

Developing the Speaking Proficiency of Non-Native English Teachers

非母国語話者の英語教員の流暢さを育てる語学研修

Shoichi TSUJI and Malcolm Ross SWANSON

辻 一・マルコム R スワンソン

四天王寺大学紀要
第67号 2019年3月

(抜刷)

Developing the Speaking Proficiency of Non-Native English Teachers

非母国語話者の英語教員の流暢さを育てる語学研修

Shoichi TSUJI and Malcolm Ross SWANSON

辻 一・マルコム R スワンソン

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on a speaking proficiency development program for non-native (NNS) English teachers given in Osaka, Japan, in March 2018 and discusses some important factors in developing the speaking proficiency of NNS English teachers, which is a major issue in countries where English is mainly taught by non-native English teachers as a foreign language. In Japan, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) has announced that English should be taught in English in high schools (MEXT, 2009), but few teachers are confident or willing to do so because of their lack of communicative ability in English. The program gave the participants opportunities to use English in an impromptu manner by involving them in a variety of activities whose final goal was to present a drama only with a rough storyline. The program was small scale and a one-shot event, but it enabled us to consider some implications for developing the speaking proficiency of non-native English teachers.

keywords : NNS, EFL, teacher, professional development, language proficiency, drama, teaching English through English (TETE)

INTRODUCTION

The notion that native English speaking teachers are better than non-native speaking teachers, which was termed a “native speaker fallacy” by Phillipson (1992), is not widely held, at least in academic circles now. NNS teachers with sufficient proficiency and teaching skills in the target language can be as good as, or even better than NS teachers. At the same time, many NNS teachers, especially those in EFL situations, are struggling to improve their speaking proficiency. Although there are many components to developing teacher expertise, speaking proficiency in the target language is considered to be a base requirement. Acquiring a sufficient level of speaking proficiency is a primary issue for many NNS teachers, especially in countries with an EFL situation, such as Japan.

In Japan, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) has

announced that English should be taught in English in high schools (MEXT, 2009). The Courses of Study (MEXT, 2010) stipulates “when taking into consideration the characteristics of each English subject, classes, in principle, should be conducted in English in order to enhance the opportunities for students to be exposed to English, transforming classes into real communication scenes.” (p. 3) This was a shock to many practicing high school teachers of English because the teaching method most popularly employed in Japan now is grammar-translation, where the medium of instruction is predominantly Japanese (Igawa, 2013).

Another shock was the news that MEXT is discussing the introduction of a spoken English test using external tests such as STEP Eiken, GTEC, or TOEIC in place of, or along with the English tests of the National Center Test for University Admissions (the Center Test) in 2020. The Center Test, which does not have a speaking section, has been one of the major reasons for many English teachers in Japan to use the grammar-translation method instead of incorporating communicative activities. Putting aside the actual effect of an introduction of external tests for university admission on the teaching practice at the high-school level in general, English teachers are now under pressure to change their teaching methods, or at least to accommodate some speaking-skill-enhancing activities into their lessons, which will require higher teacher English proficiency, especially in speaking and listening.

Therefore, how they can develop speaking proficiency is an issue, as well as how proficient they should be and whether or not there are any differences between general proficiency and the proficiency required for teachers.

BACKGROUND ON NON-NATIVE SPEAKING TEACHERS IN EFL SITUATIONS

Now, it is widely accepted in academic society that drawing a clear line between native speakers and non-native speakers is extremely difficult, and that being a native speaker does not guarantee their “supremacy” as an English teacher over a non-native speaker (Phillipson, 1992). Therefore, an NNS with a sufficient level of proficiency and teaching skills in the target language can theoretically be as good as, or even better than, an NS language teacher. NNS English teachers have some advantages over NS teachers. Medgyes (1999) lists the advantages of NNS English teachers, citing his own words from Medgyes (1994):

- 1) They provide a good learner model to their students.
- 2) They can teach language strategies very effectively.
- 3) They supply learners with more information about the English language.
- 4) They anticipate and prevent language difficulties better.
- 5) They are more empathetic to the needs and problem of learners.
- 6) They make use of the learner’s mother tongue.

In the same paper, Medgyes (1999) also says that while acknowledging the elusiveness and inappropriateness of the native/non-native dichotomy, it is still useful. He admits that he is “still short of the competence any genuine native speaker is endowed with” (p. 178), even though he “may be a near-native speaker, a speaker with native-like proficiency, a pseudo-native speaker, or an honorary native speaker with native-like proficiency” (p. 178).

Not many NNS teachers, especially those in EFL situations, would be able to say that they have near-native English proficiency. In Japan, a 2017 MEXT survey showed that the percentage of junior high school and senior high school English teachers who passed the pre-level 1 STEP Test (roughly equivalent to CEFR B2) is 33.6% and 65.4% respectively. Many are struggling to improve their proficiency. The target language proficiency, especially in speaking, is considered to be a baseline of teachers’ pedagogical knowledge and ability. Therefore, acquiring a sufficient level of speaking proficiency is a primary issue for many NNS teachers.

Teacher’s General English Proficiency vs. Teaching Specific Proficiency for Teachers

English teachers’ efficacy is not only determined by their general language proficiency (TGLP). Freeman says that conventional definitions that connect general English proficiency, often based on generic statements about language use, do not address the type of classroom language teachers need in order to teach. Further, language training focused on general language proficiency often does not directly address teachers’ particular professional needs (Freeman, 2017). Tsang (2017) also says that very few rigorous studies demonstrating that higher proficiency equals better teaching have been conducted.

A program designed for teachers at a primary school in Japan is described by Moser, Harris, and Carle (2012). The primary focus of the program was on the teacher’s use of English for classroom management, for task work, and for monologues. Considerable improvement was observed with the teachers’ repeat performance of the task. The feedback on the program suggested it helped boost teachers’ confidence and willingness to use English in the classroom and equipped them with some of the language resources they needed to do so (Moser, Harris, & Carle, 2012).

Considering what we know about TGLP and English for special purposes for language teachers, we should plan a speaking proficiency development program which addresses both proficiencies.

Teachers’ Anxiety

Kondo and Yang (2003) concluded from the results of a test administered to 213 university students in first-year and second-year English classes that classroom anxiety is associated with three main factors: low proficiency, speaking activities, and fear of negative evaluation by classmates. NNS English teachers are also learners of English. It is reasonable to think that as learners, they share the same foreign language anxieties as felt by learners in general, or an even higher level of anxiety because of their professional responsibilities.

Considering the factors above, we authors designed our speaking proficiency development program as follows:

1. Even though NNS teachers have some advantages over NS teachers and can theoretically be as good as, or even better than, their NS counterparts, they need to have a certain level of language proficiency, especially in listening and speaking.
2. The program should cover both general language proficiency and classroom language use to be effective.
3. The program should deal with both teachers' and learners' anxiety.
4. The program should encourage the participants to use English "on the spot" (improvise).

THE PROGRAM

Using Improvisation to Build Speaking Proficiency

Improvisation, or "improv" as it is often called, is a form of live theatre in which all the elements of the performance—the plot, the situation, the characters, and the script—are decided upon at that moment with little or no preplanning. Because of this inherent spontaneity, it is often used in comedy shows with hilarious results. In its truest form, these improvised performances can only ever be seen once because even if the elements are repeated, the results will change. Each performance is different, and this is what makes this form of theatre unique.

Because of the natural style of such performances, teachers have for many years used these techniques in the classroom in such areas as drama, performing arts, social studies, and language studies. In contrast to traditional or rehearsed performances, the use of improvisation offers a number of unique benefits, including:

- It **breaks the ice**. This is particularly useful if a teacher is working with a group of students who do not know each other well or who haven't worked much together before. It offers all the benefits of a natural conversation, but with the added focus of a structured activity to get students actively working together.
- It encourages a more **natural** form of communication. Because students are speaking from their heads and not from the paper, they are far more likely to speak in the authentic language they use outside the classroom. As Gasparro and Falletta (p. 2, 1994) mention, they "begin to feel the language and gain the confidence to interact outside the classroom using the target language." They will also put more thought into what they say, as they must create a dialogue that actually makes sense. Piper (p. 33, 1984) takes it further, arguing that "extending the notion of role taking to include the kind of role shifts that characterize everyday life, we are far more likely to encourage . . . the creative exchange of language."
- It encourages **active listening**. Because of the reactive and spontaneous nature of the dialogue, participants must listen carefully to what other students are saying in order to respond

appropriately. They are not just listening for cues, but are assessing what is being said and responding to the content, situation, and meaning of what they are listening to.

- It fosters student **collaboration**. Rather than just focusing on their own role in an activity, students need to work together to make improvised performances work. They must build basic trust in each other, learn each other's strengths, and develop teamwork skills. They need to learn when to step in to take the lead, and when to step back and give other members a chance.
- It builds **public-speaking** skills. Students are often nervous about presenting or performing in public, but because of the group nature and trust factor inherent in improvisations, they come to feel more comfortable about performing. This increased confidence has a flow-on effect into other areas.
- It develops **critical thinking** abilities. Creating something using your imagination is a very high-level cognitive skill and constructing a dialogue with a clear focus and flow is even more demanding. With critical thinking enjoying more attention in Japanese schools recently, improvisation is the perfect way to foster those skills.
- It **opens** our minds. Because of the reliance on other students, and because we must look at the characters we play from an outside perspective, participants need to open their minds to different viewpoints on topics, situations, beliefs, and social norms. This is a valuable skill for students to develop.
- It provides opportunities for **review**. Whether reviewing knowledge or material previously studied, or simply reinforcing content from current lessons, improvisation offers opportunities to actually consider and use target material in a reasonably authentic situation.
- It develops **fluency**. Atas (p. 962, 2015) emphasizes the value of improvisation for fostering fluency, stating, "Speaking a language without any preparation is of great importance for fluency. Fluency requires 'performance.' To achieve fluency, a learner has to perform the language." Particularly for students studying a foreign language, the authentic nature of the dialogues requires a naturalness that simply reciting a memorized skit cannot offer. Communication becomes vital, and it must be effective and clear. A large component of this is increased fluency on the part of the speaker.

As can clearly be seen, improvisation is a powerful tool for the teacher, and in language learning situations it offers learners numerous authentic opportunities to develop their skills in the target language. Boudreault (2010) talks of improvisation being "an organic experience where skills are constantly being refined" in which students "develop an increasing facility to meet changing or unknown stimuli with immediate responses."

However, such an activity cannot stand on its own, but requires a large amount of foundational work to succeed. Students need to know sufficient vocabulary in order to create sentences that fit the situation. They need to have reasonably strong grammar skills with which to generate coherent responses. They need to have cultural and social knowledge to understand the context. And, they need to have practiced

similar elements before to have an appropriate starting point from which to proceed. In all this, the teacher can offer vital assistance by providing scaffolding for the situation. This can be in the form of long-term instruction to provide a base structure, or short-term learning for content related to the situations which will be used.

Improvisation for Developing Teacher Speaking Proficiency

As has been argued elsewhere in this paper, there is a strong need for English speaking proficiency, not just with our students in Japan, but among our teachers too. Students require clear examples of form on which to base their own language development, and for this the teacher is the obvious model. Busy as they are with work responsibilities, most teachers have little time for developing their language skills beyond what is needed in the classroom. However, speaking proficiency in the target language is one area in which it is vital for teachers to continue efforts towards mastery, as lack of competency is easily apparent, and speaking proficiency leads to confidence!

With this in mind, part of the workshop at the ACROSS seminar in March 2018 was devoted to the use of improvisation for cultivating teacher-speaking proficiency. ACROSS (Association of English Teachers for Cross-Cultural Communication) is a non-profit, self-funded organization of English teachers in Japan, whose main objective is to design, organize, and implement a variety of programs for the professional development of its members. Six teachers at the junior and senior high school level spent two days with one of the writers, going through a series of activities aimed at developing their speaking proficiency. Initially, the activities were simply aimed at boosting confidence and teamwork skills, but as time progressed more complex tasks were added. Here are some of the activities we accomplished in order of completion:

1. **1-2-3-Wahoo!** This is an exceptionally simple game, but a good one for getting people comfortable working together. The group is divided up into pairs, and they must simply repeat counting off from 1 to 3. As they become comfortable, the speed is increased. At any time, if they make an error both partners must raise their hands and shout, "Wahoo!" Variations include change numbers for actions, such as clapping instead of saying "3". While it sounds simple, it is actually quite difficult in practice and it serves to break the ice and get people comfortable with working together.
2. **Random Numbering:** This is another simple game but a worthwhile one as it develops nonverbal communication skills. Everyone stands in a group circle and the facilitator says, "Start!". The group members begin to count off from 1-2-3.... However, what makes it difficult is that anybody can say any number, so the decision on who will speak is decided by nonverbal cues. The object of the game becomes how can you go before making an error, such as when 2 people speak at the same time.
3. **Animal Sounds:** In this activity, the participants had to choose an animal as a character, and then introduce their actual selves, but doing so while using the sounds and actions of that

animal. This was a good way to remove any last vestiges of shyness the group may have had.

4. **Restaurant workers:** After the preceding ice-breaker activities had been completed, we began a series of situational activities. The first of these was a roleplaying activity. The participants were divided up into pairs, and each had to decide which member was the customer and which was the wait staff. We warmed up just using a simple ordering a meal dialogue. From there, each group was given a situation to deal with. They had no time to prepare as they had to launch directly into the dialogue. Some examples were:
 - a. “There’s a fly in my soup.”
 - b. “This isn’t what I ordered.”
 - c. “My steak is overcooked.”
 - d. “Sir, you cannot smoke in here.”
 - e. “I’m sorry, I seem to have forgotten my wallet.”
5. **Class Problem:** This was similar to the preceding activity, but the roles were more fluid and each skit had a varying number of actors. This activity was more accessible for the participants because they were all teachers. Once again, we roleplayed various classroom situations, such as dealing with problem students, planning a class event, or bullying and ostracizing. This time, after each roleplay was complete we went back and discussed the results and talked about different ways each situation could have been handled. This activity has powerful in-class possibilities for resolving issues with students playing the opposites sides of their actual roles.
6. **Panel of Experts:** In this session, each participant was put in the limelight and had to introduce themselves as an expert in a particular field—usually something nonsensical. Other participants then fired questions at the ‘expert’ and that person had to provide adlib answers as quickly (and crazily) as possible. This was a lot of fun, especially for the crazier vocations such as:
 - a. Hamster farmer
 - b. UFO hunter
 - c. Skyscraper window cleaner
 - d. Camel racer
7. **Final Presentations:** As there was an expectation that each workshop group would perform a final presentation, we split into three groups and proceeded to put together their performances. Although our topic was “improvisation,” this final presentation involved a fair amount of preplanning so much of the spontaneity was lost. However, we got partly around this by breaking the preparation into stages:
 - a. Stage 1: Each group prepared a scenario for a dialog, mapping out the characters and the situation. These were given to another group.
 - b. Stage 2: The groups looked at the situation they had been given, and began writing a loosely formed dialogue. This was only to act as a guide for the performers as they

would need to prepare the final dialogue themselves. These dialogues were given to the next group.

- c. Stage 3: Each group looked at the dialogue they had been given and revised it how they wished, as long as the intent of the original writers remained the same. They then practiced it ready for their performance. They were encouraged not to write a hard-and-fast skit dialogue, but to memorise only the main areas and act it out naturally when it was their turn.

For all these activities, we ran a feedback session afterwards, discussing what they had learned, and what they felt the objectives of the session were. Over the two days that we ran the workshop, a steady improvement in participation, group trust, and confidence could be seen. Although not measurable, this was matched by progress in fluency as well. Speech became smoother, and responses more immediate. There was less awkwardness about the errors which naturally occurred. Conversations flowed better, and English became the working language of the room. This would probably not have occurred if we had concentrated on strict adherence to a script.

Improvisation Workshop Participant Feedback

After the workshop was over, the participants were invited to complete a survey on their experiences. All participants responded to the survey, and following is a sampling of their answers.

Comments on the workshop as a whole

The letters (A – F) refer to each participant. Q1 – Q6 are questions asked in the questionnaire. See the Appendix for the full participants' comments.

Many participants mentioned feeling confused or insecure at the start, though those feelings subsided as the workshop went on:

“Before we started, I had been worried because I didn't know whether we could do such a thing. However, once we started working together as a group, good ideas came one after another. I'm quite satisfied we were able to make a good story.” B (Q1)

“I was a little baffled because it was a completely new experience for me, but I enjoyed it with great interest.” F (Q1)

There was praise also for this type of activity and an understanding of its effectiveness for fluency building:

“Improvising dialogues is a great idea. We were not allowed to prepare beforehand or use written scripts, so we repeated the process of focusing on what to say and vocalizing it, eventually making up a story together. I became aware of the gap between coming up with an idea and putting it into words.” A (Q1)

“I think group work was the key to success. Looking at other members’ improvised lines and acting as professional teachers impressed me and inspired my creativity.” B (Q1)

“Responding to other members’ lines and actions instantaneously made a training to develop teacher’s fluency.” B (Q1)

“Improvising conversation was not as difficult as I had expected. I could say lines and act in a relaxed way because there were no strict rules or a fixed script.” E (Q1)

“We had to speak English to talk about the situation, characters of the people, or how we should present the skit, which was a good training for my speaking proficiency.” E (Q1)

Comments on the beneficial aspects of the activities

Many participants offered extra feedback on the merits of some of the activities we did:

“The activities were about speaking out what we had in mind on the spot. I could use them in my class and they would help developing student’ spontaneity and fluency. Above all everything was fun.” A (Q3)

“It was good not only for my own speaking proficiency but also for an activity in my class.” C (Q3)

Reasons for their answers

As well as feedback, the participants offered reasons for their answers, including:

“I didn’t really understand what speaking proficiency was until (this workshop). Now I think I have a hint on how to improve my speaking proficiency.” A (Q5)

“I realized again that our speaking ability depends on how much English we know we can output.” B (Q5)

“It was close to a real-life situation because what had been decided was the content, not the lines.” E (Q5)

“Although the goal is far, it was a luxury to experience (the activities) as a student.” F (Q5)

Facilitator Comment

After doing this workshop, plus several subsequent improvisation-based sessions in other situations, I can see how valuable this technique is for helping participants with all areas of language mastery—but particularly, speaking proficiency. The authenticity of the dialogues, and the need for immediate and well-constructed responses, lends itself well to their needs. Reading through the participants’ feedback, I can see that anxiety, particularly in a workshop’s early stages, is a major issue, and I intend to refine the activities I use to address this. I can also see that more post-session discussion would help them to clearly understand the role that improvisation could play in their language growth.

Discussion

Let us look at the responses from the participants in the appendix.

On the improvisational characteristics of the skit creating activity and others, all the participants [A (Q1, Q3, and Q5), B (Q1 and Q5), D (Q5), E (Q1), F (Q1)], give positive comments, as we discussed above. For example, responding to Q5, participant B says, “The session was a good training for responding to what others said on the spot.”

Some participants [A (Q6), B (Q1), E (Q5)] refer to the benefits of group work. B says, in responding to Q1, “I think group work was the key to success. Looking at other members’ improvised lines and acting as professional teachers impressed me and inspired my creativity”

Responding to Q4, all the participants rate the instructor’s skills and personality high, and many are inspired by them and consider him as their role model.

Some participants [A (Q1, Q6), B (Q5), F (Q6)] realize their lack of language proficiency. A (Q1) says, “I realized how small my vocabulary is when it comes to speaking.” It seems that the realization motivates them rather than making them lose confidence. B responds to Q5 saying, “I realized again that our speaking ability depends on how much English we know we can output. I cannot say that my speaking proficiency improved through this session, but it sure is the first step of it.” F (Q5) also says, “I have to work harder to develop my speaking proficiency.”

The responses from the participants and the facilitator’s comments suggest that a program for developing speaking proficiency using improvisation activities can be effective because of the advantages of improvisation given above. We also have some further suggestions to make a speaking proficiency program successful:

- (1) We need to prepare the participants to help them get over their anxiety.
- (2) Group work by teachers can be effective, and it works better when the relationship between participating teachers is warm and relaxing. The relatively quick reduction of the participants’ anxiety is at least partially due to their long-term relationship as members of the organization, as well as the instructor’s skills and attitude.
- (3) The instructor’s attitude, skills, and resulting good relationship with the participants are also important, and can help them to act as a role model in their profession of language teaching.
- (4) A successful speaking proficiency development program leads to the participants’ realization of their needs and provides motivation for professional development.

We are well aware of the limitations of this report. The program was given in a specific and unique circumstance owing to the participants having known each other as teachers for a length of time to such an extent that they do not have to worry about exposing their language proficiency or be concerned about negative responses from their peers. We do not know whether or not this program affected their actual teaching practice. We cannot judge whether or not the program actually improved the participants’ speaking proficiency because of the subjectivity of the participants’ responses.

Still, we hope that this report offers some useful suggestions for improving NNS English teachers' speaking proficiency, which is an important but difficult facet of language learning to develop.

APPENDIX

Participants

All the participants were experienced (ex-) teachers with more than 15 years of teaching experience and were long-term acquaintances and friends

Participant Number	School	Teaching Experience (years)	Self-Evaluated Proficiency
A	Junior High Age 13 - 15	39	B2
B	Junior High Age 13 - 15	35	B1
C	Senior High Age 16 - 18	15	B1
D	Junior High Age 13 - 15	38	B1
E	Senior High Age 16 - 18	32	B1
F	Junior High Age 13 - 15	37	B1

Responses

The original responses were written in Japanese, but were translated into English by the authors. The code letter in front of each comment corresponds to that of the participants listed above.

Q1. On skit creating activity

- A. Improvising dialogues is a great idea. We were not allowed to prepare beforehand or use written scripts, so we repeated the process of focusing on what to say and vocalizing it, eventually making up a story together. I became aware of the gap between coming up an idea and putting it into words.
- B. Before we started, I had been worried because I didn't know whether we could do such a thing - making a skit without a script prepared. I thought about the settings such as topic, characters, and so on, but I didn't come up with any good ideas and was worried so much. However, once we started working together as a group, good ideas came one after another. I'm quite satisfied we were able to make a good story. I think group work was the key to success. Looking at other members' improvised lines and acting as professional teachers impressed me and inspired my creativity. Responding to other members' lines and actions instantaneously made a training to develop teacher's fluency. We performed on the second day, we repeated the same story several times, which helped us make our lines and actions smoother trimming unnecessary part.
- C. It was fun and beneficial for me, but doing only this project during the two-day seminar is not good

enough. A group of six people is a good one for a lecture or a workshop, but too many to making up a skit. Four would be appropriate for it.

- D. No comment.
- E. We decided on the situation, what type of character we are going to be, and, and the rough story line, which enabled me to become that character. Improvising conversation was not as difficult as I had expected. I could say lines and act in a relaxed way because there were no strict rules or a fixed script. We had to speak English to talk about the situation, characters of the people, or how we should present the skit, which was a good training for my fluency.
- F. I was a little baffled because it was a completely new experience for me, but I enjoyed it with great interest.

Q2. Name other beneficial activities

- A. To pretend to be a fictional expert and answer questions asked by peers. Making a story contributing a sentence taking turns. It was fun and beneficial for me, but doing only this project during the two-day seminar is not good enough. A group of six people is a good one for a lecture or a workshop, but too many to making up a skit. Four would be appropriate for it.
- B. To pretend to be a fictional expert and answer questions asked by peers.
- C. Mini lecture and workshop on what we should pay attention to when we have a skit creating activity in real teaching situation
- D. Experiencing an example of teaching English through English as a student
- E. To pretend to be a fictional expert and answer questions asked by peers.
- F. To pretend to be a fictional expert and answer questions asked by peers.

Q3. Reasons why they were beneficial

- A. The activities were about speaking out what we had in mind on the spot. I could use them in my class and they would help developing student' spontaneity and fluency. Above all everything was fun.
- B. Those fictional professions were well thought ones and it was fun to pretend to be an expert such as a UFO hunter, imagining why I had chosen it as my profession or what kind of work it really was.
- C. It was good not only for my own speaking proficiency but also for an activity in my class.
- D. I learned the process of TETE from warming up to active learning and the performance as a goal.
- E. The interview with the "experts" was a good practice of listening to people attentively and with interest and of developing the topic by asking questions in real situations.
- F. The fictional expert activity the instructor created were humorous and interesting. They stimulated our imagination and made us more creative. The activities had been planned to lessen the pressure. We could help each other when we were interviewed as experts because we were always in pairs. We interviewed them as a group, which enable us to think about what to ask while other people

were asking questions.

Q4. On the instructor (very good, good, so-so, not good, not good at all)

- A. Very good. All the activities the instructor brought were simple, fun and meaningful showing what is needed to create a skit. He has a great repertoire of activities and each activity was very well thought one. His encouraging comments were of great help to me as a teacher.
- B. Very good. To make us achieve the goal of creating a skit, he led us step by step with activities such as creating a story contributing a sentence each time to answering questions pretending to be an expert.
- C. Very good. I was impressed with his repertoire and flexibility, which enable him to deal with a variety of "students", such as university students and teachers.
- D. Very good. He was always smiling.

The things that helped us are:

- (1) providing us with ideas on the skit
 - (2) leading us taking small steps from the warming up to the skit
 - (3) giving us opportunities to comment on each other's performance by showing recorded performance of ours on his iPad
 - (4) teaching as how we can perform with the audience in mind
- E. Very good. He is so good at making us relaxed in a friendly atmosphere. He observed us very carefully and gave us all the necessary advice, while he never was fussy leading us to creating a skit on our own contributing ideas.
 - F. Very good. His English was so easy to understand, probably because he tweaked the level of English he spoke for us. He provided us with most appropriate material from his great repertoire. I was very comfortable because he treated us neither expecting too much nor in a condescending way.

Q5. Did the activities help you to develop your speaking proficiency? (helped a lot, helped, not sure, not helped, not helped at all)

- A. Helped. I realized how little English I can say on the spot. I didn't really understand what speaking proficiency was until I worked with the instructor. Now I think I had a hint to improve my speaking proficiency.
- B. Helped. The session was a good training for responding to what others said on the spot. I realized again that our speaking ability depends on how much English we know we can output. I cannot say that my speaking proficiency improved through this session, but it sure is the first step of it.
- C. Helped. Presenting a skit determines the kind of output we make. So, I didn't choose the highest evaluation because I don't think we practiced general speaking proficiency.
- D. Helped a lot. I feel my speaking proficiency level went up from one or two out of ten to three or three point five. I was able to say only words when we were practicing the skit, but I was able to say

two full sentences and improvised one sentence on the real stage.

- E. Helped. I had to speak out because the whole thing would stop if I didn't. It was close to a real-life situation because what had been decided was the content not the lines.
- F. Helped. Naturally we have to speak to develop speaking proficiency. I don't think we improved our speaking proficiency during the camp, but this camp had the "place" where we could speak. We communicated in English to prepare the skit, not only presented the skit in English. What we did, warming up, skit making and so on, was something we could use in our class. I wish I could facilitate my class as the instructor did. Although the goal is far, it was a luxury to experience the activity as a student.

Q6. What you learned

- A. I realized how small my vocabulary is when it comes to speaking. I understand the process of exploiting everyone's strengths by communicating and exchanging ideas.
- B.
 - (1) How poor my English is
 - (2) The difficulty to respond to other people understanding what they say
 - (3) The advantage of group work
 - (4) The importance of positively accepting what students did
 - (5) The importance of planning steps to achieve a goal
- C. I realized how little attention I am paying to the speaking proficiency and pronunciation when I speak English. I learned part of process of making a skit and of having students make a skit.
- D. I have to express myself in the Global English having an identity of a non-native English speaker. I have to have "Intercultural Competence" and speaking proficiency so that others can understand me easily and comfortably. I also have to have "Intercultural Competence" and speaking proficiency as an English teacher to be a role model for the students and to develop students' "Intercultural Competence" and speaking proficiency. I believe I learned a lot about speaking in a real (or close to real) situation through this seminar as well as the seminar in 2017.
- E. I learned the situation changes when other people are surprised or interested when I say something, and I learned the fun of it. In my real life, I become nervous when I speak English, but I will try to enjoy the response of others and the changing situations.
- F. I learned:
 - 1. great samples of activity
 - 2. role model of teacher facilitating activities
 - 3. patience we have to have to develop speaking proficiency
 - 4. that I have to work hard to develop my speaking proficiency

あとがき

共著の分担

氏名 辻 莊一

担当した章

P131 ABSTRACT から P133 Teachers' Anxiety まで及び P140 Discussion

氏名 マルコム R スワンソン

担当した章

P134 THE PROGRAM から P139 Facilitator Comment まで

REFERENCES CITED

- Atas, M. (2015). The reduction of speaking anxiety in EFL learners through drama techniques. *Procedia–Social and Behavioral Sciences* 176. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/82721768.pdf>
- Boudreault, C. (2010). The benefits of using drama in the ESL/EFL classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal* 16(1). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Boudreault-Drama>.
- Freeman, D. (2017). The Case for Teachers' Classroom English Proficiency. *RELC Journal* 47(1): 31–52.
- Gasparro, M., & Falletta, B. (1994). *Creating drama with poetry: Teaching English as a language through dramatization and improvisation*. Eric Digest. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED368214.pdf>
- Igawa, K. (2013). Language proficiency needs of NNS teachers in Japan. *Shitennoji University Bulletin*, 56, 191–215.
- Kondo, S., & Yang, Y-L. (2003). The English Language Classroom Anxiety Scale: Test construction, reliability, and validity. *JALT Journal*, 25(2), 593–598.
- Medgyes, P. (1999). Language Training: A Neglected Area in Teacher Education. In: Braine, George (Ed.) *Non-Native Educators in English Language Teaching*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, 177–195.
- Ministry of Education (MEXT). (2009). 高等学校学習指導要領解説外国語編英語編. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/micro_detail/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2010/01/29/1282000_9.pdf
- Ministry of Education (MEXT). (2010). 中学校学習指導要領英訳版（仮訳）外国語. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/new-cs/youryou/eiyaku/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2012/10/24/1298353_3.pdf
- Ministry of Education (MEXT). (2017). 平成29年度「英語教育実施状況調査」（中学・高等学校関係）. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/detail/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2018/04/06/1403469_01.pdf
- Moser J, Harris J, and Carle J (2012) Improving teacher talk through a task-based approach. *ELT Journal* 66(1): 81–88.
- Phillipson, R.H.L. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (平田雅博ほか訳「言語帝国主義 英語支配と英語教育」. 東京:三元社, 2013.
- Piper, T. (1984). Putting reality into role play. *TESL Canada Journal*, 1(2), 29–34. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v1i2.432>
- Tsang, A. (2017) EFL/ESL Teachers' General Language Proficiency and Learners' Engagement. *RELC Journal* (1): 99–113.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the English teachers who were kind enough to participate in this study, which was conducted in Japan in March 2018. All of them are members of “ACROSS” (Association of English Teachers for Cross-cultural Communication).

Without these teachers, who remain anonymous, this study would not have been possible. We are also grateful to the officers of ACROSS: Ms. Fusayo Nakagawa, President; Ms. Hiromi Inagawa, Vice President; and Ms. Emi Tanabe, Vice President. They kindly allowed us to proceed with our study in their spring seminar. Special thanks go to Dr. Koji Igawa, who inspired us to start the study and gave us valuable advice.

非母国語話者の英語教員の流暢さを育てる語学研修

辻 荘 一・マルコム R スワンソン

ノン・ネイティブ・スピーカー（NNS）は、理論上ネイティブ・スピーカー（NS）と同等のあるいはより優れた英語教師になりうると言われている。しかし日本のような外国語として英語を教える環境においては特に、自身の英語運用能力への自信を持つことができない教師が多いこともまた事実である。英語を英語で教えること（TETE）が求められ、大学入試へのスピーキングテストの導入が検討される中、NNSの英語教師の運用能力の向上が本人にとっても社会にとっても大きな課題となっている。本研究は、個々の登場人物のセリフを決めず大まかなストーリーラインに沿って英語のドラマを上演することを最終段階とし、6人のNNS教員に対して行われた研修について報告すると同時に、参加者へのアンケート結果から即興性を重んじた活動、指導者のあり方、教員同士の関係性の重要性について論じ、また今後のNNS教員対象研修のありかたについて示唆を得ようとするものである。