Articles

What do JTEs Really Want?¹

Wendy F. Scholefield

Charles Sturt University

Team teaching plays a vital role in foreign language teaching in Japan. The *Monbusho* (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology) alone employs over 4000 Assistant Language Teachers² (ALTs); in addition, vast numbers of ALTs are directly employed by cities and schools. A great deal of ancedotal comment has been directed to the role of the ALT, and the type of ALT best suited to team teaching in Japan. Thus far, however, there has been little research to validate such comments. In this project, Japanese teachers of English (JTEs) at 31 junior high schools were surveyed over 2 years via 86 Evaluation Forms (see Appendix 1) to discover what were considered to be the strengths and weaknesses of the ALTs, and what improvements were desired. A wide variety of responses were recorded. Confirming general intuitive notions, the importance of the ALT's personality was repeatedly stressed, as was the motivational impact on students. The one-shot system attracted widespread disapproval. Conflicting evaluation of some aspects, in particular the use of Japanese in school, underscores the importance of both ALT flexibility and JTE clarity in conveying individual needs.

日本の外国語教育では、ティーム・ティーチングが重要な役割をはたしている。文部省 だけでも4,000人を超えるALTが短用されており、それに加えて地方自治体や学校が、多数 のALTを直接、雇用している。ALTの役割と、日本のティーム・ティーチングにいちばん あっているALTのタイプについて、多くのコメント、逸話、個人的な反応などが流布して いる。しかしながら、これらの逸話的なコメントの妥当性についてなされた研究は、これ までのところほとんどない。このプロジェクトは、二人のAETが二年間にわたって訪問し た31の中学校で教える日本人の英語教師に、付録1にALT評価表によって、この二人の AETを評価してもらい、二人の長所と弱点はそれぞれ何だと考えられているか、どのよう な改善が望まれているかを明らかにした。合計86枚の評価表が回収され、反応はさまざま であったが、一般的な直感を哀害きするように、ALTの性格の重要性と、生徒への勤機づ け機能が繰り返し強調され、一回限りの訪問には根強い反対が表明された。人によって評 価の別れる要素、特に学校における日本語の使用に関しては、個々のニーズを伝える際の ALTの柔軟性と日本人教師の明確さの重要性が強調された。

JALT Journal, Vol. 18, No. 1, May, 1996

The large-scale use of native speaker Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs) in Japanese foreign language classrooms began in 1977 with the *Monbusbo* (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology) English Fellows Program; this was followed a year later by the British English Teachers Scheme. In 1987 these two programs were merged to form the JET (Japan Exchange Teaching) Program, and participant numbers have grown dramatically from the nine Americans of 1977 to 4,179 people from eleven countries in 1994 (Juppe, 1994). Still more ALTs are hired by local boards of education and sister-city programs.

The ALT system has generated a great deal of comment and debate in the national press, and in publications such as *The Language Teacher*, the *Team Teaching Bulletin*, and the *JET Journal* (Bauer, 1994). One area of continuing controversy is the ALT's role in team taught classes. The Ministry of Education states that successful team teaching

depends on the frequency with which the students are engaged in communicative activities, and the creative use which the Japanese teacher and the Assistant Language Teacher . . . make of a textbook. (CLAIR, 1992a, p. 7).

However, in reality successful team teaching depends to a great extent on the establishment and maintenance of a comfortable working relationship between the ALT and the Japanese Teacher of English (JTE), within which such team teaching activities can be developed (Bailey, Dale & Squire, 1992; Hanslovsky, Mayer & Wagner, 1969; Shannon & Meath-Lang, 1992). The JTE/ALT relationship is considered crucial for the success of team teaching by ALTs (Greenhalgh, 1993; Sturman, 1992) and by JTEs.3 The literature is sprinkled with anecdotes and comments on how best to develop such rapport. Allen (1972) stresses the need for clear-cut division of responsibilities in the team teaching situation, a factor also emphasised by Stein (1989), Sturman (1992), and Kyoto Prefecture Wakaura Junior High School (1992). However, expectations of ALT contributions vary significantly, from the broad expectation of helping JTEs develop communicative competence (Kageura, 1992) and learn new teaching approaches (CLAIR, 1992b), to reassuring JTEs who are insecure about their English ability (CLAIR, 1992c; Lisotta, 1993), to making English lessons more communicative and "fun" for students (Thorkelson, 1993, p. 66).

In addition to the plethora of educational expectations, there is a range of expectations about the type of person best suited to the ALT role. The Ministry of Education itself recommends that ALTs be positive, flexible, energetic, people-oriented, [and to have] a win-win attitude when confronted with conflict, non-judgmentalness about Japanese culture and customs, patience, a willingness to learn . . . (CLAIR, 1992d, p. 29)

The trait of flexibility is mentioned by researchers (Cominos, 1992), by JTEs (Yamamoto, 1993) and by ALTs themselves (Lisotta, 1993; Scholefield, 1994). Cross-cultural tolerance is stressed by some (Kobayashi, 1993; Nordquist, 1992; Robinson, 1985); others are more concerned that the ALT be friendly (Arakawa, 1993; Kiguchi, 1994).

This small-scale project is an exploration of empirical validation of this range of intuition and anecdote regarding ALT behaviour and classroom roles. The data are based on *one-shot* junior high school ALTs (i.e., ALTs who do not teach regularly at any one school, but visit a large number of schools in a given year) but is considered relevant to all Japanese foreign language team teaching situations for two reasons. Firstly, when *regular* ALTs meet classes for the first time, their position is similar to that of the one-shot teachers. Secondly, strengths and weaknesses which affect the JTE/ALT relationship are likely to be equally pertinent to regular ALTs, although further studies are needed to confirm this.

The Study

The Board of Education in the target location requests JTEs to complete an *ALT Evaluation Form* (see Appendix 1) after each visit by the ALT. From the total number of Evaluation Forms, all those in English (86) were analysed. The forms originated from 31 junior high schools and involved two different ALTs and 121 JTEs over a two year period. The ALTs (one of whom is the present writer) had both been language teachers in Australia before coming to Japan.

The forms required evaluation of the ALT in six categories:

- 1. Strong points (of the ALT's teaching, of the visit in general).
- 2. Weak points.
- 3. Suggestions for improvement.
- 4. What impressed the students the most.
- 5. What impressed the teachers and administrators the most.
- 6. Additional comments.

Results are given as a percentage of the total responses in each category.

The quality of the data was occasionally marred by difficulty in understanding the English written by the JTEs, who might have written more expansively had the option of replying in their L1 been available. In addition, some JTEs appear to have merely photocopied the previous year's report: there were 16 instances of identical submissions in one or more categories about the two different ALTs, with only the pronouns altered from *be* to *she*. This is a disappointing indication that a small number of

| Strong point number of it | tems cited | % |
|--|------------------------|------|
| Teaching strategies [| n = 105; 46.5%] | |
| Clear pronunciation/simple vocabulary & s | syntax 29 | 13 |
| Interaction with students | 14 | 6.3 |
| Teaching skill [not further specified] | 13 | 5.8 |
| Gestures & expressions | 8 | 3.6 |
| Interesting self-introduction [not further spe | ecified] 8 | 3.6 |
| Visual aids | 8 | 3.6 |
| Realia | 7 | 3.1 |
| Student management [including praise] | 6 | 2.7 |
| Use of Japanese | 5 | 2.2 |
| Humour | 3 | 1.3 |
| Previous teaching experience | 3 3 | 1.3 |
| Equal involvement of JTE & ALT | 1 | 0.4 |
| Student response | [n = 57; 25.6%] | |
| Increased motivation | 18 | 8 |
| Enjoyed English class | 17 | 7.6 |
| Understood/were understood by ALT | 17 | 7.6 |
| Felt relaxed | 3 | 1.3 |
| Liked ALT | 2 | 0.9 |
| ALT's personality/appearance | [n = 28; 12.5%] | |
| Friendly/kind/nice/polite approach | 18 | 9 |
| Enthusiastic/positive/cheerful approach | 4 | 1.8 |
| ALT's smile | 3 | 1.3 |
| Flexible approach | 3 2 | 0.9 |
| ALT's eye & hair colour | 1 | 0.4 |
| Lesson content | [<i>n</i> = 33; 9.4%] | |
| Cultural information | 12 | 5.4 |
| Listening practice | 4 | 1.8 |
| Games | 3 | 1.3 |
| Variety of activities | 2 | 0.9 |
| Live example of different language/culture | 12 | 5.4 |
| Total | 223 | 99.6 |

Table 1: Strong Points of the ALT's Teaching and/or Visit

Note: 86 of 86 responded. Because of rounding, the percentage total does not equal 100%.

JTEs were not interested in seriously evaluating the ALT contribution, and thus potentially improving the team teaching situation.

Results

Strong points: As indicated in Table 1, the response rate in this category was 100%, with the 86 respondents mentioning a total of 223 items. These were grouped into five subcategories: teaching strategies; student response; ALT's personality/ appearance; lesson content; and

| 1-shot ALT hard to accept by students & JTEs410Inadequate preparation time25ALT not ready12ALT not ready12ALT rired12ALT staffroom behaviour12ALT's staffroom behaviour12ALT system has too much paperwork12Distance of school from ALT's office12ALT's teaching $[n = 15; 38.5\%]$ 7Unclear/non-American pronunciation25Difficult vocabulary/syntax25Insufficient written work25Student management25Errors in cultural information12Not enough Japanese used12Too much Japanese used12Students couldn't understand25Ability range in class not met12Students noisy12Students noisy12Students tense12 | Weak point number | of items cited | % |
|--|--|------------------------|-------|
| 1-shot ALT hard to accept by students & JTEs410Inadequate preparation time25ALT not ready12ALT not ready12ALT tired12ALT's staffroom behaviour12ALT's staffroom behaviour12ALT system has too much paperwork12Distance of school from ALT's office12ALT's teaching $[n = 15; 38.5\%]$ 3ALT didn't speak with all students37Unclear/non-American pronunciation25Difficult vocabulary/syntax25Insufficient written work25Student management25Errors in cultural information12Not enough Japanese used12Student reactions $[n = 8; 20.5\%]$ 5Decreased confidence25Students couldn't understand25Ability range in class not met12Students noisy12Students tense12 | Problems not related to lessons | [n = 16; 41%] | _ |
| Inadequate preparation time25ALT not ready12ALT not ready12ALT tired12ALT's staffroom behaviour12ALT's staffroom behaviour12ALT system has too much paperwork12Distance of school from ALT's office12ALT's teaching $[n = 15; 38.5\%]$ 7ALT didn't speak with all students37Unclear/non-American pronunciation25Difficult vocabulary/syntax25Insufficient written work25Student management25Errors in cultural information12Not enough Japanese used12Too much Japanese used12Student reactions $[n = 8; 20.5\%]$ 5Decreased confidence25Students couldn't understand25Ability range in class not met12Students noisy12Students tense12 | 1-shot system unproductive [not furthe | er specified] 5 | 12.8 |
| ALT not ready12ALT not ready12ALT tired12ALT's staffroom behaviour12ALT's staffroom behaviour12ALT system has too much paperwork12Distance of school from ALT's office12ALT's teaching $[n = 15; 38.5\%]$ 3ALT didn't speak with all students37Unclear/non-American pronunciation25Difficult vocabulary/syntax25Insufficient written work25Student management25Errors in cultural information12Not enough Japanese used12Insufficient vitures used12Student reactions $[n = 8; 20.5\%]$ 5Decreased confidence25Students couldn't understand25Ability range in class not met12Students noisy12Students tense12 | 1-shot ALT hard to accept by students | & JTEs 4 | 10.3 |
| ALT tired12ALT's staffroom behaviour12ALT's staffroom behaviour12ALT system has too much paperwork12Distance of school from ALT's office12ALT's teaching $[n = 15; 38.5\%]$ 3ALT didn't speak with all students37Unclear/non-American pronunciation25Difficult vocabulary/syntax25Insufficient written work25Student management25Errors in cultural information12Not enough Japanese used12Insufficient vritten work25Errors in cultural information12Not enough Japanese used12Student reactions $[n = 8; 20.5\%]$ 5Decreased confidence25Students couldn't understand25Ability range in class not met12Students noisy12Students noisy12Students tense12 | Inadequate preparation time | 2 | 5.1 |
| ALT's staffroom behaviour1ALT's staffroom behaviour1ALT system has too much paperwork1Distance of school from ALT's office1ALT's teaching[n = 15; 38.5%]ALT didn't speak with all students3Unclear/non-American pronunciation2Difficult vocabulary/syntax2Difficult vocabulary/syntax2Student management2Errors in cultural information1Not enough Japanese used1Realia1Too much Japanese used1Student reactions[n = 8; 20.5%]Decreased confidence2Students couldn't understand2Ability range in class not met1Students noisy1Students tense1Students tense1Complexition2Students noisy1Students tense1Complexition2Students tense1Complexition2Students tense1Complexition2Students tense1Complexition2Students tense1Complexition2Students tense1Complexition2Students tense1Complexition2Students tense1Complexition2Complexition2Complexition2Complexition2Complexition2Complexition2 <td>ALT not ready</td> <td>1</td> <td>2.6</td> | ALT not ready | 1 | 2.6 |
| ALT system has too much paperwork1Distance of school from ALT's office122ALT's teaching[n = 15; 38.5%]ALT didn't speak with all students3Junclear/non-American pronunciation2Difficult vocabulary/syntax2Difficult vocabulary/syntax2Student management2Errors in cultural information1Not enough Japanese used1Realia1Too much Japanese used1Student reactions[n = 8; 20.5%]Decreased confidence2Students couldn't understand2Ability range in class not met1Students noisy1Students tense1Students tense12531253132334141515151525351525353535361737383919110210110210310310310310310310 </td <td>ALT tired</td> <td>1</td> <td>2.6</td> | ALT tired | 1 | 2.6 |
| Distance of school from ALT's office12ALT's teaching $[n = 15; 38.5\%]$ $[n = 15; 38.5\%]$ ALT didn't speak with all students37Unclear/non-American pronunciation25Difficult vocabulary/syntax25Insufficient written work25Student management25Errors in cultural information12Not enough Japanese used12Realia12Too much Japanese used12Student reactions $[n = 8; 20.5\%]$ 5Decreased confidence25Students couldn't understand25Ability range in class not met12Students noisy12Students tense12 | ALT's staffroom behaviour | 1 | 2.6 |
| ALT's teaching $[n = 15; 38.5\%]$ ALT didn't speak with all students3Juclear/non-American pronunciation2Difficult vocabulary/syntax2Insufficient written work2Student management2Errors in cultural information1Not enough Japanese used1Realia1Too much Japanese used1Student reactions $[n = 8; 20.5\%]$ Decreased confidence2Students couldn't understand2Ability range in class not met1Students noisy1Students tense1Students tense1 | ALT system has too much paperwork | 1 | 2.6 |
| ALT didn't speak with all students37Unclear/non-American pronunciation25Difficult vocabulary/syntax25Insufficient written work25Student management25Errors in cultural information12Not enough Japanese used12Realia12Too much Japanese used12Student reactions $[n = 8; 20.5\%]$ 5Decreased confidence25Students couldn't understand25Ability range in class not met12Students noisy12Students tense12 | Distance of school from ALT's office | 1 | 2.6 |
| Unclear/non-American pronunciation25Difficult vocabulary/syntax25Insufficient written work25Student management25Errors in cultural information12Not enough Japanese used12Realia12Too much Japanese used12Student reactions[n = 8; 20.5%]5Decreased confidence25Students couldn't understand25Ability range in class not met12Students noisy12Students tense12 | ALT's teaching | [n = 15; 38.5%] | |
| Difficult vocabulary/syntax25Insufficient written work25Student management25Errors in cultural information12Not enough Japanese used12Realia12Too much Japanese used12Student reactions $[n = 8; 20.5\%]$ 5Decreased confidence25Students couldn't understand25Ability range in class not met12Students noisy12Students tense12 | ALT didn't speak with all students | 3 | 7.7 |
| Insufficient written work25Student management25Errors in cultural information12Not enough Japanese used12Realia12Too much Japanese used12Student reactions $[n = 8; 20.5\%]$ 2Decreased confidence25Students couldn't understand25Ability range in class not met12Students noisy12Students tense12 | Unclear/non-American pronunciation | 2 | 5.1 |
| Student management25Errors in cultural information12Not enough Japanese used12Realia12Too much Japanese used12Student reactions[n = 8; 20.5%]5Decreased confidence25Students couldn't understand25Ability range in class not met12Students noisy12Students noisy12 | Difficult vocabulary/syntax | 2 | 5.1 |
| Errors in cultural information12Not enough Japanese used12Realia12Too much Japanese used12Student reactions[n = 8; 20.5%]Decreased confidence2Students couldn't understand2Ability range in class not met1Students noisy1Students tense12122 | Insufficient written work | 2 | 5.1 |
| Not enough Japanese used12Realia12Too much Japanese used12Student reactions[n = 8; 20.5%]Decreased confidence2Students couldn't understand2Ability range in class not met1Students noisy1Students tense122 | Student management | 2 | 5.1 |
| Realia12Too much Japanese used12Student reactions[n = 8; 20.5%]Decreased confidence2Students couldn't understand2Ability range in class not met1Student proficiency too low for communication1Students noisy1Students tense1 | Errors in cultural information | 1 | 2.6 |
| Too much Japanese used12Student reactions[n = 8; 20.5%]Decreased confidence2Students couldn't understand2Ability range in class not met1Student proficiency too low for communication2Students noisy1Students tense1 | Not enough Japanese used | 1 | 2.6 |
| Student reactions[n = 8; 20.5%]Decreased confidence2Students couldn't understand2Ability range in class not met1Student proficiency too low for communication2Students noisy1Students tense1 | Realia | 1 | 2.6 |
| Decreased confidence25Students couldn't understand25Ability range in class not met12Student proficiency too low for communication12Students noisy12Students tense12 | Too much Japanese used | 1 | 2.6 |
| Students couldn't understand25Ability range in class not met12Student proficiency too low for communication12Students noisy12Students tense12 | Student reactions | [<i>n</i> = 8; 20.5%] | |
| Ability range in class not met12Student proficiency too low for communication12Students noisy12Students tense12 | Decreased confidence | 2 | 5.1 |
| Student proficiency too low for communication12Students noisy12Students tense12 | Students couldn't understand | 2 | 5.1 |
| Students noisy12Students tense12 | Ability range in class not met | 1 | 2.6 |
| Students noisy12Students tense12 | Student proficiency too low for comm | unication 1 | 2.6 |
| | Students noisy | 1 | 2.6 |
| Total 39 100 | Students tense | 1 | 2.6 |
| 10,41. | Total | 39 | 100.3 |

Table 2: Weak Points of the ALT's Teaching and/or Visit

Note: 32 of 86 responded. Because of rounding, the percentage total does not equal 100%.

| Suggestion number of items | cited | % |
|--|---------------|------|
| ALT's teaching [n = 3 | 57; 53.6%] | _ |
| More interaction, with more students | 11 | 15.9 |
| More realia/pictures | 5 | 7.2 |
| More cultural information | 3 | 4.3 |
| More advice/correction to JTEs & students | 3 | 4.3 |
| Improved classroom management | 2 | 2.9 |
| Improved pronunciation | 2 | 2.9 |
| More interaction with non-English-speaking sta | ff 2 | 2.9 |
| More lesson responsibility to ALT | 2 | 2.9 |
| Fewer errors in cultural information | 1 | 1.4 |
| Improved blackboard writing | 1 | 1.4 |
| More games | 1 | 1.4 |
| More individual reading aloud from students | 1 | 1.4 |
| More lesson variety | 1 | 1.4 |
| More natural rate of speech | 1 | 1.4 |
| More use of Japanese in lesson breaks | 1 | 1.4 |
| | 24; 21.7%] | |
| More visits | 11 | 15.9 |
| Less paperwork | 2 | 2.9 |
| ALTs should be experienced teachers | 1 | 1.4 |
| Wider range of ALTs in 1 year | 1 | 1.4 |
| More preparation time between JTE/ALT | 9 | 13 |
| | [n = 4; 5.8%] | |
| Greater awareness of vocabulary lists at each le | evel 2 | 2.9 |
| Greater awareness of Japanese educational syst | | 1.4 |
| Notification of equipment needs | 1 | 1.4 |
| | = 4; 5.8%] | |
| More activities to improve fluency | 2 | 2.9 |
| Teach more communicative expressions | 2 | 2.9 |
| Fotal | 69 | 99.2 |

Table 3: Suggestions for Improvement

Note: 55 of 86 responded. Because of rounding, the percentage total does not equal 100%.

the fact that the ALT was a live example of a different language/culture.

Weak points: Table 2 indicates a response rate of just over 37% in this category, with a total of 39 items cited by the 32 respondents. These items were grouped into three subcategories: problems not related to lessons; the ALT's teaching; and student reactions.

Suggestions for improvement: There was a response rate of 64%, with a total of 69 items mentioned by the respondents (see Table 3). Over half of

| Feature number of | of items cited | % |
|---|-------------------------|------|
| ALT's teaching | [<i>n</i> = 42; 23.3%] | |
| Gestures & expressions | 8 | 4.4 |
| Games | 7 | 3.8 |
| Teaching strategies [not further specifie | d] 7 | 3.8 |
| ALT's use of Japanese | 6 | 3.3 |
| ALT's self-introduction [not further spec | cified] 5 | 2.8 |
| Students' active role in lesson | 3 | 1.7 |
| Clear pronunciation | 2 | 1.1 |
| Praise from ALT | 2 | 1.1 |
| Use of simple vocabulary & syntax | 2 | 1.1 |
| Cultural information | [<i>n</i> = 33; 18.3%] | |
| Not specified | 13 | 7.2 |
| Realia | 9 | 5 |
| Visual aids | 9 | 5 |
| Australian English | 2 | 1.1 |
| ALT's personality | [<i>n</i> = 59; 16.7%] | |
| Friendly/cooperative/kind approach | 25 | 13.9 |
| Enthusiasm | 5 | 2.8 |
| Humourous/enjoyable/relaxed lesson | 29 | 16.1 |
| Being able to communicate with native speak | er [n = 28; 15.6%] | |
| Communicated with ALT | 20 | 11.1 |
| Hearing a native speaker | 5 | 2.8 |
| Understood ALT | 3 | 1.7 |
| ALT's appearance | [<i>n</i> = 8; 4.4%] | |
| ALT's smile | 6 | 3.3 |
| Physical attractiveness | 2 | 1.1 |
| Motivational impact | 6 | 3.3 |
| Talking with students during lunchbreak | 2 | 1.1 |
| ALT's knowledge of Japan | 1 | 0.6 |
| ALT visit personalised English study | 1 | 0.6 |
| Total | 180 | 99.8 |

Table 4: What Impressed the Students the Most

Note: 84 of 86 responded (98%). Because of rounding, the percentage total does not equal 100%.

these referred to the ALT's teaching; other subcategories were the oneshot system itself; the need for more preparation time between JTE and ALT; the ALT's own preparation; and the JTE's own preparation.

What impressed the students the most: Table 4 shows a response rate in this category of 98%, with 180 items mentioned. These were spread across a wide variety of subcategories. However, five subcat-

| Feature number of item | is cited | % |
|--|-------------|-------|
| Teaching strategies [n = | 60; 40.8%] | |
| Knowledge of language teaching methodolog | y 14 | 9.5 |
| Humourous/enjoyable lesson | 10 | 6.8 |
| Simple vocabulary & syntax | 7 | 4.8 |
| Realia | 5 | 3.4 |
| Student management | 5 | 3.4 |
| Clear pronunciation | 3 3 | 2 |
| Professional approach | 3 | 2 |
| Use of praise | 3 2 | 2 |
| Use of communicative English | 2 | 1.4 |
| Use of Japanese | 2 | 1.4 |
| Visual aids | 2 | 1.4 |
| Acceptance of students' simple English | 1 | 0.7 |
| Australian English | 1 | 0.7 |
| No translation into Japanese | 1 | 0.7 |
| Standard English | 1 | 0.7 |
| ALT's personality/appearance [n = | 49; 35.8%] | |
| Friendly/coooperative/nice approach | 28 | 19 |
| Enthusiastic/positive/cheerful approach | 15 | 10.2 |
| ALT's smile | 6 | 4.1 |
| Cultural information | 10 | 6.8 |
| • | = 10; 7.3%] | |
| Increased motivation | 5 | 3.4 |
| JTE reflection on teaching styles | 3 | 2 |
| Positive student response [not further specifie | | 1.4 |
| Interaction with students & staff during lesson brea | | 4.8 |
| ALT's study of Japanese | 6 | 4.1 |
| Effort in understanding & assisting JTEs | 4 | 2.7 |
| Lesson content | 1 | 0.7 |
| Total | 147 | 100.1 |

Table 5: What Impressed the Teachers and Administrators the Most

Note: 83 of 86 responded (97%). Because of rounding, the percentage total does not equal 100%.

egories dominated: the ALT's teaching; the provision of cultural information; the ALT's personality; and the humourous or relaxed nature of the ALT's lesson. Additional subcategories were: the chance to be able to communicate with a native speaker; the ALT's appearance; the motivational impact; talking with the ALT during lunch breaks; the ALT's knowledge of Japan; and the personalisation of English study brought about by the ALT visit.

| Comment number of ite | ems cited | % |
|---|-----------------------|-------|
| Informal comments [n | <i>a</i> = 24; 38.1%] | |
| Thanking ALT | 12 | 19 |
| Looking forward to seeing ALT again | 9 | 14.3 |
| Wishing ALT well | 3 | 4.8 |
| Positive response to ALT's teaching [n | <i>ı</i> = 17; 27%] | |
| Teaching skill [not further specified] | 6 | 9.5 |
| JTEs enjoyed the lessons | 4 | 6.3 |
| Students enjoyed the lessons | 3 | 4.8 |
| ALT's previous teaching experience | 1 | 1.6 |
| Realia | 1 | 1.6 |
| Teaching about Australian English | 1 | 1.6 |
| Use of Japanese | 1 | 1.6 |
| Requests for more visits | 11 | 17.5 |
| Motivational impact on JTEs & students | 5 | 7.9 |
| Extracurricular Activities | [n = 6; 6.3%] | |
| JTEs enyoyed discussions | 1 | 1.6 |
| JTEs enjoyed teaching methodology suggest | tions 1 | 1.6 |
| Post-visit mail contact with students desired | 1 | 1.6 |
| Suggested that ALT play sport with students | ; 1 | 1.6 |
| ALT's friendly approach & smile | 1 | 1.6 |
| Negative response to ALT's use of Japanese | 1 | 1.6 |
| Total | 63 | 100.1 |

Table 6: Additional Comments

Note: 38 of 86 responded (44%). Because of rounding, the percentage total does not equal 100%.

What impressed the teachers and administrators the most: A category by category breakdown of the responses received (97%) appears in Table 5. Respondents indicated 147 items in this category. The two dominant subcategories were: the ALT's teaching strategies; and the ALT's personality and/or appearance. Further subcategories were: the provision of cultural information; the response of JTEs and/or students; interaction with students and staff during lesson breaks; the ALT's proficiency in Japanese; the effort made by the ALT to understand and assist the JTE; and the lesson content.

Additional comments: Table 6 shows a breakdown of the 63 additional comments received, with 44% of those surveyed responding. The majority of these were informal comments. Additional subcategories referred to: a strong positive response to the ALT's teaching; requests for more visits; the motivational impact on JTEs and students; extracurricular involvement; the ALT's friendly approach and smile; and a negative reaction to the ALT's use of Japanese.

Discussion

Strong points

The most substantial subcategory referred to the ALT's teaching strategies, in particular clear and slow pronunciation of English pitched at the students' vocabulary level. Interaction with students was commended, as was the use of gestures, realia, and "exciting" self-introductions. In essence, these responses constitute a favourable reaction to Westernstyle teaching in general, which, according to Ryan (1993) typically attempts to foster enthusiasm and motivation via interesting content and presentation. The positive comments on previous teaching experience and student management skills (2.7%) may reflect approval for ALTs becoming involved in matters (discipline and student management) which the Ministry of Education specifically instructs ALTs are solely ITE responsibility. Of course, in the reality of the classroom, student management in the form of teacher voice variation, body language and facial expression tend to be part and parcel of effective teaching. However, JTEs who rely on the effective communication skills of ALTs for student management are abrogating their responsibilities in the team teaching situation.

The ALT's use of spoken and/or written Japanese as a teaching strategy in class was praised on 2.2% of the responses.

The second largest subcategory saw student response as the strong point of the ALT visit. It is not known how this was judged; some JTEs utilise formal evaluation sheets, but it is likely that others passed on their impressions from informal conversations with students, and even from their judgment of students' expressions and reactions in class. At any rate, 8% reported that students were more motivated as a result of the team-taught lesson; 7.6% reported that students enjoyed the lesson, and 7.6% reported that students understood or were understood by the ALT.

The third subcategory, some 12.5%, felt that the strong point of the visit was the ALT's personality and/or appearance, with friendly attitude at the top of the list. The ALT's smile was specifically cited by 1.3%. One JTE (0.4%) wrote about the ALT's eye and hair colour as the strong point of the visit, an interpretation of *internationalisation* as merely seeing something different, rather than involving cognitive or psychological processes.

The content of the team taught lesson was perceived by many (9.4%) as the strong point, in particular the role of ALT as cultural informant (5.4%).

Finally, a small proportion of respondents (5.4%) felt that the living, native English of the ALT constituted the strong point of the visit.

Weak points

Almost half (41%) of the responses in this category were not directly related to the team-taught lessons. The majority (23.1%) referred to difficulties with the one-shot system and the demands placed on ALTs, JTEs, and students to function effectively without knowing each other well, and being limited to a brief period of time. A few (5.1%) respondents referred to inadequate preparation before the visit. Many JTEs appear to be in a no-win position regarding preparation time for team-taught lessons, desiring more time for such and recognising its benefits, but unable to find time in busy daily schedules for sufficient team preparation. Adequate team preparation time has been repeatedly nominated by researchers and teachers as crucial to the success of team teaching (CLAIR, 1992a). It is clear that a commitment to successful team teaching must include a commitment to preparation time.

The behaviour of the ALT was cited by 7.8% of respondents as the weak point, and points to the necessity of ALTs increasing their awareness of behaviour appropriate to the teaching culture in Japan. Contributing factors to this are the fact that, by the very nature of the one-shot system, all eyes are on the foreigner in the staffroom. To complicate matters, the expectations, status, and role of teachers appear to differ significantly between Japan and Australia. The bind is that the "foreignness" of the ALT is part of the appeal—providing that no offense is caused. The one-shot ALT is in the unenviable position of having to find that balance in as many as 40 different schools, each of which may have a different view.

For 38.5% of the respondents, some aspect of the ALT's teaching constituted the weak point; 7.7% were unhappy that the ALT did not speak with all the students in the class, and 10.2% were unhappy with the interaction that did take place, citing unclear or non-American pronunciation, and the use of vocabulary or syntax that was difficult for students. Interestingly, whereas one respondent felt that not enough Japanese was used in class by the ALT, another felt that too much Japanese was used.

One respondent commented that the use of realia was ineffective, in contrast with seven respondents who considered the use of realia to be

one of the strong points of the ALT's visit, and five respondents who suggested team taught lessons would be improved with more realia (see *Strong points*).

Several respondents (20.5%) referred to the student response as a weak point, in particular that slow learners lose confidence if they are bewildered by the ALT's English, and that in mixed ability classes some students find the ALT's English too easy, whereas for others it is too difficult. Pre-lesson briefing of the ALT might help prevent such problems; ALTs also need to develop the ability to adjust their English to the needs of different classes and students.

Suggestions for improvement

It is heartening to note that the number of responses in this section (69) and the number of *Strong points* (223) both far outnumbered the *Weak points* (39), indicating that, overall, JTEs took a positive view of the team teaching arrangements.

Over half of the responses (53.6%) suggested improvements to the ALT's classroom strategies. Of these, the majority wanted more interaction with more students, a demand which may be difficult to implement, given the class sizes of 35 and above at the junior high school level. It may be useful for ALTs to learn strategies for working with small groups within classes. In addition to meeting JTE expectations, this would have the added effect of personalising the intercultural contact in the classroom. Even if small group work is not possible, the ALT's approach to working with large classes will benefit from a heightened awareness of the need for more interaction.

As mentioned above, more realia was desired, as was more cultural information, and more advice and/or correction to students and JTEs. However, one respondent suggested that the ALT speak Japanese during lesson breaks and lunch times, reflecting a view of English not as a communicative tool but as a *school subject* without practical application. Furthermore, this suggestion does not take into account that Japanese proficiency is not a deciding factor in selection of JET Program ALTs (Juppe, 1994).

Another concern is the suggestion of one respondent that the ALT try not to speak with an Australian accent. This sort of comment shows a lack of understanding and awareness of different English variations and dialects; it is potentially part of the role of the ALT to teach about these differences, and to create a climate of understanding, acceptance, and awareness of the varieties of English spoken in the world today. *Internationalisation* must be interpreted as more than the ability to

Scholefield

comprehend "standard" North American English. With English fast becoming the international language of mediation between countries with different first languages, Japan's English speakers will be dealing with other EFL speakers, particularly in the Asia-Pacific. Becoming accustomed to many varieties of English is thus extremely important.

Improvements to the one-shot system, in particular requesting a greater number of visits to each school throughout the year, were suggested by 21.7% of respondents. In addition, 13% suggested that there be more time for pre-lesson discussion between ALTs and JTEs. It would appear that for the team teaching model to succeed, particularly with one-shots, the preparation for ALT visits must be absorbed by more than the English faculty, perhaps by other staff relieving English teachers of some duties to enable them to attend planning discussions with the ALT. An equal number of respondents suggested more careful separate preparation by both ALTs and JTEs. These comments generally referred to increasing the awareness of the role of the team teaching partner, suggesting that ALTs become more familiar with word lists of each year level, and with the Japanese education system in general, and that JTEs prepare students with precommunicative activities in readiness for the ALT visit.

What impressed the students the most

It should be noted that as these evaluation forms were compiled by JTEs, it is impossible to know how and to what extent student reactions were gauged.

The majority (23.3%) referred to the ALT's teaching strategies, including the use of gestures and facial expression, the ALT's use of praise, and the active role students were required to play in lessons, features which the students may have been unaccustomed to. Six respondents (3.3%) were impressed with the ALT's use of Japanese during lessons, while 18.3% were impressed with the cultural information provided by the ALT, including the use of realia, the Australian accent, and visual aids used to teach about Australian culture.

The friendliness and/or enthusiasm of the ALT impressed 16.7%. Perhaps related to this, 15.6% cited being able to understand and make themselves understood by the ALT, clear acknowledgment of the impact on students of firsthand experience of English as more than a school subject, but as a real means of communication.

What impressed the teachers and administrators the most

This section refers not only to JTEs but also to non-English-teaching staff and school administrators, who on some occasions visited the team-taught lesson, but on others were able only to meet the ALT in the staffroom.

Again, the majority of responses referred to the ALT's teaching strategies, in particular the ALT's knowledge of language teaching methodology, and ability to make lessons humourous and/or relaxing for students. Two respondents cited the ALT's use of Japanese as an impressive teaching strategy; in contrast, one respondent cited the lack of translation into Japanese as the strong point. Similarly, one respondent was impressed by the use of "Australian English" but another was impressed by the use of "standard English".

A substantial number of respondents (35.8%)were impressed with the ALT's personality and/or appearance, with 4.1% specifically citing the ALT's smile. The cooperativeness, flexibility, and friendly approach of the ALT are clearly important for staff who have little opportunity to get to know the ALT and, operating within the time constraints of the one-shot system, must still develop some limited degree of rapport with the school for the team teaching exercise.

The cultural information offered by ALTs was considered the highlight by 6.8% of respondents, reinforcing the response by students and JTEs.

Additional comments

The majority of these (38.1%) were informal, thanking the ALT, wishing him/her well, looking forward to the next visit. Of the more formal responses, 27% were a positive response to the team-taught lessons, including one respondent with a positive response and one with a negative response to the ALT's use of Japanese.

Finally, 17.5% requested more visits by the ALT, and 6.3% of the additional comments referred to extracurricular activities either undertaken by or suggested for the ALT. This may imply a desire for ALTs to become part of the school culture and participate in more than classroom lessons, just like JTEs.

Conclusions

The most striking finding is the importance of the ALT's personality in the team teaching situation. Of course, this is particularly important in the one-shot system, where motivation of students seems to be the primary result. A friendly, encouraging ALT is thus vital for students and for putting JTEs at ease. It should be noted, however, that this demand puts a great deal of pressure on ALTs to be *genki* (lively or outgoing) at all times; to maintain a smile, no matter what happens; to adapt to and accept any situation, no matter how demeaning. Such an expectation shows the need for further education and the development of increased awareness in the area of *internationalisation*, which stresses common humanity as well as the understanding of cultural differences. Thus, it is vital that ALTs consider the teaching of this sort of understanding an important part of their work, while maintaining a tolerant attitude and understanding of the need for an increase in this sort of awareness by Japanese students. The result will be true understanding of other peoples and a more genuine *internationalisation*.

Widespread praise for the cultural informant role of the ALT comes contrary to the expectation of researchers (Cominos, 1992; Juppe, 1993) that this aspect of team teaching should these days be receiving less attention. The emphasis placed on previous teaching experience and classroom skills, supporting an earlier finding by Kawamura and Sloss (1992), gives food for thought to the Ministry of Education, which shows a clear preference for recent college graduates over more experienced applicants (Leonard, 1994). These factors indicate a need for the Ministry of Education to consult closely with JTEs to re-evaluate, and possibly reformulate, team teaching aims and objectives. Until such consultation, the Ministry of Education's selection criteria of ALTs are in danger of becoming an obstruction to the success of actual classroom teaching.

The variety of responses supports the widespread intuitive claim that ALTs must be extremely flexible, as different schools, and different teachers within each school, have widely varying expectations about the role of the ALT. This has been found to be particularly true for the use of Japanese, the use of realia in lessons, and the nature of the English used in class. The use of Japanese is a particularly thorny issue in the team teaching situation. At present, JET Program ALTs are hired regardless of their Japanese ability (Juppe, 1994). While this may make life difficult for them in general, and is certainly a barrier to integration of the ALT into the school as a whole, in the classroom it encourages the use of English for genuine communication. If ALTs use a significant amount of Japanese in the team teaching class their role is reduced to one of cultural informant. The present study does emphasise the importance of this role, but it also indicates the strong impact on both students and staff made by communication with the ALT in English.

It is of paramount importance that JTEs make quite clear to ALTs exactly what their individual expectations are, so that ALTs may adjust to the differing needs of specific situations. ALTs must not assume that each JTE wants the same style of teaching; JTEs must not assume that ALTs know precisely what is expected of them in terms of behaviour and classroom role.

This study has highlighted the need for better training of ALTs before they begin their assignments about the Japanese educational system; the need for the building of awareness and tolerance of the different varieties of English and their cultures, and other aspects of the work of ALTs. Clear communication and friendly, flexible approaches from both ALTs and JTEs will foster successful team teaching and thus, it is hoped, better serve the foreign language needs of students.

Wendy Scholefield currently lectures in second language acquisition at Charles Sturt University, Australia. She was a 1993 JALT Research Scholar, and worked as a JET Program ALT for 2 years, after teaching language to primary, secondary and adult learners in Australia.

Notes

- 1. This research project was conducted with the support of a 1993 JALT Research Scholarship Grant.
- 2. The term ALT (Assistant Language Teacher), used by the Ministry of Education, is used throughout this paper rather than the more commonly heard term Assistant English Teacher (AET). ALT refers all those who assist in foreign language classes, even though most, if not all, ALTs teach English.
- 3. Akita Prefectural Odate Homei Senior High School, 1992; Gifu Prefectural Mashita Minami Senior High School, 1992; Kanagawa Prefectural Ichigao Senior High School, 1992; Kumamoto Prefectural Kumamoto Kita Senoir High School; Okayama Prefecture Sozan Senior High School, 1992; Osaka Prefecture Suita Higashi Senior High School, 1992; Tottori Prefecture Yazu High School, 1992; and Aichi Prefectural Tempaku High School, 1994.

References

- Aichi Prefectural Tempaku High School. (1994). Effective approaches to teamteaching in improving students' reading and writing ability. Nagoya: Tempaku High School.
- Akita Prefectural Odate Homei Senior High School. (1992). *Team-teaching for communicative competence and entrance exams*. Odate, Akita: Odate Homei Senior High School.
- Allen, D.W. (1972). *Team teaching*. (Sound recording). Chicago: Instructional Dynamics.
- Arakawa, T. (1993). Receiving a young man from a foreign country through the JET Programme. *JET Journal*, Summer 1993, 82.
- Bailey, K.M., Dale, T., & Squire, B. (1992). Some reflections on collaborative team teaching. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Collaborative team teaching* (pp. 162-

178). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bauer, C. (1994). Does the Monbusho listen? *The Language Teacher*, *18*(4), 34,35. CLAIR. (1992a). *The ALT bandbook*. Tokyo: CLAIR.
- CLAIR. (1992b). The JET program(me) 1992. Description of service and general comments. Tokyo: CLAIR.
- CLAIR. (1992c). General information handbook. Tokyo: CLAIR.
- CLAIR. (1992d). The JET program(me)-5 years and beyond. Tokyo: CLAIR.
- Cominos, A. (1992). Foreign language education and cultural exchange: Is reconciliation possible in the JET Program? *Japanese Studies Bulletin, 12*(1), 8-22.
- Gifu Prefectural Mashita Minami Senior High School. (1992). Improvement of students' basic communicative competence through team teaching. Gifu: Mashita Minami Senior High school.

Greenhalgh, N. (1993). Where should compromise begin? *JET Journal*, Summer 1993, 67.

Hanslovsky, G., Mayer, S. & Wagner, H. (1969). Why team teaching? Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Juppe, R. (1993). Cutting the tether: Developing team teaching approaches. Bulletin of School Education Centre, University of Tsukuba, 15, 187-203.

- Juppe, R. (1994). Personal communication.
- Kageura, O. (1992). Foreign language teaching in Japanese secondary schools and ALTs' roles. Unpublished paper, JET Program Tokyo Orientation, July 1992.

Kanagawa Prefectural Ichigao Senior High School. (1992). Oral work in the writing classes. Ichigao, Kanagawa: Ichigao Senior High School.

- Kawamura, Y., & Sloss, C. (1992). JTEs and the JET Program: A survey report. *The Language Teacher*, *16*(11), 37-39.
- Kiguchi, Y. (1994). Conversation with an AET. *Team Teaching Bulletin, 2*(1), 4,5.

Kobayashi, J. (1993). Overcoming obstacles to intercultural communication: AETs & JTEs. Unpublished paper, JALT 1993 Conference, October.

- Kumamoto Prefectural Kumamoto Kita Senoir High School. (1992). *How to develop listening and speaking abilities.* Kumamoto: Kumamoto Kita Senior High School.
- Kyoto Prefecture Wakaura Junior High School. (1992). *Final Report*. Kyoto: Wakaura Junior High School.

Leonard, T.J. (1994). Team teaching together. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.

Lisotta, C. (1993). A focus on team-teaching: Teachers and their roles. JET Journal, Summer 1993, 110-114.

Nordquist, G. (1992). Content follows form: The importance of lesson planning in the team teaching classroom. *The Language Teacher*, 16(11), 31-35.

- Nunan, D. (ed.). (1992). Collaborative language teaching. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Okayama Prefecture Sozan Senior High School. (1992). Utilizing team teaching to teach the various skills in English. Okayama: Sozan Senior High School.

- Osaka Prefecture Suita Higashi Senior High School. (1992). In English IIA lessons how should we encourage students to speak English and what should the best lessons be like to improve their English listening and speaking skills? Osaka: Suita Higashi Senior High School.
- Robinson, G.L.N. (1985). Cross cultural understanding. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Ryan, S. (1993). Good teacher, good student: A cross cultural study. Paper presented at the JALT International Conference on Language Teaching/Learning, Omiya, Japan.
- Scholefield, W. F. (1994). JTE attitudes to ALTs: Reflections of a 1-shot ALT. *Team Teaching Bulletin, 2*(1), 10-15.
- Shannon, N.B. & Meath-Lang, B. (1992). Collaborative language teaching: A coinvestigation. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Collaborative language teaching* (pp. 120-140). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Stein, L. (1989). Some comments on "Team teaching in Japan: The Koto-ku Project." *JALT Journal*, 11(2), 239-244.
- Sturman, P. (1992). Team teaching: A case study from Japan. In D. Nunan (Ed.), Collaborative language teaching (pp. 141-161). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tottori Prefecture Yazu High School. (1992). Advice for developing the students' productive abilities. Tottori: Yazu High School.
- Thorkelson, T. (1993). Teaching: performance versus reality. *JET Journal*, Summer 1993, 66.
- Yamamoto, N. (1993). Six months since receiving an ALT. *JET Journal*, Summer 1993, 68.

(Received April 24, 1995; revised August 22, 1995)

Appendix: Sample of AET Evaluation Form'

AET EVALUATION FORM

Name of School: Municipal K J.H.S. Date of Visit: May 28, 1993

1. Strong points: (of the AET's teaching)

The first, the color of her eyes and hair are different from us. It impressed on the students that they can talk with foreigners.

The second, her brief self-introduction and talk about Australian goods is very wonderful. Especially, the students excited Australian dollars and Vegemite.

2. Weak points:

In class, teaching only in English is important. It is very effective to translate difficult words in Japanese in a low voice. But at the lunch time, the students want her to use Japanese a little. The first, the color of her eyes and hair are different from us. It impressed on the students that they can talk with foreigners.

The second, her brief self-introduction and talk about Australian goods is very wonderful. Especially, the students excited Australian dollars and Vegemite.

3. Suggestions for improvement:

At the lunch time, I wish her to talk in English and Japanese, if possible. If so, she will have a much better time with the students and their homeroom teacher.

- What impressed the students the most: Her cheerful personality Australian strange food: Vegemite
- 5. What impressed the teachers and administrators most: Her pleasing personality Her cooperative attitude
- 6. Additional comments:

Thank you very much for your visit. Our students and I had a very cheerful time with you. Especially, Vegemite was very delicous, I think. Please bring Australian money and Vegemite at the next visit. Because the students with Ms. O... will be interested in them.

* Note: This form is reproduced unchanged from the original.



【収録内容】 英語史/文法・発音・磁り/口語体と文語体/地域的・社会的多様性―アクセントと方言/新語・ 隠語・俗語・常套句/専門用語/英語の語彙の膨大な範囲と創造性/文学用語/ユーモア英語/英語学習/世界 語としての英語/英語の未米

