

Evaluation of a Training Workshop for Teachers of English on Automatization in Communicative Context of Essential Speech Segments (Access) in Sokoto South Educational Zone, Sokoto State Nigeria

Bello U.¹ Abdulaziz N.² & Bello L.M.³

Department of Curriculum Studies, Sokoto State University, Sokoto State, Nigeria¹

Department of Curriculum Studies, Sokoto State University, Sokoto State, Nigeria²

State College of Basic and Remedial Studies, Sokoto State, Nigeria³

Abstract: It has been established that the traditional practices of teaching grammar through rules and structural drills do not help learners resolve the problem of knowing the rules but not being able to use them in communication. It is in response to this that the researchers planned and implemented a workshop to expose English Language teachers to an approach to grammar teaching i.e. Automatization in Communicative Context of Essential Speech Segment ACCESS with a view to evaluating its effectiveness in triggering teachers' positive reaction, promoting teachers learning and behavioural changes in their classroom practices. In the planning and implementation of the training, ADDIE model an acronym for Analysis, Design Development, Implementation and Evaluation guided the researchers while in the evaluation aspect, Kirkpatrick Model level 1,2&3 was used to assess the success or otherwise of the training. Descriptive, correlational and one group experimental design was used. The researchers employed 4 different instruments, Teacher Reaction Questionnaire (TRQ), Teacher Achievement Test (TAT), Teacher Sense of Efficacy Questionnaire (TSEQ) and Teaching Practice Observation Sheet (TPOS) to test the 4 related constructs namely reaction, learning (involving teacher sense of efficacy) and behavioural change (application) respectively. All the instruments were validated through trialing. Using Chronbach Correlation, the internal consistency of the TRQ, TAT, and TSEQ was calculated. Respectively, 0.755, 0.782 and 0.854 was found good enough to consider the instruments reliable at 0.05 significant level. The TPOS inter rater reliability was also calculated at 0.784. Teachers of English Language in secondary schools in Sokoto South Educational zone, Sokoto State Nigeria were the participants. Out of the 67 teachers, 57 were used as sample. With the help of Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 20), Mean values and Standard Deviation were computed to address descriptive survey questions while paired samples t-test and Pearson Product - Moment Correlation was used to test the various null hypothesis. The findings of the study reveal positive reaction from the participants. The scores of teachers' performance in the TAT posttest was higher than in the TAT pretest, signifying an increase in teachers' learning. More so, an increase in participants' perceived sense of efficacy after the training was found. A positive non-significant relationship was found between Teachers' Sense of Efficacy and classroom application. Based on the findings of the study, it was recommended among other recommendations, that governments, NGO and schools should be conducting periodically, needs analysis on the various aspects of English Language Teaching so that based on the result found, similar intervention could be conducted to enhance teachers' capacity, particularly on grammar instruction being the most problematic aspect of English Language Teaching.

Keywords: Inert Knowledge, Grammar, Instruction, Training Workshop, Automatization.

Introduction

Teacher - on – the job training is a key component of teacher professional development that government and stakeholders embark upon to help address not only the challenges teachers face in handling difficult situations in their instructional practices but also to expose teachers to issues, trends, innovative strategies and approaches that could ensure successful classroom delivery.

In English as Second Language (ESL) classroom, the most challenging situation particularly in Grammar instruction remains how to help learners acquire skills to use the knowledge they have gained about grammar in meaningful communication. The researchers' experiences while teaching in schools and colleges at various levels have shown that grammar teaching is usually shrouded with challenges especially as to how to teach students to use the knowledge of grammar from their grammar classes in real communication. This challenge is compounded by the teachers' thinking that exposing learners to repetitive practice, rules verbalization and other structural drills in isolated sentences are adequate to make the learner perform his communicative functions. This common view is usually considered erroneous in Second Language (L2) grammar instruction (Larsen - Freeman 2001). A communicative activity that encourages repetitive practice while integrating it with other components of language use such as its use in sociolinguistic and pragmatic sense is therefore proposed. This is because the goal of language is to achieve communicative competence which is componential comprising of not just linguistic competence focusing on form but also pragmatic, sociolinguistic and strategic competences. Larsen – Freeman (2009) indicates that it is not sufficient for students to notice or comprehend grammatical structures but must also practice meaningful use of grammar in a way that takes into account “transfer appropriate”. Grammar teaching according to Ibrahim & Bello (2019) is not purely a business of acquiring the formal language skills as in Phonology, Syntax, and Morphology but also acquisition of practical skills that will ensure meaningful use of the language in interaction and transaction. To do this, the teacher must bring into his classroom activities that will ensure learners produce fluent utterances automatically without having to wait and form mentally the arrangement and selection of linguistic items to be used in producing the desired utterances in discourse.

The issue of Automaticity referred to above, means the mastery of specific utterances rather than of their structures. Some kind of integration of rule/structure - based automatization and utterance - based automatization processes may ultimately be called for, as DeKeyser (2001) suggested. This was why Gatbonton and Segalowitz (1998) offered Creative automatization where controlled patterned sequences are automatized as they will naturally occur in some given communicative contexts.

As it was discovered that utterances used in Creative Automatization could well be produced by learners differently, Gatbonton and Segalowitz (2005) modified the Creative Automatization by integrating it with communicative activities to produce a model they call ACCESS, an acronym standing for Automatization in Communicative Contexts of Essential Speech Segments. The author refers to the speech segments as the targeted set of utterances that students can go home with after every lesson. ACCESS ensures that these essential speech segments are elicited and practiced (hence, Automatization) in genuinely Communicative Contexts (Gatbonton and Segalowitz, 2005).

Striking the right balance between knowledge and the ability to use the knowledge in meaningful communication is a huge problem to handle on the part of teacher. From the result of the needs analysis conducted by the Bello and Bello (2022) in some selected educational zones in Sokoto State, it has been established that most of the teachers in the various secondary and upper basic schools in

the state teach rules and isolated structures where learners are engaged in fill in the blank activities, repetition, recognition, awareness activities to automatize structures not in communicative context. Teachers were observed using classroom time excessively explaining grammatical terminologies and giving notes for their students to copy at the expense of classroom activities that will ensure the students not only learn grammar but also use the knowledge of grammar they gained in communication. Even though learners have mastered the grammar rules, there was no connection noticed between what was learned and its use in communicative context. There is therefore the need to expose teachers to such innovative methods such as ACCESS considered by its proponents as a viable method of overcoming this Inert Knowledge problem in grammar instruction and also to evaluate its efficacy in propelling, teachers' positive reaction, improving their knowledge, its applicability in classroom situation and of course, its capacity to produce desired learning outcomes.

It is for the above reason several Teacher training programmes implementation and evaluation have been conducted in various parts of the world. For example, Piryani, Dhungana, Piryani & Neupane (2018) assessed the Self-Reported Perceived Confidence of faculty members after participating in a basic teacher - training workshop at Kirkpatrick level 1 where they found that the self-reported perceived confidence level of the participants was significantly increased after the teacher - training workshop in India. Cocca & Cocca (2018) studied the Correlation between Self-Efficacy Perception and Teaching Performance among preschool primary teachers and found high inconsistencies between self-judgments and actual teaching performance. Azimi (2014) found that English teachers refer to their past experiences in a training they had attended in selecting methods and strategies in teaching grammar. Uzun (2015) in his evaluation of the latest English Language Teacher Training Programme in Turkey found that the English Language Teacher Training is not the exact source of knowledge and skills that will meet the needs and interests of the teacher trainees. Aslan (2020) evaluated the implementation of an online In - service teacher training programme for English language teachers in non-formal education institutions and found that the majority of the teachers had a positive attitude towards the programme and that the programme had a significant impact on teachers' knowledge and behaviour. For Reza (2016) the EFL grammar teaching training workshop he conducted for in-service teachers in Iran exerted positive result on learners' performance as the experimental group (students taught by teachers who attended the training) performed better than the control group.

From the above, it appeared that in spite of the various studies conducted on teacher training evaluation, there was no such programme designed, implemented and evaluated on specifically approach(es) of overcoming the inert knowledge problem which constitute the problem of the study. Besides, most of the teacher - training evaluation focus on assessing training programmes for the purpose of improving the program using formative (during the program) and summative (after the programme) methods where questions are asked relating to how participants enjoyed the programme or perceived it, whether they learned key information and how the programme might be improved for future sessions (e.g. Uzun, 2015; Piryani, 2018). Some, left aside other levels of evaluation, such as reaction, learning, application to jump to impact/outcome, the final level (e.g. Reza, 2016). The present study goes beyond finding out whether the program is well-designed and well-received to finding out whether what was learned in the training got implemented on the job for according to Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2014), 'training has no value unless what is learned gets applied on the job'. It is against this backdrop that the researchers went beyond assessing participants' reaction and learning to assessing teacher classroom application of the knowledge and skills gained at the

workshop using the New World Kirkpatrick Training Evaluation Model levels 1, 2, &3 to guide the conduct of the study.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are:

1. to examine the reactions of the participants to the training program?
2. to examine if there is any significant difference between the participants' level of learning before and after the training
3. to find if there is any significant difference between participants' perceived sense of efficacy before and after the training?
4. to examine the degree to which the participants apply the knowledge and skills acquired?
5. to assess if there is any correlation between teachers' perceived sense of efficacy and teachers' application of the skills acquired?

Research Questions

The study therefore will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. What are the reactions of the participants to the training program?
2. Is there any significant difference between the participants' level of learning before and after the training?
3. Is there any significant difference between participants' perceived sense of efficacy before and after the training?
4. To what degree participants apply the knowledge and skills acquired?
5. Is there any significant correlation between teachers' perceived sense of efficacy and teachers' application of the skills acquired?

Research Hypotheses

The following null hypothesis are generated based on the research questions 2, 3 &5 at 0.05 level of significance.

H₀₁: There is no significant difference between participants' level of learning before and after the program.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference between participants' perceived sense of efficacy before and after the training.

H₀₃: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceived sense of efficacy and teachers' application of the skills acquired.

Significance of the Study

The findings of the study could improve the knowledge of the teachers in the teaching of grammar for communicative purposes. The teachers' perception on grammar teaching being simply mechanical rather than communicative will change. Moreover, it is envisaged that the training will bring about behavioural changes in the teachers' instructional practices as per as grammar teaching is concerned. Teachers' confidence and sense efficacy could be enhanced by the outcome of the training such that they will use the knowledge and skills acquired to enhance their learners' performance in the use of English for communication. Aside from adding to the existing literature, curriculum planners and designers could use the findings of the study to improve upon the existing curriculum by incorporating content and activities that will promote fluent and automatic use of grammar in connected discourse.

Literature Review

The Concept of Grammar and Grammar Instruction

Grammar has been used to mean differently for different schools of thoughts. Larsen- Freeman (2009) provided a list of different definitions of grammar as perceived by different theories. It can be conceived as internal mental system that generates and interprets novel utterances (mental grammar), a set of prescriptions and proscriptions about language forms and their use for a particular language (prescriptive grammar), description of language behavior by proficient users of a language (descriptive grammar), the focus of a given linguistic theory (linguistic grammar), a work that treats the major structures of a language (reference grammar), the structures and rules compiled for instructional and assessment purposes (pedagogical grammar) and the structures and rules compiled for instructional purposes for teachers (usually a more comprehensive and detailed version of point (6)) (teacher's grammar).

Going through the list of definitions, it becomes apparent why the use of the term “grammar” is really ambiguous because of its multidimensional nature. For instance, Mental Grammar can be regarded as both learner grammars and proficient language speaker grammars (Larsen Freeman, 2009). Descriptive grammars consider the structural form of the language as the starting point and then, looks at grammar as largely what is used for social interaction, explaining why one linguistic form is more appropriate than another in satisfying a particular communicative purpose in a particular context (Larsen Freeman, 2014). Leech (2000) also places his view of grammar within a pragmatic framework where he claims that any grammatical category may be analyzed on three levels: syntactic (structural and formal description of language), semantic (of meaning), and pragmatic (of use). This definition tallies with the idea of pedagogical grammar as suggested by Larasen –Freeman (2009). Based on the above conception, a pedagogical grammar which is the concern of this study should be broad enough to draw on many of these linguistic theories in such a manner they are focused on fulfilling the teaching and learning functions.

A definition for a pedagogical grammar that is encompassing enough to accommodate both traditional and newer approaches, and one that can be applied to different languages, is that grammar is a system of meaningful structures and patterns that are governed by particular pragmatic constraints (Larsen-Freeman, 2009). From the definition above it can be seen that pedagogical grammar has three dimensions: form, meaning, and use (Larsen – Freeman, 2014). This conception of grammar provides the framework through which to teach grammar in such a way as to overcome the problem of knowing and that of use. In order to address the inert knowledge problem, students must be made to practice using the construction under psychologically authentic condition where the conditions of learning and of use are aligned (Larsen – Freeman, 2014). The phenomenon of Inert Knowledge was first coined by Alfred North Whiteboard (1929) as information which one expresses but cannot use it. It is according to Larsen Freeman (2014) the knowledge that students have but they cannot use it yet for their own purposes. It is a Knowledge, although seemingly available, is often not used for problem solving. That means it remains "inert".

Various approaches that cater for the transfer problem have been suggested by different scholars taking into account important aspects that have been raised by the different explanations of scholars such as Larsen- Freeman (2001), (2009), (2014); Schmits and Richards (2002); Benhima, (2015); Gatbonton & Segalowitz, (2005).

Automatization of Communicative Context of Essential Speech Segment (ACCESS)

Automatization of Communicative Context of Speech Segments (ACCESS) is the modified version of Creative Automatization of Utterances earlier suggested by Gatbonton and Segalowitz (1988). It is the integration of the Creative Automatization and the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) which takes into account other features of communicative competence such as not just exposure to comprehensible input interpreted widely to mean having students use language in genuine interactions but also something tangible for the learner to go home with. Gatbonton and Segalowitz (2005) indicates that even those innovations that advocate for focusing on form in Communicative Language Teaching, CLT have not succeeded in changing many teachers' perception that CLT provides little that is concrete and tangible for students despite the attention it paid to fluency. This calls for the introduction of ACCESS which is an acronym that stands for Automatization in Communicative Contexts of Essential Speech Segments. Essential Speech Segments here, refers to the targeted set of utterances that students can go home with after every lesson (Gatbonton and Segalowitz, 2005). In this approach, these essential speech segments (targeted utterance) are elicited and practiced in real time Communicative situations so they can be produced with greater accuracy and fluency.

ACCESS therefore, has three phases Creative Automatization Phase where learners are made to practice speech segments such that they will rapidly effortlessly, and flawlessly produce speech segments in communicative situations namely: Language Consolidation Phase where the learning of the speech segments is focused on problematic speech segments noticed during the Creative Automatization Phase, and a Free Communication Phase where learners are made to freely communicate to test the use of the automatized utterances in a different context. The Creative Automatization Phase leads into the Language Consolidation Phase, which in turn leads into the Free Communication Phase. The temporal sequencing between the Creative Automatization and Language Consolidation phases allows alternating between the two phases (Gatbonton and Segalowitz, 2005).

This method not only teaches grammar but also promotes the automatization of utterances (Essential Speech Segments) that feature those grammatical elements intended to be learnt without jeopardizing the communicative value of the utterances. The approach shows not only how communicatively based automatization can work in principle, but also how other means of promoting learning (e.g., explicit explanation of and practice of forms) can be integrated into a CLT framework without undermining its communicative character (Gatbonton and Segalowitz, 2005). Below is the schematic outline of the ACCESS methodology.

Teacher Training

Although Teacher Training and Teacher Development may seem similar, they are however distinct terms. While Teacher Development is a broader concept and refers to activities for overall professional improvement teacher training is rather related to particular purposes to accomplish better learning and teaching (Arslan, Mirici & Oz 2020). Example of a teacher training according to Arslan, Mirici & Oz (2020) is when there is need for teachers to receive teacher training for adapting ELT (English language teaching) materials or motivating learners to speak English. Teacher training therefore relies on professional needs and specific aims. Those aims are formulated according to Tulder, Veenman & Sieben (1988) “to stimulate professional competence and development of teachers, “to improve school practice, “to implement political agreed-upon innovations in schools” etc. The planning of a training programme is of crucial importance in that the program should stand on a well-established design by paying great attention to every detail. For planning and implementing

a program, all the stakeholders responsible for selection of participants need to cooperate before, during, and after the course is over (Davies and Gunashekar, 2013). It means that needs analysts, designers, materials developers, trainers and evaluators work together in order to run an effective programme (Musaeva in Davies and Gunashekar, 2013).

Methodology

The study employs both Descriptive Survey design and One Group Pretest – Posttest design which is used when the control group used for comparing with the experimental group is not present (Creswell, 2014).

Participants

The population of this research comprised Secondary School English Language Teachers from Sokoto South Educational Zone, Sokoto State, Nigeria. As per the list supplied by the affected schools, there are 67 English Language Teachers in the zone. 57 participants out of the population were computed as the sample size using calculator.net, an online sample size calculator.

Instrument for Data Collection

A Self Structured 1-5 points Likert Teachers' Reaction Questionnaire (TRQ) comprising 10 items was structured in alignment with the Kirkpatrick evaluation model level 1 including relevance, perception and usefulness. Items requiring demographic information such as age, sex, educational qualification, teaching experience were included. A 10 items 1-5 points scale on how much the teacher can do to address the Inert Knowledge problem in grammar teaching (Teacher Perceived Sense of Efficacy Questionnaire, *TSEQ*) with responses, 1= 'nothing' 2 = 'very little' 3 = 'not sure' 4= 'quite a bit' and 5 = 'a great deal' was used. To test participants' learning, a 25 items multiple choice and fill in the blank Teacher Achievement Test (*TAT*) at Kirkpatrick level 2, was developed by the researchers based on an ACCESS. The observation sheet (TPOS) was structured by the researchers also in alignment with the Kirkpatrick evaluation model level 3 and based on the phases in the ACCESS Model. It was also structured on a 5-point scale, ranging from 5=outstanding, 4=good, 3 = poor 2= fair, 1= v poor.

Validity of the Instruments

Trialing was used to validate the TRQ, TSEQ and TAT. This was done by administering the tools to 5 teachers outside the targeted sample to respond to in order to find out whether teachers understood each question as intended by the researcher, and whether the items were understood the same way by each teacher (Dornyei and Taguchi, 2010). As a result of the trialing, some questions were retained while some reframed for their lack of clarity and others were removed for not addressing the purpose of the study.

Reliability

TRQ, TAT and TSEQ, were subjected to reliability check using test – retest, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient and internal consistency was computed at 0.755, 0.782 and 0.854 respectively. As per the TPOS's reliability and objectivity, an Interrater Correlation Coefficient (ICC) was used and the correlation of the mean scores of the two ratings was 0.784. From the figures obtained, all the 4 instrument were considered reliable.

Procedure of Data Collection

A Needs analysis was conducted to look at the following areas of grammar instruction beginning with the teachers' preparation, method, activities and material. It was the findings of the Needs Analysis that was used to establish the need and to put up a plan for the workshop.

Before conducting the workshop proper, for ethical considerations, the researchers sought for the consent of the Zonal Education Office to have access to the participants for the training. TRQ, TSEQ and TAT were administered to all the 57 participants to respond to before and after the training. For the teaching observation, a follow up visit was undertaken where 15 Teachers among the participants were selected using convenient sampling for the classroom observation in a micro teaching encounter 1 week after the workshop. The classroom encounter was recorded digitally and stored for analysis.

Method of Data Analysis

Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 20 was used to analyse all the data collected in this study. For the descriptive data Mean and Standard Deviation were employed. Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to test the null hypothesis Ho1 and Ho4 and paired sample t-test, was used to test Ho2 and Ho3.

Results

Below is the analysis of the findings addressing the various research questions and/or hypothesis generated for the study:

1. **Research Question1:** What are the reactions of the participants to the training program?

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics for the Reaction of the Participants on the Training Workshop

Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Learners' Perception	57	2.33	4.67	3.8070	.52685
Relevance of the Training	57	3.00	5.00	3.9035	.45746
Usefulness of the Training	57	3.60	4.80	4.0561	.28222
Valid N (listwise)	57				

The statistics on table 1 above, addresses the research question 1 which sought to find the reaction of the participants to the programme. It reveals positive reaction as per relevance, perception and usefulness of the training as each of the three constructs measured has the mean value above 2.5 which is high enough.

Table 2 Mean Score of Teachers' Learning (TL) before and after the Training Programme

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
T L before Treatment	11.9123	57	7.75813	1.02759
T L after Treatment	30.9123	57	10.20378	1.35152

It can be seen from table 2 above that the mean score of teachers' learning before the programme is much less than their score after the training indicating that their knowledge about the method has increased after the training.

H₀₁: There is no significant difference between participants’ level of learning before and after the program.

Table 3 Paired Samples t -test analysis of Teachers’ Learning before and after the Training

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev	P value	Decision
TL before	11.9123	7.75813	.000	H ₀₁ rejected
TL after	30.9123	10.2378		
Criterion for decision: Reject H ₀ if $P \leq \alpha(0.05)$				

From the result of the paired sample t-test in table 3 above, it can be seen that the p value was .000 < the α value, 0.05 indicating that the null hypothesis is rejected. By implication this means that teachers learning involving knowledge, skill and attitude has increased significantly after the training.

Table 4 Means Score of Teachers’ Perceived Sense of Efficacy(TSE) before and After the Training

	Mean	N	Std. Dev	Std. Error Mean
TSE before Training	3.8895	57	.27300	.03616
TSE after Training	4.2769	57	.50488	.06687

It is clear from the table above that teachers’ sense of efficacy after the training was slightly higher than before the training with 4.2769 and 3.8895 respectively indicating that the participants’ confidence was higher even before the training given the 3.8895 mean score which is way above the average of 2.5.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference between participants’ perceived sense of efficacy before and after the training.

Table 5 Paired Samples t -test analysis of Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy before and after the Training

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev	P value	Decision
TSE before	3.8895	.27300	.000	H ₀₁ rejected
TSE after	4.2769	.50488		
Criterion for decision: Reject H ₀ if $P \leq \alpha(0.05)$				

Table 5 above shows that the p value .000 is greater than the alpha value at 0.05 significant level. This means that the null hypothesis has been rejected signifying that the difference is statistically significant.

Research Question 4: To what degree participants apply the knowledge and skills acquired?

Table 6 Mean Score of the interrater Cronbach alpha on Application on the Job

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Application on the job	16	2.40	3.50	2.8875	.29861
Valid N (listwise)	16				

The table above addresses research question 4, extent of the application of the knowledge gained at the training. It shows the aggregate mean scores of the participants applying the knowledge they gained in their classroom teaching encounters which stands at 2.8875, a score considered high as it is above the average of 2.5.

HO₃: There is no significant relationship between teachers’ perceived sense of efficacy and teachers’ application of the skills acquired.

Table 7 Relationship between Teachers’ Application on the Job and Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy

Variables	No	Mean	Std	Cal. r	P value	Decision
TSE after Training	57	4.2769	.50488	.053	.847	Accepted
Application on the Job	15	2.8875	.29861			

Although as earlier stated, teachers’ cumulative mean score in classroom application is above the average of 2.5, a positive but insignificant relationship was found between teachers’ perceived sense of efficacy and the classroom application where cal. is .053 and P value of .847 being higher than the alpha value at 0.01 significance level which shows that the null hypothesis is retained.

Discussion of the Findings

From the findings it can be seen that as a whole the training programme has recorded some level of success because in terms of teachers’ reaction, there was clear positive response as per as the perception, relevance, usefulness of the programme is concerned. This finding is in line with Aslan (2020) findings on his evaluation and implementation of an online In - service teacher training programme for English language teachers where the researcher found the majority of the teachers having a positive attitude towards the programme. On the teachers’ learning, it was found that the learning of the participants significantly increased after the training. This finding is in consonance with the findings of Aslan (2020) and Reza (2016) who found that the participants’ experiences in the training reflected on their performance and learning.

Teacher Sense of Efficacy also increased after the training and the difference in TSE before and after the training was found to be significant. It is envisaged that as the participants’ confidence to use the method increases, the teachers’ behavioural change in classroom teaching should also increase. However, from the result of the correlational assessment of the teachers’ on –the- job - application and their TSE, a positive linear relationship was found between the two constructs that is statistically insignificant. This might be due to the possibility of the relationship happening by chance because of the fewer number of population samples used in the teaching observation or the possibility of the facilitators not paying much attention to practical application of method during the training. This goes with Coca & Coca (2018) and Uzun (2015) who found no connection between Teachers confidence and self - efficacy before training and its application on the job.

Conclusion

From the results obtained participants indicated their likeness to have professional training on grammar instruction as they showed positive reaction to the program and showed evidence of learning in both the TAT and the teaching observation sessions. The conclusion one could draw from the findings of this study is that teacher training improves learners’ knowledge, attitude and sense of efficacy if properly planned and implemented. The so called inert knowledge problem students encounter in their grammar learning ‘of knowing and not being able to apply the knowledge’ is something that must be addressed by any grammar pedagogy. Teachers having high sense of efficacy in the choice and search for a methodology to address this challenge is the first step towards successful classroom delivery in grammar class. The awareness on the existence of the problem itself is another step which the present study has successfully uncovered. Teachers not only are aware of the problem but also demonstrated confidence to use the method and acquire knowledge, skill and attitude to handle the challenge in the future.

Recommendations

1. Such trainings should be undertaken periodically to strengthen teachers' capacity and to keep them abreast with trends in language teaching.
2. From time to time needs analysis should be conducted to diagnose the training needs of teachers.
3. ACCESS and other methodologies that integrate language learning and communication should be undertaken with a view to overcoming learners' difficulty in applying the knowledge in communication.
4. During training of this nature, organizers and facilitators should prioritize skills development rather than concentrating on knowledge and theories.
5. Curriculum designers and planners as well as course developers should incorporate content, materials activities that will teach the blend of grammar teaching and communication

Limitations and Recommendation for Further Study

Due to constraints of time and resources, this study only assessed the training programme on levels 1,2&3 of the Kirkpatrick New World Training Evaluation Model leaving out the level 4 which is students' learning outcome. Since no significant relationship was found between the self-efficacy exhibited by the teachers in the use of the method and its application in class owing to the smaller population used in the teaching observation assessment, further research should include larger population samples to address the situation. Moreover, further studies should go beyond levels 1,2, &3 to level 4 to test students' learning outcome. Specifically, another study should be undertaken by the researchers or other interested researcher(s) to find out students learning resulting from teachers' participation in the training.

References

- Arslan, S., Mirici, İ. H., & Öz, H. (2019)., In-service training needs of EFL teachers in non-formal education settings. *Selçuk University Journal of Faculty of Letters*, 42, 223-244.
- Aslan S. (2020)., Implementation and evaluation of an EFL teacher training program for non formal education settings. *Researchgate*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2020.729666>
- Azimi, M., (2014). Program evaluation: English grammar in the language classroom. *The Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Science* 2(1).
- Bello U. & Bello L.M. 2022., An evaluation of the teaching practices of the ESL teachers in secondary schools in Sokoto State. Unpublished (output)
- Benhima M. (2015). "Grammaring", *The fifth skill in language teaching and learning* unpublished seminar output, Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah University, Morocco.
- Calculator.net, an Online Sample size calculator. <https://www.caculator.net/sample-size-calculator>
- Cocca, M., Cocca, A. & Martinez, E.A, (2018). Correlation between self-efficacy perception and teaching performance: The case of Mexican preschool and primary school teachers. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)* 9 (1) pp 56-70. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no1.4>

- Creswell, J.W. (2014) *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*, 2 International ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.
- DeKeyser, R. (1997). Beyond explicit rule learning: Automatizing second language morphosyntax. In Larsen- Freeman D, (eds) *Teaching and testing grammar in C.J Doughty & M. H. Long (eds.), The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 518–542). Malden, MA: Blackwel.
- Donyei, Z. Taguchi, T., (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research: construction, administration & processing*. Taylor & Francis, London, UK.
- Gatbonton, E. & Segalowitz, N. (1998). Creative automatization: Principles for promoting fluency within a communicative framework. *TESOL Quarterly* 22, 3, 473–92.
- Gatbonton, E. & Segalowitz, N., (2005) Rethinking communicative language teaching: A focus on ACCESS to fluency. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 61(3) pp, 325-353
- Ibrahim A.A. & Bello U. (2019)., The Washback effect of WAEC/SSCE English test of orals on teachers Methodology in senior secondary schools in Sokoto metropolis. *English Language Teaching*; Vol. 13, No. 1; (pp. 182 -183)
- Johnson, K., & Johnson, H. (1998)., *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics: A Handbook for Language Teaching*.: Oxford Blackwell
- Kirkpatrick J. & Kirkpatrick W.K (2021)., *An introduction to the new world Kirkpatrick model*. Kirkpatrick Partners.
- Larsen – Freeman D (2009)., *Teaching and testing grammar in C.J Doughty & M. H. Long (eds.), The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 518–542). Malden, MA: Blackwel.
- Larsen-Freeman D. (2014)., *Teaching grammar*. In M, Celce Murcia, D.M. Brinto & M.A Snow, *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. (pp 256 - 270) Boston M.A., National geographic
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001)., *Teaching grammar*. In M. Celce-Murcia (ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd edn., pp. 251–66). Boston, MA: Thomson/Heinle.
- Leech, G. (2000). Grammars of spoken English: New outcomes of corpus-oriented research. *Language Learning* (50)4 pp. 675–724.
- Musaeva S. (2013)., How to integrate the planning, implementation and evaluation of trainer training courses. In (eds). Davies P. & Gunashekar P. *Assessing and evaluating English language teacher education*, teaching and learning selected papers from the Second International Conference of English Language Teacher Educators, Hyderabad, India.
- Piryani R.M., Dhungana G.P., Piryani S. & Neupane M.S. (2018)., Evaluation of teachers training workshop at Kirkpatrick level 1 using retro–pre questionnaire. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*. 9

- Quigley G. (2023). ADDIE model 5 steps to effective training. L&D strategy blog.
- Richards J.C. & Schmidt R. (2002)., *The Longman dictionary of language teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Segalowitz, N. (1998). Automaticity and second languages. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 382–408). Malden, MA: Blackwel.
- Tulder, M. V., Veenman, S., & J. Sieben, J. (1988)., Features of effective in-service activities: Results of a Delphi-study. *Educational Studies*, 14(2), 209-223
- Uzun, L. (2015)., Evaluation of the latest English language teacher training programme in Turkey: Teacher trainees' perspective. *Curriculum & Teaching Studies*. *Cogent education*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1147115>