this deletion is appropriate or not, considering that the revised list would represent a hurdle many prospective teachers may not be able to clear. This will contradict the “open door policy” – the cornerstone of teacher education in Japan today.

To ensure the effectiveness of this instrument it is imperative to provide a clear definition of the purpose of self-assessment descriptors, namely role will they serve for teacher education. The purpose of the list can be defined in several ways: for example,

as:

- a set of competences language teachers should strive to attain,
- a set of competences prospective language teachers are expected to acquire,
- a set of competences attainable for prospective language teachers if they make some efforts,
- a set of baseline competences every prospective teacher must attain, or
- a frame of reference or guidelines universities and colleges can flexibly use.

The organization, contents, and numbers of the descriptors will be contingent upon its purpose. The first adaptation is just the first step in the process which should be examined and improved through action research and consultations with stakeholders.

2. Identifying the areas of professional competences

The EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors are sub-divided into seven categories which “represent areas in which teachers require a variety of competences and need to make decisions related to teaching (Newby et al, 2007).” As far as English language teaching is concerned, these seven categories can be adapted to the Japanese context. However, teachers’ responsibilities in Japan extend well beyond the realm of the classroom. In fact, administrative and advisory duties – be it in the capacity of a career counselor, a member of the disciplinary committee or a homeroom teacher who has to spend a significant amount of time dealing with the problems of the students’ family lives – often represent the biggest burden on the teachers’ time. In order to perform these important duties teachers have to possess certain qualities and aptitudes. However, no clear benchmarks have been established on which to base the assessment of these qualities. As is mentioned in “Qualities of student teachers necessary for employment” (Section 1, II, 2), at the time of employment ‘personal traits’ and ‘enthusiasm for the profession’ are the two areas most stringently assessed. Also, MEXT suggests that student teachers should obtain ‘a sense of mission’ and ‘passion for education’ (MEXT, 2008). These aspects are not included in the EPOSTL descriptors. Therefore, it would be necessary to broaden the checklist in order to include personal qualities necessary to cope with the professional demands on language teachers outside the classroom.

3. Establishing standards for language teacher education

EPOSTL was built on CEFR, ELP, and the Profile. Some European countries have implemented EPOSTL in their own context just like ELP by adjusting it to the national language curriculum and standards for teacher education (Little, 2007). Unfortunately, in developing EPOSTL in the Japanese context, we have no sources to build on. There are no standards or benchmarks for professional competences except for English literacy level of EFL teachers, STEP pre-1st grade, stipulated in the action plan. We have the “Course of Study,” but it is not considered as equivalent to the national language curriculum of other countries. Therefore, it is expected that the development and dissemination of this adaptation will help researchers, teacher educators, teachers, supervisors, and other stakeholders become aware of the importance of standards for language teacher education.

A number of descriptors in this adaptation may be difficult for Japanese prospective teachers because they will need much higher ability than STEP pre-1st grade level. Through surveys and consultations, they should be refined further to identify the appropriate competence stages of teachers. The major findings of the previous surveys we have seen in Section 1-II suggest the possibility to specify descriptors appropriate for each competence stage: novices, apprentices, practitioners, and experts or mentors. If we identify the descriptors appropriate for prospective teachers as well as the purpose of the EPOSTL adaptation, then it will help establish standards of language teacher education.

Education policy is highly centralized in Japan. Therefore, MEXT, in partnership with the local boards of education, teacher training universities, and academic societies, can play a pivotal role in promoting teacher education paradigm shift. The adaptation of the EPOSTL self-assessment descriptors will surely support the policy of MEXT not only to enhance and define professional competences of language teachers, but also to create a new system of continuing professional development: a continuum which extends from initial teacher education, through induction and on throughout the whole of a teacher’s career. This project will hopefully become a stepping stone in this complex but vital process.

4. Action plans in 2010-2012

To refine this adaptation and to advance this project further, the following activities are now planned:

- workshop in the context of the conference of JACET-Kanto Chapter on June 20, 2010, in which this adaptation will be presented and feedback from the audience

will be collected and analyzed,

- presentation at the Asia TEFL conference in Hanoi, Vietnam, on August 6-8, 2010, in which reactions to this adaptation from the Asian researchers will be observed, and, if time allows, implementing EPOSTL in the Asian context will be discussed.
- inviting Professor D. Newby, EPOSTL chief coordinator, both to the joint symposium of JACET, Japanese Association of German Literature, and Japanese Society of French Language Education on August 20, and to the JACET Summer Seminar in Kusatsu on August 22-25, 2010, in which the contextualization of CEFR and EPOSTL will be discussed.
- symposium regarding the development and the ultimate objective of the EPOSTL adaptation in the Japanese context at the JACET conference in Mioyagi on September 7-9, 2010,
- the second joint symposium of JACET, Japanese Association of German Literature, Japanese Society of French Language Education, and Society of Japanese Language Education on March 18, 2011,
- national surveys among prospective teachers mainly at private universities which offer teacher training courses in 2010-2012,
- national surveys among practicing teachers taking the mandatory re-training programs under the auspices of local boards of education in 2010-2012.

References

- Ayabe, Y. (2009). Sengo nihon no makuro-shakaiteki eigokyouiku bunka [Micro-social English Education and Culture after World War II]. In Y. Ayabe, W. Koyama & T. Enomoto (Eds.). *Gengo-jinnruigaku karamita eigokyouiku [English Education from the Viewpoint of Linguistic Anthropology]*. 87-193. Hitsuji Shobo
- Eigo Kyoiku [English Teachers' Magazine]*. (2002). “ ‘Eigo ga tsukaeru nihonjin’ no ikusei notameno sennryaku-koso” nitsuite monnbu-gagakusho ni kiku [An interview with an official from MEXT about the Action Plan to cultivate ‘Japanese with English Ability’] . vol. 51. NO. 10. 30-35. Taishukan Shoten
- Hatta, G. (2000). *Rifurekuchibu apurochi niyoru eigo kyousho no yosei [English Teacher Education through Reflective Approach]*. Kinseido
- Hisamura, K. (2009). Sukottorando no kyouin kyoiku womeguru kenkyu to kosatsu [A Study of Scottish Teacher Education]. *Den-en Chofu Gakuen Daigaku Kiyo* No. 3

- [*Den-en Chofu University Bulletin* No. 3]. 193-213. Den-en Chofu University
- Hisamura, K. & Jimbo, H. (2008). Eigokyouushi ni motomerareru chikara [Competences required of English teachers]. *Eigo Kyoiku* [*English Teachers' Magazine*]. vol.57. No. 4. 10-13. Taishukan Shoten
- Jimbo, H. & Yoffe, L. (2009). European Language Portfolio (ELP) and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. *Developing English Teacher Competencies: An Integrated Study of Pre-service Training, Professional Development, Teacher Evaluation, and Certification Systems*. 46-57. JACET SIG on English Education
- Little, D. et al. (2007). *Preparing teachers to use the European Language Portfolio*. European Centre for Modern Languages. Council of Europe
- MEXT. (2001). *Report from the Panel to Promote Revisions in English Language*.
http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chousa/shotou/018/toushin/010110.htm
- MEXT. (2002). *Developing the Strategic Plan to Cultivate 'Japanese with English Abilities'*. <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/news/2002/07/020901.htm>
- MEXT. (2003). *Action Plan to Cultivate "Japanese with English Abilities"*.
<http://www.mext.go.jp/english/topics/03072801.htm>
- MEXT. (2008). Kyoshoku Jissen Enshu no donyu notameno ryuijiko [References for the implementation of Seminar for Teaching Practice]
- MEXT. (2009). *Kyoushoku-katei Nintei-daigaku Jicchi-shisatu Houkokusho* [A report of inspections into accredited universities for teacher education]
- Nagasaki, M. (2009). Kyoushi wo sodateru akushon risachi no susume [Recommendations for action research to nurture teachers]. *Eigo Kyoiku* [*English Teachers' Magazine*]. vol.57. No. 13. 13-15. Taishukan Shoten
- Newby, D. et al. (2007) *The European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages*. European Centre for Modern Languages. Council of Europe
- Otani, Y. (2007). *Nihonjin nitotte eigo toha nanika* [What Is English for Japanese People?]. Taishukan Shoten
- SIG. (1998) *Eigoka kyoikuhou zenkokuchosa hokokusho* [A report of national survey on English teaching methodology classes]. JCET SIG on English Education
- SIG. (2003). Problems in English Teacher Training Curriculum. JCET SIG on English Education
- SIG. (2005) (2006). Developing English Teacher Competency: An Empirical Study of PreService Teachers, Training, and Curriculum. JCET SIG on English Education
- SIG. (2007). A Teacher Certification Renewal System and Teacher Education and Assessment. JCET SIG on English Education

- SIG. (2008)(2009). Developing English Teacher Competencies: An Integrated Study of Pre-service Training, Professional Development, Teacher Evaluation, and Certification Systems. JCET SIG on English Education
- TERG. (2002)(2003)(2004). A Comparative Study of In-Service English Teacher Education in Japan—from status quo to renovations—. Teacher Education Research Group
- Tamai, K. (2009a). Rifurekutibu purakutisu to kyoshi no seicho [Reflective practice and teacher development]. *Eigo Kyoiku* [*English Teachers' Magazine*]. vol.57. No. 13. 10-12. Taishukan Shoten
- Tamai, K. (2009b). Rifurekutibu purakutisu [Reflective practice]. In Yoshida, T. et al. *Rifurekutibu na eigokyoiku wo mezashite* [*Seeking Reflective English Education*]. 119-190. Hitsuji Shobo
- Yokomizo, S. (2009). Kyoshi ga tomoni seichosuru toki [When teachers develop together]. In Yoshida, T. et al. *Rifurekutibu na eigokyoiku wo mezashite* [*Seeking Reflective English Education*]. 75-118. Hitsuji Shobo

Chapter 2

Mentoring Programs Developed at Northern Arizona University: Implications for Japanese Teacher Education

Natsue Nakayama, Shien Sakai, Hisatake Jimbo

I Background

1. Teacher professional development and standards

Their chosen occupation requires teachers to develop professionally throughout their career. Despite their relative professional inexperience, many novice teachers can be effective in the workplace thanks to their youthful enthusiasm, sensitivity to students' needs and passion for the profession. The teachers then develop professionally by building up experience throughout their career. However, experience alone will not lead novice teachers to grow in a balanced way. The importance attached to continuous teacher training in the public school system in Japan has led to the 1988 revision of the Special Rules for the Public Education Personnel and Staff Act. Article nine of this Act, stipulates the responsibility of an educator "to pursue ongoing research and seek to develop themselves in order to better meet educational challenges. On the other hand, Article 22 stipulates employer's duty to "provide all the educational personnel with opportunities to engage n training." This Special Rule has enabled teachers to attend professional development training held outside school even during the working hours. This has also led to a mandatory participation for teachers in many training programs including those for induction or for teachers with a ten-year experience. From 1992 onwards, educational institutions at every level introduced in-service teacher training. This development could be considered as a reaction corresponding to the suggestion made by the Commission of the European Communities (2005) which points out that "countries which employ teachers on a permanent basis (such as Japan) tend to suffer from the problems of teacher quality and accountability in the latter stages of their professional careers." Despite the increase in the number of in-service training programs provided, their quality is not necessarily adequate. The Commission of the European Communities (2007) describes the importance of in-service

teacher training for better student achievements as follows:

“ Research shows that teacher quality is significantly and positively correlated with pupil attainment and that it is the most important within-school aspect explaining student performance. Furthermore, other studies have found positive relationships between in-service teacher training and student achievement and ‘suggest that an in-service training program ... raised children's achievement ...(and) suggest that teacher training may provide a less costly means of increasing test scores than reducing class size or adding school hours’.”

In the light of these statements, it is time we started considering how to raise the quality of in-service teacher training in Japan. Furthermore, what kind of support will be conducive to maximizing teacher development?

One suggestion is setting professional standards which would function as guidelines for teachers' ongoing development. Osaki (2008) states that a current trend of the education in developed countries is “in the direction of setting professional standards for teachers depending on their stages of development.” Yet, Japan presents an exception to this trend. As a case in point, when teacher certification renewal system was introduced in 2009, this policy was implemented in a very haphazard way, without a due consultation among stakeholders and in the absence of clearly defined objective. As a result the new assessment mechanism was widely criticized as inadequate by professional educators. Focusing on in-service training mentioned above, there are obligatory training programs organized for Japanese public school teachers depending on their experience. However, research conducted by JACET SIG on English Education (2008) demonstrates that, most of those programs do not incorporate standards or benchmarks that map out teachers' ongoing developmental pathways. Although the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (henceforth MEXT) stipulated professional competency for English teachers as having pre- first grade of STEP (Society of Testing English Proficiency), a minimum score of TOEFL 550 or TOEIC 730 in 2003 Action Plan, the authorities made no references to teachers' professional development. Just like the problem of career-based employment as pointed out by the Commission of the European Communities, this type of unified competency requirement will not present an incentive for teachers to engage in the continuous professional development as their career will not be contingent on any further self-improvement once the established benchmark has been cleared. In order to provide an incentive for the teachers to keep on upgrading their skills throughout

their professional lives, standards that will make teachers aware of their own growth are necessary. However, the question remains: will the creation of standards be sufficient to make a significant difference in the quality of in-service training?

2. Teachers' development and mentoring process

From 2007, when then Prime Minister Abe was seeking to introduce teacher certification renewal system, JACET SIG on English Education research group has started looking into what professional knowledge or skills Japanese English teachers should possess. At that time, the research was conducted under the assumption that benchmarks or standards of pedagogical competence would be different depending on one's professional experience. Thus, we designed provisional standards for competencies of Japanese English teachers by dividing them into three categories: novice teachers, veteran teachers, and mentors (JACET SIG on English Education, 2007). At the time of the research, however, the authors did not have a well formulated notion of 'mentors'. The practice at the time was for a novice teacher to receive guidance from a veteran colleague, who was called a teaching advisor. The role of the teaching advisor was to assist a novice teacher to improve his or her practical teaching skills. The only qualification for becoming a teaching advisor was to possess more than ten years of classroom experience. No specific training on how to be a mentor was offered. As a result, in many cases mentoring was reduced to a 'follow my example' model.

Our research on benchmarks or standards of pedagogical competence involved a careful examination of several overseas models. Research teams traveled to Canada and the U.S. A. to examine policies, practices and other issues related to teacher training, professional development opportunities and assessment mechanisms. The report of the visits stressed that mentors should play a central role in the professional development for school teachers. The research also underscores some important differences in the role of a teaching advisor in the Japanese from a mentor in the American educational context. Usually, mentors in western countries were trying to promote teachers' professional development in line with various educational standards or benchmarks set. Mentors also benefited from a systematic training. Subsequently research on professional competencies evolved into a broader inquiry focusing, among other dimensions, on the role of mentors. Therefore, the objective of this paper is a more thorough understanding of the mentor roles and what elements of this system may be successfully emulated in the Japanese educational environment.

3. An overview of the mentoring system in the American educational context

According to Westerman (1991, cited in Boreen et al. 2008), there are four differences between expert and novice teachers in terms of their decision-making process.

- 1) Experienced teachers integrated present learning with past and future learning and drew connections to other disciplines, whereas beginning teachers tended to rely on grade-level objectives and had more difficulty in making cross-disciplinary connections, most likely because they were unfamiliar with the curriculum at other grade levels.
- 2) Veteran teachers tended to use proactive strategies to prevent management problems while beginning teachers waited for the problem to arise and then used reactive techniques.
- 3) Experienced teachers were more likely to see the “big picture”, while novice teachers had a “may be it will work-maybe it won’t” attitude.
- 4) Experienced teachers evaluated their lessons according to their students’ needs and growth in understanding, whereas novice teachers judged their lessons according to students’ reactions and their achievement of the original objective.

Without an efficient mentor, novice teachers need years of experience and considerable outside training to reach the level of the experienced teachers discussed above. With this view in mind, the attempt to nurture novice teachers’ competencies efficiently into those of the veteran teachers has brought about the search for effective mentoring system from the mid-19th century in the United States. Tracing the history of mentoring, Boreen et al (2008) describe the transition of the concept of student-mentor relationship as follows: In the mid-1800s, just like the case of Japan, student teachers who did not take the education courses were expected to follow the footsteps of an experienced teacher. Whereas today, students and new teachers are recognized as adult learners who have different learning styles and “multiple intelligences” (Gardener, 2006). This shows that the emphasis is now on educating new teachers to become reflective thinkers who can explore their own individual teaching styles.¹

We can see that the role of a mentor in the U.S. has changed from a role model or an instructor to a colleague or an experienced peer who will help novice teachers reflect on their own problems and in the end become autonomous. To explore how these

principles apply in a practical educational setting, a visit to Northern Arizona University (NAU) on March, 2009 was undertaken. NAU was chosen because we were primarily interested in their workshop on mentoring that took place in 2007 American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) conference. Furthermore, Arizona State University System has developed various educational standards, such as Arizona Professional Teacher Standards or Professional Development Standards. Mentoring system at NAU is also in line with those standards. Space constraints do not allow us to list all the educational standards of Arizona government. (See “Standards and assessment” on <http://www.ade.az.gov/> for a full list of references).

II Teacher Induction Program at Northern Arizona University

1. Outline of the program

Within this program NAU undertakes the role of training mentors and dispatching them to secondary schools. In Phoenix, Arizona, there are seven school districts and NAU was sending 32 mentors to each district. These mentors belong to a school district and not to each school, so one mentor can be responsible for beginning teachers at several schools in a district. This program is quite unique in the United States. The existence of it is the evidence of the good financial state of the school district and of the recognition it receives.

NAU organizes training for mentors who support the growth of the beginning teacher, and for the administrators who evaluate the beginning teachers. All these programs are systematically designed to meet the Arizona State Teacher Standards. Under this unified set of standards, both mentors and administrators work to support and train beginning teachers and “to increase student achievement and develop a community of professional educators to accelerate practice (mission of TIP @ NAU: <http://tip.coe.nau.edu/>)”.

2. Characteristics and Goals of TIP@NAU

2.1 Nine Common Elements for Highly Effective Teacher Induction Programs

Within the context of their research Arizona K-12 Center has identified nine common elements for effective teacher induction program Teacher induction program at NAU is based on these elements.

(1) Orientation of new teachers at least five days in length, which includes an overview of curriculum, training in important curricular features, a review of district policies and calendar of events, and an introduction to the mentor program and opportunity to meet mentors.

(2) Time provided for support activities for new teachers, including new teacher seminars, model lessons by mentors, observations and feedback.

(3) Adjusting Working Conditions: for example, reducing student numbers, minimizing other assignments, providing classroom materials and supplies, and providing developmentally appropriate professional development activities.

(4) Formal Mentoring including the following components: matching mentors and new teachers by location, grade, and subject; regular contact and formative observations by the mentor; feedback from the mentor based on strengths, concerns, and a formulated plan for improvement; and compensation for the mentor.

(5) Professional Development mentioned in 3 above: the development and implementation of a professional growth plan, and alignment with professional teaching standards and academic standards.

(6) Opportunities for Collegial Interaction including new teacher support teams and study groups that focus on specific topics.

(7) Teacher Assessment including documentation of strengths and concerns related to the teaching practices of the new teacher, and a new teacher assessment of the level of assistance received from the mentor.

(8) Program Evaluation: including a comprehensive and ongoing system involving all participants, a focus on increased student growth and achievement, and teacher retention.

(9) Induction Continuum including continued assistance into the second and third year, and a readjustment of assistance based on the new teacher's needs.

(<http://tip.coe.nau.edu/bestpractices/bestpracticesinduction/>)

2.2 Program Goals

There are seven goals to attain the mission of TIP@NAU stated above: Accelerate Beginning Teachers' practice as defined by the Arizona Professional Teacher Standards.

- (1) Develop full-time mentors who employ a variety of formative assessment tools and strategies.
- (2) Build beginning teacher capacity to analyze student work to improve student achievement.
- (3) Assist beginning teachers in demonstrating ongoing self-assessment and reflection.
- (4) Develop a professional learning community among beginning teachers and mentors.
- (5) Increase the beginning teacher retention rate.
- (6) Implement the Nine Common Elements of a Teacher Induction Program.

(<http://tip.coe.nau.edu/>)

3. Characteristics of the Mentor Training Program at NAU

There are eight elements which are at the core of the mentor training. Since a mentor has a central role in accelerating practice of beginning teachers, these elements represent the priority areas in this process.

- (1) Beginning teachers' characteristics
- (2) Rationale for supporting beginning teachers
- (3) Skills to identify needs and concerns of novices
- (4) Building a trusting relationship
- (5) Variety of coaching techniques
- (6) Developing skills in multiple methods of classroom
- (7) Working with adults
- (8) Data collection and analysis of different types of evidence that learning is taking place and teaching is effective

Behind these eight points, there lie three principles we have learned through conferring with Dr. Horn who organizes and conducts mentor training at NAU.

- Mentors should not assess their mentees: assessment of mentees should be conducted by the administration, usually the principal or the vice-principal.
- Mentors should not instruct their mentees: a mentor should focus on the needs of

the mentee and try to promote the mentee's reflection through discussion, giving advice or making suggestions. For that, a mentor needs to focus on being a listener and let the mentee talk. Being a listener is one of the topics addressed in the mentor training session.

- To build a trusting relationship: Dr. Horn stated that a mentor should not disclose the mentee's personal information to the third party.

4. Assessment cycle that promotes mentor development

How is a mentor's development assessed? TIP@NAU supports life long learning through the implementation of an individual "mentor's growth plan". The core element of the life long learning is a formative assessment cycle for the mentors, and this cycle is used for mentors' professional growth. This formative assessment cycle consists of three major elements: Setting goals, Data collection, and Reflection. As can be seen from item (8) of mentor training program, this cycle has been introduced not only to promote the development of a mentee but also that of the mentor.

4.1 Setting goals

The first stage of this formative assessment cycle for the mentor is to set individual "growth plan". In order to identify strengths and weaknesses mentors use "Mentor's practice and growth" framework which is based on Mentor standards of TIP@NAU.

The goals of individual "mentor's growth plan" should be flexible and sustainable and the period for development should be decided depending on the needs of the mentors, which would vary from six weeks to one year. The goal should be set in the first three to five weeks of the school year. Mentor can see their supervisor and discuss about their growth plan or ask for assistance. The items which should be included in mentor's growth plan are as follows:

- Individual growth goal: what you want to know/ what you want to achieve
- Level and description as a mentor: what is your final goal
- Action plan: what you should do to achieve your goal
- Evidence of achievement: what kind of data should be collected to prove your growth towards your set-goal

4.2 Data collection

Through data collection, which comes in the second stage of mentor's formative assessment cycle, mentors can research specific aspects of their practice and assess their degree of achievement. Data represents evidence of achievement. Mentors decide which data to collect and they can ask their coach or supervisor to collect observable data for the process. The collectable data are as follows:

- VCR that recorded practice as a mentor
- a written record of a lesson as a mentor
- self-watching report while working as a mentor
- conference data or log with the novice teacher with their names hidden
- conversation record with the administration
- research on novice teachers (with electronic file or document file)
- data collection tool such as students' behavioral patterns or seating charts
- management tool such as weekly planner or communication log with a novice teacher
- various types of evidence photos
- communication log of all the people involved

All of the above mentioned data could be included in "Portfolio for mentor's professional growth" and will be used to assess degree of achievement of individual "mentor's growth plan".

4.3 Reflection

Reflection is a critical function of successful teaching and learning, whatever an individual's experience or level of education (Boreen et al. 2009, p.57) The following are viewpoints which mentors use to reflect on their own practice:

- What kind of difference can I make by mentoring?
- Are things which I am learning impacting mentees or their students?
- How can I determine if I am working effectively?

In order for the mentors to reflect on their own practice, they should collect evidence in line with the viewpoints mentioned above. The collected data will be documented and included in the "Portfolio for mentor's professional growth". "Summary of the growth" report would include components that promoted or hindered their growth. "Next step" section would clarify how a mentor wishes to continue dealing with the present goal and whether a new goal setting is advisable. These documented reflections should also be included in the above mentioned portfolio.

During the period of reflection, mentors should analyze whether they have fulfilled

their “growth plan”. If they think the goal is no longer appropriate, they should analyze whether the set goal has already been achieved or it is no longer relevant. When that stage is reached, a mentor should start setting new goals for the “growth plan” and start a new process from the beginning.

III Summery of mentor training program@NAU

While space constrains prevent us from a more expanded description of the mentor training program at NAU, the following two dimensions of this mechanism warrant further attention:

- 1) An emphasis on fostering collegiality between a mentor and a mentee, and
- 2) is trying to develop mentor’s meta-cognitive strategy through training.

The sections below provide an overview of relevant literature dealing with these features.

1. Fostering collegiality

The program at NAU emphasized the growth of both the mentor and the mentee as colleagues engaged in an equal, rather than a hierarchical, relationship. The advice should be based not only on the personal experience of the mentor but perhaps even more importantly on the pedagogical and language learning theories. Then, the mentee can understand his or her practice was theoretically sound, while the mentor also gains insights from observing the mentee’s practice and applying the appropriate theoretical base. Costa and Garmston (2002) advocate “cognitive coach” is a way for teachers to be conscious about their teaching practice and philosophy. They encourage goals such as trust, mutual learning and “holonomy”, which they define as acting independently and interdependently at the same time, thus assisting teachers to feel at ease in making independent choices while also being able to work cooperatively within a team. (Boreen, et al., 2008, p.37) On the other hand, Gottesman (2000) explains peer coaching as one-on-one interchange in which reciprocal partners learn from each other. Through these experiences, mentor who will take the role of either a cognitive or peer coach, will be able to think more about one’s own classroom practice as well as how students learn. (Boreen, et al., 2009, pp.37-38) This concept is very important and useful for teaching advisors in Japanese educational settings to know because Japan is still a very hierarchical society including the realm of professional relationships. The traditional workplace dynamics make it difficult for mentors and mentees to be on equal footing

and build a trusting relationship.

2. Meta-cognitive strategy

Looking at some of the main characteristics of the mentor training program mentioned above, we can see that NAU stresses training of meta-cognitive strategies of mentors that will have a ripple effect on those of the mentee and, finally, on the students.

For example, the developmental cycle of planning, data collection analysis, and reflection mentioned above is similar to the process of meta-cognitive strategy of Schraw (2001; cited in Sannomiya, 2008) : “planning, monitoring and evaluation”. In addition, building a trusting relationship as colleagues required in fostering a mentor-mentee relationship can be considered as part of using meta-cognitive skills. To build this trusting relationship, a mentor needs to understand own emotions and the sentiments of the mentee. According to Sannomiya (2009), this ability will also be part of the meta-cognitive skills. She further explains that the effective use of emotion will be a subset of meta-cognitive skills.

Focusing on the assessment cycle of mentor and mentee, we have found that reflection, which could be included in the meta-cognitive skills as mentioned above, plays the key role. Boreen et al (2009, p.57) touch upon the importance of reflection in teacher development as follows:

Reflection can be defined as an analytical process of data-gathering and sense-making through which teachers deepen their understanding of teaching and learning.

IV Implications for Japanese Teacher Education

1. Need to establish systematic and attainable standards

In-service training is one of the major opportunities offered to the teachers for professional development. However, neither schools nor school boards which support each school, or universities which provide pre-service training have developed cohesive and comprehensive standards to improve English teachers’ professional competencies. In other words, since Japan was long considered as a homogeneous country, with almost all the people receiving very similar elementary and secondary education authorized by

the ministry of education, where school teachers had been paid highly respect. In good old days, teachers in Japanese educational environment had not been facing an urgent need to create standards. However, after late 1970s, schools have faced a myriad of challenges: a much higher rate of classroom violence; bullying, vandalism, and gaps in academic performance. Teachers were not equipped to deal with these problems, and as a result, the notion of traditional pre-service teaching education metamorphosed into the need for ongoing professional development. Minimum achievable professional standards have become an urgent need. Especially, considering the effective implementation of the teacher certification renewal system, we need unified standards which will constitute a guideline for planning and assessing the training. Presently, the assessment of teacher certification renewal system is left to the discretion of the training provider. Without unified standards that show minimum requirement for achievement, each training will have different passing standards that will create lack of fairness in the system. MEXT or local education boards should take the lead in producing unified standards that show minimum requirement for achievement and publicize them.

2. Need of meta-cognition training

Any mentoring mechanism designed in the Japanese context should also prioritize the training of the mentor's meta-cognitive strategy. Mentor and mentee should be on equal footing interacting in an atmosphere conducive to uninhibited sharing of professional concerns. This can be difficult to accomplish within the confines of the Japanese societal norms. Japanese workplace has been traditionally very hierarchical and instilling a sense of equality among mentors, who are typically more experienced teachers, and novice educators will be one of the challenges in this endeavor. Sannomiya (2008) explains, "by promoting meta-cognition, we can expect to improve ability to adapt to society, learning achievement, teaching skills or compensate failures." Thus, a mentor training program through which participants can learn both how to reflect on their performance and build trusting relationship at the same time, like the one we observed at NAU, would be needed in the Japanese context as well.

3. Need to promote cooperation between the secondary schools and universities

Inter-institutional collaboration in developing, implementing, and assessing the mentoring program is the key to the success of this mechanism. All stakeholders in this

process – academics and policy-makers, as well as parents, school administrators and teachers themselves - should engage in regular consultations to identify the needs at stake, constraints and available resources to enable them to proceed with the most effective policy.

Reference

- Boreen, J., Johnson, M. K., Niday, D., Potts, J. 2008. *Mentoring Beginning Teachers: Guiding, Reflecting, Coaching*, Stenhouse Publishers
- Commission of the European Communities. 2005. *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: Improving the Quality of Teacher Education*.
- Commission of the European Communities. 2007. *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: Improving the Quality of Teacher Education*.
- Costa, A. and R. Garmston. 2002. *Cognitive Coaching: A foundation for renaissance schools*. 2nd ed. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.
- Gottesman, B. 2000. *Peer Coaching for Educators*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- JACET SIG on English Education (2007). *A Teacher Certification Renewal System and Teacher Education and Assessment*
- JACET SIG on English Education (2008). *Developing English Teacher Competencies: An Integrated Study of Pre-service Training, Professional Development, Teacher Evaluation, and Certification Systems*
- Osaki, S. 2008. Nihon no Menkyo koushin-sei ni motomerareru kyouin kyouiku no kijyunka, *Eigo Kyoiku*, Vol57 (9), pp.32-33.
- Sannomiya, M. 2008. *Meta-cognition: Higher level of cognitive function that supports learning*, Kitaohji-shobo.

¹ Boreen et al (2008) describe the brief history of teacher-apprentice --mentor relationship in the United States as follows:

- Mid-1800s: The concept of teachers served apprenticeships as “pupil teacher” was introduced from England starting with Industrial Revolution. Apprenticed teachers, who took no education courses were expected to follow in the footsteps of an experienced teacher.
- 1920s: Some states began requiring education courses.
- 1950s: Many teacher education institutions had changed the term “practice

teaching” to “student teaching” which reflected a shift in thinking about the practice of neophyte teachers.

- 1980s: Various commissions urged the mentoring of beginning teachers.
- Today: Students and new teachers are recognized as adult learners and have different learning styles as well as “multiple intelligences” (Gardener, 2006). The emphasis now is on new teachers becoming reflective thinkers who explore their own individual teaching styles.

Chapter 3

Training English Teachers in France: The Role of the *Concours*

Hisatake Jimbo & Leo Yoffe

Introduction

Since the 19th century the study of English has played an important role in the French educational system. At present virtually all French students (approx. 97%) study English as a foreign language, most starting in grade two or three of primary school and continuing for over a decade. This clearly represents a significant investment of time and resources by the French educational authorities and underscores the importance the government of France accords to making students proficient in English. Yet, despite this national effort, the English skills of French students, as measured by the results of international assessments, have showed a marked decline. Together with several other West European nations France participated in assessment exercises conducted in 1996 and 2002 (see Note 1). The results from the former period show that French pupils were performing at a level comparable to Spain, however in 2002 (last year for which comparative data is available) the English proficiency level of the French participants was well below that of test takers from all other countries. The gap was particularly pronounced in the areas of oral comprehension and written production (The 2002 European Assessment of English Skills). The disappointing results put the spotlight on the quality of English education, and experts offered explanations ranging from France's deeply seated ambivalence towards English at a cultural level to a very uneven system of English instruction in primary schools. English teacher training at primary and secondary levels was also identified as one of the impediments to raising the communicative level of students. In this context the issue of *concours*, or highly competitive civil service examinations, came under scrutiny from many stakeholders (see Note 2). The present paper will offer some basic information about the education system in France, provide an overview of the teacher training system, and describe the challenges posed by the *concours*.

Education System in France

The French education system is centralized and comprises both public and private components. Compulsory education starts at age 6 when children enter the first year of primary school. Five-year primary education leads to lower secondary school (*Collège*) and, subsequently, to upper secondary school (*Lycée*), where students study for 4 and 3 years respectively. Higher education in France is divided between predominantly public universities and mostly private *grandes écoles*. The latter are generally much more competitive and prestigious. Students receive a *Licence* following three years of university level studies, a *Maîtrise* after four years, *Magistère* after five; and a *Doctorat* (PhD) after eight to ten years of tertiary-level education. It is important to note that French institutions of higher learning offer a number of other credentials (for further information see French Ministry of Education www.education.gouv.fr). French teachers are civil servants which makes the Ministry of Education of France possibly the largest employer in the country.

Pre-service Training of Secondary School Teachers

Since the 1990's the majority of prospective *Collège* and *Lycée* teachers have been trained at Instituts Universitaires de Formation des Maîtres (Teacher Colleges). Students interested in becoming teachers can apply to these institutions after completing three years of university studies and obtaining a *Licence*. The teacher training program spans a two-year period with the first year spent largely on preparation for a civil service examination, or a *concours*, and the second year focusing on specialized teacher education and a teaching practicum. Another path to become a teacher is by attending *école normale supérieure*. These institutions essentially belong to the category of *grandes écoles* and offer preparation for prospective high school teachers as well as university professors. Admission to these schools is highly competitive and is based on grades. The period of study is five years which includes intensive preparation for the civil service exam and a teaching practicum.

Concours

France uses very competitive national examinations to recruit teachers into the civil service.

The tradition of *concours* dates back several centuries to the reign of King Louis XV who in 1766 first introduced the notion of a comprehensive examination for prospective teachers. Since the 18th century the system expanded and at present every year approximately 100,000 hopefuls invest a considerable amount of energy and time to prepare themselves for the two assessment mechanisms: CAPES (leading to *Certificat d'aptitude au professorat de l'enseignement secondaire*) and Agrégation. The former is by far more prevalent with the ratio of respective test takers being seven to one (Whiteside, personal communication). Tests are administered in 37 different subjects including English. The passing rate is generally close to 10%. Successful candidates are rewarded by the system by being offered what is essentially a job for life. It has been generally perceived that a system of *concours* reflects the culturally embraced principles of meritocracy and ensures that the most qualified individuals enter the profession.

Criticism of the *Concours*

Poor performance on international English skills tests by French students was largely attributed to the following factors:

- Excessive use of French in the classroom even during supposedly communicative activities meant to be conducted in the target language.
- Grammatical accuracy is emphasized at the expense of fluency with teachers demanding perfection in spoken and written production. This attitude hinders students' expression and, more broadly, depresses their motivation to become conversant in English.
- French students have a very limited range of lexical knowledge in English.

These observations led to the questioning of the validity of the *concours* system itself. While there is no evidence of a direct relationship between poor student results and the inadequacy of the teacher recruitment tests, observers claim that:

- The extreme importance of the *concours* diverts the limited resources of the education system away from the pre- and in-service professional development of teachers to an intensive test preparation exercise. Prospective teachers spend a significant amount of pre-service training on learning how to answer the test questions which have little to do with classroom management or teaching skills.

- Recruitment tests evaluate one's ability to analyze the language and discuss it in French, rather than assess a candidate's ability to use it in a meaningful context.
- Recruitment tests demand a mastery of often arcane grammatical forms; a demonstrated ability to discern philosophical concepts and highly honed translational skills. While this may be useful in itself, the connection to teaching English to children aged 11 to 18 is seen as tenuous at best.

Every prominent assessment mechanism faces a degree of scrutiny, particularly if it serves as a gatekeeper to the profession. However, to determine whether the above claims are substantiated we need to examine the content of the test itself.

CAPES Examination

The external recruitment examination typically consists of four components divided into written and oral categories.

• **Written components**

1. **Analysis** (in English) of a literary text, or of a text on an aspect of American or British civilization. Time: 5 hours 10 points
2. **Essay** (in French) on a theme pertaining to the literature or civilization of English-speaking nation(s). Time: 5 hours 10 points
3. **Translation** (English to French and French to English) of diverse texts. Time: 5 hours 10 points

• **Oral Components**

4. **Presentation in English** followed by a discussion with committee members. Candidates have to demonstrate the ability to articulate their view on an issue pertaining to the English language using materials given by the committee. This component may also include a listening exercise in which the candidate is required to summarize orally in French the contents of a short recorded message. Time: 4 hours (preparation – 3 hours; presentation – 30 minutes, discussion – 30 minutes) 30 points
5. **Critical evaluation** of teaching materials (in French). followed by a discussion with committee members. Time: 3 hours (preparation – 2 hours; presentation – 30 minutes, and discussion – 30 minutes) 30 points

Agrégation Examination

Agrégation is a recruitment test taken largely by those interested in pursuing an academic career. Successful candidates usually become university professors and, less frequently, high school teachers. Typically many more prospective secondary level teachers choose to take CAPES as more positions are available via this route. In 2008 there were 942 teaching posts available via CAPES versus only 128 via Agrégation (Ministry of Education of France, 2009). However, the successful test-takers of the latter are usually destined to become members of the influential elite in the teaching community.

• **Written Components**

1. **Essay in French** on a theme pertaining to the literature or civilization of English-speaking nation(s). Time: 7 hours 10 points
2. **Analysis** (in English) of a literary text, or a text on an aspect of American or British civilization. Time: 6 hours 10 points
3. **Linguistic composition.** This component seeks to assess candidates' understanding of English language phonology and grammar. Test-takers have to explain in English a number of phonological phenomena and comment in French on three grammar points pre-identified in the text. Time: 6 hours 10 points
4. **Translation** (English to French and French to English). Time: 6 hours 20 points

• **Oral Components**

1. Presentation in English followed by a discussion with the examination committee. A candidate may choose one of the following three options: Time: 2 hours 45 minutes (preparation – 2 hours; presentation -- 30 minutes; discussion – 15 minutes) 20 points
 - A. **Literature:** A critical analysis in English of a literary text.
 - B. **Civilization:** A critical analysis in English of a cultural / historical text.
 - C. **Linguistics:** A linguistic analysis in English of a general text
2. **A demonstration lesson** based on one of the three options (A, B or C) above. Time: 5 hours 45 minutes (preparation – 5 hours, demonstration lesson – 30 minutes, discussion – 15 minutes) 20 points
3. **Listening exercise** in which a candidate listens to a recorded segment (3 minutes maximum in length) twice and provides a summary in French. This is followed by a discussion on the mechanics of the translation with the examination committee. Time: 30 minutes. 20 points

4. **Interview (in French) on the professional and ethical competences** required of a civil servant. A candidate expands on a specific topic within this theme using documents made available to him/her. Presentation is followed by a discussion with the examination committee. Time: 20 minutes (presentation – 10 minutes, discussion – 10 minutes) 20 points
5. **Analysis and problem-solving.** A candidate is required to analyze a problem of a social or professional nature, orally synthesize the relevant factors and suggest a possible solution in a presentation format, all in English. The presentation is followed by a discussion with the examination committee. Time: 5 hours 45 minutes (preparation – 5 hours, presentation – 20 minutes, discussion – 25 minutes) 20 points

Discussion and Conclusion

Obviously, both CAPES and Agrégation are comprehensive and involved testing measures. The sheer duration of the examinations is certainly very impressive. In addition to their English language productive and receptive skills, candidates are evaluated on the basis of their knowledge of Anglo-American culture and history, teaching methodology, and analytical and problem-solving abilities. Clearly, test-takers do need to invest a significant amount of time into perfecting these skills.

The critics attack the validity of the tests, claiming that the rigorous recruitment examinations do not test skills applicable in the classroom and, further, require little production in English. The analysis of the two instruments, however, reveals that test-takers do need to demonstrate proficiency in spoken and written English at a relatively high level. In the CAPES examination one-third of the candidate's grade comes from a critical evaluation of some teaching materials and in the Agrégation, a demonstration lesson is an integral component of the testing process. Thus, teaching skills as well as English skills are evaluated. Similarly, the accusations of the overuse of French seem out of place. Half of CAPES and Agrégation is arguably conducted in English in either a spoken or a written form. As to the nature of the reading materials candidates are exposed to, most of the texts are authentic and contemporary though may deal with fairly esoteric or abstract issues.

While *concours* have their limitations, they should not be singularly blamed for the declining English proficiency of French pupils. *Concours* represent a legitimate barrier to the entry into the teaching profession and should be viewed as a barometer of potential, rather than actual, teaching ability. Prospective teachers take the exams

normally during their first year of study at a teacher-training college and, whether successful or not, spend one more year on learning classroom management and other practical skills.

Civil service *concours* do not test fundamental competences in educational psychology, learning theories, and familiarity with the course of study – areas that are crucial for successful teaching. Prospective teachers gain this knowledge in the latter stages of their training, typically after they take the recruitment examination. This limitation strikes an interesting contrast with the teacher recruitment system in Japan where examinees have completed their pre-service training prior to taking the test. The examination itself, in addition to subject-specific components, includes assessments of the following competences:

1. education-related laws and regulations
2. student counseling
3. human rights education
4. lifelong education
5. educational psychology
6. school curriculum and course of study

(Tokyo Board of Education, 2010)

Perhaps where the *concours* system does fail both students and teachers is in the area of practical training. Pre-service educators are given a class to teach at the very start of their teaching practicum, while simultaneously they need to learn about the theory and practice of teaching. The system needs to be revised to allow for a more flexible curriculum in which practical classroom teaching is built not only on the intensive preparation for (relevant) recruitment exams, but also on the periods of classroom observation, discussions with in-service professionals, and incremental increases in teaching and administrative responsibilities.

Notes

1. The first assessment of the English language skills of European students was conducted in 1995-1996. The objective of this project was to compare achievements in English of pupils in France, Spain, Sweden and the Netherlands. In 2001 the European Network of Policy Makers for the Evaluation of Education Systems decided to repeat the survey with an expanded participation. Denmark, Finland, Germany and Norway agreed to take part in the study in addition to the original four participants. The instruments used in 1995 and 2001 were designed in the same way to facilitate

comparative assessment. They largely followed the testing frameworks used in France and Sweden at the time and were composed of the following elements

- linguistic (grammatical) knowledge 25 items
- reading comprehension 16 items
- written expression / production 21 items
- oral comprehension 13 items

It should be noted that oral expression was not included in this exercise. The 2002 results revealed that French pupils performed at a level significantly lower than that of six other participating nations (German results are not comparable). French examinees obtained their best mean results for reading comprehension followed by linguistic knowledge, oral comprehension and written production, in that order. While the mean scores remained relatively little changed in reading comprehension and linguistic knowledge from 1996 to 2002, they declined markedly in oral comprehension (41% to 34%) and written production (22% to 15%) in 1996 and 2002 respectively. For a complete report see

http://www.institutodeevaluacion.educacion.es/contenidos/internacional/Assessment_of_English_BED.pdf

2. Among the events which focused on the *concours* system, the roundtable organized by TESOL France in March 2008 deserves a special mention. Titled “*The Great Debate: Is the Current Concours System (CAPES and Agrégation) the Best Method for Selecting and Preparing Future English Teachers in France?*” the discussion represented an exchange between different stakeholders on the issue of the *concours*. While the colloquium itself was rather inconclusive with participants expressing a diverse spectrum of views, it was beneficial in raising the awareness of the perceived problems of the *concours* among the educators and the general public. For a full report see:

http://www.tesol-france.org/Great_Debate_Proceedings_20081007.pdf

References

- The European Network of Policy Makers for the Evaluation of Education Systems, *The Assessment of Pupils' Skills in English in Eight European Countries*, 2002
- Jahn, L. The Education System of France, presented at the AACRAO Annual Conference, 2007
- Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche, DGRH. *Concours du second degré*, 2008

TESOL France. *The Great Debate: Is the Current Concours System (CAPES and Agrégation) the Best Method for Selecting and Preparing Future English Teachers in France?* Paris, 2008

Whiteside, L. Personal communication, 2010.

協同教育研究会、東京都の教職教養、2010

Attachment

Chapter 1

Adapting EPOSTL to the Japanese Educational Context

Self-Assessment Descriptors for Student Teachers of English in Japan

CONTEXT

A. Curriculum

- 1 I can understand the requirements set in the Course of Study.

B. Aims and Needs

- 2 I can understand the value of learning other languages.
- 3 I can take account of long-term aims based on the Course of Study and learners' needs.
- 4 I can take into account differing motivations for learning English.
- 5 I can take into account the cognitive needs of learners (problem solving, drive for communication, acquiring knowledge etc.)
- 6 I can take into account the affective needs of learners (sense of achievement, enjoyment etc.)

C. The Role of the Teachers of English

- 7 I can promote the value and benefits of English learning to learners, parents and others.
- 8 I can take into account the knowledge of the Japanese language of learners and help them to build on this knowledge when learning English.
- 9 I can critically assess my teaching in relation to theoretical principles.
- 10 I can critically assess my teaching on the basis of learner feedback and learning outcomes and adapt it accordingly.
- 11 I can accept feedback from my peers and mentors and build it into my teaching.
- 12 I can observe my peers and offer them constructive feedback.
- 13 I can identify specific pedagogical / didactic issues relating to my learners or my teaching in the form of a reflective approach.
- 14 I can locate useful information (articles, journals and research findings) relating to aspects of teaching and learning.

D. Institutional Resources and Constraints

- 15 I can assess how I might use the resources available in my school (OHP, computers, library, etc.).

METHODOLOGY

A. Speaking / Spoken Interaction

- 16 I can create a supportive atmosphere and provide a specific situation for language use that invites learners to actively take part in speaking activities.
- 17 I can evaluate and select meaningful speaking and interactional activities to encourage learners to express their opinions, cultural backgrounds and identities, etc.
- 18 I can evaluate and select meaningful speaking and interactional activities to help learners to develop competencies for presentation, discussion, etc.
- 19 I can evaluate and select a variety of materials to stimulate speaking activities (visual aids, texts, authentic materials etc.).
- 20 I can evaluate and select various activities to help learners to use typical features of spoken language (fillers, supportive responses, etc.) and engage in interaction with others.
- 21 I can evaluate and select a variety of techniques to make learners aware of and help them to use stress, rhythm and intonation.
- 22 I can evaluate and select a range of oral activities to develop accuracy (vocabulary, grammar, etc.).

B. Writing / Written Interaction

- 23 I can evaluate and select meaningful activities to encourage learners to develop their creative potential.
- 24 I can evaluate and select activities which help learners to participate in written exchanges (emails, etc.) and to initiate or respond to text appropriately.
- 25 I can help learners to gather and share information for their writing tasks.
- 26 I can help learners to plan and structure written texts (e.g. by using mind maps, outlines etc.).
- 27 I can help learners to write a coherent paragraph or essay.
- 28 I can evaluate and select writing activities to consolidate learning (grammar, vocabulary, spelling etc.).

C. Listening

- 29 I can select texts appropriate to the needs, interests and language level of the learners.
- 30 I can provide a range of pre-listening activities which help learners to orient themselves to a text.
- 31 I can encourage learners to use their knowledge of a topic and their expectations about a text when listening.

32 I can design and select different activities in order to practice and develop different listening strategies (listening for gist, specific information etc.)

33 I can design and select different activities which help learners to recognize and interpret typical features of spoken language (tone of voice, intonation, style of speaking etc.)

D. Reading

34 I can select texts appropriate to the needs, interests and language levels of learners.

35 I can provide a range of pre-reading activities to help learners to orient themselves to a text.

36 I can encourage learners to use their knowledge of a topic and their expectations about a text when reading.

37 I can apply appropriate ways of reading a text in class (ex. aloud, silently, in groups).

38 I can set different activities in order to practice and develop different reading strategies according to the purpose of reading (skimming, scanning).

39 I can evaluate and select a variety of post-reading tasks to provide a bridge between reading and other skills.

40 I can recommend books appropriate to the needs, interests, language levels of the learners (for extensive reading).

E. Grammar

41 I can deal with questions learners may ask about grammar and if necessary, help them to use appropriate grammar reference books and dictionaries.

42 I can evaluate and select grammatical exercises and activities, which support learning and encourage oral and written communication.

F. Vocabulary

43 I can evaluate and select a variety of activities which help learners to learn vocabulary in context.

44 I can understand Longman's Basic 2000 Words, and evaluate and select a variety of activities with these words.

45 I can understand and use high and low frequency words, and receptive and productive vocabulary for my learners.

G. Culture

46 I can evaluate and select a variety of activities which awaken learners' interest in and help them to develop their knowledge and understanding of their own and the English language culture.

RESOURCES

- 47 I can identify and evaluate a range of coursebooks/materials appropriate for the age, interests and the English language level of the learners.
- 48 I can select those texts and language activities from coursebooks appropriate for my learners.
- 49 I can locate and select listening and reading materials appropriate for the needs of my learners from a variety of sources, such as literature, mass media and the Internet.
- 50 I can make use of ideas, lesson plans and materials included in teachers' handbooks and resource books.
- 51 I can design learning materials and activities appropriate for my learners.
- 52 I can recommend dictionaries and other reference books useful for my learners.
- 53 I can guide learners to use the Internet for information retrieval.

LESSON PLANNING

A. Identification of Learning Objectives

- 54 I can identify curriculum requirements and set learning aims and objectives suited to my learners' needs and interests.
- 55 I can plan specific learning objectives for individual lessons and/or for a period of teaching.
- 56 I can set objectives which challenge learners to reach their full potential.
- 57 I can set objectives which take into account the differing levels of ability and special educational needs of the learners.
- 58 I can set objectives for four main skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing respectively, according to the focus of individual lessons and/or period of teaching.
- 59 I can set objectives which encourage learners to reflect on their learning.

B. Lesson Content

- 60 I can structure lesson plans and/or plan for periods of teaching in a coherent and varied sequence of content.
- 61 I can plan activities to ensure the interdependence of listening, reading, writing and speaking.
- 62 I can plan activities to emphasize the interdependence of language and culture.
- 63 I can plan activities which link grammar and vocabulary with communication.
- 64 I can identify time needed for specific topics and activities and plan work accordingly.
- 65 I can design activities to make the learners aware of and build on their existing knowledge.

- 66 I can vary and balance activities to enhance and sustain the learners' motivation and interest.
- 67 I can vary and balance activities in order to respond to individual learners' learning styles.
- 68 I can take account of learners' feedback and comments and incorporate this into future lessons.

C. Lesson Organisation

- 69 I can select from and plan a variety of organisational formats (frontal, individual, pair, group work) as appropriate.
- 70 I can plan for learner presentations and learner interaction.
- 71 I can plan when and how to use the target language, including metalanguage I may need in the classroom.
- 72 I can plan lessons and periods of teaching with other teachers and/or assistant language teachers (team teaching, with other subject teachers etc.).

CONDUCTING A LESSON

A. Using Lesson Plans

- 73 I can start a lesson in an engaging way.
- 74 I can be flexible when working from a lesson plan and respond to learner interests as the lesson progresses.
- 75 I can adjust my time schedule when unforeseen situations occur.
- 76 I can time classroom activities to reflect individual learners' attention spans.

B. Content

- 77 I can relate what I teach to learners' knowledge and previous language learning experiences, current events in local context, and the culture of those who speak it.

C. Interaction with Learners

- 78 I can keep and maximize the attention of learners during a lesson.
- 79 I can be responsive and react supportively to learner initiative and interaction.
- 80 I can cater to a range of learning styles.
- 81 I can make explicit and help learners to develop appropriate learning strategies.

D. Classroom Management

- 82 I can create opportunities for and manage individual, partner, group and whole class work.
- 83 I can make and use resources efficiently (flashcards, charts, pictures, etc.).

E. Classroom Language

- 84 I can conduct a lesson in English, and if necessary use Japanese effectively.
- 85 I can encourage learners to use English in their activities.

INDEPENDENT LEARNING

A. Learner Autonomy

- 86 I can guide and assist learners in setting their own aims and objectives and in planning their own learning.
- 87 I can assist learners in choosing tasks and activities according to their individual needs and interests.
- 88 I can help learners to reflect on and evaluate their own learning processes and evaluate the outcomes.

B. Homework

- 89 I can evaluate and select tasks most suited to be carried out by learners at home.
- 90 I can provide necessary support for learners in order for them to do homework independently and assist them with time management.
- 91 I can assess homework according to valid and transparent criteria.

E. Virtual Learning Environments

- 92 I can use various ICT resources (email, Web sites, computer programs, etc), and guide learners appropriately to use them.

ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING

A. Designing Assessment Tools

- 93 I can evaluate and select valid assessment procedures (written tests, performance tests, etc.) appropriate to learning aims and objectives.
- 94 I can design and use in-class activities to monitor and assess a learner's participation and performance.

B. Evaluation

- 95 I can identify strengths and areas for improvement in a learner's performance.
- 96 I can present my assessment of a learner's performance and progress in the form of a descriptive evaluation, which is transparent and comprehensible to the learner, parents and others.
- 97 I can use appropriate assessment procedures to chart and monitor a learner's progress (reports, checklist, grades, etc.).

D. Language Performance

- 98 I can assess a learner's ability to engage in spoken and written interactions.

E. Culture

- 99 I can assess learners' ability to make comparisons between their own and the culture of the English language communities.

F. Error Analysis

- 100 I can analyze learners' errors and provide constructive feedback to them.

Section 2: Making an Adaptation of the Self-Assessment Section in the EPOSTL

Natsue Nakayama, Satsuki Osaki

1. The deleted descriptors and the reason for deletion in the process of developing first adaptation

<How to read the table>

The table consists of five columns. Each column shows the following:

- **Categories of the original EPOSTL** : It shows the seven categories used in the original EPOSTL
- **Original** : Based on the original descriptors in EPOSTL, each area (A, B, C,...) of the above mentioned categories together with the ‘can-do’ descriptor number is displayed. For example, if the descriptor was the first descriptor under area A, we displayed this descriptor as A1.
- **Process and Criteria for developing the first adaptation** : The circled number shows when the deletion took place in the process: ② shows the second step in developing the first adaption, ③ shows the third step. The number following the circled number shows the criteria for developing the first adaption mentioned in section 2. The criteria is as follows:
 - (1) Modify descriptors which do not match curricular content or pedagogical methods adopted in Japanese secondary schools.
 - (2) Modify or delete descriptors which require English language or pedagogical competences that exceed those required of the Japanese English language teachers.
 - (3) Basically delete or modify descriptors if substantial modification will be needed to match the reality of Japanese students in a teacher training course.
 - (4) Use terms or expression that would be understandable to Japanese students in a teacher training course.
 - (5) Combine descriptors if their contents overlap within the parameters of the Japanese educational settings.
- **reason(s) for deletion** : We have added further reasons for deletion.
- **‘can-do’ descriptors** : Original descriptors in EPOSTL is listed for reference.

categories	original	criteria	reason(s) for deletion	'can-do' descriptors
1. Context	A2	②-1,3	The descriptors do not fit the Japanese educational context.	I can design language courses around the requirements of the national and local curricula.
	A3	②-1		I can understand the principles formulated in relevant European documents (e.g. Common European Framework of Reference, European Language Portfolio).
	A4	②-1		I can understand and integrate content of European documents (e.g. Common European Framework of Reference, European Language Portfolio) as appropriate in my teaching.
	B6	③-3	Short period of teaching practicum in Japan cannot guarantee this level of achievement.	I can take into account and assess the expectations and impact of educational stakeholders (employers, parents, funding agencies etc.).
	C2	②-1,3	The descriptor does not fit the Japanese educational context.	I can appreciate and make use of the value added to the classroom environment by learners with diverse cultural backgrounds.
	C10	②-3	Short period of teaching practicum in Japan cannot guarantee this level of achievement.	I can identify and investigate specific pedagogical/ didactic issues related to my learners or my teaching in the form of action research.
2. Methodology	A2	②-1,2,3	The descriptors do not fit the Japanese educational context.	I can evaluate and select meaningful speaking and interactional activities to encourage learners of differing abilities to participate.

A7	③-1,2,3		I can evaluate and select activities which help learners to participate in ongoing spoken exchanges (conversations, transactions etc.) and to initiate or respond to utterances appropriately.
A9	②-1,2,3		I can help learners to use communication strategies (asking for clarification, comprehension checks etc.) and compensation strategies (paraphrasing, simplification etc) when engaging in spoken interaction.
B2	③-1,2,3		I can evaluate and select a range of meaningful writing activities to help learners become aware of and use appropriate language for different text types (letters, stories, reports etc).
B3	③-1,3		I can evaluate and select texts in a variety of text types to function as good examples for the learners' writing
B4	③-1,2,3		I can evaluate and select a variety of materials to stimulate writing (authentic materials, visual aids etc.).
B8	③-1,2,3		I can help learners to monitor, reflect on, edit and improve their own writing.
B9	②-1		I can use peer-assessment and feedback to assist the writing process.
C6	③-1,2,3	In Japanese educational context, it is difficult for teacher trainers to learn such strategies with limited time.	I can help learners to apply strategies to cope with typical aspects of spoken language (background noise, redundancy etc.)
C7	③-1, 3		I can help learners to apply strategies to cope with difficult or unknown vocabulary of a text.

C8	③-1,2,3		I can evaluate and select a variety of post-listening tasks to provide a bridge between listening and other skills.
D9	③-1	The concept of “critical reading skills” requires too much as a goal considering the Japanese educational context.	I can help learners to develop critical reading skills (reflection, interpretation, analysis etc.).
E2	③-1,3	The descriptor does not fit the Japanese educational context.	can introduce, and help students to deal with, new or unknown items of grammar in a variety of ways (teacher presentation, awareness-raising, discovery etc.).
F3	②-1	The content of F3 was divided into two descriptors through translation. Then the two new descriptors were deleted in the second phase.	I can evaluate and select activities which enhance learners' awareness of register differences.
G2	③-1,2,3	The descriptors do not fit the Japanese educational context.	I can create opportunities for learners to explore the culture of target language communities out of class (Internet, emails etc).
G3	③-1,2,3		I can evaluate and select a variety of texts, source materials and activities which make learners aware of similarities and differences in sociocultural 'norms of behaviour'.
G4	③-1,2,3		I can evaluate and select activities (role plays, simulated situations etc.) which help learners to develop their socio-cultural competence.

	G5	③-1,2,3		I can evaluate and select a variety of texts, source material and activities which help learners to reflect on the concept of 'otherness' and understand different value systems.
	G6	③-1,2,3		I can evaluate and select texts, source materials and activities to make the learners aware of stereotyped views and challenge these.
	G7	③-1,2,3		I can evaluate and select activities which enhance the learners' intercultural awareness.
3. Resource es	7	③-3	Short period of teaching practicum in Japan cannot guarantee this level of achievement.	I can guide learners to produce materials for themselves and for other learners.
	8	③-3		I can select and use ICT materials and activities in the classroom which are appropriate for my learners.
	9	③-3		I can design ICT materials and activities appropriate for my learners.
	11	③-3		I can use and critically assess ICT learning programmes and platforms.
4. Lesson Planning	B6	③-1	The descriptors do not fit the Japanese educational context.	I can plan to teach elements of other subjects using the target language (cross- curricular teaching, CLIL etc.).
	B12	③-1,3		I can involve learners in lesson planning.
5. Conducting a Lesson	A3	②-5	The descriptor is similar to A2, A4, and A5.	I can ensure smooth transitions between activities and tasks for individuals, groups and the whole class.
	A6	②-5	The descriptor is similar to A5.	I can finish off a lesson in a focused way.

	B1	②-3,4	The descriptor is too long and less important than the others.	I can present language content (new and previously encountered items of language, topics etc.) in ways which are appropriate for individuals and specific groups of learners.
	C1	②-5	C1 is similar to C2, so C1 and C2 were integrated. Then the both were deleted in the next phase.	I can settle a group of learners into a room and gain their attention at the beginning of a lesson.
	C4	②-5	C4 is similar to C3, so C3 and C4 were integrated. Then the both were deleted in the next phase.	I can encourage learner participation whenever possible.
	D1	②-3,4	The descriptor is too long and less important than the others.	I can take on different roles according to the needs of the learners and requirements of the activity (resource person, mediator, supervisor etc.).
	E3	②-1,2	The descriptors do not fit the Japanese educational context.	I can use the target language as metalanguage.
	E4	②-1,3		I can use various strategies when learners do not understand the target language.
	E6	②-1		I can encourage learners to relate the target language to other languages they speak or have learned where and when this is helpful.
6. Independent learning	A1	③-1	To promote students' "reflection" is too high level to achieve in the limited practicum period of Japan.	I can evaluate and select a variety of activities which help learners to reflect on their existing knowledge and competences.
	A2	③-1		I can evaluate and select a variety of activities which help learners to identify and reflect on individual learning processes and learning styles.

A4	③-1		I can evaluate and select tasks which help learners to reflect on and develop specific learning strategies and study skills.
B2	③-1	The descriptor does not fit the Japanese educational context.	I can set homework in cooperation with learners.
C1	②-1	To conduct project work will not be a suitable objective to achieve considering a limited practicum period in Japan.	I can plan and manage project work according to relevant aims and objectives.
C2	②-1		I can plan and organise cross-curricular project work myself or in cooperation with other teachers.
C3	②-1		I can assist the learners in their choices during the various stages of project work.
C4	②-1		I can encourage learners to reflect on their work (diaries, logs etc.).
C5	②-1		I can help learners to use relevant presentation tools.
C6	②-1		I can assess the process and outcome of project work in cooperation with learners.
D1	②-1	Portfolio work will not be a suitable educational goal to achieve for the student teachers due to limited practicum period in Japan.	I can set specific aims and objectives of portfolio work (for coursework, for continuous assessment etc.).
D2	②-1		I can plan and structure portfolio work.
D3	②-1		I can supervise and give constructive feedback on portfolio work.
D4	②-1		I can assess portfolios in relation to valid and transparent criteria.
D5	②-1		I can encourage self- and peer assessment of portfolio work.

	E3	②-3,4	It is difficult for teacher trainers to facilitate “learning platform” and discussion forum” in Japanese educational context.	I can initiate and facilitate various learning environments (learning platforms, discussion forums, web pages etc.)
	F1	②-3	Short period of teaching practicum in Japan cannot guarantee this level of achievement.	I can recognise when and where the need for extra-curricular activities to enhance learning arises (learner magazines, clubs, excursions etc.).
	F2	②-3		I can set aims and objectives for school trips, exchanges and international cooperation programmes.
	F3	②-3		I can help to organise exchanges in cooperation with relevant resource persons and institutions.
	F4	②-3		I can evaluate the learning outcomes of school trips, exchanges and international cooperation programmes.
7. Assessment	A2	②-3,5	The descriptor is similar to A1 and A3.	I can negotiate with learners how their work and progress should best be assessed.
	B2	②-1	Collaborative learning is not likely to be assessed in Japanese educational context.	I can assess a learner's ability to work independently and collaboratively.
	B3	②-3	Short period of teaching practicum in Japan cannot guarantee this level of achievement.	I can use the process and results of assessment to inform my teaching and plan learning for individuals and groups (i.e. formative assessment).
	B6	②-3	Short period of teaching practicum in Japan cannot guarantee this level of achievement.	I can use assessment scales from the Common European Framework of Reference.

B7	②-3	Short period of teaching practicum in Japan cannot guarantee this level of achievement.	I can use a valid institutional/national/international grading system in my assessment of a learner's performance.
B8	②-5	The descriptor is similar to other descriptors.同様な基準がある。	I can assign grades for tests and examinations using procedures which are reliable and transparent.
C1	②-3	Short period of teaching practicum in Japan cannot guarantee this level of achievement.	I can help learners to set personal targets and assess their own performance.
C2	②-1	The descriptor does not fit the Japanese educational context.	I can help learners to engage in peer assessment.
C3	②-3	Short period of teaching practicum in Japan cannot guarantee this level of achievement.	I can help learners to use the European Language Portfolio.
D3	②-3	It is impossible for teacher trainers to achieve this level.	I can assess a learner's ability to understand and interpret a spoken text such as listening for gist, specific or detailed information, implication etc.
D4	②-1	The attainment goal for students is too high in Japanese educational context.	I can assess a learner's ability to understand and interpret a written text such as reading for gist, specific or detailed information, implication etc
D5	②-5	There are similar descriptors to D5.	I can assess a learner's ability to engage in spoken interaction according to criteria such as content, range, accuracy, fluency and conversational strategies.

D6	②-5	There are similar descriptors to D6.	I can assess a learner's ability to engage in written interaction according to criteria such as content, range, accuracy and appropriacy of response etc.
E1	②-3	Short period of teaching practicum in Japan cannot guarantee this level of achievement.	I can assess the learners' knowledge of cultural facts, events etc. of the target language communities.
E3	②-3	Short period of teaching practicum in Japan cannot guarantee this level of achievement.	I can assess the learner's ability to respond and act appropriately in encounters with the target language culture.
F3	②-3	In general, it is difficult for teacher trainers to achieve this level.	I can deal with errors that occur in class in a way which supports learning processes and communication.
F4	②-3	In general, it is difficult for teacher trainers to achieve this level.	I can deal with errors that occur in spoken and written language in ways which support learning processes and do not undermine confidence and communication.

2. A List of Descriptor Numbers with Modification

< How to read the List >

- Categories of the original EPOSTL • Original : same as Attachment 1
- Numbers : The numbers show numbers of 'can-do' descriptors from the first adaptation. The descriptors for each number are listed in Section 2 of Executive Summary.
- Criteria : same as Attachment 1 (Notes) * shows references

categories	original	#	criteria	categories	original	#	criteria
1. Context	A1	1	1,4	4. Lesson Planning	A1	54	1,3,4
	B1	2	4		A2	55	1,3,4
	B2+B7	3	4,5		A3	56	1,3,4
	B3	4	4		A4	57	1,3,4

	B4	5	4		A5	58	1,3,4
	B5	6	4		A6	59	1,3,4
	C1	7	4		B1	60	1,3,4,5
	C3	8	4		B2+B3	61	1,3,4,5
	C4+C6	9	1,4		B4	62	1,3,4,5
	C5	10	no change		B5	63	1,3,4,5
	C7	11	no change		B7	64	1,3,4,5
	C8	12	4		B8	65	1,3,4,5
	C9	13	4		B9	66	1,3,4,5
		14	4		B10	67	1,3,4,5
2. Methodology	D1+D2	15	4,5		B11	68	1,3,4,5
	A1	16	1		C1	69	1,3,4
	A3	17	4		C2	70	1,3,4
	A4+5	18	4,5		C3	71	1,3,4
	A6	19	4		C4	72	1,3,4
	A8	20	4	5. Conducting a Lesson	A1	73	no change
	A10+A1 1	21	4,5		A2	74	1,3,4
	A12	22	4		A4	75	1,3,4
	B1	23	1 *1		A5	76	1,3,4
	B5	24	1,3		B2+B3+B 4	77	1,3,4,5
	B6	25	no change		C2	78	no change
	B7	26	no change		C3	79	1,3,4
	B10	27	1,3		C5	80	1,3,4
	B11+B1 2	28	3,4,5		C6	81	1,3,4
	C1	29	no change		D2	82	1,3,4,5
	C2	30	no change		D3+D4+D 5	83	1,3,4,5
	C3	31	2,4		E1+E2	84	1,3,4,5
	C4	32	2,4 *2		E5	85	1,3,4,5
	C5	33	2,4 *2	6. Independet	A3	86	no change
	D1	34	no change		A5	87	no change

	D2	35	4	learning	A6	88	4
	D3	36	4		B1	89	4
	D4	37	no change		B3	90	4
	D5	38	2,4		B4	91	no change
	D6+D7	39	4,5		E1+E2	92	5
	D8	40	1	7. Assessment	A1	93	1
	E1+E3	41	2,4,5		A3	94	1
	E4+E5	42	1,4,5 * 3		B1	95	no change
	F1	43	4		B4	96	1
	F2	44	2,4,5 * 1		B5	97	1
	F3	45	1 * 2		D1+D2	98	5
	G1	46	2,4		E2	99	1
					F1+F2	100	5
3. Resources	1	47	1				
	2	48					
	3	49					
	4	50					
	5	51					
	6	52					
	10	53					

(Notes) * 1 JACET SIG Natio-wide Survey (2009)／* 2 the Course of Study／* 3 JACET SIG Nation-wide Survey (2009), the Course of Study for High Schools

Section 3 A Study on Contextualization of EPOSTL in Japanese Teacher Education (1)

New set of questionnaire (plan)

The number attached before each descriptor is the original number of the questionnaire.

I Basic instruction	
A. Improving classroom teaching	
1	35. I can provide a range of pre-reading activities to help learners to orient themselves to a text.
2	36. I can encourage learners to use their knowledge of a topic and their expectations about a text when reading.

3	37. I can apply appropriate ways of reading a text in class (ex. aloud, silently, in groups).
4	43. I can evaluate and select a variety of activities which help learners to learn vocabulary in context.
5	68. I can take account of learners' feedback and comments and incorporate this into future lessons.
6	77. I can relate what I teach to learners' knowledge and the culture of those who speak the language I am teaching.
B. Understanding of educational environment	
7	4. I can take into account students' motivation to learn a foreign language.
8	5. I can take into account students' intellectual interest.
9	6. I can take into account students' sense of achievement.
10	7. I can explain the value and benefits of learning English to learners and parents.
11	8. I can take into account students' Japanese knowledge and make use of it when teaching English.
12	84. I can decide when it is appropriate to use the target language (English) and when not to.
C Lesson planning	
13	54. I can identify the course of study requirements and set learning aims and objectives.
14	55. I can plan specific learning objectives for individual lessons and/or for a period of teaching.
15	56. I can set objectives which challenge learners to reach their full potential.
16	57. I can set objectives which take into account the differing levels of ability and special educational needs of the learners.
17	58. I can set objectives for four main skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing respectively, according to the focus of individual lessons and/or period of teaching.
18	59. I can set objectives which encourage learners to reflect on their learning.
19	61. I can plan activities to ensure the interdependence of listening, reading, writing and speaking.
20	63. I can plan activities which link grammar and vocabulary with communication.
D. Conducting communicative lessons	

21	69. I can select from and plan a variety of organisational formats (frontal, individual, pair, group work) as appropriate.
22	70. I can plan for learner presentations and learner interaction.
23	82. I can create opportunities for and manage individual, partner, group and whole class work.
24	85. I can encourage learners to use the target language (English) in their activities.
E. Selecting appropriate instructional materials	
25	1. I can understand the requirements set in Course of Study.
26	29. I can select (listening) texts appropriate to the needs, interests and language level of the learners.
27	34. I can select (reading) texts appropriate to the needs, interests and language level of the learners.
28	53. I can guide learners to use the Internet for information retrieval.
29	65. I can design activities to make the learners aware of and build on their existing knowledge.
F. Flexible treatment to situations	
30	42. I can evaluate and select grammatical exercises and activities that support learning and encourage oral and written communication.
31	49. I can locate and select listening and reading materials appropriate for the needs of my learners from a variety of sources, such as literature, mass media and the Internet.
32	73. I can start a lesson in an engaging way.
33	74. I can be flexible when working from a lesson plan and respond to learners' interests as the lesson progresses.
34	5. I can adjust my time schedule when unforeseen situations occur.
G. Adjustment by reflection	
35	9. I can critically assess my teaching based on understanding theoretical principles.
36	10. I can critically assess, (based on learner feedback and learning outcomes) my teaching and adapt it accordingly.
37	13. I can identify specific pedagogical issues related to my learners or my teaching in the procedure of plan, act, and reflect.
38	15. I can recognize the resources and educational equipment available in school and adapt them to my teaching accordingly.

39	76. I can time classroom activities to reflect individual learners' attention spans.
Individual instruction and evaluation	
A. Judgment of learner's ability	
40	17. I can evaluate and select meaningful speaking and interactional activities to encourage learners to express their opinions, cultural backgrounds and identities, etc.
41	47. I can identify and evaluate a range of coursebooks/materials appropriate for the age, interests and the English language level of the learners.
42	52. I can recommend dictionaries and other reference books useful for my learners.
43	60. I can structure lesson plans and/or plan for periods of teaching in a coherent and varied sequence of content.
44	78. I can keep and maximize the attention of learners during a lesson.
45	80. I can cater for a range of learning styles.
46	89. I can select tasks most suited to be carried out by learners.
47	95. I can identify strengths and areas for improvement in a learner's performance.
48	96. I can present my assessment of a learner's performance and progress in the form of a descriptive evaluation, which is transparent and comprehensible to the learner, parents and others.
49	97. I can use appropriate assessment procedures to chart and monitor a learner's progress (reports, checklist, grades, etc.).
50	98. I can assess a learner's ability to engage in spoken and written interactions.
51	99. I can assess learners' ability to make comparisons between their own and the culture of the English language communities.
52	100. I can analyze learners' errors and provide constructive feedback to them.
B. Individual instruction for learners	
53	67. I can vary and balance activities in order to respond to individual learners' learning styles.
54	81. I can make explicit and help learners to develop appropriate learning strategies.
55	86. I can guide and assist learners in setting their own aims and objectives and in planning their own learning.
56	87. I can assist learners in choosing tasks and activities according to their

	individual needs and interests.
57	88. I can help learners to evaluate their own learning processes and the outcomes.
58	90. I can provide necessary support for learners in order for them to do homework independently and assist them with time management.
59	91. I can assess homework according to valid and transparent criteria.
60	93. I can evaluate and select valid assessment procedures (written tests, performance tests, etc.) appropriate to learning aims and objectives.
Advanced instruction of communicative English	
A. Instruction for sending a message in English	
61	21. I can evaluate and select a variety of techniques to make learners aware of and help them to use stress, rhythm and intonation.
62	22. I can evaluate and select a range of oral activities to develop accuracy (vocabulary, grammar, etc.).
63	23. I can evaluate and select meaningful activities to encourage learners to develop their creative potential.
64	24. I can evaluate and select activities which help learners to participate in written exchanges (emails, etc.) and to initiate or respond to text appropriately.
65	25. I can help learners to gather and share information for their writing tasks.
66	26. I can help learners to plan and structure written texts (e.g. by using mind maps, outlines etc.).
67	27. I can help learners to write a coherent paragraph or essay.
68	28. I can evaluate and select writing activities to consolidate learning (grammar, vocabulary, spelling etc.).
69	45. I can understand and use high and low frequency words, and receptive and productive vocabulary for my learners.
B. Preparation for instruction	
70	19. I can evaluate and select a variety of materials to stimulate speaking activities (visual aids, texts, authentic materials etc.).
71	32. I can design and select different activities in order to practice and develop different listening strategies (listening for gist, specific information etc.)
72	33. I can design and select different activities which help learners to recognize and interpret typical features of spoken language (tone of voice, intonation, style of speaking etc.)
73	38. I can set different activities in order to practice and develop different reading

	strategies according to the purpose of reading (skimming, scanning).
74	I can evaluate and select a variety of post-reading tasks to provide a bridge between reading and other skills.