研究ノート

A Pilot Study on the Effects of Follow-Up Coaching
for an In-Service English Teacher

現職英語教員に対するフォローアップコーチング
の効果に関する予備研究

Thoa NGUYEN

本研究の目的は、国際言語文化アカデミアの「英語教育アドヴァンスト研修」（高等学校英語中核教員）の修了者が、研修内容を自身の授業のなかで効果的に応用できるためのフォローアップの方法を検討することである。ここでは筆者による「コーチング」が、ある一人の修了者（現職英語教員）のフォローアップと授業改善に有効に機能したかどうかを調べた。年間指導目標の検討、3 回の授業視察と協議などを行った結果、修了者の振り返りや自己評価の分析から、コーチングにはある程度の効果が認められた。同時に、コーチングにおけるいくつかの課題が明らかになり、また効果的なフォローアップのための示唆が得られた。

Introduction

The purpose of this pilot study is to investigate whether the use of coaching is a feasible way to follow up on teachers who have completed an extensive one-year teacher training program. The Kanagawa Institute of Language and Culture has been running an in-service teacher training program for English teachers in Kanagawa Prefecture called the Advanced Program for the past seven years, since 2011. The purpose is to "develop expert educators who can take initiative in promoting effective and communicative English teaching in their respective schools and districts by further enhancing their expertise in English communication, English education, and reflective practice" (Kanagawa Prefectural Institute of Language and Culture, 2016). Each year, a group of 15 to 25 English teachers are chosen from public high schools all over Kanagawa Prefecture. For ten months, from May until February of the next year, they work with a team of expert teacher trainers who are former English teachers to hone their English communication skills, teaching expertise, and reflective teaching practice. Each participant also chooses an action research project to work on by themselves. With the help of the trainers, they identify their research questions, conduct a preliminary investigation, devise possible treatment options, measure changes in students' learning and finally analyze and report on their findings through presentations and writing up action research reports.

As of 2017, the Advanced Program has produced over 100 graduates for public high schools in Kanagawa Prefecture. In 2016, a questionnaire was sent to these graduates to ask about their teaching situation after finishing the Advanced Program (Murakoshi and Ehara,

2016). Out of the 97 graduates who received the questionnaire, 71 of them replied. The questions mainly asked for information on how the teachers have been able to disseminate what they have done in the Advanced Program with their colleagues. However, there is still no formal system in Academia as to how instructors can follow up on individual graduates and observe whether or not they are applying the theories and principles from the Advanced Program in their day to day teaching.

Research on teacher professional development (PD) programs have shown mixed results on the impact of teachers' behaviors in the classroom (Borg, 2006). At the same time, there are various institutional, psychological, and social barriers that influence teachers' performance in the classroom. Moreover, due to extracurricular activities, school management and administrative work, in addition to teaching classes, Japanese teachers are known to be one of the most overworked teachers in the world, at 54 hours per week (OECD, 2013).

This pilot study is an attempt to determine whether coaching is a feasible way for the Kanagawa Prefectural Institute of Language and Culture trainers to follow up on Advanced Program graduates, yet at the same time, avoid creating too much burden on the school or the teacher. Coaching is a teacher development technique. First, the researcher and teacher agreed upon three dates for the researcher to come, observe, and provide feedback to the teacher after the class. At the end of the study, the researcher asked the teacher to provide self-reports of whether or not she had carried out the researcher's advice and evaluate the outcome.

The remainder of this paper will briefly review the literature on teacher professional development programs, transfer of training and the effects of coaching, describe the methodology in this pilot study, explain and analyze the results, and discuss the implications for other teacher trainers or mentors for in-service English teachers, and make recommendations for future research.

Literature Review
Teacher Development Programs and the Advanced Program

What makes a professional development program effective? Garet et al. (2001) have identified six features, three structural features and three core features. The structural features are: 1) whether the activity is organized as a reform type of activity (e.g. a study group, mentor-mentee, action research project) instead of a traditional workshop, 2) the duration of activities and span of time over which the teacher development program takes place, and 3) whether the program emphasizes collective participation of teachers from the same school, in contrast to individual teachers from different schools. The core features are: 1) whether the activities offer active learning opportunities, 2) how much coherence the activities have to the

teachers' experiences and goals, and 3) the extent of content focus in order to deepen the teachers' understanding.

When examining the Advanced Program under these six features, it seems the Advanced Program can be seen as an effective teacher development program. Firstly, seminars provided to teachers are reform type of activities instead of traditional lecture workshops. There is a mentor-mentee relationship between the participant teacher and Academia trainer. In addition, all participants have to design and carry out their own action research project. Secondly, the seminars span a total of nine months, from May to January, with a total of eight full training days, in addition to two school visits, one in June and another in November. Although Garet et al. did not provide a specific duration for how long professional training programs need to be in order to be seen as "effective", they advocate training over an extended period of time in order to have deeper discussions and allow teachers to try different activities and get feedback. In this regard, the Advanced Program fulfills this criteria in fostering an environment for in-depth discussion and constant feedback to teachers. The third criteria is collective participation of teachers from the same school instead of individual teachers from a different school. The reasoning behind this is to make the training more sustainable over time as teachers all from the same school will share similar problems, experiences, can relate to one another and can work together to develop solutions. Unfortunately, for logistical purposes, this cannot be done as it would require all the English teachers from one school to take a leave on the same day, eight times throughout the year. Thus, for structural features, it seems collective participation is the only criteria not fulfilled by the Advanced Program. In terms of the core features, informal questionnaire results from participant teachers have shown that the Advanced Program was able to provide active learning opportunities which are coherent to the teachers' teaching contexts and also deepened their understanding of language teaching.

Murakoshi and Ehara (2016) examined the effects of professional transformation and information dissemination in schools through a questionnaire and follow-up survey sent to Advanced Program participants from 2011 to 2015. They received 71 replies from 97 graduates. They found that 39 teachers or 55% contributed to establishing practical pedagogical goals with their colleagues at their school after the seminar. In terms of information dissemination, they found that only 9 teachers or 12.6% of the graduates held a conference at their school to talk about what they have learned in the seminar. 27 teachers or 38% distributed their report to fellow colleagues in the English Department. The majority, 33 teachers or 46.5% shared what they have learned with only particular colleagues. Both these data sets suggest that although teachers' cognitions and behaviors have changed after graduating the Advanced Program, they are still not receiving the structural and institutional support needed to implement school-level change.

Murakoshi and Ehara's study mainly focused on teacher self-reports using questionnaires in order to understand the general situation of teachers in their schools. However, it is also important to examine whether teachers are continuing to utilize the principles and theories that they have learned in the Advanced Program in their own teaching practice, to determine the extent of transfer of training. In order to get this information, more in-depth data from observations of individual teachers' teaching in the classroom is necessary.

Coaching

Classroom research often focuses on attending a teacher's lesson to collect information through the use of observations and check sheets. The researcher sits in the back and checks some boxes. Often these experiences can be nerve-wracking for teachers. Williams (1989) identified several problems regarding traditional classroom observations such as loss of teachers' self-esteem, causing teacher anxiety, and the feeling of always being judged by the trainer. In order to avoid this, it is imperative to ensure teachers who are observed that they themselves will benefit from the observations. To accomplish both goals of following up and helping the teacher succeed in everyday lessons, an approach that allows the researcher to be in the classroom to observe the teacher and also be able to advise him/her, is necessary.

Coaching is a "means of examining and reflecting on what they [teachers] do in a psychologically safe environment where it is all right to experiment, fail, revise, and try again" (Raney & Robbins, 1989, p. 37). The "coach" can be a teacher trainer, a veteran teacher, or even a peer teacher. Richards and Farrell (2005) describes this process. One teacher adopts the role of the coach, someone who can offer constructive feedback to the other teacher in a positive and supportive manner. The two decide on some teaching aspects to explore. The coach observes the teacher's class and provides his/her observations and suggestions. However, the decision to adopt the feedback rests solely on the teacher and his/her analysis of his/her own students.

Farrell (2014) recommended a four-step sequence for conducting the coaching process: 1) a pre-observation discussion, 2) the actual classroom visit, 3) a post-visit discussion and 4) a general review of the process. In the pre-observation discussion, both the coach and teachers should be given a chance to discuss their concerns and goals for what they would like to achieve by taking part in this coaching activity. In the actual classroom visit, the coach takes notes on what he/she observes during the lesson. Richards and Farrell (2005) suggest the coach not to give comments or suggestions after the class until both feel comfortable – the teacher with having an observer in the classroom and the coach with taking notes while observing. Then, when both are comfortable, the coach can engage in giving feedback, talking about his/her observations and offering suggestions for improvement. In the fourth stage, both parties

reflect on the process. Specifically, teachers and coaches are advised to think about whether the feedback was specific, the type of language used in the feedback session and whether it was judgmental or evaluative, whether the process was helpful and led to more effective teaching.

Research Questions

In order to consider ways to conduct a more detailed follow-up on graduates of the Advanced Program and at the same time benefit the teachers' day to day teaching, this pilot study devised the use of coaching as a possible tool to achieve both objectives. The aim of this study is to investigate whether coaching is an effective method to follow up on in-service teachers who have completed a comprehensive teacher development program while benefiting their day to day lessons at the same time. The research questions are:

1) Does coaching help the teacher improve her teaching in day to day lessons?
2) Is coaching an efficient way follow up on Advanced Program graduates?

Methodology

Participant Teacher and School Background

The participant teacher was an Advanced Program graduate of the most recent 2016 cohort. She is in her late twenties and has been teaching English for four years. For her Advanced Program action research project, she was successful in improving her students' confidence and motivation in speaking English.

This year, she is in charge of 40 second-year senior high school students whom she had taught the previous year. She is teaching second-year high school English Communication and English Expression by herself, with a total of 21 classes. In addition, she is also in charge of her own homeroom class, the table tennis club, English club, alpine club and the global education committees at school.

She works at a school with very high academic standing within Kanagawa Prefecture. Thus, almost all of her students are focused on studying for the university entrance examinations to enter the top public and private universities in the nation. In order to pass these tests, the students believe that advanced reading and writing skills, as well as extensive grammar and vocabulary knowledge are necessary. Her goal, which she identified at the beginning of the study, was to teach university entrance exam English in a communicative manner to encourage students to continue speaking in English and not only to just focus on studying grammar and reading.

Procedure

Farrell (2014) recommended a four-step sequence for conducting the coaching process: 1) a pre-observation discussion, 2) the actual classroom visit, 3) a post-visit discussion and 4) a general review of the process.

In order to lessen the teacher's burden, the pre-observation discussion was done informally through a short email exchange, with the researcher asking the teacher what her goal for the year was. She replied that it was to teach *juken eigo* (English for entrance exams) in a more communicative manner.

The next step was the actual classroom visit. The researcher was able to observe a total of three lessons. The first classroom observation took place on May 26th in a regular classroom. The lesson lasted a total of 50 minutes. In this lesson, the teacher did a mini debate for the first half of the class, and then went over the textbook reading for the second half. After the lesson, the researcher and participant teacher, in addition to two other English teachers (one veteran teacher and one novice teacher), held a short 30-minute reflection meeting. All discussions were recorded. First, the researcher asked the participant teacher to fill out the Teaching Reflection Sheet (see Appendix). Then, the researcher looked through the answers given by the participant teacher on the teaching reflection and asked her reason for giving the answers she wrote. Finally, the researcher gave her comments on the lesson and suggestions for improvement.

The second observation took place on June 16th. The lesson lasted a total of 45 minutes. This was a special lesson because the Japanese students were joined by eight students from an American high school, as well as their accompanying teachers and chaperones (four total). As this was the first time for the Japanese and American students to meet each other, the teacher had students do some self-introduction activities, followed by a question and answer time to American students, and finally a Japanese-English quiz about each other's schools and hometowns. As with the previous observation, the researcher and participant teacher had a 30-minute reflection meeting after the lesson. The teacher filled out the Teaching Reflection Sheet, discussed her feelings and observations of the lesson, and then the researcher gave her comments and suggestions for improvement.

The third class observation took place on September 20th in the students' regular classroom and lasted a total of 50 minutes. The teacher did a vocabulary quiz for the first fifteen minutes, then an oral introduction of a topic related to the textbook lesson, followed by a more in-depth lesson on the textbook reading. As with the previous times, a 30-minute reflection meeting was held between the researcher and participant teacher.

In November, the researcher emailed the participant teacher a list of the advice she gave during the three class observations and reflection meetings and asked the teacher to

reflect and report whether she adopted the feedback and whether or not the feedback was useful.

Table 1 shows a summary of the lesson plan of each class visit, as well the suggestions the researcher gave to the participant teacher after each lesson observation.

Table 1 *Lesson Plan and Researcher Advice*

Date	Lesson Plan	Researcher Advice
5/26	• Mini Debate on "Japan should ban Ladies' Day."	• Show videos of other students debating • Write the argument flow on the board • Give students planning time before debating and encourage them to write their ideas in Japanese
	• Textbook lesson: read aloud, Q&A, grammar practice, worksheet on textbook content	• Tell students today's goals at the beginning of class
6/16	• Self-introduction in groups by writing name tags for each other	• Coordinate with the teachers from the American school & get help from others
	• Japanese students ask questions to American students	• Set more specific topics for students to ask questions about
	• Japanese-English quiz about each other's schools & hometowns	• Set a time to speak in half in Japanese & half in English
9/20	• Vocabulary quiz	
	• Oral introduction university rankings "quiz"	• Before asking difficult questions, start with personal response questions
	• Textbook lesson: scanning, Q&A, pair talk	• Tell students explicitly that they are practicing skills for entrance exam • Ask ALT teachers to make entrance exam questions

Results and Discussion

RQ1: Coaching and Day to Day Lessons

With regards to research question 1, "Does coaching help the teacher improve her teaching in day to day lessons?" the results indicate that it does, but depending on the advice. The results of the researcher's advice and impact on the teacher's lesson following her own observations are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 *Advice and Impact on Teacher's Lesson*

Date	Researcher Advice	Impact	Teacher's Observation
5/26	Show videos of other students debating	No impact	Most students did not watch the videos recommended by the teacher.
	Give students planning time before debating and encourage them to write their ideas in Japanese	No impact	Most students just chatted or slept during this time.
	Write the argument flow on the board	High impact	Students were able to use a worksheet the teacher made to check the logic of their arguments.
	Tell students today's goals at the beginning of class	High impact	Students make an effort to achieve the goals set by the teacher, especially when told just before doing an activity.
6/16	Set a time to speak in half in Japanese & half in English Set more specific topics for students to ask questions about Coordinate with the teachers from the American school & get help from others	Cannot be measured	The teacher plans to manage the activities following the coach's advice next year.
9/20	Before asking difficult questions, start with personal response questions	High impact	The teacher conducted a debate on a topic related to the student's personal life before introducing the chapter. Students were able to understand the chapter better after doing the debate.
	Tell students explicitly that they are practicing skills for entrance exam	High impact	Students seemed enthusiastic to read passages after the teachers analyzed and explained about how to answer questions for the university exams.
	Ask ALT teachers to make entrance exam questions	Low impact	The ALT teacher's questions were too easy so the teacher made questions by herself.

In the May observation, the researcher gave four main feedback points: 1) show videos of other students debating, 2) write the argument flow on the board, 3) give students planning time before they debate and encourage them to write their ideas down in Japanese, 4) tell the goals of the day at the beginning of class. Points 1 and 2 were given based on the researcher's

teaching experience and points 3 and 4 were principles often mentioned in the Advanced Program.

With regards to the first suggestion, the teacher reported that she suggested her students to watch the videos at home on their own time. When she asked how many have watched the video in the next class, only two students raised their hand. Thus, this advice was not effective at all. The second suggestion was to give students planning time before they debate and encourage them to write their ideas down in Japanese. The purpose of this was to encourage students to think and develop ideas more deeply. The researcher thought if they wrote down their ideas in their native language, they would be able to express their thoughts more clearly while debating. However, according to the teacher's report, *"They worked to some extent (some students still wasted time by chatting or sleeping and some took memos in English)."* Thus, this advice was also not very effective for the teacher. The researcher's third suggestion was to write the argument flow of the debate on the board so students can follow along with the arguments. The teacher reported, *"In order to check the flow and to think more logically while debating, I made an easy worksheet instead of writing key phrases on the blackboard. It really works."* The fourth suggestion was to announce to the students the goals of the day at the beginning of class in order to keep students focused. Regarding this, the teacher said, *"It seems better to tell them repeatedly, especially just before activities, so that the students make efforts to achieve the goals."* In both these cases, the coach's advice provided a springboard for the teacher to reflect on her teaching and then adapt that advice to fit her students' needs.

The June observation was a one-time event and thus, there are no opportunities for the teacher to test out the coach's suggestions. However, the teacher commented that she *"will manage the class according to your [the researcher's] advice next year."*

The September observation, the researcher suggested three main points: 1) before asking students a difficult concept question about the textbook, start with a personal response question related to the difficult concept question; 2) tell students explicitly that the activity they are doing will help them practice skills for the entrance exam; and 3) ask the assistant language teacher (ALT) to make sample exam questions for students. Points 1 and 2 are principles often mentioned in the Advanced Program and point 3 was based on the coach's personal teaching experience.

Regarding the first suggestion of prefacing the difficult question with a personal response question, the teacher gave an example of how she used this in her next class: *"I asked the question, 'What classes do you think are not useful for your future?' to the students and [had them] debate on the topic 'We should learn (the least useful subject, different depending on the class).' It was so effective for the students to understand Lesson 6 [when] comparing to*

their own experience." In this example, the teacher was able to apply the advice of the coach directly into her next lesson. The second suggestion was to tell students explicitly that the activity they are doing will help them practice certain necessary skills for the entrance exam. This suggestion was given after the teacher lamented that students were not motivated to do certain activities as they just wanted to focus more on learning grammar for the university entrance exams. The teacher explained how she implemented this suggestion: *"I tried analyzing some entrance examinations for universities, and telling the students explicitly how the questions tend to be asked. Just after I talked about it, the students seemed to be enthusiastic to read passages."* Here as well, she was able to apply the advice directly into her teaching context. The final suggestion was to ask the ALT to make entrance exam questions to help students practice. However, when the teacher tried this, she found that*, "ALTs might not be familiar with Japanese entrance examinations, so the questions they made for me were so simple and a little too easy for the students. I sometimes make some questions by myself."* The coach had mentioned to the teacher that before asking the ALTs to make questions, she should show him/her some past entrance exam questions. However, it seems the teacher had missed this part of the advice or the coach was not explicit enough in her suggestions.

RQ 2: Is Coaching an Effective Method to Follow Up?

The second research question was: "Is coaching an efficient way follow up on Advanced Program graduates?" This will be answered by the researcher's own personal observations, having been a coach to the participant teacher. The short answer is that it depends on whether future trainers are willing to jump through the bureaucratic hurdles of securing permission for school visits, whether the participant teacher is willing to participate actively throughout the entire process, and whether the researcher has appropriate measurements for determining the extent of adherence to the Advanced Program principles.

Firstly, in order to cooperate with the participant teacher on this project, the researcher had to get permission from both the Board of Education and the principal of the school back in early February. Originally, the researcher had wanted to follow up on three teachers. However, some teachers hesitated to participate for various personal reasons such as fear of standing out among colleagues. Already, there is a participant self-selection bias which would clearly influence the end results. In the future, if such a program were to be mandatory, it would definitely eliminate the self-selection bias. However, there may be backlash from the participant teachers who are forced to undergo a follow-up study since they may view it as more additional work. In addition, although the teacher adopted the researcher's suggestions, this adoption was based on teacher's self-report, not direct classroom observation as coaching advice can only be given after the coach has visited the class. Thus, the researcher was not able

to see the subsequent classes in which the teacher has adopted the advice. This is a structural and logistical issue and is difficult to remedy as teachers have a packed and unpredictable schedule every week and therefore, it is difficult for the researcher to request seeing subsequent classes.

However, after the teacher and coach are able to work out the bureaucratic and logistical details, the rest of the coaching does not take too much time. The researcher usually arrived about 10 minutes before the class starts. Then, after the classroom observation, feedback only lasted for about 20 minutes. Email exchange was also quite minimal, with the coach and teacher exchanging emails less than five times a month, usually right before the next observation. In terms of preparation, participant teachers need not do any extra work, aside from the 20-minute feedback meeting and exchanging less than five emails a month with the coach. Despite the minimal time required, the participant teacher was always very responsive in emails, welcoming to the researcher, gave her honest ideas during the feedback sessions, and willing to try out the researcher's suggestions. This positive relationship between the participant teacher and researcher is essential for the success of any follow-up program.

Finally, although the researcher is knowledgeable in the principles of the Advanced Program, she did not use any type of formal measurement criteria to measure whether or not the teacher is using what was taught in the Advanced Program and instead focused more on giving suggestions on how to help the teacher improve her day-to-day lessons. Thus, future research needs to operationalize appropriate variables beforehand in order to determine the extent to which the participant teacher is applying what he/she learned in the training program.

Implications for teacher trainers/mentors

The findings from this pilot study suggest that there are many structural and logistical challenges to the implementation of coaching as both a way to follow up on graduates of the Advanced Program and also as a means to help teachers improve their day to day teaching. Considering the results and her own experience as both the coach and researcher, the author would like to make several suggestions.

Firstly, if such a follow-up coaching program were to be implemented, the emphasis should always be on how the coach can help the participant teacher with his/her teaching goals rather than on whether or not the teacher is implementing the principles and theories learned in the Advanced Program. The researcher realized this as one of her mistakes when reflecting upon the limitations of this study. At the beginning of the year, the researcher asked the participant teacher what she would like help on and what her goal was for the year. The teacher answered, *"I will be grateful if you give me some advice in terms of teaching juken eigo (entrance exam English) communicatively."* Unfortunately, throughout all but the last

observation, the coach/researcher failed to focus on the teacher's overarching goal and instead focused more on feedback regarding the individual content of each lesson without addressing the teacher's concern on how to teach *juken eigo* more communicatively. If the researcher had put an emphasis on the teacher's goal in mind, the teacher could have come up with more ideas to teach *juken eigo* communicatively, like she did following the suggestions of the September observation.

Secondly, although there may be structural and logistical hurdles in organizing classroom observations, the researcher found these visits invaluable in order to gain insights into the classroom atmosphere, the teacher's relationship with her students, and the students' reactions in general. Thus, it is recommended that the coach observe the class at least once at the beginning of the year (in May or June), in order to cater advice to the teacher appropriately. After the observation, the coach and teacher should use the teaching reflection sheet to discuss that day's lesson.

Thirdly, since neither the coach nor the teacher has much time for classroom observations and feedback sessions every week, it is incumbent on the teacher to reflect on his/her teaching after each lesson. The teaching reflection sheet can be a useful reflection tool as it does not require too much time (at most ten minutes) to fill out. This act of reflection can help teachers figure out their own problems and how to solve them, or identify problems and contact their coach by email or phone, in order to get advice. The teacher does not need to fill it out after every lesson for every class. He/she can choose one class to reflect on and make sure to reflect on the lessons for only that class. Mann and Walsh (2017) argue that with the proper training and guidance on how to effectively reflect on one's own pedagogical practice, teacher reflection can be an important tool for personal growth and professional development. Future research can explore the techniques to train in-service teachers to conduct reflective practice by themselves.

Finally, as with all follow-up programs, there should be a final observation in December/January to observe how the teacher has made progress towards his/her goals. In this session, the coach/researcher can ask the teacher explicitly to reflect on this question, identify some best practices, and work together to solve remaining difficulties. This was not done in this pilot study as the coach was not able to visit the teacher in December or January due to the teacher's schedule.

Table 3 summarizes the above and shows a sample coaching plan which teacher trainers and their participant teachers can use to carry out a similar teacher development sequence.

Table 3 *Sample Coaching Plan*

Month	Action to be taken
April	• The teacher decides his/her teaching goal for the year.
May/June	• Coach observes the teacher's class, gives feedback on what he/she observed, and discusses with the teacher on how he/she can work towards her goal for the year, in the context of the classroom.
May – December	• In order to identify best practices and problems in the lessons, the teacher reflects on his/her lesson using the teaching reflection sheet, or any other medium he/she prefers. • The teacher takes a proactive approach to ask his/her coach and/or other colleagues for advice in order to solve any difficulties which may arise in the classroom.
December/January	• Coach observes a second time, gives feedback on the lesson, and asks the teacher to reflect on how much progress he/she has made towards his/her goal for the year. Then, the two discuss to solve other areas of difficulty the teacher may have.

Conclusion

The purpose of this pilot study was to identify whether coaching is a feasible method for following up on Advanced Program graduates while giving support to the participant teacher with her day to day lessons. To this aim, the researcher took upon the role of a coach to the teacher. She observed three of the teacher's lessons, conducted a 20-minute feedback session after each observation to advise the teacher in her lesson. Results from the teacher's self-report showed that the teacher successfully adopted and adapted more than half of the coach's suggestions in her teaching practice. In terms of practicality, if the teacher and researcher/coach are able to clear the logistical hurdles, the coaching process itself (discussion about coaching, classroom observations, feedback meeting, communication emails) did not take too much of either party's time. This pilot study was able to identify several challenges in coaching and the researcher has provided several suggestions for going forward in the future. A combination of goal-setting, coaching and teacher self-reflection is necessary to overcome structural and logistical constraints and to ensure the final goal of teachers – being the best teacher they can be in their classroom.

There are several ways in which the findings in this study can contribute to the seminars in Academia. Firstly, the reflection sheet created from this study can be distributed to

teachers who attend future workshops as well as teachers in the Advanced Program, in order to encourage them to be more proactive and reflective in their day-to-day teaching. Secondly, this coaching sequence (as illustrated in the sample coaching plan in Table 3) can be introduced to senior teachers who are assigned to mentor the younger teachers at their school. Having a set plan like this ensures that all parties follow through on their duties, with the focus being on improving the teaching skills of younger teachers more quickly and efficiently.

References

村越亮治, & 江原美明. (2017). 高等学校英語科における協働的指導改善に関する課題. 神奈川県立国際言語文化アカデミア紀要, 6, 1-13.

Kanagawa Prefectural Institute of Language and Culture. (2016). *Advanced Program 2016 Program Outline*. Retrieved from http://www.pref.kanagawa.jp/uploaded/attachment/862202.pdf

Borg, S. (2015). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Farrell, T. S. (2014). *Promoting teacher reflection in second language education: A framework for TESOL professionals*. Routledge.

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, *38*(4), 915-945.

Mann, S., & Walsh, S. (2016). *Reflective Practice in English Language Teaching*. Routledge.

OECD (2014). *TALIS 2013 results: An international perspective on teaching and learning*. OECD Publishing.

Randall, M., & Thornton, B. (2003). *Advising and supporting teachers*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Raney, P., & Robbins, P. (1989). Professional Growth and Support through Peer Coaching. *Educational Leadership*, *46*(8), 35-38.

Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Williams, M. (1989). A developmental view of classroom observations. *ELT Journal*, *43*(2), 85-91.

Appendix

Teaching Reflection

Name:　　　　　　　　　　Date:　　　　　　　　　　Lesson:

Goals

① What were my goals for this class session?　今回の授業の目標は？

② What did I want to work on in my teaching during this lesson?
　　今回の授業で取り組みたかった改善策は？

My reaction to the class

③ How would I evaluate the class overall?　今回の授業の大まかな自己評価は？
1: poor　　　　　　　　2　　　　　　　　3　　　　　　　　4　　　　　　　　5: excellent

④ Did I accomplish all of my goals for this lesson?　今回の授業の目標を達成したか？
1: not　　　　　　　　2　　　　　　　　3　　　　　　　　4　　　　　　　　5: all
　accomplished　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　accomplished
⑤ How much student learning took place?　生徒はどれくらい学べたのか？
1: little　　　　　　　　2　　　　　　　　3　　　　　　　　4　　　　　　　　5: a lot

⑥ How did I feel as I left the class?　授業を終えての自分自身の満足度は？
1: dissatisfied　　　　　　2　　　　　　　　3　　　　　　　　4　　　　　　　　5: pleased

⑦ What made the lesson good or not so good?　授業の良かった点・悪かった点は？

⑧ What could I do to improve the lesson? How would I change the lesson if I could do it over?
　　この授業を向上するために、どうすればいいのか？やり直せるとしたら、何を変えるのか？
　　　・I would _____.
　　　・I would _____.
　　　・I would _____.

⑨ What new action will I try in my next lesson in order to achieve my goals?
　　目標を達成するために、次の授業でどんな新しい行動を試すか？

⑩ What did I do better this time than before?　前回の授業より良かったことは何か？