1. Introduction
Developing students’ communicative competence in a foreign language has proved difficult in Asia. Education policies intended to reform these systems are often perceived as unrealistic, as they do not take into account the local teaching contexts and constraints teachers face (Gorsuch 2000; Lamie 2001; Li 2001; Hato 2005). Furthermore, reports describing the implementation of such policies are often negative (Morris 1985; Henrichsen 1989; Lamb 1995).

This research concerns Japan’s Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) 2003 Action Plan, a nationally instituted educational policy focusing on promotion of language teaching innovation. The main goals were the improvement of English classes and teaching ability of English teachers to cultivate students’ communication ability (MEXT 2003c). Adoption of these goals was to be initiated through mandatory in-service training programs for Japanese teachers of English (JTEs), which were devised and administered separately by each respective prefectural board of education. While Japan-specific studies are useful in providing an understanding of JTE perceptions towards government policy (Gorsuch 2000, 2001), current issues in English Language Teaching in Japan (Browne & Wada 1998; Kobayashi 1993; Lamie 2000; Hato 2005), past attempts to reform English education (Henrichsen 1989), and the impact of in-service training on JTEs attending an overseas course (Lamie 2001), the author is unaware of any studies in English concerning specific programs originating from MEXT’s 2003 Action Plan apart from anecdotal reports. Thus this case study hopes to fill that gap by describing, examining and evaluating one prefecture’s program based on the experiences of one participant, to determine what features of the program facilitated or inhibited the participant’s adoption of the training program’s goals. The results of this analysis will be of benefit to teacher trainers.

2. The 2003 Action Plan
Since 1992, MEXT has revised the Course of Study for Foreign Languages (MEXT 2003a) to include explicit references to the importance of developing students’ communicative competence. It does not, however, contain a clear definition of how communicative competence is interpreted for Japan (Fraser 2010).

The 2003 Action Plan was a 5-year plan focusing primarily on the improvement of English classes, where “the majority of an English class will be conducted in English and many activities where students can communicate in English will be introduced”, and “the teachers’ abilities to cultivate students’ practical communication abilities” (MEXT 2003c). Both of these goals were to be addressed through mandatory participation, regardless of qualifications, in intensive in-service training. MEXT provided prefectures with a document (MEXT 2003b) containing guidelines and an example of a 10-day program, and initial funding, but prefectures were to develop their programs independently of MEXT (Butler & Iino 2005) and were not required to send MEXT further documentation (Private conversation with Program Administrator), despite MEXT’s public declaration that “MEXT will evaluate the state of implementation of all measures aimed at improvement and review the action plan annually” (MEXT 2003c: 1).

3. Known Constraints to the Adoption of Communicative Language Teaching in Japan
Communicative competence is “the knowledge of not only if something is formally possible in a language, but also the knowledge of whether it is feasible, appropriate, or done in a particular speech community (Richards & Schmidt 2002: 90).” To develop this competence, students need opportunities to practice using all four language skills within communicative contexts. CLT is an approach to language learning “grounded in the theory of intercultural communicative competence that can be used to develop materials and methods appropriate to a given context of learning” (Savignon 2002: 22-3). Many factors, however, have inhibited its widespread use in Japan. It has been argued that pre-service training is inadequate (Gorsuch 2001), and many teachers have reported being inadequately prepared for their English teaching duties (Browne and Wada 1998). Additionally, high-stake university examinations
have been criticized as they do not test communicative ability (LoCastro 1996), their difficulty has remained unchanged over time (Kikuchi 2006), and they continue to have a strong negative ‘washback’ effect (Brown and Yamashita 1995). A listening test was introduced in 2006 into the government-sponsored nation-wide university entrance examination (University Center Examination), but it is unclear what effect this is having on classroom practice. According to a survey by Kikuchi & Browne (2009), however, first-year university students felt classes were not being taught for communicative purposes. Kikuchi and Browne concluded that the influence of college entrance exams leads to over-reliance on traditional teaching methods which focus on translation (Hino 1988; Gorsuch 2001) and difficult reading passages. The required use of MEXT-approved textbooks, which also emphasize reading, has also inhibited the adoption of CLT (Gorsuch 1999).

4. Methodology

For this research an instrumental case study format (Stake 1995: 3) was chosen to examine one prefecture’s interpretation of the Action Plan, as experienced by one participant. The drawback of this approach is that this participant’s experience may not be representative. However, a detailed description of the program is beneficial as it illuminates “the kinds of problems … that all language teacher professionals must confront” (Markee 1997: 5) when devising and implementing similar programs. The basic research methodology is as follows:

After observing and collecting relevant materials from the training and one participant’s classes, the data were initially analyzed for key incidents. A key incident indicates a part of a lesson directly related to the program’s main focus, namely, Teaching English through English (TETE) (e.g., an oral introduction in English to a reading passage). Using lesson plans, textbooks, class handouts and video recordings of the classes, these incidents were then shown to the research participant, the program administrator and 3 teacher trainers, to determine the degree to which the participant successfully incorporated the training goals into her lessons. This technique, known as Stimulated Recall, “can be used … to evaluate teaching effectiveness” (Gass & Mackey 2000: 18). The data was then reanalyzed in light of interview comments to identify features of the program that facilitated or inhibited the participant’s adoption of the training goals.

Research Participant

The teacher who participated in this study was in her second year of employment, and had graduated from a university outside the prefecture. She was therefore unlikely to have been exposed previously to the content and lecturers included in this training program. The teacher graduated from a university of good standing with a major in French and a minor in English Education. She did, however, undertake her 2-week teaching practicum in the prefecture.

5. Overview of the training program

Although the general goals for the program were based on the Action Plan (MEXT, 2003c), it appears that the guidelines (MEXT, 2003b) were not closely followed. For example, the content and format of the training differ considerably. Whether the teacher trainers had access to these guidelines was, unfortunately, unconfirmed, yet strict adherence to the guidelines was not expected by MEXT (Butler & Iino 2005), particularly from the fourth year when MEXT stopped funding the program.

The training seminar was designed by four university professors in conjunction with a Board of Education teacher consultant, all of whom were Japanese. It should be noted that the head teacher trainer along with 3 other teacher trainers from the program who oversaw the training in each of the four districts authored a book on teaching English through English. Moreover, the main focus of this book, teacher talk – the ability to provide students with comprehensible L2 spoken input—, became the main focus of the training.

Initially, the training consisted of 4 topics: Teaching English through English (TETE), Task-Based Learning (TBL), Reading, and Writing. The first two are clearly related to the Action Plan. The latter two were replaced in the second year by lectures chosen by the trainers, based on their respective specialties (e.g., grammar). A survey conducted during the orientation, however, revealed that Writing and Reading were the first and third most popular topics. These results might suggest a gap between what teachers wanted to study and the contents of the training. It appears, though, that Reading was a focus, as most of the demo-lessons and examples were based on reading passages. This should not be seen as surprising, as the most commonly-used textbooks and teaching methodology in Japan share this focus (Gorsuch 1999, 2001; Hino 1988). The lack of tasks in the research participant’s lessons resulted in the researcher focusing on TETE. TBL will not be
In the fourth year, the training was composed of a one-day orientation and a 5-day intensive seminar. Table 1 outlines the program and changes made over 4 years, namely the introduction of the orientation, assigned reading, a demo lesson and changes in funding.

Orientation
An orientation session was introduced in the second year. Participants heard introductory lectures concerning Teaching English through English and Tasks and, from the third year, observed a demonstration lesson, which was performed independently by previous participants on the program, and standardized in year 4.

What is most interesting to note about the orientation is the format of the TETE lecture. Much time was devoted to demonstrating the type of L2 input students should be provided with and different types of reading comprehension questions. However, by utilizing a demo-lesson format instead of a lecture format, the theory was implicitly, rather than explicitly, taught and somewhat neglected the purpose of the afternoon demo lesson. What plagued both sessions, though, was a lack of time for questions or discussion. This meant that participants were exposed to a number of activities and methods but their merits and theoretical underpinnings were not discussed.

In addition, it would be difficult for teachers to explore these issues further, as no assigned reading was provided or reference made to the book this lecture was based upon. This book, in any case, is out of print.

In preparation for August, participants were expected to implement ideas from the orientation into their classes and prepare two lesson plans, one for each focus: TETE and TBL. Only the TETE lesson plan had to be based on a taught lesson, a further indication of the presumed difficulty of implementing TBL. In August, participants gave brief demonstrations of their lesson plans.

Intensive Summer Seminar
The first two days of the intensive summer session were devoted to TETE and TBL, the third to demonstration lessons performed by past participants, and the fourth to preparation of a demonstration lesson to be given on the last day. Here I will focus on day one and five, as they concern TETE.

Day 1 was divided into four workshops with three directly related to TETE. In the morning lecture, the teacher trainer demonstrated how to introduce a topic in English. It is important to point out that this was the first time guidelines for teacher talk were explained explicitly and the model lesson focused on the pre-reading stage. Although one training goal was to teach English through English throughout all stages of a lesson, by focusing only on the pre-reading stage, it reinforced the perception among teachers that this is where TETE is most realistically applied (Interview with Program Administrator). Thus it is not surprising that most demonstrations concerned the introduction of a lesson, to the disappointment of the teacher trainer whose classroom I observed. Given that the instructions during the orientation were for participants to bring a lesson plan they had already taught, this was foreseeable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content of August training</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching English Through English (TETE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Task-based Learning (TBL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| May Orientation | No | Yes – 100% in English | Yes – TBL Lecture Not 100% in English |
| Assigned Reading | No | Distributed in August | Distributed in May |
| Demo Lesson | No | No | Yes – Former participants prepared individually |
| Funding | MEXT | MEXT | Prefecture |

Table 1. Evolution of the Seminar (2003-2006)
**Assigned Reading**
With respect to assigned reading, two manuscripts written in English were used from 2004. The first gave a basic introduction to task-based learning and the second discussed CLT in Japan, the communicative competence required of English teachers, and the current state of university entrance exams. No assigned reading was provided in relation to Teaching English through English, a point subsequently rectified in the final year, and no lists of background reading found in the guidelines (MEXT, 2003b) were provided.

**All in English**
Despite all of the participants and trainers being Japanese, the program was conducted exclusively in English. The justification was that teachers need to become comfortable using English with other Japanese people (Interview with Head Teacher Trainer). Some participants felt it was unrealistic to learn new concepts (e.g., Task-based Learning) in their second language and thought it would have been more efficient to learn them in Japanese (Private conversation with Teacher Trainer).

**6. Analysis**
Key incidents representative of the trainee’s experience are now examined chronologically, allowing the reader to experience and evaluate different stages of the program from the trainee’s perspective.

**6.1 Pre-training Observations**
Between the Orientation and the intensive training, two classes were observed: a first-year English class and a third-year reading class. Three critical incidents are now examined to illustrate the tension between MEXT’s goals and the context into which they are being implemented, one drawback of introducing the training goals implicitly, and the different expectations the head-teacher trainer and the trainee had towards TETE.

**MEXT’s goals and the trainee’s teaching context**
One training goal was to increase the amount of English JTEs use in class, and an oral introduction to a lesson is where JTEs are most likely to use English (Interviews with teacher trainers). The trainee learned this basic technique in her pre-service training, and during the first-year class that I observed, it was the only extensive use of English and even then, it lasted less than one minute. It is possible that this lesson was not representative, although even less English was used in the third-year class, a tendency common in classes where exam preparation takes precedence (Lamie 2000). In a follow-up interview, she mentioned that during her teaching practicum, she was discouraged from using English to introduce a lesson. The supervising teacher saw this as a waste of time. Indeed, when she imitated his teaching style, she felt that the students favourably evaluated her classes. Interestingly, her supervisor’s feedback contradicts the direction taken by MEXT and illustrates how reform is dependent on teacher ability to adopt it and on the importance of convincing various stakeholders of its merits.

**Introducing the training goals implicitly**
One benefit of the training was exposure to activities demonstrated by seasoned teachers. On the other hand, with little time devoted to discussion and essentially no reference to the relevant literature, most participants only came away with examples of useful activities without the rationale for using them. The repercussions of this can be seen in the following examples.

**Example 1: Failure to understand and implement activities successfully**
In both the Orientation lecture and demonstration lesson, ‘jigsaw’ or ‘reorganization’ reading activities were demonstrated. One such activity the trainee prepared, however, was impossible to do without reference to the textbook. Instead of focusing on the organization and relationship of ideas, students could only reorder the sentences by matching key words in the text with those on the handout. She also used this activity type, unsuccessfully, on the last day of training, where she was unfortunately given no specific feedback about how to improve her implementation of the activity.

**Example 2: Different expectations towards TETE**
The last example stems from a 50-minute class where 15 minutes were devoted to confirming the accuracy of the students’ translation of a reading passage, a homework assignment. This is an example of traditional Japanese teaching methodology, Yakudoku, or grammar translation. Slightly edited versions of interviews with the trainee and the head teacher trainer illustrate their different expectations regarding TETE.

This sentence is difficult so I wanted to explain in Japanese. Because, in this training, I learned paraphrasing. But paraphrasing is not the same as explaining the sentence. They understand the vague meaning and story, but they don’t understand the sentence precisely....

<Later in the interview> ... I think some students really enjoy it (being taught in English), but it depends on the school and the situation. But, I think the English through English training is useful for every school. We can change the
difficult words into easy words... but this technique is not useful for the explanation of difficult content, such as entrance exams. Just explaining the introduction - using easy words- is fine, but students want to know more about the context, more precisely. I think that stage (level) is similar to a Japanese course, gendai bun, where students read contemporary articles and discuss it at a deeper level. The higher-level English student's stage (level) is similar to that class. (Teacher Trainee)

Although her reasoning is compelling, one may question the amount of time devoted to exploring the issues present in the textbooks, as set against the time spent explaining the linguistic features of those texts. She does, however, raise a valid point: When should JTEs teach in English and when in Japanese? The researcher did not observe these issues being discussed in the training.

The textbook passage was also shown to the head-teacher trainer. When asked if it would be possible to teach it in English, he explained why it was important to do so and showed how it could be done.

We could express the same meaning in simple English first. Students get the idea and when students come to the complicated wording, there will be a bridge between the simple version and the more difficult version and students will come to understand it. But if we show the text from the very beginning, and if students have to understand these complicated sentences, they don't understand. But if we are very skilful and if we tell them the message first using simple expressions, then students will understand the message expressed in a different way. (Head Teacher-Trainer)

Based on his comments, he is initially concerned with the students' comprehension of the text, which is achieved by explaining it in simple English. Students can then move on to reading the text at a deeper level. An initial focus on meaning through English does not exclude a focus on linguistic aspects of the text or a discussion of the text at a deeper level in Japanese, but it is unrealistic to do both at the same time. These interview extracts demonstrate how these two teachers hold very different views of classroom English use.

To summarize the results of the pre-training phase, only a limited amount of English was used, the teacher had difficulty implementing an activity she learned at the Orientation, and she used Japanese exclusively to explain a reading passage.

6.2 The August training

The trainee's demonstration lessons on the first and last day of the program are next examined. The first demonstration is a product of the Orientation and represents the first time she received feedback. The demonstration on the last day was performed with two other teachers and represents their understanding of and struggles with TETE application.

Vague Instructions and Feedback

Instructions regarding the lesson plan participants were to prepare were vague: Bring a lesson plan in which you taught English through English. An examination of the lesson plans reveals that many teachers brought oral introductions to reading passages. This drew criticism from a teacher trainer who was not present at the orientation and assumed the plans should have included while-reading activities. This is how the participant's reacted to this criticism:

Before the training, I couldn't imagine English through English in any part of the lesson but the introduction. I did not know where in the lesson to use English through English. When I thought of the activity, I thought of the oral introduction. In May, I did not get their intention.

The lesson plans were demonstrated on the first day in groups of three, and as a result, other participants primarily provided feedback, not the teacher trainer. Comments for the research participant, while positive and constructive, were limited and general in nature (e.g., “It was appropriate to start with a personal example.”). Thus, this feedback is likely to have served simply to confirm what she was already doing was appropriate and did not push her to work towards the orientation’s stated goals.

Struggling with the concept of TETE

On the last day of the training, participants gave another demonstration. The focus of this lesson plan was while-reading activities. It is important to note that the plan was developed in cooperation with two experienced teachers, and so failures to implement the training goals are significant because they indicate that more experienced teachers may also be struggling with TETE.

In the first activity, students had to guess the meaning of new words by matching them with corresponding definitions. Despite being labelled a while-reading activity, this was demonstrated as a pre-reading exercise. The problem was that students could not guess the words' meaning as they were not introduced in the context of the story. After the demonstration this weakness was not pointed out. A similar activity was used in the Open lesson in November and repeated the same problem.

The goal of the next activity was for students to write down any words they heard. The reading passage, which was rather difficult, was simply
read verbatim. According to the head teacher trainer, this is exactly where the contents of the training should be applied. In other words, the teacher should incorporate such elements as gestures, examples, redundancy, and repetition to make the input comprehensible. The participants, however, did not get this feedback.

The lack of feedback did not sit well with the young teacher and she criticized the lack of examples of ‘while-reading’ activities during the training. In her words:

Why did they not demonstrate while-reading (activities)? We were expected to demonstrate this but we never saw an example.

6.3 Post-training Classes

The training was considered to have been completed once the participants held a demonstration lesson at their school and submitted a report to their principal. It is unclear how many teachers did this as it was left to principals to enforce (Interview with program administrator).

The principal at the research participant’s school took this requirement very seriously and invited one of the teacher trainers to observe and comment on the open lesson. Another lesson, observed by the researcher alone, was also evaluated, as open classes tend to be ‘performances’ for which teachers prepare extensively. The open class will be discussed first as it fulfilled a requirement of the training.

Through the following examples, the progress the trainee made is evident. The activities and the teacher’s use of English, when viewed in isolation, appear to be well thought out, but when viewed within the context of a series of lessons, it seems the trainee is struggling to incorporate these ideas effectively.

Post-training: The Open Lesson

In this 50-minute lesson, the first fourteen minutes were devoted to reviewing the previous lesson and introducing the next reading passage in English. This was followed by an oral introduction of ‘new’ vocabulary, a review of the comprehension questions, and a Japanese explanation of the text.

If this lesson were viewed in isolation, it would appear the teacher made excellent use of English. A science experiment introduced in a previous lesson was reviewed. The experiment was explained in English with all the necessary visual aids, examples, repetition, and redundancy. There was very little interaction with the students, however, but that weakness was mentioned later in the feedback session. Where attention needs to be drawn is to the absence of a basic premise of CLT, that there is a genuine need for communication. Unless students are grappling to understand the spoken input, it is unlikely they will be developing their strategic competence (Richards and Schmidt 2002: 91), an essential component of communicative competence. Students need training in predicting content and guessing meaning even though there are words in the input they do not know. While these skills do not have to be developed in every class, their absence was striking. Students in Japan are primarily exposed to spoken English in class and therefore, this is the most likely place for students to develop these skills. Therefore, one could argue the weakness of the lesson is that students were made to listen to material they already understood. For example, 7 minutes was spent reviewing a passage they had previously studied, another 7 minutes to introducing a passage they had read for homework, and for 5 minutes students had to guess the meaning of new words from examples given by the teacher, but it is likely students had looked these words up in dictionaries while reading the passage in preparation for class.

Fortunately, after this lesson, the teachers that observed her lesson were able to provide constructive feedback, including suggestions that the vocabulary should be taught before or while reading the passage instead of afterwards. It was also suggested that interaction with the students would have enabled her to use class time more effectively as she could better monitor student comprehension.

There were other differences with previous lessons that indicate she was thinking about improving her classes. For example, comprehension questions were placed before translation exercises. She felt that because the questions are fact-finding and students had already read and heard an introduction, they should be able to answer them earlier. This is encouraging because it means she is not relying on translation to check comprehension but is trying to do so through English.

Post-training: The September Lesson

Without knowing this lesson preceded the November open class, someone might feel it responds to criticisms from November. Instead of simply describing the life of Jesse Owens, a famous American athlete, she invited students to consider how they would feel if their accomplishments went unrecognized, which she followed with a story about VanGogh who suffered the same fate. Not only was the material
highly interesting, but it enabled her to do three things. First, it allowed her to introduce the topic without giving too much information away. One trainer felt this was ideal because it addressed a complaint that some teachers have about oral introductions detracting from the purpose of reading. Second, it allowed her to use concrete examples to explain an abstract concept (the desire to have your ability recognized). After reviewing the lesson transcript, the head trainer commented that she used language in a logical way. Last, although interaction was limited, she did interact with students, something missing in November.

Compared with the pre-training lessons, there was more interaction with the students in English and a much larger portion of the lesson was conducted in English.

7. Overall Impressions of the program

Next, the results of a survey administered to all participants are introduced before reviewing the research participant’s impressions of the training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>If I had to choose, yes</th>
<th>If I had to choose, no</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were the instructor's lectures and workshops easy to understand?</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the content of the training practical for future use?</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, were you satisfied with the training?</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Survey results of 175 participants’ impression of training

Results of the Training and General Impressions of the Course

The participants’ level of satisfaction with the program can be seen in a survey administered by the Prefectural Comprehensive Education Center (Table 2). It appears that the participants were happy with the trainers, the content, and the training itself. If the trainers use this as a barometer, then there appears to be little need for drastic changes.

This satisfaction was also shared by the research participant. As she expressed it:

Honestly, I enjoyed the training. What we did is what I wanted. In university, I only trained for oral introduction. But this year, I knew about tasks and how to introduce new materials, English through English. That was really good. I knew what is important is to communicate with students in English because English class is not a class for translation. I knew that point. As much as possible, I put those activities into my classes.

It is encouraging to know she enjoyed the training and found the content appropriate. Enjoyment, however, does not necessarily lead to change. Tomlinson (1988) and Lamb (1995) found that while teachers enjoyed their training programs, they also found it difficult to apply the ideas learned to their teaching.

One goal of the 2003 Action Plan and this prefecture’s program was for a majority of a lesson to be conducted in English. Beyond that, specific goals and objectives were not clearly stated. In addition, the implementation of TETE was limited to the introduction of the reading passages. What goals did the teacher trainers have for the program? According to the teacher trainer who observed the open class:

If the goal of the program is to increase the amount of input you give students, then she succeeded. The next step is what to talk about, when. This is difficult to train. A lot of techniques and knowledge. The training is to start them thinking about the rationale of their activities. JTEs need to have a large collection of activities. In the training, she may have found a number of activities. This was probably the most beneficial aspect of the program. (Teacher Trainer I)

Success, as tentatively stated by this teacher trainer, is using more English, a criterion the young teacher met. The teacher trainer did not specify any other benchmarks of success; instead, teachers were simply expected to start thinking about the rationale for L2 teacher talk and activities.

8. Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to provide a detailed description of one interpretation of MEXT’s 2003 Action Plan based on one participant’s experience. This program focused on spoken English to improve students’ communicative competence. Similar reforms have met with significant resistance in Japan as they conflict with how English has traditionally been taught (Henrichsen, 1989). Even though this case study may not be representative of the participants’ experiences, it is useful to explore the difficulties of implementing educational reform (Markee 1997: 5).

Was the training successful? If the goal was for teachers to use more English in class, then in this case it was. Furthermore, participants could observe a number of demonstrations by instructors and past participants. This was beneficial, but since the theories behind the innovation were not made explicit, perhaps their
full potential wasn’t achieved, as theory enables teachers to understand how to use these activities effectively. It is unrealistic, however, to expect teachers to acquire the ability to apply the principles of CLT proficiently during one 5-day training seminar. Additionally, teachers could have been encouraged to think more about the theory had there been more time for feedback and discussion, reading material provided, and clearer goals. This may be an indication that more resources could have been devoted to planning and implementation.

The above discussion should be of interest and relevance to other CLT teacher trainers responsible for the success of their respective programs, particularly within Asian contexts, where English is taught as a foreign language and where the ability to understand the factors that promote or inhibit the adoption of language teaching innovation is of great importance.
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