

## ***A Comparison of the Roles of Two Teachers in a Team-Teaching Classroom in a Japanese Junior High School***

**Naoki Fujimoto-Adamson**

*Tokyo University of Science, Japan*

This study discusses roles and responsibilities of joint teaching by English native-speaking ALTs (Assistant Language Teachers) and JTLs (Japanese Teachers of Language) in English classrooms at Japanese junior high schools. Although there seems to be strong support for team-teaching, there is much discussion surrounding the many difficulties which have arisen whilst conducting lessons. This “intrinsic case study” (Stake, 1995) focuses on the two teachers’ roles and responsibilities in the classroom and investigates discursive classroom practice based on recorded classroom data. A qualitative, discourse analytic approach is used in the data analysis, the findings of which show that, in this case, the JTL takes overall responsibility in the classroom. Also, it is seen that team-teaching is not always performed effectively because the two different interpretations toward the lesson procedure adopted by the JTL and the ALT seem to create confusion for the students and teachers themselves. Consequently, it has been concluded that if the two teachers wish to effectively cooperate, they must become more aware of their own discursive interaction.

This study discusses roles and responsibilities between Japanese Teachers of Language (JTLs) and Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs) in English classrooms in a Japanese junior high school.<sup>1</sup> The guidelines for team-

---

<sup>1</sup> The abbreviations JTL and ALT include teachers who teach not only English but

teaching are outlined by the Japanese Ministry of Education (Monbukagakusho) in its policy document (2002). Although there seem to be many advantages to team-teaching (Sturman, 1989; Miyazato, 2001; Wada, 1992; Wada & Cominos, 1994), many difficulties have also been highlighted in the partnership between the two teachers (Crooks, 2001; Gillis-Furutaka, 1994; Tajino & Tajino, 2000). Using recorded classroom data, this research investigates the pedagogic moves of the JTL and the ALT in the actual team-teaching lesson in order to specify the difficulties arising from the interaction between them. It illustrates such instances by means of an analysis of the spoken discourse which occurs with both teachers and students.

This study will firstly review the literature about team-teaching, critically analyzing various key studies undertaken which can be related to the Japanese context. Secondly, the guidelines of team-teaching provided by the Monbukagakusho policy document will be presented, focusing on the collaboration between the JTL and the ALT in the classroom. This will be followed by a description of my chosen methodology, that of spoken discourse analysis. The subsequent data analysis will present extracts from a transcribed team-teaching lesson in Japan, highlighting some of the significant problems involved in interaction. Finally, my conclusions will focus on the main findings which may possibly find resonance among other teachers and researchers investigating the future development of the classroom relationship between the JTL and ALT.

## **RESEARCH ABOUT TEAM-TEACHING AND THE POLICY DOCUMENT**

### **Team-Teaching around the World**

Team-teaching seems to be regarded as an important issue not only in

---

also Chinese, French, German, Korean and Spanish. For the purposes of this study and because of the confusion of abbreviations in the literature, only the terms JTL and the ALT, both of whom teach English, will be used.

Japan but also in other countries. Martin-Jones and Saxena (1996), for example, examine the relationship between class teachers and bilingual assistants in primary schools in Britain. Creese (1997) also investigates team-teaching in Britain and her study is conducted in secondary school classrooms. She focuses on the partnership between subject specialists and language specialists. Although these two studies were performed in British schools, the topic of collaboration between the two kinds of teachers in the classroom is also a much discussed issue among those involved in team-teaching in Japanese schools. Team-teaching seems to be an international issue, often seen to be a contentious one in which the teaching partnership is affected by the mismatch between national policy guidelines and local realities, or by the difficulties in creating effective working relationships. Those difficulties in the Japanese context will now be examined.

### **Background of Team-teaching in Japan**

Crooks (2001) describes the history and framework of the JET (Japan Exchange and Teaching) Program, which offers the main source of AETs (Assistant English Teachers) in Japanese secondary schools as follows:

The JET (Japan Exchange and Teaching) Program commenced in Japan in 1987, bringing 813 native speakers of English to team teach with Japanese Teachers of English (JTEs). ... AETs are placed in educational centers around Japan to provide native speaker input into English classes at junior and senior high schools. (CLAIR, 2000, p. 7, as cited in Crooks, 2001, pp. 31-32)

According to the Council of Local Authorities for International Relations (CLAIR, 2000, as cited in Crooks, 2001), ten countries (Australia, Canada, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, New Zealand, Singapore, South Africa, the United Kingdom and the United States) are participating in the programme and approximately 5,500 AETs are engaged in English education in the 2000-2001 Japanese school year. This large number of teachers entering the

Japanese school system has naturally led to research being conducted. I turn now to a critical analysis of some of the most significant studies in the Japanese context.

### **Research about Team-Teaching**

There is much research which deals with team-teaching in Japan and can be categorized in two groups. One of them is research which outlines its positive aspects and the second the difficulties of team-teaching. In this section, these two groups of research will be discussed. Then, the importance of using a discourse analytic approach in the investigation about the relationship between the two kinds of teachers will be described.

#### *Positive Research about Team-Teaching*

Wada and Cominos (1994) state the popularity of team-teaching based on statistics which describe the increasing number of yearly recruited ALTs. They also outline the benefits of the JET Program for JTLs, students and local communities which have all had more exposure to the English language as a consequence. Specifically focusing on the language classroom, Wada (1992) points out the more varied methodologies, particularly those which are interactive and communicative, introduced since team-teaching commenced in the late 1980s. Additionally, Wada and Cominos (1994) describe the contribution the programme has made to “the development of pedagogy and to increased international understanding (p. 2).”

Sturman (1989) presents a positive evaluation of team-teaching in research conducted in junior high schools in Koto-ku (a district of Tokyo) entitled ‘the British Council Koto-ku Project’. Although the Koto-ku Project and the JET Program are different schemes, both of them deal with team-teaching between Japanese English teachers and native-speaking English teachers in Japanese secondary schools. Specifically, Sturman (1989) states that team-teaching is effective in increasing the students’ interests and motivation. He

concludes that the Koto-ku Project was successful and “there is so much potential benefit for the students” (Sturman, 1989, p. 76). Miyazato (2001) has expressed a similar view related to team-teaching and learners’ motivation. She states that one positive result of team-teaching is that it increases learners’ motivation, taking findings based on data collected from interviews with individual college students.

#### *Research which Indicates Difficulties of Team-Teaching*

However, there is research which brings our attention to the difficulties of team-teaching as well. Gillis-Furutaka (1994), for example, points out the majority of ALTs’ lack of adequate knowledge of language teaching. In fact, the CLAIR states that recruitment of new ALTs targets recent graduates in their early twenties (CLAIR, 1992, p. 2, as cited in Wada & Cominos, 1994). Gillis-Furutaka (1994) indicates that difficult situations may occur in the team-teaching classroom because of the two kinds of teachers’ different linguistic knowledge:

There is a danger that they [ALTs] and their Japanese colleagues and students may sense a feeling of inadequacy if these different types of linguistic knowledge ... are not acknowledged and understood. (Gillis-Furutaka, 1994, p. 32)

Then she proposes to “introduce more TEFL trained ALTs” in order to share an understanding of language education (Gillis-Furutaka, 1994, p. 41). I also presume that since many ALTs are not trained teachers, difficulties may naturally arise when they team-teach with the JTLs in the classrooms. For this reason, Gillis-Furutaka’s (1994) suggested that the recruitment of TEFL trained ALTs could be a possible solution to improve team-teaching classes. Specific difficulties in team-teaching will be outlined in Section 3.7 Discourse Analysis of Two Transactions.

Kumabe (1996, as cited in Tajino & Tajino, 2000, p. 5) highlights a particular difficulty related to the roles and responsibilities of the two

teachers, in that many teachers (both JTEs and AETs)<sup>2</sup> seem to be confused about their roles and feel anxious about team-teaching. Accordingly, Tajino and Tajino (2000) suggest a possible solution of “team learning” in the team-teaching classroom, linking the roles of the JTL, ALT and the students. Additionally, Eggington (1997, p. 315 as cited in Crooks, 2001, pp. 35-36) outlines some further problems in the relationship between the two teachers by highlighting the ALTs complaints that they are too often employed as “human tape recorders or baby sitters with entertaining games”. This opinion shows that although the JTLs are trained teachers, training is not only needed for the ALTs but also for the JTLs. Crooks (2001) proposes that professional development and professional academic support for both JTLs and ALTs are necessary for team-teaching to succeed. He describes the organization of the in-service training system implemented in Sendai City.

However, the practice of team-teaching in Sendai City still seems to encounter difficult situations in terms of the relationship between the JTLs and the ALTs in the classroom. This appears to occur because of the differences in methodological approaches adopted by both teachers, despite the training scheme for the ALTs.

### **Importance of the Discourse Analytical Approach**

Although the roles and responsibilities of the ALT and the JTL constitute an important factor when investigating team-teaching, research which illustrates their partnership in the classroom by means of analyzing the spoken discourse between them is quite limited. For example, Wada and Cominos (1994) indicate that team-teaching contributes to the development of pedagogy in the language classroom but they do not present any actual data which supports their statement. Sturman (1989) and Miyazato (2001) state that team-teaching is effective in increasing students’ motivation, yet they do not show examples of any actual classroom discourse to support this

---

<sup>2</sup> JTEs and AETs are abbreviations of Japanese Teachers of English and Assistant English Teachers, respectively.

either.

Furthermore, it should be noted that, even though the research illustrates some negative aspects (Gillis-Furutaka, 1994; Tajino & Tajino, 2000; Crooks, 2001), none of the studies presents examples of actual classroom discourse. For this reason, the lack of discourse showing the difficulties referred to makes it difficult to clearly understand how communication between the two teachers is problematic. The presence of real discourse transcripts from classroom situations would enable researchers to more objectively consider solutions to the problems.

Tajino and Tajino (2000) propose the concept of “team-learning,” embracing the involvement of both teachers and students to solve difficult issues in team-teaching in terms of the relationship between the JTL and the ALT. However, I would argue that we need to know the details of what is happening in the classroom before we propose a solution.

Although Crooks (2001) describes the details of the teacher training conducted by Sendai Board of Education, his perspective is fundamentally administrative in nature. It is rather difficult to understand from Crooks’ advice what kind of problems actually exist in the team-teaching classroom and how they are to be solved from a methodological perspective. I would advocate that team-teaching needs to be thoroughly analysed in terms of what constitutes successful and unsuccessful methodological practice before teacher-training programmes are implemented. Teacher training programmes should be formulated according to actual classroom experiences and needs. Without this basis, they run the risk of providing training not suitable for local contexts.

Holliday (1994) also points out the importance of analysing classroom practice when considering the appropriate teaching methodology:

The force of my argument has been that achieving an appropriate methodology depends on learning what happens between people in the classroom. (Holliday, 1994, p. 161)

Figure 1 illustrates this concept very clearly. Holliday (1994) has drawn

attention to the fact that “learning about the classroom is an essential aspect of finding out how to teach (p. 162).”

**FIGURE 1**  
**Components of a Culture-Sensitive Methodology (Holliday, 1994, p. 162)**



In order to find out an appropriate methodology of team-teaching in Japanese English classrooms, I make an investigation of an actual classroom situation. To contextualize this study on team-teaching I will now turn to a description and analysis of the Japanese Monbukagakusho policy document addressing it.

### **Policy Document**

According to the Monbukagakusho, team-teaching in the Japanese English classroom is defined as “the type of team-teaching where a JTL and an ALT form a pair and are present at the same time teaching a class together” (Monbukagakusho, 2002, p. 14). The Monbukagakusho document states that the ALT’s position is that of an assistant and the duties are mainly to assist the JTL (Monbukagakusho, 2002). However, it also emphasizes a high degree of collaboration between the two teachers towards team-teaching as follows:

They plan lessons together, teach together and evaluate the effectiveness of their lessons together. So team-teaching here is a concerted endeavor made jointly by the JTL and the ALT. (Monbukagakusho, 2002, p. 14)

In specific terms, this stance is taken in the pre-lesson planning stage:

Before each lesson the pair should discuss together the aims of the lesson, the materials to be used, and the teaching procedures they will follow. (Monbukagakusho, 2002, p. 21)

Monbukagakusho (2002) also emphasises the high degree of collaboration between the two teachers in the classroom activities:

The JTL and the ALT should always try to assist and support each other in trying to draw out a positive response from the students. (Monbukagakusho, 2002, p. 22)

I will now turn to an account of my research which uses transcribed classroom discourse in addressing the nature of the JLT and ALT relationship in one particular setting.

## **DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF A TEAM-TEACHING CLASSROOM**

### **The Research Aim**

My research is conducted using a classroom discourse analysis of recorded data to investigate the details of one team-teaching situation in a junior high school. Since this research deals with only one classroom analysis, it may be impossible to generalize the findings to apply to all team-teaching classrooms in Japan. However, this classroom analysis illustrates the interaction which can occur between the JTL and the ALT in Japanese English classrooms. As van Lier (2001) indicates, particularization is much more important than generalization when complex classroom situations are examined. This also follows the stance taken by Stake (1995) who outlines the advantages of pursuing localized research in small “intrinsic case studies” so that teachers can better acquaint themselves with the particular issues facing their own

teaching contexts. These contexts can clearly be influenced by national policies and the wider context surrounding that classroom, school, region or country. As Holliday (1994) points out, small events in the classroom can be influenced by the wider social environment. Furthermore, when looking at the importance of small-scale research in helping to understand a wider system, in this case an educational environment, van Lier (2001) states the following:

Research must be aimed at increasing our understanding, both holistically and in the smallest details, of the social setting as a complex adaptive system. (van Lier, 2001, p. 90)

Specifically, this small-scale research may help to increase understanding of team-teaching situations in Japan and provide some indications of how to improve team-teaching lessons in the Japanese context. The findings from this study do not seek to create generalizations beyond the local context, yet they can nevertheless be possibly utilized by other researchers who may find resonance in research conducted in their own local settings. Of perhaps greater usefulness, though, is the potential transferability of the methodology chosen to investigate talk among the classroom participants. It is this methodology to which I now turn.

### **Methodology of the Study**

The analysis of the data presented here is based on a qualitative and interpretative approach broadly aligning itself to the principles outlined in Hymes' (1968) "ethnography of speaking", that is the investigation of communication in terms of "the situations, and uses, the patterns and functions, of speaking in its own right (p. 101)." I have, however, taken the micro-analysis of the talk of the teachers and students as a focal point in my methodology, employing the IRF (Initiation, Response, Feedback) speech coding mechanism of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). This micro-analysis of the classroom participants' talk is then viewed from the wider perspective of

Hymes (1968) in terms of in what precise situations speech patterns emerge from the coded transcripts, how speech is used and what functions it serves.

In terms of the context of my own research, I visited a junior high school located in Nagano Prefecture, which is situated in the central part of Japan. I spent a whole day from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. in the school and I employed four kinds of methods: (1) observations, (2) interviews, (3) audio-recordings and (4) taking field notes. I made observations in the staff room, interviewed the JTL, the ALT and their students, and observed and audio-recorded a team-teaching lesson. When I observed the classroom, I sat at the back of the room and placed a tape recorder at the front of the class. In this study, I mainly use two kinds of data: (1) observation in the staff room and (2) audio-recorded classroom data, both of which clearly illustrate the roles and responsibilities of the JTL and the ALT. I will now move on to an account of the analytical framework employed in the study of the classroom discourse.

### **Analytical Framework**

Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) have established a descriptive framework for analyzing spoken discourse in the classroom. Tsui (1994) summarizes their findings. A typical classroom exchange is made up of three moves “[1] an initiating move from the teacher, [2] a responding move from the pupil, and [3] a follow-up move from the teacher” (Tsui, 1994, p. 9). This three-part-exchange is also called ‘IRF’ and I use this framework of analysis to investigate my classroom team-teaching data.

Also, it has been said that a move is “the smallest free unit of discourse made up of one or more than one act” (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975 as cited in Tsui 1994, p. 9). Sinclair and Coulthard (1975 as cited in Cook, 1997) present a “rank structure” in which there is an order of descriptive units from acts and moves to exchanges, transactions and, finally, the lesson itself. It is the descriptive unit of moves which I shall take as the means to analyze my data.

**TABLE 1**  
**Rank Structure (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975 as cited in Cook, 1997)**

- Lesson
- Transaction
- Exchange
- Move
- Act

### **The Students, the JTL, and the ALT in the Classroom**

The group of students in the classroom were in the second grade and their age ranged from 13 to 14 years old. They started to learn English in the first grade. The JTL was a woman called Ms Suzuki<sup>3</sup>, who already had 10 years experience as an English teacher. She spoke both English and Japanese when she taught English in the classroom. The ALT was a young Afro-American man called Peter<sup>4</sup> who had been working in a few Japanese schools for two years. He had studied English literature and Japanese at a university in America. After graduating from university he joined the JET Program and began to work as an ALT. Although he had worked as a private tutor for international students in America, he had never been trained as a language teacher. The ALT spoke both English and Japanese in the classroom.

### **Pre-Lesson Context**

Next, the background information concerning the team-teaching lesson used for my observation will be described. The team-teaching lesson was arranged for the second period of the day, taking place ten-minutes after the first period. The JTL had a solo lesson for another group of students in the first period, but the ALT had no lesson at that time. On that day the two teachers had no chance to discuss their lesson plan for their team-teaching class except for the 10-minute break between the first and second periods. On

---

<sup>3</sup> The name was changed to maintain anonymity.

<sup>4</sup> The name was changed to maintain anonymity.

close observation, differences between the two teachers' approach to lesson planning and preparation became apparent before the team-teaching lesson. In the staff room during the first period, for example, the ALT did not prepare for the lesson. He read an English newspaper throughout the first period and he did not open the textbook which was intended for use in the lesson in the next period.

In contrast, after the first period had finished, the JTL came back to the staff room and quickly prepared some materials, such as worksheets and flashcards, for the team-teaching lesson. She approached the ALT, who was still reading a newspaper, and explained the lesson plan. She opened the textbook and showed him the relevant pages to be taught, along with the worksheets and flashcards, whilst explaining the overall lesson plan. After that, the two teachers moved to the classroom where they were to team-teach together.

### **The Two Teachers' Roles**

The team-teaching lesson observed can be divided into 11 transactions according to the contents of the activities as follows: (1) Greeting and framing, (2) Introduction of the researcher, (3) Bingo game, (4) Reading review, (5) Pronunciation correction, (6) Review of reading comprehension, (7) Introduction of new vocabulary, (8) Oral introduction of new text, (9) Pronunciation drills of new words (10) Class repetition of oral reading and (11) Finishing the lesson and farewell. (Refer to Appendix for more details.) In this section, I will look at the pedagogic moves of the JTL and the ALT in three of the transactions listed above in the team-teaching lesson.

### **Discourse Analysis of Two Transactions**

This section focuses on the actual discourse between the two teachers and analyze their roles from their discourse performance in the specific transactions. I have selected first two transactions in the classroom, (1) Greeting and

framing, (2) Bingo game, and (3) Oral introduction of new text, in which the ALT's performance is more involved. The rationale for the choice of these transactions is based on the involvement of the ALT in the lesson itself. These transactions involve the ALT most clearly in terms of participation in the team-teaching lesson and also illustrate the nature of the discourse between the two team-teachers and the students.

### *Greeting and Framing*

“Greeting and framing” is the transaction which opens the team-teaching lesson. It is a transaction which demonstrates the two teachers' pedagogic moves very clearly. Before Extract 1 started, there was interaction between the JTL and the students in which they greeted each other in English and the JTL asked a few simple questions to the students in English such as “How's the weather today?” At that time, there was no intervention by the ALT into the interaction between the JTL and the students. Then the interaction between the ALT and the students started, as is illustrated in Extract 1. Although this activity was set up for interaction between the ALT and the students, the JTL sometimes intervened, as can be seen below.

#### **Extract 1**

- 1 ALT: <E> Good morning, everyone.
- 2 SS: <E> Good morning, Peter.
- 3 ALT: <E> How are you?
- 4 SS: <E> I'm fine. Thank you. And you?
- 5 ALT: <E> I'm fine. Thank you. Ah, what time is it?
- 6 SS: <E> It's nine forty.
- 7 ALT: <E> What's the date today?
- 8 SS: ...
- 9 ALT: <E> (Slowly) What is the date today?
- 10 SS: <E> It's ...
- 11 JTL: <E> March ...
- 12 SS: <E> March, fifth.

- 13 JTL: <J> **So dayo ne. Moichido itte miru ka.**  
That's it. Let's say it one more time.  
14 <E> It's March fifth.  
15 SS : <E> It's March fifth.  
16 JTL: <E>Okay.  
17 JTL: <E> (to ALT) What day is today?  
18 ATL: <E> (to students) What day is today?  
19 SS: <E> It's Monday.  
20 JTL: <E> Okay, okay. Sit down.

### Transcription Key

(adapted from Martin-Jones and Saxena (1996, pp. 121-122))

ALT: Assistant Language Teacher  
JTL: Japanese Teacher of Language  
SS: Students in chorus  
<E> beginning of an utterance in English  
<J> beginning of an utterance in Japanese  
...: a few seconds of silence  
ITALICS: translation of Japanese into English  
NORMAL: transcription for English utterances  
BOLD: transcription for Japanese utterances

Although there was interaction between the ALT and the students, there was no follow-up move by the ALT to the students. Instead the JTL performed this move. For example, in line 11, the JTL said “March ...,” which was one of the follow-up moves to the students when they seemed to have a slightly difficult time understanding what the ALT wanted. In line 7, the ALT asked “What’s the date today?” but there were a few seconds of silence, so he asked the same question one more time. Although the ALT repeated the question slowly in line 9, the students could not answer smoothly, replying simply with “It’s ...” as in line 10. The JTL quickly understood the situation and she gave the students a prompt to the answer, “March ...” in line 11. Then the students answered “March fifth” in line 12. This prompting is a teacher-led follow-up move, termed as a “clue,” which

“helps the pupil to answer the elicitation or comply” (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975, p. 19). In essence, it is part of an “insertion sequence” (Schegloff, 1972, p.107) intended as a form of repair to interaction which is thought to have broken down. Later, the JTL’s employed another kind of follow-up move in line 13, one which evaluated the students’ response, but, on this occasion, she used both Japanese and English as follows: “So dayo ne. Moichido itte miru ka. (That’s it. Let’s say it one more time.)”, after which she modeled the complete English answer, “It’s March fifth.” After the students’ repetition, the JTL’s evaluating follow-up move appeared again in line 16, “OK.”

The JTL had not only the responsibility of providing prompting (clues) and evaluating follow-up moves to the students, but also a move requesting the ALT to ask the students a question. In line 17, the JTL said to the ALT, “What day is today?” This was not a question simply asking the ALT about what they had done that day, but one in which the JTL wanted the ALT to ask the students this question. After this request, the ALT asked the question in line 18 and the students answered correctly, “It’s Monday” in line 19. Then in line 20, the JTL’s evaluating follow-up move appeared again, “OK, OK. Sit down.”

According to this data, the ALT’s pedagogic moves seem to be quite limited in scope, such as greeting and asking a few questions, in addition to the fact that there was no follow-up move to the students. While there seemed to be a considerable amount of JTL follow-up moves to the students in the form of evaluation and clues, this took place mainly in the interaction between the ALT and the students. Creese (1997) has expressed a similar view in her discourse analysis of team-teaching classrooms between subject teachers and Language Support Teachers (LSTs) in British secondary schools. Creese (1997) states that “although they [LSTs] contain the follow-up move (feedback) of accepting the answer, the LST does not engage in evaluating or commenting on the answer (p. 238).”

Also, one more significant JTL pedagogic move to the ALT came in the form of a requesting move. In this respect, this may have been an advantage for the students because only the JTL engaged in follow-up moves to the

students, meaning that they would receive consistent evaluation despite the existence of two teachers. In addition, although this event focused on the interaction between the ALT and the students, it seemed to be under the JTL's control because of her follow-up move to the students and requesting move to the ALT. From the students' perspective, such a routinization of turn-taking may have given them a clear sense of what roles were played by each of the two teachers. Furthermore, since language support to the students in the form of clues were provided consistently and exclusively by the JTL, it shows the importance of the JTL's classroom role in the language learning process. Without that support, students may have been unable to complete the tasks.

However, this situation might contain a serious issue as well in terms of the two teachers' relationship. In contrast to the suggestion of the policy document, the interaction observed did not show an equal degree of contribution by both teachers. What was actually seen was the difference in status between them. In this case, we need to consider the influence upon the students as well, because they may not respect the ALT when they become aware of this inequality in the relationship between the two teachers. The next event illustrates the students' attitude towards the ALT in contrast to the JTL.

### *Bingo Game*

After "Greeting and Framing," there came the "Bingo Game." There were different pedagogic moves made by the two teachers in this transaction as well. In fact, the JTL's main pedagogic moves during this activity were concentrated on the preparation and evaluation of the game. In contrast, the ALT's main pedagogic moves in this transaction were the focus on the actual game activity with the students.

The procedure for playing the Bingo game was as follows: (1) the bingo-sheets containing 16 empty boxes were distributed by the JTL; (2) the JTL told the students to write a word in each box; (3) after the students finished writing words in all boxes, the ALT read some words; (4) if the students

found the same word in their box, they had to mark this match accordingly on their sheet; (5) when they reached the point where 'bingo' could be called out, they could get a stamp from the JTL.

Although the two teachers' moves were clearly divided, there seemed to be a degree of misunderstanding between them which sometimes created confusion for the students. In this case, when the JTL told the students to write some words on the sheets, she specified the page number of the textbook and suggested that they select some words from it. At that time, the JTL said to the students in the following manner:

#### **Extract 2**

JTL: <J> **Atarasi tango mo sode nai tango mo irete ii kara. Peter ga itte kureru kara, Peter ga itte kure sona nowo kaite ne.**

You can write both new words and other words. Peter will say some words, so write some words which he is likely to say.

However, the situation arose in which she believed that her partner would naturally consider the students' study progress when he said some words to them in the course of the game. Contrary to this expectation, the ALT's word selection seemed to be completely different from both the JTL's and the students' expectations. This is shown in Extract 3.

#### **Extract 3**

- 1 ALT: <E> Next, 'a'.
- 2 S: <E> Ah?
- 3 ALT: <E> 'A'.
- 4 S: <J> **Naani** ! What!
- 5 ALT: <E> 'A'.
- 6 S: <J> **Uso** ! No, kidding!
- 7 S: <J> **Chotto, nani sore** ! Excuse me. What is that!
- 8 ALT: <E> Hey!
- 9 S: <E> Hey!
- 10 ALT: <E> Next, uh, 'book'.

- 11 S: <J> **Otto** ! Oops!  
12 S: <J> **Yossha** ! Yeah!  
13 S: <J> **Yah, dame da!** Oh, no!  
14 S: <J> **Deru koto jitai ga ayashii.** That's a strange thing to say.

In line 1, the ALT chose the word 'a' and said "Next, 'a'". However, the students could not understand his choice. In line 2, for example, one of the students replied "Ah?". The ALT repeated in line 3 "A" and another student shouted "Naani ! (What!)". Then the ALT repeated it again in line 4, after which a couple of students shouted "Uso ! (No, kidding!)" in line 5 and "Chotto, nani sore ! (Excuse me. What is that?)" The ALT seemed to be upset about the students' attitude and said to them "Hey!" in line 8, but one of the students replied back "Hey!" In line 10, the ALT chose other words and said "Next, uh, 'book'". The students' reply from line 12 to 13 seemed to exhibit the fact that they had either not found the correct word (line 12) or indeed had found it on their game sheet (line 13). However, the student in line 14 showed his suspicion about the ALT's word choice, "Deru koto jitai ga ayashii. (That's a strange thing to say.)"

The reason why this sort of confusion occurred is probably directly related to the ALT's word selection and the students' study progress. The students were in the second year of junior high school and so in their second year of English. The words which the ALT chose in this extract, 'a' and 'book' had already been learnt one year previously, so the students might have thought that it was unlikely for those basic words to be used in the game. Actually, the title of the text was 'Secrets of the Earth' and the content matter concerned the environment. Although the JTL said to the students that they could write not only new words, but also other words which they already learnt before, the ALT could have chosen some words which were much more appropriate for the students' study progress.

This activity shows the clear difference in the two teachers' responsibilities. Although the ALT's main participation had been seen in this game activity, the JTL alone prepared the game. With regard to these different responsibilities, Stein (1989) has expressed the view that a native-speaker teacher's roles are

somehow similar to that of “an entertainer (p. 243).” From this point of view, I would compare the role of the JTL to that of a director who creates a stage for the entertainer. However, despite the efforts of the JTL, Extract 3 illustrates that the ALT could not perform the role of entertainer properly. The reasons for this may be due to lack of pre-lesson planning or experience in this teaching context.

#### *Oral Introduction of New Text*

After the bingo game, there were three reviewing transactions related to the previous lesson. Then an explanation of new vocabulary items was given, such as “rainforest” and “equator” which were to appear in the new text. After this, the ALT gave an oral introduction to the reading theme. This section focuses on how this transaction was conducted between the two teachers and refers to two extracts.

Just before the ALT started the oral introduction to the new reading text, the JTL made a requesting move to her partner as can be seen in Extract 4. The JTL’s request was very detailed, showing picture cards to the ALT in line 2 and the order in which she wanted those pictures to be used in line 3.

#### **Extract 4**

JTL: <E> So, Peter-sensei, please tell us about the rainforest.  
(Shows some picture cards)Using this map and these pictures. OK?  
Uh ..., so, first , this one, use these.

Then the oral introduction by the ALT started. Extract 5 illustrates the last part of the oral introduction. Some problems can be seen in this extract. First of all, the ALT did not seem to know the content of the text clearly and asked about it to the JTL. In line 2, the ALT asked the JTL saying “what does it say?” and the JTL showed the text to the ALT as can be seen in line 3. From line 4 to 12 is the ALT’s actual oral introduction part. It looks relatively long and difficult for the students who had just started to learn English two years

ago, for example, lexical items such as “vegetation” in line 4, “damaging” in line 9 and “natural resources” in line 11. In this case, the ALT employed language above the linguistic competence of the students, resulting in confused expressions on the students’ faces.

Extract 5

- 1 ALT: <E>The rainforest has,
- 2 ALT: <E>(to JTL) what does it say?
- 3 JTL: (Shows the text to the ALT)
- 4 ALT: <E>Yeah, 50 percent of all the earth vegetation and that what makes air.
- 5 So cut down all the rain forest might be more difficult to breath.
- 6 Can’t breath like space. Not quite good. And also, people are
- 7 burning down trees to make farms among other things as well as
- 8 research. So rainforests are very, very important. But we humans are
- 9 damaging the rainforests. Something like, probably we won’t start
- 10 because the government doesn’t really see the need to change the
- 11 electricity or other natural resources of energy which should be easy to
- 12 change.
- 13 JTL: <J> **Ah, chotto muzukashii tokoro mo atta kana?** Ah, there seemed
- 14 to be a few difficult parts, didn’t there?
- 15 ALT: <E>Yes, yes.

The JTL recognized the students’ confusion by saying in line 13 to 14, “Ah, chotto muzukashii tokoro mo atta kana? Ah, there seemed to be a few difficult parts, didn’t there?” The ALT also admitted to this, saying “Yes, yes.” in line 15. After this extract, the JTL completely ignored the ALT’s oral introduction and started another activity in which key words had to be marked in the text.

### Findings from the Interviews

In the post-lesson stage, three sets of interviews were conducted, one with the JTL, another with the ALT, and finally, a group interview with the students. In the group interviews after the lesson, various student comments

reflected a sense of dissatisfaction with the ALT's general teaching performance on that day. One student commented that the ALT's lesson 'staging' (the order in which activities were introduced) was poor. Another complained about the speed of his pre-activity instructions and others noted the differences in pronunciation of the JTL, ALT and the voice on the CD. In separate interviews with the ALT and JTL about the same lesson, the ALT complained of the "lack of freedom" to teach as he wished due to the over-dominance of the JTL. In contrast to this, the JTL did not directly criticize the performance of the ALT, instead sympathizing with him about his limited role in classroom proceedings. Analyzing these two teacher viewpoints, it is interesting to note that, despite the recognition by JTL and ALT of the limitations to his role, both seemed to shape this positioning of responsibilities: the ALT by his linguistic insensitivity, and the JTL by her key interventions in classroom interaction.

## CONCLUSION

This is an "intrinsic case study" (Stake, 1995) which has investigated a specific case rather than making generalizations. Also, as Stake (1995) suggests, this type of case study is "instrumental" in understanding a specific educational issue in a specific institution and classroom. In my case, one junior high school and one classroom were chosen to analyze how team-teaching was conducted. Although the Monbukagakusho policy document recommends a high degree of collaboration between the JTL and the ALT in team-teaching, this particular analysis of an actual team-teaching lesson reveals data which appears to contradict these guidelines. This study has examined the two stages of team-teaching: lesson planning and classroom activity. In fact, in the lesson planning stage, the JTL alone made the lesson plan. This situation is far from the "cooperative lesson planning" (Monbukagakusho, 2002, p. 21) recommended in the Monbukagakusho policy document. In the classroom activity stage, Monbukagakusho (2002)

also encourages the two teachers' equal contribution in the team-teaching lesson in the following manner: "the JTL and the ALT should always try to assist and support each other"(Monbukagakusho, 2002, p. 22).

Nevertheless, in reality, my data shows that although the assistance and support by the JTL to the ALT is seen frequently, there is very little assistance and support provided by the ALT to the JTL. Although Eggington (1997, p. 315 as cited in Crooks, 2001, pp. 35-36) describes the ALTs' dissatisfaction that they are too often employed as "baby sitters with entertaining games," my discourse analysis reveals that even an entertaining role sometimes does not work properly in the classroom.

During the bingo game activity in the class observed, the JTL's roles comprised of all the preparation such as explanation of the rules of the game to the students and description to the ALT how to manage the game. These roles undertaken by the JTL seem to suggest that she played a supporting role to the entertainer. However, the ALT's entertaining role did not always function appropriately in the lesson. Despite the efforts of the JTL, the interaction between the ALT and the students increased the students' skepticism about the ALT's word choice. This may have been caused by the ALT's lack of awareness of the students' linguistic progress. Although Monbukagakusho (2002) states that team-teaching contributes to the improvement of teaching quality, this situation clearly shows an ineffective aspect of team-teaching.

Although Crooks (2001) proposes one solution based on the Sendai City Program which provides teacher training for mainly the ALTs from the administrative view point, as Holliday (1994) suggests, to achieve an appropriate methodology, we need, first of all, to investigate the actual classroom situation. Before teacher training is conducted, I recommend that further team-teaching research be carried out in the form of discourse analysis based on actual classroom data. As is illustrated in my study, such an analysis can reveal significant insights into the roles and responsibilities of the two teachers involved in comparison with the Monbukagakusho guidelines.

## THE AUTHOR

Naoki Fujimoto-Adamson is a lecturer teaching English in Tokyo University of Science, Suwa. She used to teach at several junior high schools in Japan for eight years. She received her MA in ELT from Essex University and is currently an Ed.D. candidate of Applied Linguistics and TESOL at Leicester University.

## REFERENCES

- Cook, G. (1997). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Council of Local Authorities for International Relations (CLAIR). (2000). *2000JET program administrators' meeting material*. Tokyo: CLAIR Publication.
- Creese, A. (1997). *Mainstreaming as language policy and classroom practice: An interpretive study of partner teachers' roles, relationships and talk in multilingual British secondary schools*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.
- Crooks, A. (2001). Professional development and the JET program: Insights the solutions based on the Sendai City Program. *JALT Journal*, 23(1), 31-46.
- Egginton, A. (1997). Looking forward. In Author (Ed.), *The JET programme: Ten years and beyond* (p. 315). Tokyo: Ministry of Home Affairs.
- Gillis-Furutaka, A. (1994). Pedagogical preparation for JET programme teachers. In M. Wada & A. Cominos (Eds.), *Studies in team-teaching* (pp. 29-41). Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, D. H. (1968). The ethnography of speaking. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the sociology of language* (pp. 99-138). The Hague: Moulton.
- Kumabe, N. (1996). ALT donyu ga motarashita mono. (What the introduction of ALTs has brought). *Modern English Teaching*, 33(6), 13.
- Martin-Jones, M., & Saxena, M. (1996). Turn-taking, power asymmetries, and the positioning of bilingual participants in classroom discourse. *Linguistics and Education*, 8, 105-123.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (Monbukagakusho) (2002). *Handbook for team-teaching*. Tokyo: Gyosei.
- Miyazato, K. (2001). Team teaching and Japanese learners' motivation. *The Language*

*Teacher*, 25, 33-35.

- Schegloff, E. A. (1972). Notes on a conversational practice: Formulating place. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 75-119). New York: Free Press.
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1992). Towards an analysis of discourse. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis* (pp. 1-34) London: Routledge.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. London: Sage.
- Stein, L. (1989). Some comments on 'team-teaching in Japan: The Koto-ku project'. *JALT Journal*, 11(2), 239-244.
- Sturman, P. (1989). Team-teaching in Japan: Koto-ku project. *JALT Journal*, 11(1), 68-77.
- Tajino, A., & Tajino, Y. (2000). Native and non-native: What can they offer? *ELT Journal*, 54(1), 3-11.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (1994). *English conversation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- van Lier, L. (2001). Constraints and resources in classroom talk: Issues of equality and symmetry. In C. N. Candlin & N. Mercer (Eds.), *English language teaching in its social context* (pp. 90-107). London and New York: Routledge.
- Wada, M. (1992). T-T no genjo to shorai (Current Situation and Future of Team-Teaching). *Ego Kyoiku (The English Teachers' Magazine)*, 41(7), 48-50.
- Wada, M., & Cominos, A. (1994). Editors' introduction: Language policy and the JET program. In M. Wada & A. Cominos (Eds.), *Studies in team-teaching* (pp. 1-6). Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

## APPENDIX

### Teachers' Pedagogic Moves in the Team-Teaching Classroom

Time	Transactions	JTL's Pedagogic Moves	ALT's Pedagogic Moves
1	1. Greetings and framing	<J/E> Metalanguage to students <E> Greetings with students <E> Asking students a question <E> Follow-up to students <E> Request ALT to ask students a question <E> Giving a clue to students	<E> Greeting students <E> Asking students a few questions

A Comparison of the Roles of Two Teachers in a Team-Teaching

1	2. Introduction of the Researcher	<E> Introducing the researcher to students	
14	3. Bingo game	<J/E> Metalanguage to students Distributing the worksheets to the students <E> Directing the ALT what to do during the game <J> Explanation of the game to students <J> Answering students' questions Monitoring students' activity <E> Asking the ALT a question <J> Monitoring students' activity and giving prizes	<E> Reading some word to students <J/E> Answering a student's question <J> Answering a JLT's question <E> Follow-up to students
4	4. Reading review	<J/E> Metalanguage to students Monitoring students' reading	Monitoring students' Reading
6	5. Pronunciation correction	Writing some words on the blackboard <J> Directing students to practice these words with the ALT  <J> Follow-up of the ALT's pronunciation exercise	<J/E> Metalanguage to students <J> Explanation of pronunciations <E> Model pronunciations of the words
8	6. Review of reading comprehension	Distributing the worksheet to students <J> Explanation of the worksheet Monitoring students' activity <J/E> All-class check of students' exercise	Monitoring students' activity
3	7. Introduction of new vocabulary	<J/E> Metalanguage to students <E> Asking ALT some questions related to new vocabulary <E> Writing new vocabulary on the blackboard	(1) <E> Answering some questions from JTL

		<E> Asking the students meaning of the new vocabulary	
8	8. Oral introduction of new text	<E> Asking the ALT to tell the students about the rain forest <J/NV> Answering the ALT's questions. <J> Comment about the ALT's explanation <J> Directing the students to mark some important parts in the text.	<E> Explanation about the rain forest <E> Asking the JTL a few questions about the text <E> Feedback about the JTL's comment
3	9. Pronunciation drills of new words	<J> Metalanguage to students	<E> Metalanguage to students <E> Model reading of new words <J/E> Correction of students' pronunciation
2	10. Class repetition of oral reading	<E> Requesting the ALT about their roles in model reading of the text. <J/E> Metalanguage to the students	<E> Model reading of the text
1	11. Finishing the lesson and farewell	<J> Comment about the lesson <J> Announcement of today's homework to students <E> Farewell to students	<E>Farewell to students