

---

## Language Teaching Models in Teacher Training Programs

---

Alper Aslan  
Trakya University / Turkey  
Faculty of Education  
alperaslan2003@hotmail.com

**Recommended citation:** Aslan, A. (2016). Language teaching models in teacher training programs. *Turkish Online Journal of English Language Teaching (TOJELT)*, 1(3), 135-143.

---

Received:  
18 August 2016  
Accepted:  
25 August 2016  
Corresponding author:  
alperaslan2003@hotmail.com

**Abstract:** Any language teacher who has gone through some kind of training program for the teaching of English should be familiar with various specific language teaching models that constitute the core of the training process. A language teaching model is a guide that helps the trainee to sequence the activities designed for the expectations and needs of learners in a lesson. This paper reviews the common language teaching models in teacher training programs: Presentation, Practice, Production (PPP); Observe, Hypothesize, Experiment (OHE); Illustration, Interaction, Induction (III); Test, Teach, Test (TTT); Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT); Engage, Study, Activate (ESA); Authentic Use, Restricted Use, Clarification (ARC) and discusses them with deficiencies over each other. The study suggests that if learners' needs and expectations are known and considered in the pre-planning stages of lessons, any language teaching model may be favorable for teachers.

© 2016 TOJELT.  
All rights reserved.  
E-ISSN: 2458-9918

**Keywords:** *Language teaching models, teacher training programs, language teacher education, foreign language education*

---

### 1. Introduction

Teaching methods and models may vary regarding the needs and expectations of learners in any teaching environment. In teacher training process, the trainee becomes familiar with those methods and models. Such different methods and models are introduced to evoke awareness about how a lesson plan is designed and in what sequence the activities of the plan are proposed. Before reviewing the language teaching models for both trainers and trainees in the relevant literature of this paper, it is necessary to deal with the concept of *sequencing* with reference to instructional contexts. The ordering of activities within a lesson or a unit is related with the term *sequencing*. However, it should not be confused with the concept of *grading*. According to Nunan (1988), grading refers to the arrangement of syllabus content from easy to difficult. It can be concluded that grading refers to difficulty as the parameter of the ordering. On the other hand, sequencing refers to the overall arrangement of that syllabus content by means of several criteria, one of which is difficulty (grading), the other being frequency, learnability, usefulness and learners' communicative needs.

The concepts put forward above explain the terminological and conceptual differences between grading and sequencing. It is now pertinent to examine the presence of sequencing as an activity ordering in foreign language teaching (FLT) literature. Activity sequencing in FLT is usually formed by a *model*. The term 'model' which is directly related with sequencing in FLT literature is "used to describe typical procedures or sets of procedures, usually for teachers in training" (Harmer, 2001, p.79). Many language teaching programs have a teaching model for their understanding of the methodology, and a trainee is almost always trained in accordance with

that model. The models are designed to guide teaching practice. They guide especially inexperienced teachers or trainees in training. According to Harmer (2001), their purpose is pedagogic in terms of training, rather than inspirational as statements of theoretical belief.

*Model* is labeled differently by various scholars in FLT literature. For instance, Woodward (2001) and Harmer (1996, 2001) use the term *model*, while Scrivener (1994, 1996) calls it a *training model* and a *paradigm*. On the other hand, McCarty and Carter (1995) refer it as a *methodology*. In line with the concepts, D. Willis (1996a, 1996b) also approaches the issue of activity sequencing as *paradigm*, *approach*, *methodology*, *cycle* and *sequence*, while J. Willis refers to it as a *cycle* and an *approach* (1996a, 1996b).

With the help of a model, an inexperienced teacher or a trainee has a chance to select from a wide variety of activities. In this respect, models just guide the order of activities in a lesson or a unit. However, they differ from methods in that a method is a strict procedure for both selecting and presenting the activities in order. In addition to this, there is no more choice to select from, while using a method.

Some models reflect a specific order for a lesson schema such as, PPP, TBLT, OHE, III and TTT; while others are operational and flexible within a cycle such as ESA and ARC. In the next section, these common models will be dealt with.

## **2. Language Teaching Models**

### **2.1. PPP (Presentation, Practice, Production)**

The PPP model is the most common and traditional methodology employed by both professional programs and course books around the world. The three Ps stands for *Presentation* (P1), *Practice* (P2) and *Production* (P3). Harmer (2007) points out that the PPP procedure has been offered to teacher trainees as a significant procedure since 1960s, although it was not then referred to as PPP. However, it can be inferred from literature that the pioneer of the PPP model was Donn Byrne (1976).

While Richards and Rodgers (2001) link the PPP model to Situational Language Teaching, Harmer (2001, 2007) links it to a variation of Audio-lingualism. In fact, the PPP model is a mixture in that it carries the characteristics of Situational Language Teaching especially at presentation stage and behaviorism at practice stage. Interestingly, certain researchers; for instance, Howatt (2004), ascribes the production stage alone to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT).

As a traditional model of grammar teaching, the PPP model starts with a presentation of a new structure in a situation contextualizing it. In the practice stage, learners practice the structure using accurate reproduction techniques including choral and individual repetition and cue-response drills. Finally, the production stage is more meaning-focused and communication-oriented, where learners are encouraged to use the new language and make sentences of their own (Harmer, 2001, 2007).

The original model has been developed and modified since it was first introduced to FLT literature (Lindsay & Knight, 2006). Evans (1999, p.1) also states that “PPP has evolved over the years, cherry picking the more attractive elements of other approaches, and incorporating them into its basic format”. Some scholars think that the PPP model is still appropriate for language classes, and they attribute this to the following arguments:

1. The PPP model correlates with the Anderson’s skill acquisition model / Information processing model (Anderson, 1983, 1987, 2005).

2. If well- designed, the presentation stage makes learners notice the new language forms (Hedge, 2000).
3. The output in the practice and production stages makes learners
  - a) notice the gaps in their interlanguage.
  - b) hypothesize testing
  - c) aware of metalinguistic function (Swain, 1985, 1995, 2005)
  - d) develop automaticity (Skehan, 1998)

Apart from these arguments for the PPP model, The PPP model came under a sustained attack in the 1990s (Harmer, 2007). The arguments against the PPP model can be summarized as follows:

1. The PPP model is based on discrete items (Scrivener, 1994; Woodward, 1993).
2. It encourages accuracy over fluency (Willis, 1993).
3. It does not allow for recycling or movement between the different stages (Scrivener, 1994).
4. PPP is compatible with a structural syllabus, whereas a skill-based syllabus can be exploited in the units with the basic *pre-*, *while-*, *post-* sequence (Hedge, 2000).
5. It is less workable at higher levels when students need to compare and contrast several grammatical items at the same time.
6. It neglects three very important second language learning principles:
  - a) readiness to learn
  - b) the delayed effect of instruction
  - c) the silent period

In response to these criticisms, many scholars have offered variations on PPP and alternatives to it (Harmer, 2007). The alternatives to the PPP model are *OHE*, *III*, *TTT*, *TBLT*, *ESA* and *ARC*.

## **2.2. OHE (Observe, Hypothesize, Experiment)**

One of the language awareness-based models of language teaching is the OHE, which stands for *Observe*, *Hypothesize*, and *Experiment*. It incorporates awareness sessions into the teaching process. According to Lewis (1993, 1996), learners should be allowed to observe the language (read or listen to the language), hypothesize about how the language works and experiment to check the correctness of the previous hypothesis. In this respect, language awareness refers to the inductive teaching process.

Lewis (1993, 1996) claimed that language teaching should not be solely based on lexicalized grammar (where the priority is given to a grammar item, while lexis is necessary only to put this grammatical structure into work), but rather grammaticalised lexis, with language consisting of words, multi-word units, lexical chunks, combined into sentences, paragraphs and texts. The consequence was the shift in the types of tasks and the balance between vocabulary practice and grammar practice.

In line with Lewis' claim, Hypothesize and Experiment stages involve activities such as identifying, sorting and matching and their aim is to encourage curiosity about language and among learners. Lewis (1997) points out that the learners' attention should be directed to lexical chunks (words, collocations, institutionalized expressions, sentence frames or heads, etc).

### **2.3. III (*Illustration, Interaction, Induction*)**

III, which stands for *Illustration, Interaction* and *Induction*, is another language awareness-based model of language teaching. McCarthy and Carter (1995) - who are the pioneers of this model - argue the need for a stepaway from the three Ps to what they term the three Is. They believe that accessing real data and teaching aspects of spoken grammar should be incorporated into the lessons in order to make learners aware of the nature of spoken language and written distinctions in terms of grammatical choices.

In the III model, *Illustration* means “wherever possible examining real data which is presented in terms of choices of forms relative to context and use” (McCarthy & Carter, 1995, p.217). In this regard, learners look at real chunks of language, at real data as collected in the different corpora of spoken language available.

*Interaction* means that learners and teachers analyze the material together and talk about what language item has been noticed. Through observation learners are asked to comprehend and formulate the rules governing linguistic phenomena. In this stage, discourse awareness activities are brought to the fore, e.g. activities which focus on particular discourse patterns in the language under examination (McCarthy & Carter, 1995).

As the last stage, *Induction* takes the consciousness-raising a stage further by encouraging learners to draw conclusions about the features of the language analyzed (McCarthy & Carter, 1995). The induction stage is not followed by controlled practice compared to the PPP model.

McCarthy and Carter (1995) also point out that - with this model - learners will notice that some areas of grammar are probabilistically appropriate rather than absolutely correct, and that there are cases when their choice will be between an informal, interpersonally-orientated form, and a more formal alternative. This means that it is perhaps more proper to talk of tendencies, variable rules and choices than of fixed rules when spoken language is the object of analysis.

### **2.4. TTT (*Test, Teach, Test*)**

An alternative to the PPP model is the TTT approach to language teaching, which is an acronym for *Test, Teach* and *Test*. In this respect, it differs from PPP in that the production stage comes first (*Test* stage). In *Test* stage, learners are required to perform a particular task (a role play, for example) without any help from the teacher (TTT, n.d.). The teacher assesses the students' level of competency in the particular language area, determine their needs, and proceed with the *Teach* stage (which corresponds to the *Presentation* stage in the PPP approach). The *Teach* stage allows the teacher to discuss the grammatical or lexical problems that has been determined in the activity. In this regard, it may offer exposure to new language or some chances to notice features of language (Woodward, 2001). According to Bowen (2002), the language presented in the *Teach* stage can be predicted if the initial production task is carefully chosen but there is a danger of randomness in this model. The final stage of the TTT model is the second *Test* that aims to check how well students have learned the language item. The learners are asked to do a similar or / the same task again.

In general, the TTT model is useful when the teacher is not sure whether the learners are familiar with a particular item (Lindsay & Knight, 2006). It can be particularly useful at intermediate levels and above, where learners may have seen language before, but have specific problems with it, and also in mixed level classes to help identify objectives for each individual (TTT, n.d.)

## 2.5. TBLT (*Task-based Language Teaching*)

TBLT developed early in 1980s as an approach to language teaching within the ‘strong’ version of CLT. The strong version stresses that students must use their communicative capacities in order to learn the language (Howatt, 2004). In order to realize that communicative capacity, many forms of TBLT have been proposed (Prabhu, 1987; Nunan, 1989, 2004; Pica Kanagy, & Falodun, 1993; Willis, 1996a, 1996b). However, the most well-known model of task implementation in the teacher training programs was devised by Willis (1993, 1996a, 1996b).

In TBLT, students are presented with a task they have to perform or a problem they have to solve. Typically, TBLT consists of three stages: the *Pre-task*, the *Task cycle* and the *Language focus*. In the *Pre-task* stage, the teacher explores the topic with the class. Useful lexical items may be highlighted. In addition to this, a recording of a similar / the same task may be given to the learners to help them understand what they will do with the task itself (Harmer, 2001). The *Task-cycle* can be broken down into three stages, too. The task stage in which learners perform the task, the planning stage as to how they will report to the class and the report stage when they report what and how they did the task orally or in writing. As the last stage, *Language focus* consists of analysis and practice. In the analysis, the learners examine lexical items or structures in the recording or text. In addition to this, the teacher may provide *Practice* for that lexical item or structure (Willis, 1996b).

Although Willis (1996a) claims that TBLT cannot be identified with a PPP upside down - because “it is more flexible and offers students far richer learning opportunities”, it can be correlated with the PPP model: Pre-task (Presentation), Task cycle (Production), Language focus (Practice).

TBLT is not without its shortcomings. Ellis (2004) handles the issue as follows:

1. TBLT may not be well-suited to cultural contexts: Task-based teaching implies a particular cultural context that may be in conflict with cultural contexts where learning is not seen as a collaborative and experiential activity.
2. TBLT requires teachers to be proficient in L2
3. It reinforces the stereotypical view that English-language teachers should be native speakers.
4. What is appropriate for a second language teaching context may not be appropriate for a foreign language context.
  - a) Task-based instruction is seen as impractical in foreign language contexts because of the limited class time available for teaching the L2.
  - b) Task-based teaching is seen as difficult to implement by non-native speaking teachers whose L2 oral proficiency is uncertain.

Apart from those shortcomings, Ellis (2004) adds the following:

5. The sequencing of tasks are difficult.
6. Published materials are not readily available.

## 2.6. ESA (*Engage, Study, Activate*)

A different trilogy of teaching sequence is the ESA, which stands for *Engage, Study* and *Activate* (Harmer 1996, 1998, 2001). During the *Engage* stage, the teacher tries to arouse the students’ interests (Harmer, 2001, p.84). In this respect, “unless students are engaged emotionally, their learning will be less effective”. This contrasts with the traditional PPP model

in that the PPP model has always assumed that students come to lessons already motivated to listen or engage. The *Study* stage involves conscious attention to linguistic forms. Harmer (1996) equates it to the explanation and *Practice* of the PPP model. In this stage, the focus is on how something is constructed, whether it is a grammatical structure, a specific intonation pattern, the construction of a paragraph or text, the way a lexical phrase is made and used, or the collocation of a particular word. As for the *Activate* stage, the activities and tasks are designed to get what the students know and to use the language as communicatively as they can (Harmer, 2007).

ESA offers more flexible lessons allowing the lessons move between different stages. Harmer (1996, 1998, 2001) offers three types of lessons provided by the different ordering of Engage, Study and Activate. The first one is the *straight arrow* in which the lesson sequence is ESA. A *Boomerang* procedure, on the other hand, is equated with the TBLT procedure in which the lesson follows EAS. The last lesson procedure is the *Patchwork* lesson which involves a variety of sequences. An example for this sequence can be EASAES.

### **2.7. ARC (Authentic Use, Restricted Use, Clarification)**

The ARC, model which was put forward by Jim Scrivener (1994), stands for *Authentic use, Restricted use* and *Clarification*. A sufficient account of the ARC model can be found in Scrivener (1994):

*Restricted use*: This stage focuses on form, accuracy and practice. Restricted use involves activities where the language available to the learners is in some way restricted – For example, doing an exercise on a grammatical item, reading a coursebook text, writing in a guided way, listening coursebook tasks etc.

*Authentic use*: This stage focuses on meaning, fluency and pleasure. Authentic use is the opposite of restricted use, there being no restriction on the language. For example, free communicative activities, discussions, writing stories or poems, reading novels or newspapers, listening radio or TV programs etc.

*Clarification*: It involves clarification about a language item on its meaning, form and use. The teacher use self or guided discovery to explore the language item, gives examples, analyze learners elicit or repeat things.

Scrivener (1994, p.133) states that “by ordering the A-R-C components in different ways we can describe a wide variety of lessons.” The lesson sequences can be CRRA, RCR, ACR, RCA, ACAAC and A.

### **3. Discussion**

When the models are examined, it can be noticed that most of the models (PPP, OHE, III, TTT, TBLT) are forms of recommended sequences for trainees and teachers; however, the other two (ESA and ARC) are, in fact, used as a labeling system rather than a recommended sequence. In this sense, one can say that labeling systems are for experienced teachers that know an effective activity-ordering in a lesson.

All the language teaching models have advantages over each other in teaching practice, but they also have disadvantages compared to each other. Although PPP is the most common language teaching model, it is firstly criticized with not allowing for recycling or movement between the different stages. Secondly, it is in fact suitable for teaching grammar, rather than, teaching skills. Finally, it is especially suitable for learners at lower levels. Because of these deficiencies, many scholars offered variations on and alternatives to the PPP model.

In addition to the PPP model, there are certain models that imply a reordering of the PPP stages. For example, in TTT model, while the first and second Test stages correspond to Production in the PPP model, the Teach stage equates with the Presentation stage in the PPP model. As for the TBLT, it can also be correlated with the PPP model: Pre-task with Presentation, Task cycle with Production, and Language focus with Practice.

The reordering of the PPP stages in TBLT and TTT makes the lesson more suitable for learners at higher levels. The teacher at these models should be proficient in L2, like a native speaker. In addition to these, the two models - in this sense - forming the lesson's sequence, may not be suitable for every culture where learning is not seen as a collaborative and experiential activity.

Apart from the models that imply a reordering of the PPP stages, some other models do not include all the PPP stages. For example, OHE and III models do not include controlled practice stages compared to the PPP model. Besides this, the two models are stricter in the lesson procedure than PPP in that they must include discovery activities, which may not be suitable for all learners, who are especially at lower levels and whose learning styles mismatch with this kind of activity.

When the aforementioned models are taken into consideration, it can be inferred that there is no perfect and unique model suitable for every student. Learners as individuals prefer various lesson procedures in accordance with their level of language proficiency, culture and learning style.

Scrivener (1994) states that language teaching models are paradigms, as well. Thomas Kuhn (1996) gave *paradigm* its contemporary meaning when he adopted the word to refer to the set of practices that define a scientific discipline at any particular period of time. In line with Kuhn's concept, each of the language teaching models forms a paradigm and each language teaching paradigm has an underlying philosophy in language teaching literature:

The PPP model	: Audiolingualism and Oral Situational Approach
The OHE model	: Lexical Approach
The III model	: Discourse Analysis
The TBLT model	: Communicative Approach and Task-based Language Teaching

It can be inferred that written and spoken interaction has become an important focus of language teaching models with the developments in linguistic science, especially with Dell Hymes' communicative competence. Apart from the influence of linguistics, learning theories has also influenced the language teaching models. The most influential of these learning theories is the constructivist learning theory. As part of constructivism, learner-centeredness took part in language teaching models especially in TBLT and further versions of the PPP model. This change in the approach to language teaching made a paradigm shift in language teaching methodology, in this sense, in language teaching models.

This shift can be pursued in language teaching models with two key components of the learner-centeredness. The first one is placing more responsibility in the hands of the students to manage their own learning, and second, teachers taking roles as facilitators of knowledge to help learners learn how to learn. In this way, teachers can foster learner autonomy by creating and maintaining a learning environment through which students can develop their language and learning skills to become autonomous learners.

It should be kept in mind that it is possible to use all the language teaching models depending on the lesson (skill or grammar), culture, level of language proficiency and learning styles. Swan (1985) advises that when a new approach comes along, we should not ask; ‘Is it true?, but What good does it do ?’ and urges that we should ‘try out new techniques without giving up useful older methods, simply because they have been ‘proved wrong’. This seems to be sound advice. Teachers should be open to new ideas and decide for themselves on what works best for their particular students. If so, teachers need to be trained for making decisions about the suitable methods and models during teacher training process. As prospective teachers, they should be familiar with the methodological paradigms in methodology courses in order to choose what works best for their students as well as themselves.

#### 4. Conclusion

In this study, the main aim is to review the language teaching models in FLT literature. Therefore, to highlight the issue, seven language teaching models have been presented and compared with each other (PPP, OHE, III, TTT, TBLT, ESA, and ARC). With this aim in mind, if learners’ needs and expectations are known and considered in the pre-planning stages of lessons, any language teaching model may be favorable for teachers. The preferred model/s can be employed in a holistic way in any language classroom environment to yield better results.

#### References

- Anderson, J. R. (1983). *The architecture of cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Anderson, J. R. (1987). Skill acquisition: Compilation of weak-method problem solutions. *Psychological Review*, 94(2), 192-210.
- Anderson, J. R. (2005). *Cognitive psychology and its implications*. 6th Ed. New York: Worth Publishers.
- Bowen, T. (2002). *Task-based learning*. Retrieved from <http://www.onestopenglish.com/>
- Byrne, D. (1976). *Teaching oral English*. London: Longman.
- Ellis, R (2004). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Evans, D. (1999). *A review of PPP*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.
- Harmer, J. (1996). Is PPP dead? *Modern English Teacher*, 5(2), 7-14.
- Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach English*. London: Longman.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd Ed). Harlow: Longman.
- Harmer, J (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Harlow: Longman.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Howatt, A. P. R. (2004). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. (1996). *The Structure of scientific revolutions*, 3rd Ed. Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach: The state of ELT and the way forward*. Hove, England: Language Teaching Publications.
- Lewis, M. (1996). Implications of a lexical view of language. In Willis, D. & J. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Lewis, M. (1997). *Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theory into practice*. Hove, England: Language Teaching Publications.



- Lindsay, C. & Knight P. (2006). *Learning and teaching English*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- McCarthy, M. & R. Carter (1995). Spoken grammar: what is it and how can we teach it? *ELT Journal* 49/3
- Nunan, D. (1988). *Syllabus design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge.
- Pica, T., Kanagy, R., & Falodun, J. (1993). Choosing and using communication tasks for second language instruction and research. In G. Crookes & S.M. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks and language learning* (pp. 9-33). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (Second Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scrivener, J. (1994). *Learning teaching: A guidebook for English language teachers*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Scrivener, J. (1996). ARC: A descriptive model for classroom work on language. In J. Willis, & D. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Gass, S. and Madden, C. (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-256). New York: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In Cook, G. and Seidelhofer, B. (Eds.) *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (2005). The Output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed), *The Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp: 471-483). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Swan, M. (1985b). A critical look at the communicative approach (2). *English Language Teaching Journal*, 39(2), 76-87.
- TTT (n.d.). *Test, teach, test*. Retrieved from <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/test-teach-test>
- Willis, D. (1996a). Introduction. In D. Willis & J. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching*. (pp.iv-vi). Oxford: Heinemann.
- Willis, D. (1996b). Accuracy, fluency and conformity. In D. Willis & J. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching* (pp. 44-51). Oxford: Heinemann.
- Willis, J. (1993). Preaching what we practice-Training what we teach: Task-based language teaching as an alternative to PPP. *The teacher Trainer*, 8(1), 17-20.
- Willis, J. (1996a). A flexible framework for task-based learning. In D. Willis & J. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching* (pp. 52-61). Oxford: Heinemann.
- Willis, J. (1996b). *A framework for task-based learning*. Essex: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Woodward, T. (1993). Changing the basis of pre-service TEFL training in the UK. *IATEFL TT SIG Newsletter*, 13, 3-5.
- Woodward, T. (2001). *Planning lessons and courses: Designing sequences of work for the language classroom*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.