

EFL Teachers' Views on Team-Teaching : In the Case of Japanese Secondary School Teachers

Koji Igawa

This is a study of EFL (English as a foreign language) teachers' views on team-teaching (TT) as reflected in response to a small-scale survey conducted in Japan during the summer of 2008. A total of 105 English teachers, including 74 Japanese Teachers of English (JTEs) and 31 Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs), the majority of whom are native speakers of English, participated in the study on a volunteer basis and all these self-selected participants are teaching either at junior or senior high schools in Japan. The results of this study show the JTEs and ALTs think that TT is contributing to students' cross-cultural understanding and listening and that motivation (of both teachers and students) and teachers' professional expertise are two key factors that make TT work. Implications for designing and conducting EFL teachers' professional development programs are included.

Keyword : team-teaching (TT), Assistant Language Teacher (ALT), Japanese Teacher of English (JTE), EFL (English as a Foreign Language), motivation, cross-cultural understanding, professional development (PD), JET Programme

I. INTRODUCTION

This is to report a study of EFL (English as a foreign language) teachers' views on team-teaching (TT) as reflected in response to a small-scale survey conducted in Japan during the summer of 2008. A total of 105 English teachers, including 74 Japanese Teachers of English (JTEs) and 31 Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs), the majority of whom are native speakers of English, participated in the study and all these self-selected participants filled out the questionnaire on a volunteer basis.

Since the inauguration of the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) Programme in 1987, team-teaching has been a standard feature in English language classes at junior and senior high schools in Japan. Team-teaching in Japanese EFL classes is commonly conducted by a team of a Japanese Teacher of English (JTE) and an Assistant Language Teacher (ALT) who is usually a native speaker of English and is often hired by the government-sponsored JET Programme. In academic year of 2008, 4,288 young people from 27 countries were recruited as ALTs to work with Japanese teachers (JET Programme Official Homepage¹⁾).

1) <http://www.clair.or.jp/e/index.html>

A number of studies have been undertaken to examine how team-teaching is carried out at Japanese junior and senior high schools, to evaluate team-teaching's outcome and efficiency, and to generate pedagogical suggestions to improve the quality of the team-teaching process and its end products. See, e.g., Fujita (1997), Gorsuch (2002), Miyazato (2001), Sick (1996), and Sturman (1992).

However, it is quite disappointing to note that teachers' own voices (e.g., Bailey & Nunan, 1996; Gaies, 1991) are not well represented and practical suggestions for their professional development are scarce (Crooks, 2001; Matsuda, 1999/2000). These two aspects are nevertheless indispensable to find a breakthrough in the current "impasse" of English language education in Japan.

Many authors from a variety of fields point out problems with English education in Japan. Much of this criticism is directed towards Japanese teachers of English and how competent they are to teach English as a means of communication. It is not often the case, however, that the criticism comes with suggestions for improvement (cf. Guest, 2000; Igawa, 2007; Lamie, 1999; Reischauer, 1988).

The purpose of this study is threefold:

- (1) to investigate the teachers' "situated" views (Doyle, 1994) on their own team-teaching practices,
- (2) to juxtapose the views of the two groups of teachers, JTEs and ALTs, to see any differences thereof due to cross-cultural differences (Kramsch, 1993), native-speaker (NS) and non-native-speaker (NNS) communication (Braine, 1999), power/role relations (Riley, 1985), and so forth, and
- (3) to gain feasible implications for designing and conducting professional development (PD) programs for EFL teachers (Freeman & Richards, 1996), particularly to better cope with team-teaching (TT) situations.

Subsequent to the introduction, the second section of this study consists of a brief review of literature regarding the current studies on team-teaching in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages). The third section is to report the results of the survey conducted in the summer of 2008, with a discussion thereof. The final section is the conclusion of the study with implications for EFL teachers' professional development.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

One of the more revealing metaphors regarding "team-teaching" is one used by Bailey, Curtis, and Nunan (2001) in the title of a chapter from their study: "Team teaching: Learning to dance" (pp. 180-205). In team-teaching, you have to learn to teach together with your partner, often not of your choice. All the while, you must avoid faux pas and try to move in coordination. In their hearts, every teacher may prefer

solo-teaching.

Teachers team-teach for a variety of reasons. But in most cases, they try to create a situation that is positive for both members and they hope to create synergy through the collaboration to generate an outcome that is greater than the sum of the individual parts.

It might also be worth noting an illuminating observation from Bailey, Curtis and Nunan (2001). They point out that team-teaching is not only teaching together, but as with other types of teaching, it also involves preparing and evaluating with one another:

So team teaching really consists of three (reiterated) phases: (1) pre-instructional planning, (2) instructional in-class teamwork, and (3) post-instructional follow-up work. (p. 181)

Now, it is probably best to turn to the definition of “team-teaching.” In general education, the classic definition of “teaching team” is as follows:

A teaching team is a group of two or more persons assigned to the same students at the same time for instructional purposes in a particular subject or combination of subjects. (Johnson & Lobb, 1959, p. 59) (Cited in Bailey, Curtis, & Nunan, 2001, p. 180)

Obviously, this classic version does not afford the idea of the “three reiterated phases of team-teaching” by Bailey, Curtis, and Nunan (2001). Richards and Farrell (2005), in the field of TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages), advocate the following, which incorporates the idea of the three team-teaching phases:

Team teaching (sometimes called pair teaching) is a process in which two or more teachers share the responsibility for teaching a class. The teachers share responsibility for planning the class or course, for teaching it, and for any follow-up work associated with the class such as evaluation and assessment. It thus involves a cycle of team planning, team teaching, and team follow-up. (Richards & Farrell, 2005, p. 159)

In discussing the team-teaching situation in Japan, many authors cite the definition by Brumby and Wada (1990):

Team-teaching is a concerted endeavor made jointly by the Japanese teacher of English and the assistant English teacher in an English language classroom in which the students, the JTE, and the AET are engaged in communicative activities. (Brumby & Wada, 1990, p. vi)

However, this definition is applicable only to the specific situation of Japanese junior and senior high school EFL classrooms and does not afford the global view of Richards and Farrell (2005).

Richards and Farrell (2005) also list some benefits of team-teaching which seem worthy of attention in discussing TT's purposes and outcomes (pp. 159-161):

TABLE 1. Benefits of Team-Teaching (Adopted from Richards & Farrell 2005)

NO.	BENEFIT	DESCRIPTION
1	Collegiality	TT promotes collegiality among teachers in a school.
2	Different roles	TT provides an opportunity to move between teaching and observing or assisting.
3	Combined expertise	Teachers can learn from each other's strengths when planning and teaching lessons.
4	Teacher-development opportunities	Team teaching provides a ready-made classroom observation situation, but without any evaluative component.
5	Learner benefits	Students hear two different models of language, experience two different styles of teaching. There is also more opportunity for individual interaction with a teacher.

Regarding this government sponsored team-teaching practice in Japan, a variety of studies have been undertaken to investigate how team-teaching is carried out, to evaluate its outcome and efficiency, and to generate pedagogical suggestions to improve the quality of its process and end products. In the rest of this section, some of the relevant points are summarized from the TT studies.

Analyzing transcripts of team-teaching lessons taught by a female JTE and two ALTs at a Tokyo senior high school, Fujita (1995) stresses the benefits of using collaborative evaluation as a research tool and presents two suggestions for better TT practice:

- In team-teaching in Japan, JTEs are perceived as more responsible and more experienced in teaching than ALTs. Therefore, the consequences of uncomfortable moments may be more serious to JTEs. (p.43)
- Clarifying expectations in TT may not change an individual teacher's behavior, but it may help teachers develop an awareness of what is really going on in team-teaching and develop tolerance among ALTs and JTEs. (p. 43)

Influenced by the notion that teachers are also learners (Allwright, 1984), Tajino and Walker (1998) argue that the traditional roles assigned to JTEs and ALTs in the classroom should be re-considered and that teachers should be aware of their roles as learners in the classroom. It is interesting from the professional development point of view, and Tajino and Walker (1998), as well as Tajino and Tajino (2000), advocate

that “team-teaching” should be “team-learning.” Tajino and Walker (1998) mention:

We should then perhaps expect a team-taught class to be one in which all the participants can manage learning and involve themselves in learning from one another through live person-to-person interaction. One possible, and perhaps the best, way is to start with the view that classroom interaction in a team-taught class is not something unilaterally in the teachers' hands but a co-production of all of the participants. (Tajino & Walker, 1998, p. 124)

This concept of “team-learning” might prove more essential in designing and conducting teacher development programs when combined with the notion that TT consists of three phases: (1) pre-instructional planning, (2) instructional in-class teamwork, and (3) post-instructional follow-up work (Bailey, Curtis, & Nunan, 2001; Richards & Farrell, 2005). Also it is worth noting the view that team-teaching, as is any type of teaching, is a co-production by all the participants, including teachers and students. (See also Johnson 1995.)

III. THE STUDY: Design, Results & Discussion

In the summer of 2008, a small-scale survey was carried out to investigate EFL teachers' views on team-teaching (TT). The study was intended to shed light on this unique feature of English language teaching at Japanese junior and senior high schools as conducted by JTEs (Japanese Teachers of English) and ALTs (Assistant Language Teachers).

The participants of the study were asked to fill out a questionnaire which consisted of three parts: (1) Participant Information; nationality, native language, sex, age, school, teaching experience, (2) TT Fundamentals; years of TT, ALT arrangement, average planning & preparing time, TT initiative, student control, post-TT meeting, and (3) Teachers' Views on TT; what TT is contributing to, what makes TT work. The participants were also asked to explicate their responses and this qualitative data is quoted in the discussion section of this study to supplement and/or clarify their views on the issues of team-teaching.

A. Participant Characteristics

The participants of this study are 105 English teachers practicing at Japanese secondary schools. They all agreed to fill out the questionnaire on team teaching (TTQ) during the summer of 2008. The participants are teaching in many parts of Japan, including Osaka, Hyogo, Kyoto, and Fukuoka Prefectures, and they are either members of ACROSS (the Association of English Teachers for Cross-Cultural Communication, Osaka, Japan) or e-dream-s (NPO for global education, Osaka, Japan), or are teachers who were asked to

participate by members of the two organizations.

Included in the participant pool are 74 Japanese teachers of English (JTEs) and 31 Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs). The majority of the participating ALTs are in Japan on the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) Programme, which is run by Japanese government. The nationalities of the participating ALTs are as shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2. Nationalities of the ALTs

COUNTRY	NO.	%
USA	23	74.2%
Canada	2	6.5%
India	2	6.5%
UK	2	6.5%
Australia	1	3.2%
Cameroon	1	3.2%
Total	31	100.0%

The JET Programme is a government-sponsored project “financed and run jointly by the Japanese Ministries of Education, Home Affairs, and Foreign Affairs” (Browne & Wada, 1998, pp. 105-106). Inaugurated in 1987, it is “the biggest education program in humankind's history”, according to Robert Juppe, first advisor to the program (Cited in Brown, 2001). The official JET Programme homepage explains their mission by stating the following ²⁾ :

... [it] aims to promote grass roots internationalization at the local level by inviting young overseas graduates to assist in international exchange and foreign language education in local governments, boards of education and elementary, junior and senior high schools throughout Japan.

Most of the ALTs speak English as their native language, while a few of the others mentioned they are native speakers of languages other than English. However, it is naturally assumed that those teachers whose native language is not English are competent in communicating in English. (See Table 3.)

TABLE 3. Native Languages of the ALTs

NATIVE LANGUAGE	NO.	%
English	28	90.3%
Chinese	1	3.2%
Hindi	1	3.2%
Telugu	1	3.2%
TOTAL	31	100.0%

2) <http://www.jetprogramme.org/j/introduction/index.html>

In fact, the official home page of the JET Programme specifies the following as one of the qualifications of ALTs:

Have excellent pronunciation, rhythm, intonation and voice projection skills in the designated language in addition to other standard language skills. Have good writing skills and grammar usage³⁾.

This is only for the ALTs on the JET Programme, but other assistant language teachers, hired by local governments or private companies, are supposed to fulfill this requirement as well, even if they are not native speakers of English. Of the 31 participating ALTs of this study, 25 are on the JET Programmes and 6 are not.

It might be worth while to quote the duties of ALTs as specified by the JET Programme Official Homepage:

These participants are placed mainly in public schools or local boards of education. ALTs assist with classes taught by Japanese teachers of English (JTE) and are thus involved in the preparation of teaching materials and in extracurricular activities like English clubs or sports teams. More than 90% of JET participants are employed as ALTs.

Typical duties for an ALT:

- "Team teaching", or assisting with classes taught by JTEs
- Assisting in the preparation of teaching materials
- Participating in extra-curricular activities with students

More than 20 years after the inception, the JET Programme is at a crossroads. Many prefectures and municipalities in Japan are now facing financial difficulties and it has become fairly common for them to shy away from the expensive JET Programme. In a recent newspaper article, Takahana (2008), writing for *the Japan Times*, reports the situation:

In the past, ALTs were recruited through the government-sponsored Japan Exchange and Teaching [JET] Program [Programme]. But as the coffers of local governments began to dwindle in recent years, many switched from JET program ALTs to those cheaper private companies outsource. ... But the lower cost of company ALTs comes at the expense of the teachers' low salaries and lack of benefits, including health insurance, unemployment insurance, pension and less paid leave.

In fact, it is noteworthy that all the ALT participants teaching at junior high schools are non-JET ALTs.

3) Retrieved September 9, 2008, from <http://www.jetprogramme.org/e/aspiring/eligibility.html>

The gender of the participants, both JTEs and ALTs, is as shown below (Table 4 Participants by Sex). It should be mentioned here that there are more female JTEs (68.9%) than males (27.0%).

TABLE 4. Participants by Sex

SEX	JTE		ALT		TOTAL	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
MALE	20	27.0%	18	58.1%	38	36.2%
FEMALE	51	68.9%	13	41.9%	64	61.0%
Not Identified	3	4.1%	0	0.0%	3	2.9%
TOTAL	74	100.0%	31	100.0%	105	100.0%

This probably reflects the “feminized” situation of the language teaching profession in Japan in general; “gendering of the TESOL profession” as pointed out by Ehrlich (1997) and Sunderland (1994). This could also be a reflection of the feminization of the teaching profession in Japan in general; female teachers are on the increase. (See Table 5 J.H.S. & S.H.S. Teachers by Sex.) At the same time, the participants include more male ALTs than females, which might show the reality of the general ALT population. In other words, the participants of this study may not be much different from the general gender composition of the English language team-teaching population in Japan.

TABLE 5. J.H.S. & S.H.S. Teachers by Sex

SCHOOL	JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL			SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL		
	2001	2004	2007	2001	2004	2007
Academic Year	2001	2004	2007	2001	2004	2007
Total No.Teachers	241,985	234,017	231,528	255,803	242,967	234,287
Male	NA	141,100	138,314	NA	178,753	170,675
Female	NA	92,917	93,214	NA	64,214	63,612
Female Ratio	NA	39.7%	40.3%	NA	26.4%	27.2%

(Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science & Technology, Japan, as of October 2007)

Looking at the participants by age group, one characteristic of the participants becomes clear; the majority of the JTEs are in their 40s and 50s, 47.3% and 23.0% respectively, while 67.7% of the ALTs are in their 20s (Table 6. Participants by Age Group).

TABLE 6. Participants by Age Group

AGE	JTE		ALT		TOTAL	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
20s	8	10.8%	21	67.7%	29	27.6%
30s	14	18.9%	7	22.6%	21	20.0%
40s	35	47.3%	3	9.7%	38	36.2%
50s	17	23.0%	0	0.0%	17	16.2%
Total	74	100.0%	31	100.0%	105	100.0%

According to a recent press release from Japan’s Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science & Technology (MEXT), the average age of teachers at Japanese schools has been steadily increasing over

the past years. Recently, the average age of teachers at Japanese schools reached an all time high in October 2007. (See Table 7 J.H.S & S.H.S. Teachers by Age Group.)

TABLE 7. J.H.S & S.H.S. Teachers by Age Group

SCHOOL	JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL			SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL		
Age Group / Year	2001	2004	2007	2001	2004	2007
~ 24	1.3 (%)	1.6(%)	2.0(%)	1.5(%)	1.4(%)	1.3(%)
25~29	9.2	7.2	7.7	8.4	7.2	6.4
30~34	13.9	12.4	10.9	11.1	11.5	10.7
35~39	18.4	15	13.2	16.4	13.2	12.2
40~44	21.8	20.9	16.7	17.1	18.8	16.3
45~49	16.2	16.2	21.4	15.5	16.5	18.7
50~54	11.8	13.7	16.3	14.7	15.5	16.3
55~59	6.7	8.5	10.7	11.9	12.7	14.7
60 ~	0.8	0.9	1.2	3.3	3.2	3.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average Age	41.8	42.9	43.8	43.8	44.3	45.1

(MEXT, as of October 2007)

As to the schools they teach at, the majority of the participating JTEs and ALTs are teaching at senior high schools rather than junior high schools. (See Table 8 Schools of the Participants.)

TABLE 8. Schools of the Participants

SCHOOL	JTE		ALT		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
J.H. School	9	12.2%	3	9.7%	12	11.4%
S.H. School	65	87.8%	28	90.3%	93	88.6%
Both	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	74	100.0%	31	100.0%	105	100.0%

This could be because the survey was conducted from early July to early August, which is a busy season for junior high school teachers. Also, the fact that the survey was written in English might have discouraged junior high school JTEs to participate.

The teaching experience of the individual participating teachers reflects their ages. The JTEs, the majority of whom are in their 40s and 50s, have much longer teaching experience (18.7 years on average) than the ALTs (3.3 years on average), who are usually in their 20s (Table 9 Average Years of Teaching).

TABLE 9. Average Years of Teaching

	JTE	ALT	TOTAL
Average Years of Teaching	18.7 (yrs)	3.3 (yrs)	14.2 (yrs)

B. Team-Teaching Fundamentals

The basic data regarding the participants' team-teaching practice is reported in this section.

The average number of years of participants' team-teaching experience naturally reflects their average years of teaching; JTEs, whose average teaching experience is 18.7 years, have much longer team-teaching experience than ALTs, who, on average, teach for 3.3 years. (See Table 10 Average Years of Team-Teaching.)

TABLE 10. Average Years of Team-Teaching

	JTE	ALT	TOTAL
Average Years of TT	12.02 (yrs)	2.34 (yrs)	9.16 (yrs)

The differences between the JTEs' teaching experience and TT experience is caused by the fact that they might not team-teach in a certain year or semester depending upon the school they teach at and/or the assignment they are given. As for the ALTs, the differences can be attributed to the fact that the participants include a few non-JET teachers who have prior teaching experience as solo-teachers before coming to Japan to serve as an ALT. Naturally, these ALTs have more teaching experience than the average ALT.

Sick (1996) studied how the introduction of ALTs contributed to the improvement of students' listening comprehension and presented three (3) types of ALT assignments (p. 201). (See Table 11 ALT Assignments.)

TABLE 11. ALT Assignments

NO.	SYSTEM	DESCRIPTION
1	One-shot / Occasional Visit System	ALTs make irregular visits, usually once or twice per year, to each school in a local district.
2	Regular Visit System	ALTs are assigned to more than one school, but make regular and more frequent visits, usually once a month.
3	Base School System	A school has its own ALT(s) who teaches regular classes, generally once a week or twice a month.

The majority of the participating teachers mentioned that their team-teaching situation is System Type 3, Base School System (Table 12 TT Situation).

TABLE 12. TT Situation

SITUATION	JTE		ALT		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One-shot	7	9.9%	0	0.0%	7	7.1%
Regular	13	18.3%	5	17.9%	18	18.2%
Base School	50	70.4%	23	82.1%	73	73.7%
Other	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	1	1.0%
TOTAL	71	100.0%	28	100.0%	99	100.0%

Not all the participants chose one (1) item: Some participants chose more than one (1) category while others did not choose any at all.

In response to the question, "How much time do you and your partner usually spend on planning and preparing for a lesson?", the participants answered 28.03 minutes on average; JTEs and ALTs say that they spend about the same amount of time (Table 13 Average Planning & Preparing Time).

TABLE 13. Average Planning & Preparing Time

	JTE	ALT	TOTAL
Planning & Preparing Time (minutes)	28.61	26.54	28.03

When asked who shows more initiative in team-teaching, about 40% of the JTEs mention their partners (ALTs) and about 35% name both JTEs and ALTs, while about half the ALTs say they have more initiative and about 40% mention both (Table 14 TT Initiative).

TABLE 14. TT Initiative

	JTE		ALT		TOTAL		
	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%
You	17	23.9%	13	46.4%	JTE	18	18.2%
Partner	28	39.4%	1	3.6%	ALT	41	41.4%
Both	25	35.2%	11	39.3%	Both	36	36.4%
Other	1	1.4%	3	10.7%	Other	4	4.0%
TOTAL	71	100.0%	28	100.0%	TOTAL	99	100.0%

Not all the participants chose one (1) item: Some participants chose more than one (1) categories and others did not choose any.

In this item, many JTEs and ALTs have almost the same opinion that ALTs take more initiative in TT. But a significant number of the participating JTEs and ALTs say that they share the initiative in TT classes. However, it should be mentioned that while about 24% of JTEs maintain that they exercise more initiative, almost no one in the ALT group thinks that JTEs take more initiative.

Remembering her ALT experience in Japan, McConnell (2000) notes in her anecdotal book on the JET Programme the two patterns of TT role relations in the classroom:

In my own observations of team-taught classes, I was repeatedly struck by how the Japanese teachers' strategies clustered around the two extremes. Either the entire class is turned over to the foreign teacher, or the foreign teacher becomes part of the furniture of the regular classes as a kind of human tape recorder. (p. 211)

The JTE-ALT roles seem to switch completely when it comes to student control (Table 15. Student Control). The JTEs assume more responsibility than the ALTs: More than 50% of the JTEs say they are more responsible and about half of the ALTs say their JTE peers have more responsibility, while no ALT says they are more responsible in this regard.

TABLE 15. Student Control: Who is more responsible

Who	JTE		ALT		TOTAL		
	No.	%	No.	%	Who	No.	%
you	41	57.7%	0	0.0%	JTE	54	55.1%
partner	9	12.7%	13	48.1%	ALT	9	9.2%
both	21	29.6%	11	40.7%	Both	32	32.7%
other	0	0.0%	3	11.1%	Other	3	3.1%
TOTAL	71	100.0%	27	100.0%	TOTAL	98	100.0%

Pennington (1998) introduces four (4) frames of classroom discourse, modeled as concentric circles:

1. The Lesson Frame: removed or sheltered from outside influences and most likely, in a language class, to maintain second-language usage,
2. The Lesson-Support Frame: intermediate layer of classroom discourse aimed at clarifying talk, repairing miscommunication, maintaining discipline, and supporting on-task behavior,
3. The Institutional-Support Frame: in which communication in relation to the wider school agenda outside a particular class takes place.
4. The Commentary Frame: the outermost circle, a frame for speaking in one's authentic voice as an individual or community member.

It could be argued that in Japanese TT classrooms, ALTs often take the initiative in the Lesson Frame reserved for second language use, while JTEs assume more responsibility in all of the other frames, probably in Japanese, the native language of JTEs and the students.

One of the participating ALTs mentions:

The best team teaching comes from a JTE who is good at keeping the children on task, and an ALT with a good lesson that the students can easily understand and enjoy. (NS01 USA)

The JTEs and the ALTs show different responses when asked if they have a post-TT meeting: more than 60% of the JTEs say yes, but more than 80% of the ALTs say no (Table 16. Post-TT Meeting).

TABLE 16. Post-TT Meeting: Do you and your partner have a post-TT meeting?

	JTE		ALT		TOTAL	
Yes	43	62.3%	5	19.2%	48	50.5%
No	26	37.7%	21	80.8%	47	49.5%
TOTAL	69	100.0%	26	100.0%	95	100.0%

Where does this difference come from? The following comment by a JTE is interesting: “We talk about the lesson on the way back to the teachers' room ...” (NNS 33). It might be possible that JTEs, busy performing many duties at school, think that a chat from the classroom to the teachers' room is a “meeting,” while ALTs do not share this understanding. In fact, one of the ALTs remarks:

It is not a meeting, but we discuss the good and bad aspects of class while walking back to the staffroom, discussing what needs to be changed, if anything. (NS20 USA)

As to the content of the Post-TT meeting, one of the JTEs explains more in detail:

We talk about how much students understood the target expressions and how much we made the students' involved in the activities. We also talk about the allotment of each part of the lesson, and some points to be improved or changed in the next lesson. (NNS05)

A slight difference is observed in the perceived ratio of classroom English use. On average, ALTs think they use English more often than JTEs (Table 17. Ratio of English Use).

TABLE 17. Ratio of English Use: How much of what you say during TT is in English?

	JTE	ALT	TOTAL
How much in English (%)	60.0	70.9	63.2

This might be quite natural when considering the functions of ALTs and JTEs as the team-teaching handbook (Ministry of Education, 2002) specifies: “The ALT can give firsthand data in the target language and the JTL [JTE] can take care of difficulties stemming from the learners' cultural and linguistic background” (p. 15). However, the Ministry of Education (2002) strongly recommends the use of English, not only for ALTs, but also for JTEs: “The JTL and the ALT should use the target language in class together” (p. 19).

The perceived use of English in the classroom can be understood, following Pennington's (1998) frames

mentioned earlier, that the ALTs are mainly concerned with the Lesson Frame (in English), while the JTEs are also concerned with the other frames of the Lesson-Support, the Institutional-Support, and the Commentary Frames (in English and/or Japanese), for which they think they are more responsible.

Yet how much the students understand what the teachers say in English is a different matter. Table 18 (Students' Understanding) shows the teachers' views of how much the students understand their English on average (Table 18. Students' Understanding).

TABLE 18. Students' Understanding: How much of what you say in English do your students understand?

	JTE	ALT	TOTAL
Students' Understanding (%)	56.8	45.6	53.5

The JTEs think their students understand 56.8% of what they say in English, while the ALTs think only 45.6% of what they say is understood by their students. Why do the ALTs think that less than a half of their English is understood by the students while more than 70% of their classroom talk is in English?

One of the reasons for this unfortunate discrepancy might be related to the restraint of Asian students, particularly in the EFL classroom. Tsui (1996) studied the perceptions of Hong Kong ESL teachers about the reticence of their students and came up with five (5) reasons contributing to the lack of student participation:

1. the students' low English proficiency
2. their fear of making mistakes and being ridiculed by classmates.
3. the teachers' intolerance of silence, which leads to a very short wait time for students to think about the question and come up with an answer,
4. the unequal speaking opportunities afforded to each student by the teacher, and
5. the overly difficult teachers' language input. (p. 155)

It seems that any one of the five reasons could be applicable to Japanese TT classrooms. Yet when Reason (2) is the case, teachers tend to think their students don't understand what they say; in fact the students do understand, but they don't want to show that they do. When either Reasons (3) or (5) is the case, the students are not in a situation where they can easily understand what the teachers say or demonstrate that they understand. The JTEs might understand the reticence of the Japanese students because they share the same culture.

Students' reticence seems particularly significant in examining Japan's team-taught EFL classes because as Johnson (1995) mentions second language lessons are jointly enacted by teachers and students:

Within second language classrooms, the patterns of communication are jointly constructed by teachers as they control the content and structure of classroom communication, and by students as they interpret and respond to what teachers say and do. (p. 89)

This view of team-teaching as “joint construction” is similar to the notion of “TT as co-production” by Tajino and Walker (1998), discussed earlier.

C. Teachers' Views on Team-Teaching

The participating teachers are asked to identify what their team-teaching is contributing to by choosing three (3) items from a list of nine (9) factors recognized in the current literature, including “students' listening (STs' Listening)”, “students' speaking (STs' Speaking)” and “others”, which is open to participants' ideas and comes with a blank space to fill in if they choose “others” (Table 19 What TT is Contributing to).

TABLE 19. What TT is Contributing to

ITEM	JTE			ALT			TOTAL		
	No.	%	Rank	No.	%	Rank	No.	%	Rank
STs' Listening	54	73.0	2	27	87.1	1	81	77.1	1
STs' Speaking	34	45.9	4	18	58.1	4	52	49.5	4
STs' Cross-cultural Understanding	57	77.0	1	24	77.4	2	88	77.1	1
STs' Motivation	50	67.6	3	20	64.5	3	70	66.7	3
JTE's Proficiency in English	14	18.9	5	2	6.5	6	16	15.2	5
JTE's Teaching Expertise	4	5.4	7	1	3.2	8	5	4.8	7
ALT's Understanding of Japan	6	8.1	6	4	12.9	5	10	9.5	6
ALT's Proficiency in Japanese	0	0.0	9	1	3.2	8	1	1.0	9
Others	1	1.4	8	2	6.5	6	3	2.9	8

NOTE: “ % ” means the ratio of the participating teachers who identified the item.

The participating teachers, both JTEs and ALTs, think that TT is largely contributing to students' cross-cultural understanding (77.0% of the JTEs and 77.4% of the ALTs) and students' listening (73.0% and 87.1%, respectively). This might seem quite obvious as a result of employing native speakers of the target language and it is what the Ministry of Education expects to attain in return for the substantial amount of funding they invest in the JET Programme.

The participating teachers also think that TT is contributing to students' motivation (67.6% of the JTEs and 64.5% of the ALTs) and students' speaking (45.9% and 58.1% respectively). This also seems unsurprising and is what the Ministry expects.

According to the handbook for team-teaching compiled by Japan's Ministry of Education, motivating students is a very important "merit" of the ALT:

The presence of an ALT in a classroom gives the students a practical and immediate motive to use the language as a means of communication. They do not need any explanation regarding the need to speak the language. (p. 15)

One of the JTEs confirms the "merit" of team-teaching: "In order to improve students' motivation to learn English, team-teaching is more beneficial than teaching only by JTEs" (NNS 67). Yet, another JTE is rather skeptical about it:

The existence of ALT has not brought a great motivation on learning another language. Some decades ago it worked as it was intended. But it has been faded away. (NNS 58)

Another JTE is also doubtful about TT's contribution to improving students' language proficiency:

The small number of TT/week for one student gives little or no influence on improvement of the student's listening and speaking. (NNS20)

An ALT also expresses doubt:

I am not convinced that we are really producing English speakers. Japanese students just start learning English too late, and the English curriculum is not really designed to foster fluency of speech, but rather focuses on rather abstract and high-level paper tasks, i.e. grammatical exercises. (NS18 Canada)

However, student motivation and language improvement are two crucial issues that need to be addressed in Japan's English education system, particularly in an age when the number of students is dwindling due to low birthrates and globalization is losing its glow because of economic polarization and the current worldwide recession. These aspects and the relationships that exist between the different aspects should be closely studied in future research.

In her seminal book, Kramsch (1993) asks the fundamental question about foreign language education: "How can a foreign way of viewing the world be taught via an educational culture which is itself the product of native conceptions and values?" (Kramsch, 1993, p.9)

In the English language education system in Japan, team-teaching by JTEs and ALTs clearly underlines

this dilemma; ALTs representing their “foreign way of viewing the world” and JTEs reinforcing the “educational culture which is itself the product of native conceptions and values” of Japan.

Therefore, it is interesting that the majority of the JTEs and ALTs identify “Students’ Cross-cultural Understanding” as a factor TT is contributing to.

In the list of characteristics of NNS (Non-Native Speaking) language teachers, Roberts (1998) observes: “Where teachers and learners share a common culture, group norms may exert a powerful influence on their behavior, whereas NS [Native Speaking] teachers may be exempted from such norms” (p. 97).

Stated as a basic assumption of the language teaching profession that FLL (foreign language learning) promotes cross-cultural understanding, Byrnes (1989) argues that “any L2 learning would inherently work toward the goal of building up students’ cross cultural competence” (p.205), which is defined as two-fold:

- (1) competence that “derives from knowledge of a wide range of synchronic and diachronic facts about the other culture”, and
- (2) competence that “manifests itself in an awareness of the rules of language use, both oral and written, as they mark a given culture.” (p.209)

It might be worth researching, in future studies, “cross-cultural understanding” and/or “cross-cultural competence” as an outcome of TT in Japanese EFL classes.

Here, some comments from the participating teachers might suffice:

An ALT says:

I think my presence in the school and the classroom does serve to foster greater cross-cultural awareness. I try to inject as much cross-cultural content, that is, information about cultures other than English-speaking ones, as I can into my classes. (NS18 Canada)

Another ALT comments:

In fact, I just got back student surveys of a 3rd year English grammar class, and they said their favorite part is when I talk about life in America for five minutes at the beginning of class. It wakes them up, gets them thinking in English, and gives me something to refer back to with examples during the lesson. This keeps student motivation up. (NS15 USA)

On the other hand, a JTE says:

My students usually have a lesson from an ALT once every other week and I don't think it is enough to improve their speaking and listening ability. However, the time to spend with an ALT gives the students chances to think about foreign culture and possibly motivates them to study English. When I prepare for classes, I talk with ALTs in English and I think this helps me improve my English proficiency. (NNS38)

Certainly, both sides agree that TT contributes to the development of the students' cross-cultural understanding and TT motivates students to study English.

The participating teachers are asked to identify what makes team-teaching work by opting for five (5) items from a list of fifteen (15) factors recognized in the current literature, including "JTEs' English Proficiency", "ALTs' Expertise", "Students' (STs') Motivation" and "others." The final option, entitled "others," is open to participants' ideas and comes with a blank for the participants to fill in if they choose "others" (Table 20 What Makes TT Work).

TABLE 20. What Makes TT Work

ITEM	JTE			ALT			TOTAL		
	No.	%	Rank	No.	%	Rank	No.	%	Rank
JTE's English proficiency	27	36.5	9	13	41.9	6	40	38.1	7
JTE's expertise	33	44.6	5	14	45.2	4	47	44.8	5
JTE's motivation	40	54.1	1	17	54.8	2	57	54.3	1
JTE's personality	12	16.2	12	11	35.5	9	23	21.9	11
ALT's Japanese proficiency	2	2.7	13	0	0.0	15	2	1.9	14
ALT's expertise	40	54.1	1	13	41.9	6	53	50.5	2
ALT's understanding of Japan	30	40.5	8	4	12.9	11	34	32.4	10
ALT's motivation	34	45.9	4	18	58.1	1	52	49.5	3
ALT's personality	26	35.1	10	12	38.7	8	38	36.2	9
STs' English proficiency	13	17.6	11	3	9.7	12	16	15.2	12
STs' motivation	29	39.2	6	15	48.4	3	44	41.9	6
class size	29	39.2	6	10	32.3	10	39	37.1	8
ambience	0	0.0	15	2	6.5	13	2	1.9	14
planning	38	51.4	3	14	45.2	4	52	49.5	3
other	2	2.7	13	1	3.2	14	3	2.9	13

NOTE: " %" means the ratio of the participating teachers who identified the item.

More than half of the JTEs think that JTE's motivation (54.1%) and ALT's expertise (54.1%) are important factors that make TT work in their classroom. The majority of the ALTs, on the other hand, think that ALT's motivation (58.1%) and JTE's motivation (54.8%) are significant factors that make TT work.

Many JTEs believe that planning (51.4%), ALT's motivation (45.9%), and JTE's expertise (44.6%) are also making TT work, while a large number of ALTs believe that student motivation (48.4%), JTE's expertise (45.2%), and planning (45.2%) are significant factors.

Looking at these results, it can be argued that "motivation" seems to be a key in team-teaching. To be more specific, the participating teachers believe that their own motivation, as well as the motivation of their team teaching partners, is significant in making TT successful. The ALTs indicated that they think student motivation is also important. Motivating students, as well as the teachers themselves, seems to be a necessary area of professional development for EFL teachers in Japan.

One ALT explains the necessity of motivated JTEs:

Since the JTE spends more time with the students and is considered their primary teacher, the JTE is able to influence the students as to how much importance the ALT has. If the JTE is apathetic to TT, the students will follow suit. If the JTE tries to involve the ALT in every and any possible way, the students will see that enthusiasm and be enthused themselves. (NS19 USA)

On the other hand, a JTE explains why ALT motivation is necessary:

Usually, ALTs don't have any experience of teaching and JTEs should tell them what we should do and how we should do it in a classroom. So, the JTE's English proficiency and expertise are necessary for successful team-teaching. I think ALTs can compensate for their lack of experience with their motivation to make TT work. (NNS 38)

Another key term is "teachers' expertise." Both groups of teachers think JTE expertise is vital and the JTEs believe that ALT expertise is also significant. While this underscores the importance of teacher professional development to foster expertise, the nature of expertise should be discussed.

Advocating the need for teachers to pursue professional development, Richards (1998a) proposes six (6) domains of "Second Language Teacher Education (SLTE)": (1) theories of teaching, (2) teaching skills, (3) communication skills, (4) subject matter knowledge, (5) pedagogical reasoning & decision making, and (6) contextual knowledge.

It is most likely that the JTEs, who have on average much longer teaching experience, hope that the ALTs possess both the (2) teaching skills and (3) communication skills domains of expertise. The "teaching skills" domain includes "the observable performance of the variety of teaching acts...organizing and managing the classroom; presenting clear explanations and vivid descriptions; assigning and checking

work; and interacting effectively with students through questions and probes, answers and reactions, and praise and criticism” (p. 4).

Naturally, the “communication skills” domain is of crucial importance in language teaching. This domain also encompasses overall “General Communication Skills” :

- Personality, presence, general style
- Voice – audibility, ability to project, modulation
- Voice – speed, clarity, diction
- Ability to establish/maintain rapport (p. 6)

Particularly for non-native speakers of the target language, Richards (1998a) mentions “Language Proficiency” and explains: “Presumably one needs to attain a certain threshold level of proficiency in a language to be able to teach effectively in it, and activities addressing language proficiency are often a core component of many SLTE programs” (p. 7).

This domain of “communication skills” assumes more importance when the recommended teaching method is “communicative language teaching,” which propagates that communication is learned only through communication and requires the teacher to use English in the classroom (e.g. Savignon, 1991).

In Richards’ list of SLTE, what the ALTs expect the JTEs to have in order for their TT to be successful is (5) pedagogical reasoning & decision making, and (6) contextual knowledge, where the former means:

...the capacity of a teacher to transform the content knowledge he or she possesses into forms that are pedagogically powerful and yet adaptive to the variations in ability and background presented by the students. (p. 10)

Contextual knowledge is defined as: “...an understanding of how the practice of language teaching is shaped by the contexts in which it takes place, and the role of societal, community, and institutional factors in language teaching” (p. 12). An ALT explains:

The JTE’s expertise is important because they are the full-time teachers to the students and when push comes to shove, it is ultimately their classroom. If the JTE is not effectively teaching the class when the ALT is not there, it is nearly impossible for team teaching to work successfully because adding another instructor complicates the situation even further. (NS 26 USA)

A JTE also mentions the professionalism of JTEs:

The JTE should be a professional. So we need proficiency and skills or methods in teaching. The ALT is not always a professional teacher under the current system. So they do not always have those professional skills. However, if they really want our class work to be better, we can talk and exchange ideas on teaching and share ideas. (NNS13)

Anyhow, it might be worth noting that team members have to recognize each other's expertise and trust each other as Richards and Farrell (2005) put it: "Implementing successful team teaching requires that both teachers have a strong sense of confidence in each other" (p. 167).

The importance of planning and preparation for TT is duly recognized by both JTEs and ALTs, yet to have good team-planning, a strong command of the English language is necessary on the part of the JTE. The quality of planning and preparation in reality, however, is sometimes questionable as some of the ALTs mentioned that the planning and preparation are always done without the involvement of the JTE.

A JTE also explains:

Some teachers, especially older teachers, totally depend on the ALT, and they do nothing but watch. Under such situations, team-teaching lessons never make it. Or required goals can never be obtained. Both ALTs and JTEs should have a basic knowledge of TT lessons and should work on planning in detail together. (NNS33)

Although it is not rated high among the participating teachers of this study, the JTEs' English proficiency has to be mentioned here.

It is often argued that Japanese teachers try to avoid TT because they are not confident in their communicative competence in English, which is necessary in preparing and conducting TT classes. For example, McConnell (2000), former ALT and author of a book on her JET Programme experience in Japan, notes:

Why was team teaching so threatening to JTLs [JTEs]? Certainly, deficiency in English conversational ability led many to fear loss of face in the classroom and in the teachers' room. While JTLs [JTEs] often claimed that they were too busy with other school affairs to spend time in preparing and evaluating team-taught classes, in fact, language skills were the biggest roadblock. (p. 211)

Butler (2004) conducted a survey on Korean, Taiwanese and Japanese teachers of English, teaching at elementary schools in their respective countries, and asked them to self-evaluate their communicative

competence in English. In addition, these teachers were also asked to identify how good their English should be in order to perform their teaching responsibilities. The majority of them, JTEs in particular, said their competencies, especially productive skills, are not high enough.

Igawa (2007), investigating the professional development needs of EFL teachers at Japanese and Korean secondary schools, reported a similar tendency for non-native-speaking teachers of English to rank highly their needs to improve their communicative competence in the target language. Cullen (1994) advocates the inclusion of a language improvement section in teacher development programs.

An ALT mentions his evaluation of JTE English proficiency:

There are some JTEs who are inadequately poor in English and need an ALT as a red pen in their lessons. JTEs are more encouraged to teach in English or speak English in their own classes after having TT experience. (NS16 USA)

One of the JTEs explains another aspect of JTE English proficiency:

I believe the JTE can be a good role model for the students if the JTE can speak English fluently. This also motivates students to speak English. (NNS25)

Surprisingly, however, in this study, the JTE's proficiency in English is not ranked highly, by either JTEs or ALTs, as a factor that makes TT work. The ALT group ranks this item as the 6th (41.9%) most important factor, which is slightly higher than the JTE group ranking, which places this factor at the 9th (36.5%) highest position.

There could be several reasons for this low ranking. First, it has been more than 20 years since TT first began in Japan. JTEs have had time to increase their proficiency in the language to the point where they are better able to handle the communicative requirements involved in TT. Also, the roles of both groups in this specific teaching activity have become well established. Therefore, face-threatening situations do not occur nearly as often, as long as both the JTE and the ALT follow the same routine. Finally, it is also possible that only the JTEs who are confident in their TT abilities responded to this questionnaire.

CONCLUSION

...teaching is realized only in teachers; it has no independent existence. Teacher education is hence less involved with transmitting models of effective practice and more concerned with providing experiences that facilitate the development of cognitive and interpretative skills, which are used

uniquely by every teacher. (Richards, 1998b, p. 81)

This study of EFL teachers' perceptions of TT (team-teaching) at Japanese secondary schools involved 74 Japanese teachers of English (JTEs) and 31 assistant language teachers (ALTs). The majority of the ALTs are native speakers of English and are hired by the Japanese government-sponsored "JET Programme". The results of the study could be summarized as follows:

- ALTs (Assistant Language Teachers) generally take more initiative in TT. However, a significant number of the participating JTEs (Japanese Teachers of English) and ALTs think that they share the initiative in TT classes.
- Regarding student control, JTEs assume more responsibility than ALTs: More than 50% of JTEs say that they are more responsible for student control than their ALT counterparts. At the same time, about half of the ALTs agree and say that their JTE peers carry more responsibility in this regard.
- As to the question of whether or not they have a post-TT meeting, the JTEs and the ALTs had contrasting responses; more than 60% of the JTEs say that they do have a meeting, but more than 80% of the ALTs say that they do not. This discrepancy appears to be at least partially due to the facts that most JTEs have busy schedules and that the ALTs and JTEs define "meetings" differently.
- The perceived ratio of classroom English use differs: On average, ALTs think they use English more often than JTEs (70.0% and 60.9%, respectively).
- JTEs think their students understand 56.8% of what they say in English, while the ALTs think only 45.6% of what they say is being understood by their students.
- Both JTEs and ALTs think that TT is largely contributing to students' cross-cultural understanding (77.0% of JTEs and 77.4% of ALTs) and students' listening (73.0% and 87.1%, respectively).
- The participating teachers also think that TT is contributing to students' motivation (67.6% of JTEs and 64.5% of ALTs) and students' speaking (45.9% and 58.1%, respectively).
- Both groups of teachers expressed some doubts about TT truly contributing to students' language improvement (listening and speaking) and motivation. These aspects of TT should be further investigated.
- The content of "cross-cultural understanding" and/or "cross-cultural competence" as a result of TT in Japanese EFL classes should also be studied further.
- More than half of the JTEs think that JTE motivation (54.1%) and ALT expertise (54.1%) are important factors in making TT work in their classroom. The majority of the ALTs, on the other hand, think that ALT motivation (58.1%) and JTE motivation (54.8%) are significant factors in making TT work.
- Many JTEs believe that planning (51.4%), ALT motivation (45.9%), and JTE expertise (44.6%)

are also making TT effective, while a large number of ALTs believe that student motivation (48.4%), JTE expertise (45.2%), and planning (45.2%) are significant factors.

- Motivation seems to be a key to Japan's EFL team-teaching. More specifically, the participating teachers believe that their own motivation, as well as the motivation of their partners, is a significant factor in making TT successful. The ALTs also think that student motivation is important.
- Motivating students, as well as motivating themselves, appears to be a necessary area of professional development for EFL teachers in Japan.
- Another key phrase in TT is "teachers' expertise." Both JTEs and ALTs feel that JTE expertise is vital. In addition, JTEs believe that ALT expertise is also significant.
- The teaching expertise of the individual teachers is of crucial importance in the professional development program and the nature of their expertise should be explored more thoroughly.
- The importance of planning and preparation for TT is duly recognized by both JTEs and ALTs alike.
- In this study, the JTE's proficiency in English is not ranked highly by either the ALT or the JTE group as a factor in making TT more effective. However, comments from the participants attest to its crucial significance and it underscores the necessity for language improvement within the realm of professional development for non-native speaking teachers.

Inquiring into the professionalism of language teachers and the development of that professionalism, Roberts (1998) lists characteristics of the profession, including the following three attributes:

- Uncertainty: Teaching differs from many other occupations because it is characterized by intention rather than certainty.
- On display: Teaching is also highly public; our teaching self is on display for all the learners to see.
- Isolation: Teaching is an unusual occupation in that much of the work goes on while cut off from peers. (p. 107)

Team-teaching is a type of teaching practice and naturally these attributes constitute a portion of it. The preparation/planning efforts are meant to cope with the uncertainty in the classroom, although teachers cannot fully prepare for the spontaneity of the classroom process (Bailey, 1996). The "curriculum events" address where teachers and students jointly negotiate content and meaning (Doyle, 1994). In TT, the two teachers are on display, but they should not feel isolated.

Finally, in regards to the implications of the professional development of EFL teachers specifically for team-teaching and team-learning, the following list of program contents is presented to conclude this

study. It is true that TT itself could be viewed as a teachers' professional development opportunity (Richards & Farrell, 2005). Yet for better team-teaching, the professional development is important; TT is a form of teaching and "teaching," as Richards (1998b) mentions, is realized only in teachers:

1. How to share the responsibility/roles between JTEs and ALTs should be a main focus of both the ALT and the JTE. These responsibilities include, but are not limited to, the following: TT initiative, student control, and the Lesson Frame. (Pennington, 1998)
2. How to conduct the preparation/planning of pre-TT meetings and the follow-up/evaluation of post-TT meetings.
3. Motivating students, as well as the teachers, seems to be a necessary area of professional development for EFL teachers in Japan.
4. The content of cross-cultural understanding and cross-cultural competence, as well as how to foster each of them, should be part of the content included in the teacher development program.
5. The teaching expertise of each type of teachers (JTEs and ALTs) is of crucial importance in the professional development program and the nature of their expertise should be explored.
6. It is necessary to include a language improvement section in the professional development program for non-native speaking teachers.
7. Professional development programs for team-teaching should be an opportunity to explore and practice the notion of "team-learning". (Tajino & Walker, 1998)

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank the EFL teachers, JTEs and ALTs, who were kind enough to participate in this study during the summer of 2008. I am also grateful to two organizations, "ACROSS" (Ms. Yoshiko Kawano, President, and Mr. Toshiyuki Fujisawa, Vice President) and "e-dream-s" (Mr. Shoichi Tsuji, Chair, and Ms. Fusayo Nakagawa, Vice Chair), for the special arrangements they made for this study. Special thanks also go out to the senior officers of the organizations who functioned as research cooperators for this study: Ms. Fusayo Nakagawa and Ms. Miki Tsukamoto. I would also wish to extend my thanks to Mr. Keoki Noji, who kindly gave assistance in regards to reaching JET teachers and in proofreading the earlier version of this paper.

References

- Allwright, R.L. (1984) The importance of interaction in classroom language learning. *Applied Linguistics* 5(2), 156-171.
- Bailey, K.M. (1996). The best laid plans: Teachers' in-class decisions to depart from their lesson plans. In K.M. Bailey, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom* (pp. 15-40). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bailey, K.M., Curtis, A., & Nunan, D. (2001). *Pursuing professional development*. Singapore: Heinle & Heinle.
- Bailey, K.M., & Nunan, D. (Eds.) (1996). *Voices from the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Braine, G. (Ed.). (1999). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Brown, E.K. (2001, April 6). JET Stream: Opening the doors to the world. *The Japan Times*. Retrieved August 20, 2008, from <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/getarticle.pl5?fl20010406eb.htm>
- Browne, C.M. & Wada, M. (1998). Current issues in high school English teaching in Japan: An exploratory survey. *Language, Culture & Curriculum*, 11(1), 97-112.
- Brumby, S., & Wada, M. (1990). *Team teaching*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- Butler, Y.G. (2004). What level of English proficiency do elementary school teachers need to attain to teach EFL?: Case studies from Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(2), 245-278.
- Byrnes, H. (1989). Reflections on the development of cross-cultural communicative competence in the foreign language classroom. In B. F. Freed. (Ed.). *Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom* (pp.205-218). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Crooks, A. (2001). Professional development and the JET Program: Insights and solutions based on the Sendai City Program. *JALT Journal*, 23(1), 31-46.
- Cullen, R. (1994). Incorporating a language improvement component in teacher training programs. *ELT Journal*, 48 (2), 162-172.
- Doyle, W. (1994). Curriculum and pedagogy. In P.W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook on research on curriculum* (pp.486-516). New York: Macmillan.
- Ehrlich, S. (1997). Gender as a social practice: Implications for second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 421-446.
- Freeman, D., & Richards, J.C. (Eds.). (1996). *Teacher learning in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fujita, M. (1997). Is team-teaching really a nightmare? : A comparison of two teams. In S.S. Davis, & Y. Iwata (Eds.), *Discourse analysis in foreign language education* (pp.29-52). Shonan, Kanagawa, Japan: Tokai University Shonan Campus, Foreign Language Center.
- Gaies, S. (1991). English language teaching in the 1990s: How will teachers fit in? *JALT Journal*, 13(1), 7-21.
- Gorsuch, G. (2002). Assistant foreign language teachers in Japanese high schools: Focus on the hosting of Japanese teachers. *JALT Journal*, 24(1), 5-32.
- Guest, M. (2000). What's wrong with Japanese English teachers? *The Language Teacher*, 24(1), 30-31.
- Igawa, K. (2007). Professional development needs of EFL teachers practicing in Japan and Korea. *International Buddhist University Bulletin*, 45, 431-455.
- Johnson, K.E. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lamie, J.M. (1999). In-service training with Japanese teachers. In A. Barfield, R. Betts, J. Cunningham, N. Dunn, H. Katsura, K. Kobayashi, N. Padden, N. Parry, & M. Watanabe. (Eds.), *On JALT 98: Focus on the classroom, Interpretation, JALT Conference Proceedings* (pp. 64-69). Tokyo: Japan Association for Language Teachers.

- Matsuda, P. K. (1999/2000). Teacher development through native speaker-nonnative speaker collaboration. *TESOL MATTERS* 9(6). Retrieved May 5, 2003 from http://www.tesol.org/s_tesol/sec_document.asp?CID=196&DID=828
- McConnell, D.L. (2000). *Importing diversity: Inside Japan's JET program*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2002). *Handbook for team-teaching* (Rev. ed.). Tokyo: Gyosei Corp.
- Miyazato, K. (2001). Team teaching and Japanese learners' motivation. *The Language Teacher*, 25(11), 33-35.
- Pennington, M.C. (1998). *Classroom discourse frames*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics (20th, Seattle, WA, March 14-17, 1998). ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 420 200.
- Reischauer, E.O. (1988). *The Japanese today: Change and continuity*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Richards, J.C. (1998a). The scope of second language teacher education In J.C. Richards (Ed.), *Beyond training* (pp. 1-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C. (1998b). Teacher beliefs and decision making. In J. C. Richards(Ed.), *Beyond training* (pp.65-85). Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C., & Farrell, T.S.C. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Riley, P. (Ed.). *Discourse and learning*. London & New York: Longman.
- Roberts, J. (1998). *Language teacher education*. London: Arnold.
- Savignon, S. J. (1991). Communicative language teaching: State of the art. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25 (2), 261-277.
- Sick, J. (1996). Assistant language teachers in junior high school: Do programs stressing their inclusion produce better listeners? *JALT Journal*, 18(2), 199-210.
- Sunderland, J. (Ed.). (1994). *Exploring gender: Questions and implications for English language education*. Hertfordshire, UK: Prentice
- Sturman, P. (1992). Team teaching: A case study from Japan. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Collaborative language learning and teaching* (pp. 141-161). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajino, A., & Tajino, Y. (2000). Native and non-native: What can they offer? *ELT Journal*, 54(1), 3-11.
- Tajino, A., & Walker, L. (1998). Perspectives on team teaching by students and teachers: Exploring foundations for team learning. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 11(1), 113-131.
- Takahana, K. (2008, January 5). Assistant language teachers in trying times. *The Japan Times*. Retrieved August 28, 2008, from <http://search.japantimes.co.jp/print/nn20080105f1.html>
- Tsui, A.B.M. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In K.M. Bailey, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom* (pp. 145-167). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

英語のティーム・ティーチング (TT) を考える： 日本の中学・高校で教える JTE 教員・ALT 教員の場合

井 川 好 二

本稿は、2008 年夏に行われたティーム・ティーチング (TT) に関するアンケート調査にあ
らわれた EFL (外国語としての英語) 教員の見解を報告するものである。調査参加者は、参加
呼びかけに応じ、本研究に自発的に協力をしていただいた日本の中学・高校で教える日本人英
語教員 (JTE) 74 名、外国人の外国語指導助手 (ALT) 31 名の合計 105 名で、ALT の大半は、
英語を母国語とする外国人である。調査結果によると、両グループの教員は共に、TT が生徒
の異文化理解と聴解能力開発に役立っていると考えている。また、TT がうまくいくための要
因として、教師、生徒の双方のモチベーション (動機付け) と、教師の持つ専門的知識・技
術を挙げている。JTE と ALT の TT に関する認識に違いが見られ、それらも併せて報告し考察
する。また、本研究から得られた、より良い TT のための教員研修への提案も、結論に付記する。

キーワード：ティーム・ティーチング、ALT (外国語指導助手)、日本人英語教師 (JTE)、外
国語としての英語教育 (EFL)、モチベーション (動機付け)、異文化理解、教
員研修 (PD)、JET プログラム