

Globalisation and Its Effects on Team-Teaching

Globalisation and Its Effects on Team-Teaching

By

Naoki Fujimoto-Adamson

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



Globalisation and Its Effects on Team-Teaching

By Naoki Fujimoto-Adamson

This book first published 2020

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2020 by Naoki Fujimoto-Adamson

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-4833-3

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-4833-6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations	vii
Preface	viii
Chapter One.....	1
Introduction	
1.1 Aims and Scope of the Study	1
1.2 Historical Context	7
1.3 Research Questions	18
1.4 The Chapters of this Book	21
Chapter Two	23
Literature Review of Team-Teaching	
2.1 Introduction.....	23
2.2 Team-Teaching in Non-ELT Contexts.....	24
2.2.1 CLIL	25
2.2.2 Partnership Teaching	35
2.3 Native and Non-Native Issues.....	48
2.3.1 Ideology of the Native Speaker	48
2.3.2 English as a Global Language	51
2.4 Team-Teaching in ELT Contexts.....	54
2.4.1 The EPIK in South Korea.....	56
2.4.2 The NET Scheme in Hong Kong.....	59
2.4.3 The FETIT Scheme in Taiwan.....	62
2.5 Team-Teaching in Japan.....	65
2.5.1 JET Programme.....	67
2.5.2 Non-JET Programmes	80
2.5.3 Team-Teaching in the Classroom	87
2.6 Critique of Japanese Policy Documents.....	96
2.6.1 ALTs as Assistants	99
2.6.2 Equal Partnership between ALTs and JTEs	102
2.6.3 ALTs as Teacher Trainers.....	104

Chapter Three	106
Research Methodology	
3.1 Introduction.....	106
3.2 Research Design.....	106
3.3 Data Collection and Analysis Process.....	117
3.3.1 School Access.....	117
3.3.2 Classroom Observations.....	120
3.3.3 Interviews.....	127
3.3.4 Ethical Issues.....	138
Chapter Four.....	141
Findings and Discussion	
4.1 Introduction.....	141
4.2 Sakura Junior High School	142
4.2.1 Participants' Backgrounds	143
4.2.2 Classroom Observation	145
4.2.3 Participants' Perceptions of Team-Teaching.....	160
4.3 Wakaba Junior High School.....	167
4.3.1 Participants' Backgrounds	168
4.3.2 Classroom Observation	170
4.3.3 Participants' Perceptions of Team-Teaching.....	187
4.4. Momiji Junior High School.....	194
4.4.1 Participants' Backgrounds	195
4.4.2 Classroom Observation	198
4.4.3 Participants' Perceptions of Team-Teaching.....	208
Chapter Five	217
Conclusions	
5.1 Introduction.....	217
5.2 Globalisation and its Intersections with Team-Teaching.....	218
5.3 Globalisation and National Policy Guidelines	222
5.4 Globalisation and Team-Teaching Practices	225
5.5 Implications for Stakeholders	230
Bibliography.....	236
Index.....	259

ABBREVIATIONS

AET	Assistant English Teacher
ALT	Assistant Language Teacher
CLAIR	Council of Local Authorities for International Relations
CLIL	Content and Language Integrated Learning
ELT	English Language Teaching
IRF	Initiation, Response, Follow-up
JTE	Japan Exchange and Teaching Programme
JTL	Japanese Teacher of Language
L1	First language
L2	Second language
LET	Local English Teacher
MEXT	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology
MIC	Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications
MOE	Ministry of Education, Science and Culture
MOFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MOHA	Ministry of Home Affairs
NEST	Native English Speaker Teacher
S	Student
SS	Students

PREFACE

This research has its origins in my Ed.D. (Doctor of Education) study at the School of Education at the University of Leicester, where I specialised in Applied Linguistics and TESOL (Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages) from 1999 to 2011. I have taken a particular interest in the area of team-teaching, possibly due to my teaching background since I used to work as a language teacher at state schools in Japan and so was involved in team-teaching myself as a Japanese Teacher of English (JTE) from the late 1980s to the 1990s for almost 10 years. I learned a lot from my colleagues, both fellow JTEs and Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs), the latter of whom came mainly from English speaking countries at that time. As part of that learning experience, I also encountered challenging situations in the working partnership with ALTs and saw first hand how that relationship could shape classroom dynamics between the teachers and students. Under these at times perplexing circumstances, I started to think about actually investigating the nature of this joint instruction between the two types of teachers, specifically, through both a pedagogical and a sociolinguistic lens. My own reading for my studies alongside my own practical experiences in interaction with classroom participants in team-teaching led me to wish to problematise traditional native and non-native English speaker issues in my own doctoral research.

I feel very relieved that this research project has now come to a conclusion in book form after dedicating almost 20 years to studying it. Along the way, I have received support and encouragement from numerous people, especially teachers and students at junior high schools in Nagano Prefecture. Without their generosity, I would not have completed this research properly. Also, I wish to thank various past and present faculty in the School of Education at the University of Leicester; its teachers, students and examiners of my viva played an important role in guiding and developing my understanding of research methodology, specifically, those concerned with the linguistic and social aspects in foreign language classrooms. I would particularly like to thank my previous supervisors, Angela Creese and the late Peter Martin, the internal examiner, Julie Norton, and the external examiner, Adrian Holliday, from Canterbury Christ Church University.

My appreciation is also extended to my family, especially my father, Yasumasa Fujimoto, and my mother, Yoriko Fujimoto, for allowing me to study in England. My deepest gratitude and thanks are for John Adamson, previously my coursemate at the University of Leicester and now my husband, who has always given me constructive advice and proofread the whole manuscript of this book.

Finally, I would like to extend my appreciation to all the editorial staff at Cambridge Scholars for their guidance and assistance in this endeavour.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Aims and Scope of the Study

Nowadays, our society is increasingly shaped by global factors. As numerous researchers (Canagarajah 1999; Canagarajah 2005; Kubota 2015) point out, educational language policy and classroom practices in many countries are also affected by globalisation. Team-teaching in English classrooms in Japanese schools is not an exception.

The aim of my study is to reveal the underlying connections among global issues, national policy-making, and local practices related to team-teaching in the Japanese context. Since the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) Programme launched in 1987, team-teaching between local Japanese teachers and Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs) from other countries in English classrooms has become common practice. This is due to the fact that the JET Programme is one of the largest exchange schemes for language teachers in the world, regarded as a stable programme which celebrated its 30th anniversary in 2017. As a consequence, according to the Council of Local Authorities of International Affairs (CLAIR 2017), there are approximately 60,000 JET teaching alumni around the world. Due to the potential impact on foreign language education and the image of Japan, a

substantial amount of studies have been conducted on the scheme; however, research specifically focusing on globalisation and its effects on team-teaching is relatively scarce.

One notable exception to this paucity is McConnell (2000), an American anthropologist, who investigated the influence of globalisation upon the JET Programme in *Importing Diversity: Inside Japan's JET Program*. This study was pivotal in team-teaching studies in the Japanese context at the time as, after more than a decade after its introduction into Japanese secondary schools, he sought to identify the link between the global economy and the creation of the JET Programme. Almost two decades have passed since McConnell published this work and, perhaps inevitably, the situation surrounding team-teaching in Japanese schools has changed. In particular, although the JET Programme is still the largest scheme with thousands of participants who work as ALTs, JET ALTs no longer represent the major source of ALTs working in Japanese schools. The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) (2016) states that more than 15,000 ALTs taught in Japanese state schools in 2013. However, JET-recruited ALTs were only approximately a quarter of the total, the rest recruited from the private sector or directly hired by local boards of education. Under these more recent circumstances, research which embraces the experiences of not only JET ALTs but also non-JET ALTs from the private sector and other sources is necessary. In response to this vastly changed make-up of ALTs, one of the purposes of my study is to compare and contrast team-teaching practices among JET ALTs and non-JET ALTs.

Regarding research methodology into team-teaching, McConnell used an approach broadly based on anthropology by collecting data from various

stakeholders of team-teaching such as government officials in Japan, JET participants and Japanese teachers of English (JTEs) over 10 years. With these diverse perspectives, he looked at the influence of globalisation on team-teaching practices in a top-down manner from the perspectives of the global economy, international politics between Japan and the United States, domestic politics in Japan, the creation of the JET Programme, individual schools and finally JET participants' personal experiences. One critique of McConnell's study is that actual classroom practice was, although not disregarded, not the main focus in the triangulation of data. I believe that in order to investigate the influence of globalisation in language classrooms, we need to adopt an approach which addresses this shortcoming. Recently, some researchers (Rampton, Harris and Small 2006; Blommaert 2007; Tusting and Maybin 2007; Creese 2008; Copland and Creese 2015) have proposed "linguistic ethnography" to investigate the relation between the discourse embedded in the pedagogies of classroom interaction and wider social contexts. Specifically, Blommaert (2007: 628) states that ethnography "addresses complexity" to effectively reveal the "insiders' view" of the "micro-events" in everyday educational routines, fundamentally a reflexive stance of classroom participants towards their lives. Moreover, Creese (2008) summarises the benefits of linguistic ethnography from an epistemological aspect as follows:

Linguistic ethnography argues that ethnography can benefit from the analytical frameworks provided by linguistics, while linguistics can benefit from the process of reflexive sensitivity required in ethnography. (Creese 2008: 232)

The most significant point in this approach is the “bottom-up orientation” (Copland and Creese 2015: 26), which from its outset focuses on classroom interaction using an analytical framework of linguistics to investigate its relation with social theory. Copland and Creese outline the objective of linguistic ethnography as follows:

Linguistic ethnography links the micro to the macro, the small to the large, the varied to the routine, the individual to the social, the creative to the constraining, and the historical to the present and the future. (Copland and Creese 2015: 26)

Kubota expresses a similar view, saying that “language education is shaped by a complex interplay between policy and practice” (2015: ix). Consequently, she recommends research be undertaken from both macro and micro perspectives. Although in broad agreement with this sociolinguistic approach, in my study, I propose the addition of one more perspective, the “meso” (Kaplan and Baldauf 2003; Rampton, Harris and Small 2006; Tusting and Maybin 2007; Baldauf 2012), which positions itself between the macro and micro. The reason for this perspective is that in order to investigate the complex relationship among team-teachers and their students in the classroom, not only macro but also meso perspectives could be helpful. Although national guidelines exist, the local boards of education in each municipality, representing the intermediary force at play, have slightly different stances towards team-teaching reflected in their recruitment policy of ALTs. In fact, Kaplan and Baldauf describe how “the impact of language planning and policy depends heavily on meso and micro

level involvement and support” (2003: 201), a point which suggests more focus be placed on the institutional forces which receive governmental policy and are instrumental in passing it down to the local schools.

Meanwhile, it has recently been said that educational research needs to be evidence-based, which means “to include speculation based on data rather than personal experience or perceived notion” (Hamanaka 2016: 197, translated by Fujimoto-Adamson). This concurs with the studies on educational leadership conducted by Taysum, who puts forward the concept of “evidence informed leadership” (2010: 1), an approach to management which advises us “how to make informed judgements using evidence when leading in educational settings” (Taysum 2010: 1). Specifically, she stresses the importance for educational management to find the balance of interests for both individuals and society. Important in this managerial construct, Taysum suggests that we need to know ourselves and the roles that we play in society as follows:

This is done by thinking what is best for the individual and what is best for the community/society and finding equilibrium in the balance of interests.

This balance focuses on getting to know the self, and understanding the role the self plays in relationship with the community or communities. (Taysum 2010: 1)

In response to Taysum’s advice to position oneself in relation to the study and research contexts at hand, let me clarify my own position in society. I wrote this book as an educational researcher and ex-state school English teacher now employed in tertiary education. My objective is to find the

balance of interest between team-teaching and what is best for teachers and students in the classroom as viewed from the micro level, for the communities from the meso level of local municipalities, and for the wider Japanese society from the macro level, as influenced by the global economy and international politics.

As can be seen, this book naturally critically reviews the current literature in the field of team-teaching in Japanese schools. From the useful perspective of wider Asian contrast, I also draw upon team-teaching research from other Asian contexts. Team-teaching in English classrooms is widely implemented, notably in the English Programmes in Korea (EPIK) in South Korea, the Native-speaking English Teachers (NET) Scheme in Hong Kong, and Foreign English Teachers in Taiwan (FETIT) in Taiwan. In those countries, team-teaching is conducted between local English teachers and teachers from other countries (mainly English speaking countries), similar to that in the Japanese school context. Further to this Asian contrastive perspective, similar types of joint instruction can be seen in collaborative teaching in British and Australian schools between language and subject teachers and also in European schools in which Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) has been carried out. Therefore, I believe that insights from this particular Japanese context may carry resonance over to a wider audience in different countries around the world in which team-teaching is conducted.

1.2 Historical Context

Taysum highlights the significance of “know[ing] the self” and recognising the role the self plays in wider society when conducting educational research with an emphasis on “evidence informed leadership” (2010: 1). In light of this call for evidence, this section explains the historical background of team-teaching and how such collaborative teaching was introduced into foreign language classrooms in Japan from two perspectives – (1) national history and (2) personal history – to elucidate the position which I played in this particular educational setting.

1.2.1 National History

Team-teaching was introduced on a wide scale in the country after the introduction of the JET Programme. According to the MEXT (2002), there have been some smaller sized schemes providing Assistant English Teachers (AETs) to schools sponsored by prefectural and municipal boards; however, the JET Programme is the only scheme organised by the national government. It represents the largest among all the schemes and involves the employment of the largest number of foreign teachers. Therefore, when the historical context of team-teaching is considered, the history of the JET Programme takes the main focus.

The JET Programme was officially launched in 1987, but surprisingly, the rationale for its foundation was not purely educational due to the influence of the economic and political situation existing between the United States and Japan at that time (McConnell 2000; Imura 2003;

Fujimoto-Adamson 2006; Torikai 2014). In fact, in 1986, just one year before the programme started, there was a conference between the American president, Ronald Reagan, and the Japanese prime minister, Yasuhiro Nakasone, popularly dubbed the ‘Ron-Yasu’ summit. They were said to enjoy good relations, so they often called each other by their nicknames. According to McConnell (2000), during the 1980s there was an on-going trade war between the United States and Japan, a consequence being that the trade deficit for the United States increased enormously, with the trade surplus for Japan gradually expanding. As a result of this increasing friction, the American government put pressure on the Japanese government to purchase more U.S. products in order to balance the trade deficit. McConnell describes an offer from Japan to the United States to address this imbalance during the summit as follows:

... the proposal for the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) Program was first presented as a ‘gift’ to the American delegation... (McConnell 2000: 1)

Torikai (2014) expresses a similar view, admitting that the JET Programme was in principle organised to counter trade friction. Further to this, though, there already existed domestic demand for English education from leading business leaders in the mid-1950s, years before the JET Programme, during the post-war Japanese economic boom. Imura (2003) and Fujimoto-Adamson (2006) indicate that this domestic call for ‘Practical English’ at that time was to equip the Japanese workforce with the language skills required to conduct growing international business during the Economic Miracle period (1950s-1970s). In brief, then, it is important to bear in mind

that the creation of the JET Programme led to the creation of its own valid educational objectives, but it was also strongly influenced by the global economy, specifically, the economic and political situation between the United States and Japan at that time.

When the JET Programme started in 1987, 848 people were selected to participate in the scheme from four English speaking countries: the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand (MEXT 2002). There were two types of position within the programme: (1) Coordinators for International Relations (CIRs) and (2) Assistant English Teachers (AETs). More than 90 percent of the participants were employed as AETs (813), whereas only 35 of them held the position of CIRs. According to Imura (2003), the number of successful applicants for the programme from the United States stood at 470, representing more than half of those recruited. Therefore, the American applicants were prioritised over those from other countries.

CLAIR (2017) reports that the number of the JET participants and participating countries increased drastically over the next 15 years from 1987 until it reached a peak in 2002 of more than 6,000 participants from 40 countries around the world. One significant turning point in the programme was the invitation of language assistants of other languages apart from English. In 1989, for example, German and French speakers were recruited, then in 1998, team-teaching with Chinese and Korean teachers started. Thereafter, those language assistants were called “ALTs”, standing for Assistant Language Teachers, and they included teachers of English, German, French, Chinese and Korean (MEXT 2002).

In addition, one more significant point in the history of the JET

Programme occurred when ALTs were invited from Singapore to teach English in 2000 (Ozawa and McLauchlan 2003), because English is not spoken as a mother tongue in Singapore, but as the official language. When the programme started, the participant countries were only English speaking countries where English is used as a mother tongue. Nevertheless, the invitation of ALTs from a country where English is regarded as a second language, or an “Outer Circle” nation (Crystal 2012: 61; Kachru 1985: 12), could be seen as an attempt to counter-balance the predominance of recruitment from “Inner Circle” countries (Crystal 2012: 61; Kachru 1985: 12) in the scheme. The recent situation of the programme and team-teaching will be explained in **Chapter 2.5 Team-Teaching in Japan.**

After reaching a peak in the number of JET participants in 2002, there was a gradual decrease until 2011 when the number fell to 4,330, which was almost two thirds of the total when compared to the peak year (CLAIR 2017). As for global economic influences, although Japan has continued its surplus in trade with the United States, after 2000, due to the growing power of newly developing countries such as China, Japan started to reduce its market share in the United States (Oizumi 2015). Moreover, due to the sub-prime crisis and the bankruptcy of Lehman Brothers in 2008, a financial crisis hit the global economy (The Economist 2013) causing a worldwide depression, which in turn badly affected the Japanese economy. Compounded with these events, 2011 saw the North East Japan Earthquake and the nuclear accident in Fukushima which impacted the Japanese economy dramatically. Japan’s balance of trade deteriorated and created a deficit for the first time in 30 years, which lasted for four years until its recovery in 2015 (Ministry of Finance Japan n.d.). Of some significance

educationally around this period of time, it can be noticed that the recruitment of JET participants, despite Japan's economic downturn, gradually increased from 2012 to reach over 5,500 from 54 countries in 2018 (Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications, MIC 2018).

At the beginning of this subsection, I indicated that the JET Programme was created in order to reduce Japan's trade surplus, yet the number of JET participants has increased despite Japan's trade deficit. This recent trend is closely associated with domestic education policy. In particular, English education used to begin in secondary schools in Japan but due to the influence of globalisation and internationalisation, "foreign language activities" started in all primary schools from 2011 (MEXT 2016). Currently, unlike other subjects such as science and social studies, "foreign language activities" is not a recognised subject in its own right since there is no exam and pupils are not formally evaluated. Recently, however, the MEXT (2016) has announced plans to elevate its status to make it a subject (English) in 2020 for Year 5 and Year 6, then introduce foreign language activities from Year 3 and Year 4 to younger age groups. Consequently, the demand for ALTs in primary schools will be much higher than in secondary schools. In fact, according to the MEXT (2016: 73), 11,515 ALTs were employed in Japanese public schools in 2014, of whom 6,325 worked at primary schools and 5,190 at secondary schools, including junior and senior high schools. Therefore, more than double the amount of ALTs already worked in primary schools compared to secondary schools in 2014. Kano et al. (2015) predict that the number of ALTs in primary schools is likely to increase more in the future due to the change in educational policy.

This appears as a significant turning point since, in this case, the

Japanese government appears to prioritise education over the economy. However, this trend is also linked to social practice and economic needs because in 2020 Japan will host the Tokyo Olympics, the largest international sporting event in the world, which entails widespread hosting responsibilities associated with the games. Accordingly, nurturing young people with higher language proficiency could offer numerous benefits to the country.

1.2.3 Personal History

In relation to national history, this subsection will outline my own personal background and motivation for embarking upon this research. I was born in the late 1960s during the Economic Miracle period in Japan in a small city called Okaya with a population of approximately 60,000 located in the middle of Nagano Prefecture, a mountainous area situated in the centre of the Japanese archipelago. The city used to be a highly industrialised area in the prefecture specialising in precision industry such as cameras and watches. Reflecting on this local environment, I have a working class family background in which my father was an engineer and my mother was a telephone operator. When I was 13 years old, my father had an opportunity to have some training in the United States for a few weeks, and after coming back, he showed me some photos of some machines in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and of Niagara Falls, which were impressive images from an unfamiliar land. Although I did not go to the United States myself in my own formative years of childhood, his stories and souvenirs from America motivated me to study English as I believed that learning English

would broaden my horizons in life, especially for my future working career.

After finishing secondary school education at the age of 18, I joined a two-year college to take a basic qualification to teach English in junior high schools. Afterwards, I started to work as a supply teacher at a junior high school for 14 months from 1988 to 1990 in Iida, located in the south part of Nagano Prefecture, where I took part in team-teaching for the first time. When I look back to those days, I realise that I had never actually been trained in how to deal with the demands of team-teaching at college before I actually began to teach at school. My training focused primarily on how a single teacher alone engages in dealing with a large class of learners.

Moving to the macro perspective around that period of time, the JET Programme was launched by the government in 1987 to promote team-teaching with Native Speakers (NSs) of English in language classrooms in Japanese secondary schools. My first team-teaching experience in 1988 was just one year after the beginning of the nationwide programme, and I had difficulties with this because, although I had basic training to teach English, there had been no formal teacher training about team-teaching when I was a student in college (1985-1987). However, fortunately, I had a colleague who was relatively good at team-teaching, and he taught me how to write lesson plans in English and invited me to observe his lessons. As a result, I had a sort of informal training at the workplace. I also participated in a seminar for young teachers held by the local Prefectural Board of Education and had a chance to gain insights into how team-teaching was conducted in different schools in the region. Nevertheless, I have to admit that team-teaching with an AET from an English speaking country was quite a challenging experience for me at that time.

During my contract as a supply teacher, I simultaneously took a distance course at a university for a bachelor's degree in English literature, which also involved a higher qualification to teach English at secondary schools with the status of a university graduate. However, as in my college days, I noticed that there was no special training for team-teaching at university as teacher training focused primarily on solo lessons. After receiving a higher qualification of English teaching, I was officially hired as a state school teacher in 1991 and worked until 1998 for seven years at three different schools in Nagano Prefecture. Each school had a slightly different system of team-teaching because although the JET Programme is organised nationally, municipalities are usually responsible for its finance and management (McConnell 2000; MEXT 2002). Also, some municipalities do not use the JET Programme and have their own sources for recruiting ALTs (Ozawa and McLauchlan 2003; Kano et al. 2015). In fact, of all the four schools I worked in over eight years, team-teachers in three of them were non-JET ALTs from different schemes; only in one school was the AET hired from the JET Programme. This is indicative of a quite complicated political and economic situation surrounding team-teaching recruitment as shared between the national government and the local municipality level.

The frequency of team-teaching also changed from the late 1980s to the 1990s. When I worked from 1988 to 1990 as a supply teacher, there were more than ten Junior High Schools (JHSs) where I taught and only one ALT visited all schools. In this case, the ALT worked in each school in the area for about a month a year, meaning that, at that time, I only team-taught for a limited period of time in a year. Later, however, the frequency of my team-teaching lessons gradually increased. In fact, in my last year as a state school

teacher from 1997 to 1998, team-teaching was basically scheduled the whole year round because there was only one school in the town and an ALT from the JET Programme was permanently stationed in the school, meaning that she did not need to visit any other schools. Consequently, team-teaching lessons became a much more regular feature of the English curriculum compared to before.

On reflection, I learned a lot from team-teaching, one of the biggest benefits being that I needed to use English for communicative purposes at the workplace. When I taught solo lessons, I alone focused on encouraging students to use English as a means of communication, as well as on preparing them for the obligatory entrance examinations to go to high schools. This was a time in which I was the model of English use to my students. In contrast, when I team-taught with an ALT, my own use of English carried with it another meaning; that is, I had to use the language as a tool to communicate with the ALT, such as writing a lesson plan in English and discussing the plan in English. I also had to talk in English with the ALT in front of the students during the lesson. Significantly, in this new context, the model of English in front of students represented a shift to the interaction between myself, as former sole Japanese model of an English-speaker, and a native-English speaking foreigner.

In terms of the partnership with ALTs, many facets of the relationship depended on the teachers themselves, rather than the national guidelines set down for us. All ALTs that I team-taught with for eight years were from English speaking countries such as Australia, the United States, Britain, New Zealand and Canada. I should admit that I sometimes had a relatively smooth relationship with most ALTs but I could not get on very well with

others. At that time, I felt these discrepancies might have been due to various factors concerning the academic background and work experience of the ALTs themselves. However, there was another case in which an ALT with whom I did not get on very well had a good relationship with another Japanese colleague. As a consequence, I noticed that it was not only the individual background of the ALTs that influenced the partnership of team-teaching, but also the background of the Japanese teachers. For this reason, I realised that the highly contextualised personal chemistry between the Japanese teacher and the ALT needs to be considered. It is to that contextualisation that this research now turns.

Concerning the relation between foreign language education and social practice, I highlighted the possible link between recent English language policy in primary schools and the Tokyo Olympics in 2020 in the previous subsection, **1.2.1 National History**. Actually, I can also see the resonance between the Winter Olympics in Nagano in 1998 and its education policy in the city. In fact, I was working as a state school teacher in Nagano Prefecture during that time and so recognised the strong influence of the international sporting event upon the local community. In particular, there was a special activity called the '*Ikko Ikkoku Undo*' ('One School One Country Campaign') during the Olympics. In this campaign, each school was coupled with a specific country's athletes to support, and students learned its culture and language in order to interact with athletes and people from the country (Asahi 2007). Saito (1998) reported that 77 schools in Nagano City including both primary and secondary schools were involved in the campaign. Apparently, the activity was successful and highly evaluated as a grassroots international exchange by the International Olympic Committee

(IOC), to such an extent that it was carried over to subsequent Olympics such as Sydney in 2000, Salt Lake City in 2002 and Turin in 2006 (Asahi 2007).

Going back to my own experience during this time, I started to take voluntary training to be an interpreter, organised by the prefecture, in 1994 twice a month for three years before the Olympics. Then, during the Nagano Olympics themselves, I had a chance to work as a volunteer interpreter for cultural events such as introducing the kimono (a traditional Japanese costume) to athletes and young people participating in the Youth Camp. Accordingly, I realised that foreign language education in the local community and social practice were closely associated with each other.

After the Winter Olympics in 1998, I resigned from my job as a school teacher as I had decided to undertake postgraduate studies in England. At that time I was 30 years old, so I wished to take further academic qualifications to improve my career prospects. I studied for an MA in English Language Teaching (ELT) at the University of Essex (1998-1999) and for a Doctorate in Education (Ed.D.) in Applied Linguistics and TESOL at the University of Leicester (1999-2002). I naturally chose team-teaching as my research topic since I was practically engaged in this topic. When I was a doctoral student in 2002, I went back to Japan to work in tertiary education and started to give academic presentations and publish my Ed.D. assignments written at the University of Leicester. Around that time, I was also invited as an instructor for teacher development seminars organised by local teaching associations and had opportunities to share my knowledge about team-teaching research I had acquired during my postgraduate studies at British universities.

1.3 Research Questions

In light of my own experiences in team-teaching both on a practical and academic level, I have chosen to investigate the following three research questions:

- (1) What is the purpose of team-teaching as seen through macro, meso and micro lenses?
- (2) To what extent are the national policy guidelines concerning the roles and responsibilities of JTEs and ALTs in team-teaching shaped by local practices and global influences?
- (3) Comparing team-teaching practices at three schools, what similarities and differences exist in the roles and responsibilities of the JTEs and ALTs in terms of communities of practice, and how do they affect pedagogic interaction?

The reason for choosing the first question is that since its inauguration and my early involvement in the programme on a practical level, I have been interested in the circumstances surrounding the creation of the JET Programme, as it has become apparent that it was closely related to global economic issues and international politics in the 1980s. I myself did not initially know about such connections between globalisation and this educational exchange scheme at that time. Only whilst studying as an MA student at Essex University (1998-1999) did I have a chance to talk with a colleague studying at another university in Britain. Since I was writing my MA dissertation on team-teaching in Japanese secondary schools at that

time, we discussed issues surrounding its inauguration in depth. She put forward the premise that the JET Programme had been started in order to reduce Japan's trade surplus, a view which shocked me, because as an MA student, my team-teaching research was focused solely upon educational issues of internal school and classroom policies. As a consequence of this limited awareness, I had never imagined including global economic affairs and politics in my pedagogy-gearred team-teaching study. Soon thereafter, upon becoming an Ed.D. student at the University of Leicester, I read about the team-teaching research conducted by McConnell (2000) and realised the importance of conducting research on both micro and macro levels. In addition, on reflection at that period of time, when I looked back on my own team-teaching experience working at some schools located in different municipalities, I recognised the differences in ALT employment policies. Consequently, as a supplement to the micro and macro levels of analysis, I noticed that viewing team-teaching policy and practice through a meso perspective would also provide significant insights. Accordingly, the purposes of team-teaching as analysed through macro, meso and micro lenses are investigated in this current study.

The second research question is an analysis of the national policy guidelines concerning the roles and responsibilities of JTEs and ALTs in team-teaching. Seven years after the introduction of the JET Programme, the Japanese Ministry of Education (MOE, now called the MEXT) issued national policy guidelines for team-teaching entitled *Handbook for Team-teaching* (1994). Later, in 2002, the handbook was revised in a minor manner in that the foreign teachers formerly known as Assistant English Teachers (AETs) were renamed as Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs); the

policy guidelines, however, remained fundamentally the same, so I mainly used this revised version for my analysis. While I was an Ed.D. student at the University of Leicester, I wrote an assignment on the analysis of the national policy guidelines regarding teacher partnership in team-teaching, which was published in an academic journal in 2003. At that time, I recognised contradictory elements in the relationship between JTEs and ALTs, since the guidelines generally describe ALTs as assistants yet sometimes stress their equality with JTEs as fellow teachers, even elevating their status to that of teacher trainers. As a postgraduate student, I could not clarify the reason for this contradiction, but now I am trying to explore it by analysing aspects of local practice and global influences which may lead to such diversity and discrepancies.

Finally, the third research question concerns team-teaching practices investigating the roles and responsibilities of the two types of teachers in the classroom. The main data was collected at three local schools in Nagano Prefecture from late 2008 to early 2009 over four months, employing the triangulation of findings from classroom observation and interviews with the JTEs, ALTs and their students. Moreover, the author's interpretation is included during the data analysis process, since, being a researcher who has studied this topic for almost two decades and an ex-state school teacher actually involved in team-teaching, I am aware of both *etic* and *emic* issues in this field. Stake defines "etic issues" as "researcher's issues", or, more specifically, "issues of a larger research community, colleagues and writers" (Stake 1995: 20), providing important objective and outsider perspectives. In contrast, "emic issues" are explained as "issues of the actors, the people who belong to the case" (Stake 1995: 20) which encapsulate subjective and