

## Part-time teachers developing their coordinators

**Brad Deacon**

*Nanzan University*

**Graham Taylor**

*Nanzan University*

### Reference data:

Deacon, B., & Taylor, G. (2009). Part-time teachers developing their coordinators. In A. M. Stoke (Ed.), *JALT2008 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

### Abstract

Although part-time teachers in Japanese universities assume most of the teaching workload, many program coordinators rarely cultivate the kinds of *learning enriched* school cultures (Rosenholtz, 1989) where all teacher voices are taken into account. Research shows (see Hadley, 1999; Bryan, 2002; Viswat, Duppenhaler, Nishi, & Podziewski, 2003) that failure to include part-timers in curriculum development, and the absence of adequate training provision and support during program implementation, leads to lower morale and poorer quality instruction. In addition, coordinators may be missing out on valuable opportunities to grow and develop without properly cultivating supportive relationships with part-time teachers. This paper considers these factors and focuses on ways that part-time teachers can develop their coordinators when given the chance.

日本の大学では非常勤講師が授業の大半を請け負っているにも関わらず、全ての講師の声を考慮に入れると唱える「相互啓発を推進する学園方針」(Rosenholtz, 1989)にほとんど力を入れていないコーディネーターもいる。ある研究(see Hadley, 1999; Bryan, 2002; Viswat, Duppenhaler, Nishi, & Podziewski 2003)から、非常勤講師を巻き込まないカリキュラム(履修課程)の開発や、不十分な訓練規定および支援下では、非常勤講師の志気低下や質の低い教育を招くことが明らかになっている。さらに、コーディネーターにとっても、非常勤講師との協力的な関係を適切に育くむことなしには、自己発展の貴重な機会を見逃している可能性も考えられる。この論文では、機会が与えられれば、非常勤講師がコーディネーターを開発することが可能である方法について焦点をあてている。

A developing trend in many Japanese universities is the shift from non-existent, or perhaps loose, to more tightly coordinated language programs. This shift is leading away from *learning impoverished* school cultures to the creation of more *learning enriched* school cultures (Rosenholtz, 1989, as cited in Cholewinski & Sato, 2005), where colleagues now collaborate more regularly to develop both each other and their language programs. While such programs can lead to growth and development on many levels, they also present various challenges. To illustrate, part-time teachers, who teach the majority of classes in most programs, often have demanding schedules at multiple schools and may struggle to accommodate coordinators who hope to hold the kinds of regular meetings that are necessary for both initiating and sustaining more learning

enriched school cultures and language programs. Coordinators, too, may find it tough to monitor all part-timers and to provide adequate feedback and guidance for successfully implementing a program. Moreover, coordinators need to be especially concerned with their own professional development since they are the central figures in the program from perspectives such as course design, management, and others (see Stevick, 1980, p. 16-17). Though coordination and coordinator development are challenging endeavors, the potential rewards are worth the efforts.

In this paper, one possibly overlooked and at times unappreciated resource that can facilitate coordinator development, part-time teachers, will be explored. To begin, coordination will be defined, followed by a summary of key theoretical principles specific to program coordination and professional development. Then one author (Graham Taylor, a part-time teacher) will share reflections from what worked and what didn't over the first semester of university teaching at four universities with four different styles of coordination. Next, the other author (Brad Deacon, a coordinator at one of these institutions) will respond and share both qualitative survey and structured interview responses from other part-timers that helped him to grow and develop professionally.

## **Background**

Before proceeding, it will help to clarify the terms coordinated program and coordinator. Evans, Fenning, and Heigham (2007) define a coordinated program as, "a program where teachers teach from common syllabi using the same, or similar, lesson plans, materials, and assessment instruments to reach shared goals and objectives" (p. 51). Coordinators, then, are the "lead teachers" (Brown, 1995) who conduct meetings, draw teachers into curriculum activities, and otherwise assume responsibility for the overall development and ongoing monitoring of programs. Furthermore, lead teachers are responsible for creating a supportive school environment that promotes collaboration and dialogue amongst the other teachers (Karavas-Doukas, 1998).

Coordination also involves adopting an appropriate leadership style for one's environment. Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) described three leadership styles ranging from autocratic to democratic to laissez-faire. Pritchard (2006) noted the awareness that coordinators need of the critical balance between both teacher autonomy and program coordination for creating effective language programs. Kluge (2007) summed up this challenge as being situated along a continuum anchored by freedom on the one side and control on the other. To add yet another perspective, coordination can also be viewed as either top-down or bottom-up in nature. Hence there are various styles of coordination and each leads to vastly different experiences for both part-timers and coordinators. Markee (1997) is not alone when saying that top-down approaches face a greater danger of being rejected in contrast to bottom-up approaches that take into account the voices of all teachers in the structuring and carrying out of program goals. There is a definite need for part-time teachers, in particular, to be meaningfully involved in program development and implementation, and to this end bottom-up approaches are most often preferred (see Lamie, 2005 for a comprehensive summary).

Admittedly, coordinators are faced with demanding program decisions that require a great deal of skill, time, energy, and thought. Coordinating can nonetheless be highly rewarding and offers opportunities to develop leadership, management, evaluation,

and other skills. Coordination affords the opportunity to tackle greater challenges in the profession beyond teaching, as Richards (2001) states, “Teachers need to expand their roles and responsibilities over time if they are to continue to find language teaching rewarding...” (p. vii). To this end, coordinated programs hold great potential for coordinators to take advantage of the “insights, knowledge, and advice of others (to provide) choices as well as stimulation” (Fanselow, 1997, p. 166).

One particularly useful tool for facilitating professional growth is reflection—a point made by Ur (1997) when she wrote, “Most competent teachers will tell you if you ask them that the single most important contribution to their present expertise was reflection on their own experience...” (p. 63, underline in original). Much has been written about reflection, including by Schon (1984), who talked about reflection-in-action, or in the moment as issues occur, and also reflection-on-action, or that which occurs in post-teaching, where teachers can then provide reasons that guided their actions and behaviors after the fact. Reflection as a tool for growth as a coordinator may be most effectively considered as reflection-for-action (Killon & Todnew, 1991)—toward the development of a proactive thinking capacity for the purpose of impacting future action. Reflection can be a useful tool, though it is has limitations, as Ur concludes when writing, “...but to only learn from oneself is limited” (p. 63).

In addition, collegial feedback on our performance can provide alternative insights for reflection and allow us to learn in a more symbiotic manner. In the business sector, upward feedback (Farey, 1993), where subordinates provide feedback to their managers via anonymous questionnaires that suggest areas of strength and weakness, is in many cases leading to significant leadership development (Forbes, 1995). A modified version of this approach has promising potential for part-time teachers to influence their coordinators (Deacon, in progress).

### **Views of coordination from one part-timer’s experience**

Imagine looking for work as a part-time teacher and having four different language programs from which to choose. Choose from one of the following now.

**Table 1. Composition of four university English language programs**

Program	A	B	C	D
No. of teachers	20	10	50	15
Type of student	English major	non-major	non-major	non-major
Level of coordination	high	fair	somewhat	loose

Note: Please use your own interpretation of “level of coordination.”

Now consider the reasons influencing your decision. Did you choose a program most closely matching your present context or are you looking for a change with regard to coordination style? In the remainder of this section, each program is contextualized and reflections are shared from having taught in each situation. Please compare and contrast your own experiences in coordinated programs to determine if there are any likenesses.

### ***Program A***

All textbooks, grading schema, and syllabi are identical across the program. In fact, the syllabi go into such detail that creating lesson plans is unnecessary. All teachers are required to stay for a casual daily lunch gathering to share what happened in class. Coordinators use this opportunity to pass along information, ensure that part-time teachers are on track, and gather feedback in hopes of improving the program for the following year.

Although the rigidity of the syllabi may seem constrictive to some, few could dispute the pertinence and quality of its subject matter—a by-product of years of part-time teachers and coordinators reflecting on failures and incorporating successes. Additionally, suggestions for improvement were elicited from day one. This balance of top-down coordination and genuine bottom-up development has been key to being satisfied as a part-timer and justifies relinquishing complete autonomy when teaching. It is also one of the reasons that the teachers in the program do not seem to feel imposed upon by the mandatory teacher lunch meetings.

Conversely, student assessment is one area of Program A that could be further developed. Grading rubrics were often unclear to teachers and students, who were expected to use them in peer evaluations. Additionally, grading criteria for oral exams were defined only weeks before students were expected to take the exams. Grading criteria need to be defined much earlier so that teachers can help students better prepare for their examinations.

### ***Program B***

In this program, most teachers use the textbook recommended by the coordinator, but some teachers choose alternate texts. Teachers design their own lessons and find themselves covering generally the same material from the text as others using it, even though there is no specifically defined syllabus to follow. In place of a syllabus and a textbook, there is a set of speaking goals, defined within a grading rubric, which teachers need to help students reach by the end of the year. These goals have brought teachers together and have led to discussion centered around teachers' interpretations of how students are progressing in respect to program goals. Indeed, a good number of the activities that are being used are adaptations of activities and materials that other teachers in the program have shared and that have proven effective in facilitating the progress of students toward the goals. Mandatory meetings are held three times a semester for the purpose of program administration and ensuring teachers' impressions of the program goals are aligned. As final examinations for each teacher's students are externally moderated by a partner teacher from within the program, these meetings are a necessity and are twice scheduled during class time to assure attendance.

In lieu of a specifically defined syllabus, the clearly defined program goals and collaborative peers of Program B have offered both freedom and support to experiment with more different teaching ideas than in any other program. Program B has also adopted a bottom-up approach to program development that gives teachers a strengthened sense of value as team members. From day one, the coordinator said, "This is not my program—it's our program" and is constantly seeking feedback from program members.

One challenge has been the unavailability of the grading rubric until partway through the semester. Although the teachers did have a general idea of the types of skills upon which to assess students, it was difficult to know how close or far away from these

goals students were. Even after the rubric was made available, learning how to interpret it also took time. Disparities in student evaluations between the midterm and the final exam may have left some students bewildered as to how their performance ranking could have shifted so far up or down without any significant change in their actual ability. That being said, this is a newly developing program and this problem of access to and use of the grading rubric is less likely to occur again in the future.

### ***Program C***

In this program the coordinator assigned a program-wide textbook and weekly lesson plans based on the coordinator assigned syllabus. With the exception of weekly vocabulary tests, the manner in which the content is delivered is almost entirely up to each teacher. The coordinator encourages teachers to use their own ideas and extra materials as long as they follow the one golden rule: “make sure the activities you incorporate match the goals of the program,” which are broadly defined as preparing students to answer simple questions and discuss simple topics.

The Program C syllabus acts as a supportive framework that helps to guide weekly lesson planning and classroom activity development. At times, the textbook can be too difficult, lengthy, or dry for the students, and it is not always clear how far away from the textbook that teachers can safely diverge. While very prompt with emails, this coordinator teaches on another campus during this part-timer’s teaching day, and so opportunities for face-to-face discussion are rare. Especially during the first semester of teaching, it would have been appreciated to have had more opportunities for access to consulting with the coordinator. On the other hand, in the teachers’ lounge, there are always experienced part-time teachers who have generally been very helpful with ideas, suggestions, and answers to questions about the program. Everyone does seem to have his or her own separate interpretation of what is suitable, and so it’s best to ask around and then build your own summary.

### ***Program D***

Guidelines have been set instructing teachers in this program to include aspects of writing, oral communication, and presentation work. However, aside from an initial face-to-face meeting with the coordinator, there has been no follow-up nor introductions to the other teachers in the program.

While this situation may seem ideal to some, it has been the most difficult program for this novice teacher. Perhaps a lack of experience in being able to judge what is appropriate for students and concordantly develop a suitable syllabus, plays a stronger part for a novice than it would for a veteran part-timer. However, the general absence of input about how to approach classes, in combination with the lack of peer discussion for idea sharing and for fueling self-evaluation, has been detrimental to more effectively teaching these classes. The teachers certainly have thoughts and ideas about how to improve their classes, and also this program, by changing some of its guidelines. Unfortunately, there is no one in this program to discuss ideas with and no one is asking for feedback.

### ***Summary***

While other teachers or coordinators in these same programs may have very different impressions, it is hoped that some discussion about the pros and cons of the different programs has been stimulated.

### **Views of coordination from one coordinator's experience**

The start of the 2008-09 academic year marked a transition point in Nanzan's English Program at Seto (NEPAS) as it moved towards greater coordination. This was a shift from previous years where teachers had been largely autonomous and some classes even mirrored Gossman & Cisar's (1997) description of their earlier program where, "(there was) no concordance between any two classes except by accident" (p. 31). Eager for a new challenge, the author, a full-time teacher, volunteered to coordinate the Policy Studies Oral Communication program that included six other teachers and set to work on the task of co-constructing the program with the other full-time teachers. Although the part-timers had not yet been hired for the program, many important questions demanded attention including: What will part-timers want and need to know? How can they be supported to become better classroom teachers? How can the coordinator ensure that the program guidelines are understood and followed?

Growth as a coordinator came quickly and in various forms. For example, searching the literature for models of coordinated programs provided insights into effective coordination. Other, more experienced coordinators in local schools likewise offered valuable tips. Another rich source for growth soon surfaced in the form of the new part-time teachers. This first became apparent during an orientation meeting to launch the school year when the new Oral Communication program plan was introduced. Bewildered looks and frequent questions from the part-timers made it clear that the plan contained too much jargon (e.g., paralinguistic, shadowing, and timed conversations), too much detail in terms of the aims and objectives of the program, and not enough detail on supporting structures. Thus, the insight learned was that communication should always aim to be clear and concise. Specific ideas for change by part-timers within the program have included alternative textbook suggestions, the adjustment of scales within the testing rubric, and requests for additional training to assess students more effectively.

### **The questionnaire**

To gain greater access into part-time teachers' perspectives on coordinators, a brief survey was distributed (see Appendix 1), and then follow-up interviews were conducted. Feedback on both the Nanzan Policy Studies Oral Communication program and other non-specified programs was encouraged as it was believed that a more diverse range of perspectives would allow for greater comparison, reflection, and growth. In all cases, anonymity in naming either specific people or specific programs outside of the Nanzan Policy Studies Oral Communication program was strictly stressed so as not to inadvertently lead to embarrassment for anyone. What follows are the respective positive and negative themes that emerged through coding along with selective quotes.

#### ***Positive areas***

Coding revealed the following categories that suggested coordinator strengths.

##### *Goals and syllabi*

Teachers tended to appreciate clear program goals and syllabi.

- “Since ‘teach them English’ is such a broad goal, I prefer to have some really clear course goals.”

### *Approach*

Responses showed that a democratic, bottom-up, collaborative program, encouraging a facilitative approach with plenty of opportunities for idea exchange was favored.

- “(He made) me feel I have genuine input into the shape of the course.”
- “If the coordinator has taken the time to put together a well-intentioned program and has also invited feedback from the other teachers in the planning of the program, then chances are that it will run more smoothly for everyone.”

### *Attitude*

Some of the key words used to describe positive coordinator attitudes included: supportive, friendly, kind, caring, demanding (but not overly), encouraging (of risk-taking), and empathetic.

- “Coordinators who showed empathy through sharing their own experiences as part-time teachers have made me feel I am understood.”

### *Availability*

Part-timers appreciated when coordinators were physically present such as in a common room and especially at times between classes, during lunch, and after classes. They most appreciated having coordinators available to listen to their input ranging from concerns to program suggestions, inquiries about procedures, and so on.

- “Be around and listen to your team carefully.”

### *Teacher development*

Opportunities for teacher development included non-evaluative observations, sharing teaching strategies and techniques, open sharing in general, and facilitating any kind of career development.

- “He observed my lessons as a trainer and not as an evaluator.”

### *Materials*

Providing appropriate texts and course activities to match students’ levels and interests were valued. In addition, some busy teachers were grateful when coordinators provided photocopies and also readings that matched their research interests.

- “I know it is not easy, but providing materials that teachers and students like and find useful made teaching and learning more effective.”

### *Meetings*

The presence of regular to somewhat regular meetings to exchange teaching ideas, get to know the other team members, and so on helped the teachers to feel more a part of the community and valued as contributing members.

- “Since we were constantly meeting and talking about our practice, I was able to improve my skills by borrowing from others who were teaching basically the same students in the same context and my teaching improved immensely.”

### *Community*

Many part-timers perceive that coordination can lead to a stronger sense of community.

- “I must say that those experiences where I was valued as ‘Bob’ (a pseudonym) rather than feeling like ‘Bob the part-timer’ have been the most meaningful and rewarding for me because I felt like part of a community.”
- “It’s a lot friendlier and more social than my somewhat loosely coordinated program experience.”

### *Negative areas*

The following categories, which in many cases mirror those above, illustrate commonly mentioned areas that some coordinators need to consider more carefully and develop further.

#### *Goals and syllabi*

Goals and syllabi were categorized unfavorably as fuzzy, or in the worst cases as non-existent.

- “They didn’t have a plan but they had a title.”

#### *Approach*

In general, the teachers were critical of laissez-faire and overly controlling approaches.

- “Sputnik, as I called him, gave no support, had no accountability, and no heart.”
- “Coordination is bad if it is a controlling form designed by people who basically don’t trust their teachers and so try to deprive them of autonomy in lesson planning.”

#### *Attitude*

Negative coordinator attitudes were categorized as condescending, overly prescriptive, and at worst manipulative.

- “When I had a manipulative coordinator I felt unlucky. The coordinator had a choice to fire instructors, but the instructors didn’t.”

#### *Availability*

Quite simply the coordinator was reported as aloof or else ghost-like.

- “Never mixing with part-time teachers.”
- “Never contacting part-time teachers or introducing themselves as the course coordinator.”

#### *Teacher development*

Opportunities for teacher development were non-existent or perceived as a waste of time.

- “I wanted a chance to find out how to teach in the program better like in a workshop or something but never was given anything.”
- “We basically took over the meeting because he didn’t know what he was doing.”

#### *Materials*



The major concern was that materials failed to match the students' levels and interests.

- “Imposed textbooks that were inappropriate and not chosen in consultation with the teachers teaching the course.”

### *Communication*

Two key problems mentioned included communication that was indirect and made through others, and communication that felt blocked in some way.

- “Relied on other part-timers to pass on information about the course.”
- “I didn't like something but I'm not even being given the chance to bring about change, much less express myself.”

### **Discussion**

Morris (1994, as cited in Richards, 2001) noted key indicators of a quality educational institution as follows: program goals are clearly stated, programs are well-planned and balanced, there is a commitment to learning and a high degree of staff involvement in decision making, and concern with teacher development, to name but a few. In contrast, Gross, Giacuinta, and Bernstein (1971) found that program failure was attributable to a lack of: clarity among teachers about teaching roles in terms of what specifically they were expected to help students achieve, skills to carry out their new roles, materials and equipment to implement the plan, training, and feedback to gather a sense of whether or not they were on track with the program. The presence and absence of these and other factors were echoed in the survey results above and suggestive of concrete steps for success-oriented coordinators to consider.

Part-time teacher's feedback, such as the comments above, is a valuable source for coordinator development. How coordinators choose to invite such feedback, either directly or indirectly, will depend on their rapport with staff, comfort level with feedback, cultural background, and various other considerations. In some cases, feedback may be a face-threatening proposition for coordinators and a risky proposition for part-timers. However, listening to part-time teachers is critical to making them feel part of the team. In the extreme, disregarding or marginalizing part-timers will not only lower morale, but will also have other serious consequences, as Brown (1995) succinctly states: “To ignore the attitudes and opinions of any of the groups in a program is at best an act of arrogance and at worst an act of political suicide” (p. 44). To be blunt, “(if) the members of a group do not put aside their rank, the group cannot develop as a whole and will not function effectively” (Richards & Farrell, 2005, p. 55). Perhaps the ultimate way for coordinators to put aside their rank is to invite open feedback on their performance from part-timers.

Furthermore, knowledge alone does not lead to development, and the above insights are not meant to be prescriptive by any means. Nonetheless, coordinators would do well to reflect not only on the insights provided by the part-timers above but more importantly to invite such participation in their own programs. And for the purpose of making such experiences educative, it is useful to keep in mind Dewey's (1933) suggestions to cultivate open-mindedness, wholeheartedness, and responsibility in order to gain greater awareness and access into our assumptions.

A final suggestion for coordinators when weighing feedback is to remember that we are not superhuman and few among us are expert enough to do well everything that strong programs require. One point that became clearer through reflection is that it is

wise to tap into communal strengths and share the responsibilities among all members. To be successful, coordinators must cultivate and develop the various areas of program management and encourage meaningful involvement of all team members.

### **Conclusion**

Program coordinators are responsible for myriad duties that require many demands. However, if they don't step back now and then to not only evaluate the program as a whole but also their own performance, then they will miss out on significant developmental opportunities. When coordinators invite part-timers to share feedback, they have access to multiple perspectives such as those provided by Graham in this article. These perspectives lead to emerging themes that can allow coordinators to reflect more deeply on what they are doing to impact the program in both productive and unproductive ways. Empowered with this awareness, coordinators can then make changes where appropriate. Programs will likely continue to contain varying degrees of coordination along with different benefits and restrictions, but hopefully all will have ongoing goals of self-examination, especially for coordinators.

### **Acknowledgments**

The authors would like to sincerely thank their colleagues and students in the Nanzan English Program at Seto (NEPAS) for their participation and helpful feedback to improve the program. Also, they would like to extend their gratitude to Joseph Sheehan who provided many valuable suggestions to improve this paper.

### **Bio data**

**Brad Deacon** currently coordinates a language program and has been told that he looks like John Cusack. <braddeacon@mac.com>

**Graham Taylor** is teaching in a variety of coordinated programs and was once told that he looks like Prince William. <gtaylor@alumni.sfu.ca>

### **References**

- Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Bryan, T. J. (2002). Integrating part-time instructional faculty members into the department. *The Department Chair*, 12(4), 20-24.
- Cholewinski, M., & Sato, K. (2005). Building a collaborative school culture through curriculum development. In T. Murphey, & K. Sato (Eds.), *Communities of supportive professionals* (pp. 35-45). Virginia: TESOL.
- Deacon, B. (In progress). Hierarchically challenged? Part-timers developing program coordinators.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. Boston: Heath.
- Evans, H., Fenning, A., & Heigham, J. (2007). Coordinated English language programs: Three views. *JALT2006 Conference Proceedings*, pp. 50-64.
- Fanselow, J. (1997). Postcard realities. In C. P. Casanave, & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *On becoming a language educator* (pp. 157-162). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Farey, P. (1993). Mapping the leader/manager. *Management Education and Development*, 24, 109-121.

- Forbes, R. (1995). Upward feedback: The neglected wisdom. *Management*. October, 16-17.
- Gossman, D., & Cisar, L. (1997). Renovating required English classes at Kanto Gakuen University. *The Language Teacher*, 21(3), 30-1, 35.
- Gross, N., Giacquinta, J. B., & Bernstein, M. (1971). *Implementing organizational innovations: A sociological analysis of planned educational change*. New York: Harper Row.
- Hadley, G. (1999). Innovative curricula in tertiary ELT: A Japanese case study. *ELT Journal*, 53(2), 92-99.
- Karavas-Doukas, K. (1998). Evaluating the implementation of educational innovations: Lessons for the past. In P. Rea-Dickens & K. Germaine (Eds.), *Managing evaluation and innovation in language teaching: Building bridges* (pp. 25-50). Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Killon, J., & Todnew, J. (1991). A process of personal theory building. *Educational Leadership*, 48(6), 14-16.
- Kluge, D. (2007). Freedom and control: Administrators, teachers, and learners. Paper presented at The Art of Coordination Conference at Nanzan University, July 22, 2007.
- Lamie, J. (2005). *Evaluating change in English language teaching*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created 'social climate'. *Journal of Psychology*, 10, 271-299.
- Markee, N. (1997). *Managing curricular innovation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morris, P. (1994). *The Hong Kong school curriculum*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Pritchard, C. (2006). Determining the balance between teacher autonomy and curriculum coordination. *The Language Teacher*, 30(6), 9-14.
- Richards, J. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J., & Farrell, T. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenholtz, S. (1989). *Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools*. New York: Longman.
- Schon, D. (1984). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Stevick, E. (1980). *A way and ways*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Ur, P. (1997). Teacher training and teacher development: A useful dichotomy? *The Language Teacher*, 21(10), 59-67.
- Viswat, L., Duppenthaler, C., Nishi, K., & Podziewski, K. (2003). A pilot study on a coordinated approach to language instruction. *Bulletin of the Educational Research Institute*, 23, 79-92.

## **Appendix 1**

### ***Part-time teachers' survey on program coordinators***

1. How many university classes are you teaching part-time now?
2. How many years have you been teaching part-time in university classes in Japan?

3. Underline your preference below for teaching in a (very loose) or (highly coordinated) program.  
(very loose) (somewhat loose) (somewhat coordinated) (highly coordinated)
4. Briefly give some reasons to explain your preference above in question #3.
5. In your experience teaching in coordinated programs, what are some of the things that program coordinators did that helped you to teach more effectively in those programs?
6. In your experience teaching in coordinated programs, what are some of the things that program coordinators did that increased your job satisfaction in those programs?
7. In your experience teaching in coordinated programs, what are some of the things that program coordinators did (or didn't do) that hindered your ability to teach effectively in those programs?
8. In your experience teaching in coordinated programs, what are some of the things that program coordinators did (or didn't do) that decreased your job satisfaction in those programs?
9. What suggestions do you have to help program coordinators to be effective?
10. If you have any other thoughts or comments to share with respect to program coordination in general and program coordinators in particular, please add your comments below.