

**TO FIT OR NOT TO FIT: School Management at CLS 'X'**

by

Jeremy Scott Boston

January 2003

## **1.0 Introduction: An Organization of Individuals**

White *et al.* (1991: 6-7) draws the distinction between schools as *institutions* and as *organizations*. An **institution** is simply what type of legal entity a school is, in other words, what kind of school it is. An **organization** is the 'network of relationships among the individuals who regard themselves as belonging to the organization...Organizations have no other existence other than through the people who make them up...Without people, there is no organization...(White et al 1991:7).

'Fit' or 'Split' are terms used by Pascale (1991) to describe an institution's organization (i.e. the relationship between individuals) in terms of how closely they work together in coordination (**fit**), or how much autonomy of action they have (**split**).

In this paper we shall be looking at both the 'fit' and 'split' aspects of an independent commercial language school's (CLS 'X') organizational structure and examine the advantages and disadvantages arising from the current organization of CLS 'X'. Also, some suggested changes to the current organization of CLS 'X' will be put forth, that if implemented could improve upon the current situation.

### **Part I: Terminology**

## **2.0 The Business Aims of Commercial Language Schools**

Any *commercial* language school (CLS) is in the 'business' of providing ESL/EFL lessons as its 'product'. As Doyle (1999:54) notes, CLS institutions are:

- motivated primarily by profit; to make a profit requires...
- providing a quality product to attract customers, to be able to...
- compete with similarly motivated institutions.

Later in this paper, we shall see that CLS 'X's current organization limits teacher's ability to "provide quality lessons". However, any CLS will want to keep costs down to maximize profit. The cheaper a proposed change to the organization is to implement; the more likely the change is to occur, which is why the changes proposed in this paper will be relatively modest in scope.

## **3.0 The Needs to be met by an Institution's Organization**

White *et al.* (1991: 8) cites Adair (1983) in noting that, broadly speaking, an organization will need to fulfil, maintain and balance three sets of needs: task needs, group needs and individual needs.

**Task needs** are those “which have to be satisfied in order successfully to carry out the work of the organization” (White: *ibid.*). This includes such administrative tasks as keeping financial records or the paying of bills. However, in this paper we will restrict ourselves to discussion of the task(s) of providing quality lessons.

**Group needs** refers to those “to do with the organization as a social unit. For an organization to meet task needs, successful group maintenance is vital, because if it becomes split into antagonistic factions...it will be swept off target.”(*ibid.*). This basically refers to the degree to which the organization works smoothly together to meet common aims.

**Individual, or personal, needs** include the basic human needs of the individuals who comprise the group: such as the need to feel valued, or personal/professional growth. Not meeting these needs will lead to a loss of morale and motivation among those who make up the group; which will make maintenance of the group more difficult.

It must be stressed that these needs are interconnected and must be balanced. An imbalance between the needs will have an adverse effect on the fulfilling and maintaining of all the needs. We will return to these three need types when examining the pros and cons of CLS 'X's organizational structure.

#### **4.0 Fit**

ELTM 6.5.1 defines Pascale's (1991) concept of organizational 'fit' as:

the extent to which all parts of an organization are running smoothly together...with all parts of the organization (i.e. the people in it) working together for a common aim and all departments carrying out their responsibilities well and in line with overall objectives.

This definition could be re-worded as 'the degree of co-ordination between 'units' of an organization (remembering that the smallest 'unit' is the individual). However, I would like to distinguish between 'fit' as '**co-ordination by consensus**' and '**fit by fiat**'.

#### **4.1 Co-ordination by Consensus**

Co-ordination by consensus is one way to have units 'working together' (see ELTM 6.5.1 in section **3.0** above). To achieve this we need:

- A. Common aims for all units concerned.
- B. That these aims and overall objectives be known, understood and agreed upon by all units.

- C. To 'run smoothly together' further requires that there is agreement amongst units as to the means of achieving these ends.
- D. Which can only be achieved and sustained via lines of communication between different units of an organization, making sure that all units *actually* are carrying out their responsibilities in line with the decisions made by all in steps A, B and C above.

The smaller the organization, the easier it will be to achieve 'fit' by this kind of 'democratic' cooperation, what White et al (1991: 7) calls a 'collegial organization culture'.

#### **4.2 Fit by Fiat**

Maintaining open and ongoing lines of communication to achieve consensus becomes more difficult the more units an organization has. More units increase the complexity of the required communication network, which may eventually become unwieldy. In such a case an organization may opt to achieve 'fit' by **fiat**.

'Fit by fiat' occurs when an organization decides to centralize the decision making process by setting up a central decision making body from which (in essence) **orders** stem, which the members of the organization are expected to adhere to.

#### **5.0 SPLIT**

ELTM 6.5.2 defines Pascale's (1991) notion of 'split' as:

...the tendency to decentralise, that is, to give units within an organization greater autonomy.

The 'autonomy' of a unit within an organization refers to the amount of sanction given to the unit to make decisions and take action *without being required to ask for permission from, or co-ordinate with, another unit(s) to do so*.

An organization may opt against centralization to increase administrative efficiency, in other words, taking the approach of 'split' rather than the opposite 'fit by fiat' approach, to deal with the large-equals-unwieldy problem. Each unit becomes self-administrating rather than coordinated from 'above' by a central body.

The above relates to another reason why 'split' may be deliberately structured into an organization, related not so much to size *per se*, but rather to the diversity of 'products' an organization offers. Different units responsible for different 'products' that require

different expertise and resources to produce them, are likely to be 'split' from each other. For example, in a CLS that offers both Japanese and English lessons, there is likely to be a split between the teachers of English and those of Japanese.

So far only planned 'split' has been discussed. Yet as we have already seen from White *et al.* (1991:7): "For an organization to meet task needs, successful group maintenance is vital, because if it becomes **split** into antagonistic factions...it will be swept off target." (emphasis added). When consensual 'fit' cannot be achieved, or when a central decision making body cannot (for lack of a better word) enforce compliance throughout the organization, a **de facto split** between units may occur.

## **Part II: Fit and Split at CLS 'X'**

### **6.0 The Institution**

The school being examined is an independent (i.e. not 'chain') commercial language school. It is individually owned, operated and managed by "the manager", who is Japanese.

### **7.0 The Individuals**

Along with the manager, CLS 'X' employs a single secretary/receptionist (also Japanese) and four full-time and five part-time native English teachers along with a single Japanese part-time teacher of English.

### **8.0 The Human Resource Pool: Teachers**

Each individual member of an organization is a human resource. One cannot evaluate the merits of an institution's organizational structure without considering the human resources being organized. The following is a list of the experience and teaching qualifications of the teachers at CLS 'X'.

#### **Full Time Teachers**

Lester: RSA CTEFLA Certificate. Three years ELT in Japan, two years at CLS 'X'.

Jonvier: No formal ELT qualifications, however, had studied Japanese full-time under a Japanese government sponsored programme. One year ELT in Japan at CLS 'X'.

Heather: No formal ELT qualifications. BA in Education. 8 years ELT outside Japan. Six months ELT in Japan at CLS 'X'.

Sebastian: RSA CTEFLA Certificate. Six months ELT in Japan at CLS 'X'.

### **Part Time Teachers**

Anthony: TEFL Diploma, MA TEFL in progress. Three years ELT in Japan, one year at CLS 'X'.

Alex: MA Ed. (non-TEFL). 15 years experience in Japan, six years at CLS 'X'

Jeremy: BA Ed. MA TEFL in progress. Three years ELT outside Japan, five years ELT in Japan, two years at CLS 'X'

Daemon: BA Ed. TEFL Diploma. Three years ELT in Japan, six months at CLS 'X'.

Keith: BA Ed. TEFL Diploma. Four years ELT in Japan, one year at CLS 'X'.

Masu: Retired Japanese high-school English teacher. Twenty-five years of ELT experience.

All native English part-time teachers currently hold full-time employment at Japanese colleges. We will return to this list later in this paper's analysis of the pros and cons of 'fit' and 'split' at CLS 'X'.

### **9.0 CLS 'X's' 'Products'**

The school has 350 students, who can choose to take the following lesson types:

#### Special Focus Classes

Speaking I-V (I' being the lowest level)

Listening/Reading I-V

Grammar I & II

TOEIC Preparation

#### General Purpose Classes

Beginner I & II

Intermediate I-III

Advanced I & II

At CLS 'X', all classes other than the TOEIC are taught by native English teachers.

### **10.0 The Organization of CLS 'X': Hub and Spoke**

Fukuyama (1995:274) notes that a 'hub and spoke' organizational structure is typical of small owner/founder run companies. Using the image of a wagon wheel, in such an organization decision making occurs only at the wheel's hub (center); in this case the

manager/owner is the school's 'hub'. Decisions then radiate out to individual teachers along the spokes of the wheel, with each individual teacher being located at the end of a particular 'spoke'. However, the metaphor breaks down insofar as the 'wheel' has no rim. That is, there is little communication and decision making between teachers 'around the rim' of the wheel.

### **11.0 Fit by Fiat for the Majority**

To the manager's credit, she has founded an independent CLS that has survived for over a decade. In light of this, the manager's ability to independently make business decisions seems sound. However, she also selects the majority of the textbooks to be used by teachers, decides what type of cycle the text will be taught, and so therefore 're-chunks' the texts to fit this schedule; and these are very much teaching/pedagogic choices.

The majority of students are enrolled in classes below the Intermediate III, or 'IV' level of the special focus classes (see "CLS 'X': **Products**" above). As CLS 'X' guarantees (as a selling point) that the maximum class size shall not exceed ten students; there are a number of the same classes offered on different days of the week. Therefore, a number of different teachers are responsible for teaching the same type of class.

The manager chooses the textbooks to be used in a given class type (with some exceptions, as we shall see later). Furthermore, the manager has also decided on the pacing of the classes. All classes are to be taught on three-week cycles over 22 weeks (approximately six months) per class, with all class cycles beginning on the same week.

For example, all classes start the first week of October or April. All teachers teaching the '*Listening/Reading I*' classes must use two texts, *Listening Power* and *Read all about it*. Teachers must cover the first unit of *Listening Power* the first two weeks of the three week cycle, and the first unit of *Read all about it* on the third week. On the fourth week, a new three-week cycle begins. All teachers are required to adhere to the pacing dictated by the manager. Herein, these types of classes shall be referred to as **fit classes**.

### **12.0 Split at CLS 'X'**

As the majority of classes are fit classes, CLS "X" as an organization is best characterized by 'fit by fiat'. However, there are some notable examples of planned (sanctioned) 'split' within the organization.

As mentioned earlier, the majority of classes are below the Intermediate III or 'IV' level. In fact, there is only one Intermediate III class, one Advanced I or II class, and one level IV or V class of a given special focus type offered. As such, these classes are offered only once a week, with each class having only one teacher responsible for teaching it.

Teachers responsible for teaching the classes that are only available once a week have been given near *carte blanche* to create the syllabus for these classes. Some teachers choose to use a single text-book for the entire six month period (student contracts are six months long), while others choose to use a variety of copied materials in lieu of a textbook. While teachers are expected to keep the manager informed of roughly what they intend to do in class and keep records of what has actually been done; the granting of permission to teachers to implement their syllabus has been, in my experience, largely *pro forma*. The manager/owner, as the major stakeholder in the school has the need and the right to be kept informed, but I could find no examples of her having ever contested the teacher's plans. These types of classes will be referred to as **split classes**.

### **13.0 Two Minds are Better than One**

Fukuyama (1995:274) points out that if all decisions in a 'hub and spoke' organization come from the founder/owner, the quality of these decisions are limited by the ability of the founder/owner to make wise ones. Yet the manager of CLS 'X', by self-admission, has never actually taught before; raising the question then of, on what grounds is the manager basing her choice of syllabus content and pace.

When gently queried about the above, the manager related to me that she bases her choice of texts on her own experiences of being an EFL student herself. This in itself is not without merit, as the manager, unlike all but two teachers, has actually been on the student-receiver end of commercial second language lessons, and by doing so has achieved an extremely high degree of English competence. Nevertheless, EFL *teaching* is a skill/profession in itself. If we examine the ELT experience and qualifications of the teachers employed (see '**Human resources**' above) we can see that the teachers, especially when taken together as a group, have at *least* as much, if not more, ability to make judicious decisions regarding appropriate course texts.

### **14.0 No Pooling of Human Resources**

Not that the manager *never* consults the teachers, but she never consults the teachers as a group. For example, in the first week of August 2002, the manager gave each teacher a 'textbook feedback form'. This form asked each teacher which current textbooks they wanted to keep and which they wanted to change. We were asked to write reasons and to suggest any alternative textbooks that we knew of. These forms were then handed to the school's secretary to be given to the manager.

Only the manager has read the teacher feedback forms. They were never copied and disseminated to other teachers. The teachers have not had the opportunity to discuss the issue of textbook selection for fit classes, a decision that effectively sets the syllabus for a class, together as a group.

As the new semester starts the first week of October, and as of the third week of September no decision as of yet has been made by the manager, teachers will be *told* what texts we will be using at what amounts to the last minute. This obviously poorly meets the **task need** informing teachers what they are expected to cover in time for them to prepare adequately, and is a poor utilization of human resources.

We shall now turn to other advantages and disadvantages arising from the 'fit' and 'split' organization of CLS 'X', in terms of **task**, **group**, and **individual needs**.

### **15.0 Standardization I**

While students are encouraged to come regularly to the same classes on the same day(s) each week, inevitably changes in students' lives outside of school, such as changes in their job schedules, mean that some students need to change the days they come to study English. By rigidly standardizing the syllabi of **fit** classes, students are guaranteed to be taught the same lesson regardless of the day-of-the-week they take a particular class. This satisfies a **task need** to provide a flexible schedule to students whenever possible.

However, a selling point of CLS 'X' is the guarantee of small class size. Small classes are intended to allow teachers to meet the **task need** of catering to the needs of individual students. Yet the manager, by requiring teachers to adhere to a fixed syllabus pace schedule, has taken away much of the teachers' ability to do so. I have often felt that I either had to rush students through the textbook content, or to pass over content that I have felt would behoove the students to address, to make the lesson and students

conform to the pacing laid down by the manager. Similarly, the fixed syllabus schedule does not allow teachers to bypass content, which they may feel students already have a good grasp of, to free up class time to deal with other areas of the syllabus that would fill some of the gaps in the students' developing English ability.

As noted earlier, when the student demand for a certain class type, usually higher level classes, is less than 10 students in total, the school is unable to give students a selection of days when the lesson-type could be taken. In such situations, **split** classes are created. Teachers are free to attempt some sort of "needs analysis" on their own and then creating lessons that cater to those needs, thus satisfying the **task need** of providing more personalized attention in more student centered lessons.

### **15.1 Standardization II**

Teachers have an **individual need** to be able to gauge their own performance relative to other teachers to ensure their jobs will not be jeopardy for their not performing up to the group standard. Therefore it is important for an organization to clearly establish at least the *minimum* standards of job performance required. Simply stated, in **fit** classes, the teacher's job is to teach the text.

Therefore, almost any English speaker can teach the **fit** classes offered at this school. This makes the **task need** of hiring relatively simple, as no, or little, teaching experience is required to be able to conduct a lesson. Almost any 'English-speaking-foreigner-off-the street' can be hired to adequately fulfil the job requirements. Assuming for the moment, and this is a large assumption, that the textbook/materials selected for teachers to use are suitable for the class type/level, and are easy for novice teachers to use, then this system would ensure a kind of minimum quality control. As the EFL industry has a high teacher turnover rate, and that the range of experience, training, and ability of those working in the EFL field varies widely, the administrator is rightfully concerned with quality control. By having this minimum lesson quality built in to the system, rather than having to trust it to the individual teacher, not only widens the pool of potential employees, it also guarantees at least a minimum standard of lesson quality.

A further **task** and **group need** met by this system is that if a teacher falls ill, goes on vacation or quits during the course of the semester, other teachers can easily fill in because it has already been predetermined what the original teacher was meant to cover.

### 15.2 Standardization III

Another **group need** advantage related to the above, is that teachers of **fit** classes can see what the content of the next level of a given class type will be. Teachers can look at the linguistic content, activity types, and speed of the listening activities (if any) of the next level up (e.g. from Listening I class to Listening II), to assess whether the student would be able to 'handle' the higher level class.

However, if a student is felt to be unable to 'move up', the student is consigned to having to repeat the exact same course again. This creates two problems, firstly, this is disheartening to the student, and secondly, repeating the class is boring, as the student will already have heard the same tapes, read the same dialogues and already have the written answers to the textbook questions. This once again conflicts with the **task need** of catering lessons to address student problems.

### 15.3 Lack of Standardization: Split Classes

**Split classes** are less easily assessed by other teachers not responsible teaching it.

Hutchinson & Torres (1994:320) write:

As a shared enterprise with known goals the teaching-learning process demands a map. There are only three places where this map can reside – in the teacher's head, in a written syllabus...or in the form of pre-planned materials (i.e. a textbook)...If it is only in the teacher's head, it is inaccessible to anyone else.

Some of the **split** classes at CLS 'X' do have their syllabi mapped out entirely in the teacher's head. Other teachers trying to decide whether to move their students into such a class have difficulty deciding whether the class is appropriate for the students concerned. This fails to meet the important **group need** of being able to look beyond only his or her lesson for the purposes of placing students into new classes.

Furthermore, these 'split' classes are mostly taught by the part-time teachers who are only paid for their teaching time. Leading this writer to question to what degree a part-time teacher will actually take the time to pre-plan the entire semester rather than planning each lesson as a 'one off' on a week-by-week basis. As Stern (1992:46) writes:

...the laudable intention to give freedom to the teacher and responsibility to the student must not serve as an excuse for not planning the curriculum.

### **16.0 Fit by Fiat: Individual Needs**

I would argue that in itself, a degree of standardization is a good thing. However, at CLS 'X' **fit** classes are too rigidly standardized, and that the manager, by imposing this standardization rather than negotiating it with those responsible for delivering the standardized lessons, fails to meet so many individual needs amongst teachers that most of the benefits of the current organization are lost.

### **17.0 Teaching as Labour**

Requiring teachers to stick to rigid guidelines, and by checking the teacher's 'lesson plan' reports (a standardized form to filled out by all teachers after every lesson) to ensure adherence to the syllabus schedule, turns the teacher's job into "Teaching as Labour" (Wise *et. al.* 1984:7 in Skinner 2002:271). This 'fit by fiat' aspect of CLS 'X's organizational structure frames teacher into a 'labour' mold. It removes the opportunity to, and mitigates the need for, teachers to employ much of their creativity to independently weigh-up teacher and learning problems, make decisions and weigh outcomes.

### **18.0 High Turnover Rate Amongst Full-Time Teachers**

In the two years I have worked as a part-time teacher at CLS 'X', every year has seen a 75% turnover rate amongst the full-time teachers. When asked at their respective farewell parties why they were leaving CLS 'X', the answer has been invariably that the job is 'boring'. It must be noted that these teachers had no intention of leaving Japan or the ELT field, rather that they were looking for jobs at a different CLS organization. The 'teaching as labour' mold expected at CLS 'X' does not meet the **individual needs** of teachers for professional development and personal growth. This development is not surprising, as Skinner (2002:269) writes:

The strict routine of teaching five or six hours a day, with no opportunity to participate in activities such as course development, materials design (or selection), or administration...can eventually lead to a type of 'burn out'. (brackets added).

However, part-time teachers remain at CLS 'X' much longer than their full-time counterparts. Likely because the part-time teachers have had much of their need for professional development satisfied by their having taken, or by currently taking, some sort of professional development programme, such as TEFL Diplomas or Masters courses. Furthermore, the part-time teachers work full-time in other organizations that may be fulfilling their need for challenge and growth.

### **19.0 Club or Power Culture**

Part-time teachers are given the lion's share of the higher-level **split** classes where teachers are allowed autonomy of choice and action. On the one hand, this is a sensible decision on the manager's part, as these teachers do have more experience and training/qualifications than the full-time teachers do. The part-time teachers have also, overall, been at CLS 'X' longer and can be trusted not to 'break contract', an important point as it would be harder to substitute another teacher into these types of classes.

Yet, what this does is create an unfair split between part-timers and full-timers. The manager and part-timers constitute an organizational "power or club culture" (White et al 1991:18). Even the changes made to the **fit** classes, suggested by teachers in the past, have all been those suggested by the part-time teachers. Yet as these changes were not proposed and debated in an open forum, the full-time teachers have no idea why their proposals were rejected (and in fairness, the part-time teachers do not know what the full-timers suggested). This fails to meet the **individual need** to be treated equally. As Handy (1984) notes, power or club culture organizations "can be very exciting places to work, *if you belong to the club.*"(in: White *et al.* *ibid.*).

### **20.0 Collegiality**

Not feeling 'part of the club' makes it near impossible to feel a sense of collegiality with your co-workers, another important **individual** and **group need**. As Hargreaves (1994:187) writes:

Collegiality and Collaboration are important for the improvement of morale and satisfaction...collegiality and collaboration are also needed to ensure that teachers benefit from their experiences and continue to grow during their careers. (in Skinner 2002:268).

Which is likely another reason for the high turnover rate amongst full-time teachers.

### **21.0 Ownership**

Teachers are the ultimate deliverers of a commercial language school's product. When students are dissatisfied with their lessons, they are also dissatisfied with their teacher. You cannot really separate a course from the teacher, perhaps dooming any attempt to force teachers into a labour mold, as teachers have an **individual need** for ownership of the lesson. Therefore it is vital for a teacher to be involved in the selection of the textbooks at CLS 'X'.

When teachers feel an inappropriate textbook has been foisted upon them by the manager, or indirectly by another teacher via the manager, they may either only pay lip service to using it, or essentially 'give up' and follow the text whether or not this does the student a disservice.

If teachers are only loosely following the syllabus course laid out by the textbook, all the intended gains of standardization are lost. A case in point is the textbooks used at CLS 'X' for teaching grammar. Murphy's *Grammar in Use* series was chosen by the manager for the grammar classes. All teachers teaching these classes agree that it is very difficult to make interesting and effective lessons around what was intended by the author to be a grammar *reference* book.

Some teachers opt to cross-reference the week's target (again determined by the manager) with other classroom texts from the teacher's personal 'library', and then teach the point-of-the week using this alternate text and assign the Murphy reference text activities as homework. Others have come to the decision that this takes up too much of the teachers (unpaid) time, and in essence walk the students through the exercises/drills found in the *Grammar in Use* series.

Despite all teachers recording that they have taught the same page(s) of *Grammar in Use*, the presentation and supplementary materials are so diverse, that it is arguable whether the students in two different classes taking the same grammar course are being taught the 'same' lesson at all.

## **22.0 Suggested Changes to the Organization of CLS 'X'**

CLS 'X' is organized so that **fit** can be achieved without having to arrange teachers to gather together in one place. This is sensible insofar as the part-time teachers do have very different schedules from one another at their full-time jobs outside of CLS 'X', and unless paid to do so, it would be relatively difficult to get all the teachers to come together for meetings. Yet, this is precisely what I would recommend. Doing so would put a 'rim' around the 'wheel' of CLS 'X's 'hub and spoke' structure, in hope of changing from **fit by fiat** to **coordination by consent**.

I propose that towards the middle of the semester, teachers be required to fill out the 'textbook' evaluation form, giving teachers two weeks to do so. These forms should be collected and copied by the manager, and then given out to all teachers.

Then a meeting for *all* teachers should be scheduled for, say, the following month. The purpose of this meeting would be to give teachers an open forum to recommend textbook changes and to give other teachers the chance to examine any new textbooks being proposed.

Ideally, teachers and the manager should negotiate the course aims prior to choosing textbooks. However, this would be time consuming, which creates a problem because part-time teachers may refuse to attend unless paid to do so, creating additional costs for the school. If teachers are unpaid but nevertheless required to attend, they may put little effort into the meeting in the hopes of getting it over with as quickly as possible. Either way, we therefore need to keep meetings to a minimum.

, it is nevertheless a syllabus. Teachers, by choosing a particular textbook over another, are likely implicitly in agreement with the methodology within it, and feel the content is appropriate for the course. So an open forum for discussing textbook selection is a type of 'poor man's' way of setting course aims and means more expediently.

An open forum would allow all teachers to be heard, thus breaking the **club culture**, even if teachers did not all participate equally, they will at least have been given the opportunity to do so. It would pool the teacher-**human resources** together, to generate more ideas than a single teacher could. It gives all teachers the chance for **professional growth**, as teachers could learn from each other. Even if not all teachers can agree on a text-book, requiring arbitration from the manager, teachers would know who recommended the books eventually chosen, and could later turn to that teacher for ideas on how to use the text if necessary.

As long as discussions do not turn acrimonious, this should also create a greater sense of **collegiality**. However, knowing the teachers at the school as I do, it is unlikely a compromise could not be reached. This would give all teachers some degree of a sense of **ownership**, thus making standardization more likely. Teachers should also be allowed at this meeting to decide on how to pace and 're-chunk' the **fit classes** textbooks. Instead of setting a rigid week-by-week schedule, teachers could negotiate a time range for content. For example: a minimum amount to be covered within a certain time, say within each month.

Furthermore, full-time teachers should be given more **split classes**, again to be treated as equal to the part-timers and to allow more room for personal growth. However, **split class** teachers should be required to select a textbook for the purposes of having an **accountable** skeleton framework for the class.

In the second month of the new semester, an additional meeting should be held to, discuss any problem teachers and students are having with the textbooks: perhaps the pacing of a given course would need to be reset. Again ideas and suggestions could be shared amongst **colleagues**.

### **23.0 Conclusion**

Of course, I cannot guarantee that meetings would achieve the above advantages. Roberts (1998:85) notes that private language schools have 'a tendency towards privatism', which is definitely the case at CLS 'X', so teachers may at first find collaborating somewhat bothersome. Also, perhaps some part-time teachers like the current system, which allows them to make extra money after their full-time jobs by expending relatively little mental effort.

Nevertheless, at a CLS of this small size, with the rather 'deep' resource pool available to it, having a rigidly centralized 'fit by fiat' organization is unnecessary. 'Fit' is both a desirable and achievable goal for CLS 'X', but I would prefer to see this coordination of teachers be by consent rather than by force.

## **References**

- Bartelen, H. and Reedy, S. (2001) *Listening Power*. Macmillian.
- Doyle, P. (1999) 'Changing course: the lexical syllabus and the politics of the staffroom' in *Exploring Change in English Language Teaching* Kennedy, Doyle and Goh (eds). Macmillan-Heinemann.
- Fukuyama, F. (1995) *Trust: the Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. Penguin.
- Howard, L. (1999) *Read all about it*. OUP.
- Hutchinson, T. and Torres, E. (1994) 'The textbook as agent of change' *ELTJ* 48/4.
- Kennedy, C. and Edwards, C. (1998) *ELT Management*. University of Birmingham: CELS.
- Murphy, R. (2000) *English Grammar in Use: a self-study reference and practice book for Elementary Students*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Skinner, B. (2002) 'Moving on: from training course to workplace' *ELTJ* 56/3.
- Stern, H.H. (1992) *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. OUP.
- White *et al.* (1991) *Management in English Language Teaching*. CUP.
- Willis, D. (2000) *Syllabus and Materials*. University of Birmingham: CELS.