

6.

Contents and Activities in Team Teaching: Lessons from Observation

RICHARD C. SMITH

Introduction

What actually goes on in team taught English lessons? Although there has been much general discussion in recent years of how team teaching should or should not be carried out in the Japanese secondary school context (cf. Wada, 1987; Shimaoka & Yashiro, 1990; and Brumby & Wada, 1990, for substantial and useful contributions; also, many of the articles in Yohay, 1988; and Cominos, 1992), there has to date been very little empirical, classroom-based research, other than of an anecdotal nature, into how particular team teachers actually go about planning and performing lessons together. Recently, however, reports by Sturman (1992) and Kahny et al. (1992) have indicated a shift in emphasis away from prescription towards description (of small-scale programs), while studies by Yukawa (1992) and Garant (1992) have been based on classroom observation of individual team teachers. At the same time, publications in the 'wider world' of applied linguistics (for example, van Lier, 1988; Nunan, 1989; and Allwright & Bailey, 1991) have emphasized the value of focusing on what actually occurs in the classroom as a first step towards improvement in pedagogy.

Assuming that improvement in team teaching may result not only from top-down prescription but also on the basis of relatively impartial description and non-judgmental analysis of the way teachers are currently approaching their task, we decided to observe and describe a total of five lessons taught jointly by different Japanese teachers of English (JTEs) and assistant English teachers (AETs). By observing five entirely different teaching teams, as opposed to

the smaller numbers observed by Yukawa (1992) and Garant (1992), we hoped to gain an overview of different teaching arrangements, while remaining closer to actual lesson data than, for example, Sturman (1992) or Kahny et al. (1992).

Since our main intention was to identify and impartially discuss possibilities in team teaching rather than to make generalizations or prescriptions, a small sample size of one lesson per team was considered sufficient for our purposes (cf. Peck, 1988, p. 2; and Bailey & Allwright, 1991, pp. 41-42, for related considerations). Breadth was to be achieved by not limiting description to one variable (in the studies previously cited, Garant concentrates on 'methods', and Yukawa on 'techniques'). Instead, we hoped to gain, from a classroom-based perspective, new insights into several issues previously and frequently mentioned in the literature, including: (i) how team taught lesson contents may be selected and integrated with contents of other lessons (cf. Smith, 1988; Brumby & Wada, 1990); (ii) what types of activities may be used in team teaching (cf. Fox & Sturman, 1987; Wada, 1987), and (iii) what responsibilities and roles AETs and JTEs may take on in planning and teaching (cf. Edge, 1988; Shimaoka & Yashiro, 1990). Within these terms, we aimed to facilitate 'depth' of analysis by describing each lesson as fully as possible. For reasons of space, however, we shall concentrate in this chapter on describing (i) contents and (ii) activities; in further work we hope to present commentaries on how these were mediated during lessons themselves, together with discussion of the respective roles in planning and teaching of AETs and JTEs.

Method

Five fifty minute lessons taught by different AET/JTE teams were observed in five public junior high schools in Gunma prefecture. Schools to be visited and lessons to be observed were determined by negotiations between prefectural and local authorities over which we had no control. In practice, it is suspected that teams were chosen at least partly on the basis of their willingness to be observed, and lessons may have been, in this respect as in others, somewhat atypical. Of the five schools, two (schools 1 and 5) were located in the prefectural capital, while the remainder were situated

in semi-rural areas. Lessons were observed in March, in other words in the final month of the Japanese school year. This meant that JTEs had already finished teaching or were about to finish the students' (Ss') textbook, and some admitted to having more time than normal for 'communicative' or review activities (see "Discussion").

Class size averaged 34, ranging between 31 (in school 5) and 39 (school 4); all classes were mixed sex, with students arranged at desks in ordered rows and columns. All students received four English lessons per week, of which one was typically team taught, at least during periods when the AET was present in the school (length of visits ranged from three weeks to three months, but in all cases the students had been receiving lessons over at least the preceding two weeks from the AET we observed).

Lessons in schools 2 to 5 were video-taped (with the camera focused on teachers as opposed to students) and transcribed with the aid of notes made during observation. It proved impossible to transcribe all interactions observed during the lesson in school 1 ("lesson 1") since it was only audio-taped; however, the combination of audio tape and detailed observation notes proved sufficient for description of this lesson in the same terms applied to other lessons in "Results" below.

Observation of each team taught JTE/AET lesson was accompanied by observation of one lesson taught 'solo' by the same JTE to a different class on the same day. These 'solo' lessons will be referred to but not described in detail in this chapter.

In addition, the day's observation was followed in each case by an audio-taped interview, later transcribed, with both JTE and AET (interviewed separately in all cases except school 1). Interviews were wide-ranging, but questions were intended in particular to throw light on: (i) aspects of the lessons noted during observation as requiring clarification; (ii) the extent to which the lessons observed were typical or atypical in terms of contents and teacher/student behaviour; (iii) the planning process for team taught lessons; and (iv) benefits and problems for JTEs in team teaching.

Following transcription of lessons and interviews, the major problem arose of how to select from and present the multifarious

data we had collected. In this respect, van Lier's advice regarding classroom-based research is salient:

Our observing and subsequent describing of what goes on will necessarily be selective. We must therefore be explicit — in so far as we can be — about the reasons for selection, and aware of the incompleteness of our description. (van Lier, 1988, p. 46)

Given that our main interests were (i) lesson contents and (ii) activities, we decided to be quite rigorous in excluding information apparently unrelated to these issues from our description here, and to postpone, for example, detailed description of JTE and AET roles in planning and teaching. Readers of this chapter will doubtless find many lacunae, but are begged to accept that this is inevitable, and urged to find what does seem to be of relevance. Only the following types of information, then, are presented for each lesson: (i) year of Ss (1st year junior high school ("JHS") students are almost all 13 years old by March, and 2nd years 14); (ii) description of lesson activities, including classroom 'arrangement', for example 'pairwork', 'mingling' and so on; and (iii) description of materials for each activity, including how the language contents were derived (e.g., from Ss' textbook, from supplementary resources etc.).

It will be noted that we base results on what might appear at first sight a prejudicial and arbitrary division of lessons into "activities"; however, this kind of approach has precedents in the work of, for example, Mitchell (1988) and Peck (1988), and, as Malamah-Thomas (1987, p. 62) suggests, may "correspond in many ways to teachers' own ideas about the sub-divisions of their lessons". Rather than imposing categories on the data, then, our basic procedure was to follow Mitchell (1988, p.48) in first attempting to identify all 'framing' and 'focusing' moves in the transcript (cf. Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), in other words utterances such as "Now, . . .", or (in Japanese) "Ja, . . ." which seemed to indicate that the teacher was shifting to a new 'segment' in the lesson. Separate 'activities' (typically made up of a number of smaller 'segments') were determined when the teacher leading off referred explicitly to "doing another activity" (lessons 1, 2 and 3), and/or used a 'stronger' framing expression than normal (for example, "OK, now let's . . .", or (in Japanese) "Sore dewa, . . ."), and/or introduced a change in materials. The

only problem discriminating between activities arose with lesson 5, where there were no clues in the transcript to indicate whether activities (4) and (5) should in fact be treated as separate. However, in this school the JTE had provided a written lesson plan, and a decision was taken on this basis to indicate two separate activities. In summary then, we can be fairly confident that our division of lessons into activities as presented below is neither prejudicial nor arbitrary, but corresponds strongly to divisions present also in the minds of the teachers involved.

Results

School 1

Ss: 2nd year JHS.

Activities:

(1) Drama [memorized skits (performed by groups of Ss in turn)].

(2) Messages [prepared messages/questions (from individual Ss to AET)]

Materials:

(1) Skits written by JTE and checked by AET, derived from a book provided by the AET of folk tales from the AET's country. In a previous team taught lesson, JTE/AET presented the skits and directed pronunciation practice, then AET took groups out of a JTE 'solo' class for rehearsal. Ss memorized their parts for homework.

(2) Written end-of-year test answers, returned to Ss recently by JTE (test questions set by JTE encouraging use of any language at Ss' disposal).

School 2

Ss: 2nd year JHS.

Activities:

(1) Question Bingo [interview and recording of answers on a handout (mingling) → bingo game (the same questions, from teacher to individual Ss): all Ss circle the answer (on handout) which they derived from interview if this is the same as the response of the individual S answering the teacher's question; a line of circles constitutes "bingo"]

(2) Describe and Draw [information transfer (pair work) — one S describes a picture, which other S draws].

Materials:

(1) Handout with answer grid (five boxes by five); five selected "yes/no" question patterns written down the left hand side and vocabulary cues for the questions in boxes — all language derived from various places in Ss' (present and previous year's) textbook.

(2) Line drawings photocopied from published resource materials; this activity encourages use of any relevant language at Ss' disposal, but in particular of 1st year (previous year) JHS input ("there is/are . . ." and prepositions of location).

School 3

Ss: 1st year JHS.

Activities:

(1) "Shiritori" [word contest — each student writes one word, which must begin with the final letter of the preceding team member's word (race between columns to complete a list — last student in each column writes team's words on blackboard)].

(2) Question/Answer Find Your Partner [Ss write questions and answers on slips of paper, then these are redistributed — holders of matching questions and answers must find one another (mingling)]

Materials:

(1) Review of any words (whose spelling is) available to Ss.

(2) Review in theory of any question-answer patterns at Ss' disposal, but in practice, perhaps, especially of model question/answer patterns written on blackboard and derived from various places in Ss' textbook.

School 4

Ss: 1st year JHS.

Activities:

(1) "How many?" (I) [information exchange (pair work)]

(2) "How many?" (II) [interview (mingling)]

(3) "How many are there?" [quiz/contest (teams are columns; questions from AET open to all Ss in one row)]

Materials:

(1) Handouts ("A" and "B" handouts are similar format but

have different information: line drawings of various quantities of objects, with cue words and spaces for writing quantities of missing objects); "how many _____ do you have?" selected from what JTE has recently been covering 'solo' in the textbook; vocabulary selected from throughout textbook.

(2) Handout with vocabulary and pictures of everyday objects, and spaces to write (i) how many of the objects in question S has personally and (ii) names of other people and how many they have of the object; "how many _____ do you have?" and vocabulary selected as for (1) above.

(3) Photocopy from published resource materials, with vocabulary and pictures of varying quantities of animals; "how many _____s are there?"; "there is/are _____" selected from what JTE has recently been teaching in the textbook, "there is/are _____" also taught in previous week's team taught lesson; vocabulary determined by the photocopied materials and not necessarily known to Ss from the textbook, but reinforced with hand-written/drawn flashcards (words and pictures).

School 5

Students: 1st year JHS.

Activities:

- (1) Daily dialogue [(questions from teacher to individual Ss)]
- (2) Song [song on tape (Ss sing in chorus)]
- (3) Word pronunciation [(Ss repeat words in chorus after AET and JTE)]
- (4) Dialogue repetition [(Ss repeat in chorus after AET and JTE)]
- (5) Dialogue recitation [Ss recite from memory (in chorus → individual pairs)].
- (6) "Where is?" (I) [drill with reference to teacher-held pictures (Ss form questions/answers in chorus)]
- (7) "Where is?" (II) [drill with reference to picture on handout (pairwork → individual pairs)]
- (8) "Where is?" (III) [quiz (questions from teacher open to all Ss)]
- (9) Self-introductions [memorized self-introductions (by individual Ss), followed by prepared questions (to these Ss from other

Ss, AET and JTE)]

Materials:

(1) Routine repeated at the beginning of all (not only team taught) lessons, involving Ss answering predictable teacher questions about day of the week, date, weather and so on.

(2) Tape and photocopied words of a song from supplementary published materials (lyrics mostly consist of simple greetings); review of a previous 'solo' lesson, when JTE went over the words with Ss.

(3) Handwritten flashcards (words, no pictures) for 'new words' in dialogue (see (4) below) grouped together at foot of the page in Ss' textbook.

(4) Dialogue in Ss' textbook which JTE started teaching in the previous 'solo' lesson.

(5) Same dialogue as in (4) (Ss are expected to have memorized it for homework).

(6) Large pictures of rooms containing many objects, provided by publishers of Ss' textbook; question pattern ("Where is _____?") and focus on prepositions of location in answers determined by key sentences highlighted at foot of the dialogue (cf. (5) above) in Ss' textbook. Additional vocabulary determined by contents of the pictures (but almost all seems familiar to students from previous teaching).

(7) Handout consisting of a line drawing photocopied from published supplementary resources, headed by handwritten model question/answer ("Where are the pencils?" "They are in the drawer."), derived as in (6) above.

(8) Handout consisting of a world map (with major cities but no names of countries) photocopied from published supplementary resources, with addition of a jumbled handwritten list of countries at the foot of the map and model question/answer ("Where is Kyoto?" "It's in Japan"); this question/answer sequence derived as in (6) above. Vocabulary of countries is mostly unfamiliar to Ss.

(9) Routine repeated towards the end of all (not only team taught) lessons, involving selected students introducing self from memory (based originally on written homework encouraging use of any language at Ss' disposal). Other Ss' questions were also written

originally as homework encouraging use of any language at their disposal, though with particular emphasis on information questions.

Discussion

As has already been suggested, the lessons we observed may have been somewhat atypical, firstly with respect to other lessons taught by the same team, and secondly when compared with lessons of other team teachers. In the first respect, contents and activities may have been affected by the fact that lessons were observed at the end of the academic year, and also by 'special preparation' for the benefit of the observer (however, teachers had not been told of any specific purposes for our research, and during interview teachers of all lessons claimed that planning had been relatively unaffected by the 'threat' of observation). In the second respect, it should certainly be noted that all the team teaching relationships were reported to be 'successful' by both participants, with explicit reference sometimes being made to personal experience of less successful relationships with other (past or present) team teaching partners, or to negative experiences heard about from colleagues or other sources.

The lessons may have been atypical, then, and the sample size small (only five lessons described and observed), but it should be remembered that our aim was to investigate 'possibilities' in team teaching rather than to make general claims on the basis of the data. In this connection, what struck us most was the diversity in contents and activities both between and within the lessons observed.

Contents:

The first area investigated was "how team taught lesson contents may be selected, and integrated with contents of other lessons". Taking "selection" first, the following means of selecting language to be taught/practised seem to emerge from the data listed under "Materials" in "Results" above (lesson/activity numbers are noted in brackets):

- * Review of any language at Ss' disposal (1/2; 2/2; 3/1; 3/2 (in theory); 5/9).
- * Review of particular language from various points in Ss' textbook/course

- (1/1; 2/1; 3/2 (in practice); 4/1 (vocabulary); 4/2 (vocabulary); 5/1; 5/6 (vocabulary); 5/7 (vocabulary)).
- * Reinforcement of particular language from one point in textbook (4/1; 4/2; 4/3; 5/3; 5/4; 5/5; 5/6; 5/7; 5/8).
- * Reinforcement of particular language unrelated to Ss' textbook (1/1; 4/3 (vocabulary); 5/2; 5/8 (vocabulary)).
- * Presentation of particular language from one point in textbook (none)
- * Presentation of particular language unrelated to Ss' textbook (4/3 (vocabulary); 5/8 (vocabulary)).

Basing lesson contents firmly on language derived from a point in the students' textbook recently reached in 'solo' JTE teaching is often recommended (by, for example, Fox & Sturman, 1987; and Brumby & Wada, 1990), primarily, it would appear, as a means of giving team teaching relevance within the students' ongoing syllabus. However, as can be seen from the above summary, textbook-related teaching may in practice take at least one other form, namely review of particular language derived from points already (but not necessarily recently) covered in the book or course. The prevalence of this kind of review activity in our data was undoubtedly due in part to lessons having been observed at the end of the school year — JTE 3, for example, reported that team taught lessons normally had a stronger relation to the students' textbook, with AET and JTE performing dialogues and engaging in other activities using language recently studied by students. JTE 2, on the other hand, reported frequently engaging in team taught 'review' activities throughout the year, citing as one of their advantages that 'slower' students are given a chance to participate which the rapidly forward-flowing syllabus in junior high schools normally denies them. Taking into account the generally-acknowledged importance of review for all, not only 'slower' language learners (cf. Ellis & Sinclair, 1989, pp.16–17), there would appear, then, to be some justification for the presence in team teaching of 'review' activities such as those we have identified.

Similar justifications might also apply to review activities which seem to have no relation at all to the textbook, but which draw on

any linguistic resources students have at their disposal (for example, 1/2 and 2/2). As Garant (1992) points out, the language students use in such activities inevitably does tend to come originally from the textbook, and an even more compelling justification would seem to be that only (though perhaps, considering 3/1 and 3/2, not all) tasks which allow free language use can unequivocally be termed communicative "activities" as opposed to "drills" (cf. definitions presented in "Activities" below).

Finally, presentation and/or reinforcement of language unrelated to the textbook also makes several appearances in our data, in the form of specially written skits (1/1), vocabulary of animals (4/3) and countries (5/8), and a song (5/2). Vocabulary teaching in 4/3 and 5/8 is integrated within activities reinforcing textbook-derived grammar, but the skits (1/1) and song (5/2) constitute independent activities which might appear at first sight to lack integration with students' normal course of study. However, as we have suggested elsewhere (Smith, 1988, p.13), and as is clarified in the following summary, there would appear to be viable means of integrating content with 'normal' teaching without necessarily involving reference to the students' textbook:

- * reference to other team taught lessons
(1/1; 4/3; 5/1; 5/9)
- * reference to solo lessons (Ss' textbook)
(4/1; 4/2; 4/3; 5/3; 5/4; 5/5; 5/6; 5/7; 5/8)
- * reference to solo lessons (materials other than Ss' textbook)
(1/2; 5/1; 5/2; 5/9)
- * no reference to other lessons
(2/1; 2/2; 3/1; 3/2)

As can be seen, parts of lessons 1 and 5, in particular, showed how integration of contents with other lessons may be achieved without reference being made to the students' textbook. In lesson 1, for example, skits (1/1) were based on work done in two previous lessons within the preceding week, one team taught, and one where the AET had taken groups of students out of a JTE 'solo' lesson for rehearsal. Thus, rather than viewing work with the AET as an 'interruption', JTE 1 appeared to be making efforts to have students

see lessons involving the AET (but not necessarily the textbook) as integral to 'normal' teaching. This was also evident in the way the JTE had independently set an end-of-year examination question requiring students to write messages to the AET (used in the lesson as 1/2); indeed, AET 1 volunteered praise during interview for the way non-textbook contents of team taught lessons consistently tended to be prepared for and built on in lessons taught solo by the JTE. In a different vein, lesson 5 may also be seen to include non-textbook-related content links with both previous 'solo' and team taught lessons: as was clear both from interview and the solo JTE lesson we observed, activity 5/1 ("daily dialogue") constituted a kind of ritual repeated at the beginning of every lesson, while the final activity, 5/9 ("self-introductions"), was also reported and observed to be a feature of all lessons, whether or not the AET was present. Finally, the song (5/2) used in lesson 5 was also clearly linked to a previous lesson taught solo by the JTE.

In summary, then, there would appear to exist, in practice, a variety of means for integrating team teaching contents within students' 'normal course of study', and it is apparent that several of these means (including "review" in all its forms, and some kinds of reference to previous or solo team taught lessons) may not necessarily involve the type of close relation to recent teaching of the students' textbook which has often been recommended. It is perhaps significant in this respect that JTEs 1, 2 and 5 all reported using non-textbook-related materials/activities periodically or frequently during 'normal' solo lessons throughout the year, and it might be suggested that, given this perceived need on the part of at least some Japanese teachers to 'go beyond' the confines of the textbook in their own lessons, prescription of close reference to textbooks in team teaching should be replaced with a gentler recommendation to link contents in some useful way to students' 'normal course of study', viewed in broader terms than consisting simply of the textbook.

Activities:

Our second area of investigation was "what types of activities may be used in team teaching?". Two initial points relating partly to our discussion of "contents" above might be mentioned in this context:

(i) as shown above, the lessons we observed were characterized almost entirely by practice (reinforcement or review) of language already familiar to students from previous teaching, rather than by presentation of new language, and (ii) most activities seemed intended to practice above all oral production or interaction, as opposed to reading, writing (except 3/1 and, partly, 3/2) or extensive listening. Further research would be required to determine whether these characteristics are typical of junior high school team taught lessons in general, but it might be suggested that, if they were found to be so, thought could be given to whether (i) presentation of new language might not also be carried out through team teaching and (ii) whether AETs might not be useful also in the teaching of reading, writing (cf. Sturman, 1992, p. 151) or extensive listening (cf. Smith, 1985).

It will be seen that, as in the case of lesson contents, there was considerable diversity in the types of speaking practice activity observed. Basing definitions on a modified combination of Johnson (1982, p. 156) and Richards et al. (1985, p. 172), the following activity types might be identified:

- * Communicative activities (communication focus; use of any language at Ss' disposal)
(interview: 1/2; 5/9) (information exchange: 2/2)
- * Communicative drills (communication focus; controlled language)
(interview: 2/1; 4/2) (information exchange: 4/1) (quiz: 4/3; 5/8)
- * Meaningful drills (meaning focus, but with language practice as only ostensible purpose for interaction; controlled language)
(5/1; 5/6 (responses); 5/7)
- * Mechanical drills (form focus; controlled language; includes repetition)
(5/3; 5/4; 5/6 (questions))
- * Others difficult to define in the above terms
(drama: 1/1) (song: 5/2) (dialogue recitation: 5/5) (games: 3/1; 3/2)

"Communicative activities" are often recommended for use in team teaching (cf. Wada, 1987, p. 105), but it is sometimes unclear whether "communicative drills" are to be distinguished or included

in this prescription. Garant (1992, p. 27), who does make the distinction, notes that students "expressed interest" during the communicative activities he observed — to this might be added our own subjective impression that AETs and JTEs also seemed able to 'express their personalities' more fully and 'warmly' during the 'genuinely' communicative activities we observed than during communicative drills or other activities where language and behaviour were more controlled (activities 1/2 and 5/9 involved both JTE and AET in impromptu 'socializing' with students and each other, while much spontaneous interaction occurred in 2/2 between AET and JTE during demonstration of the activity).

Having appeared to make a recommendation for communicative activities, however, let us put this in perspective and state that other types of activity cannot easily be dismissed as having no value in team teaching. Indeed, the success of communicative activities or drills may depend on students having been prepared for them effectively via other types of activity. It is notable, in this respect, that two out of three 'communicative activities' (1/2 and 5/9) were prepared for with earlier writing, just as four out of five 'communicative drills' (4/1, 4/2, 4/3 and 5/8) were immediately preceded by 'mechanical drills' (not shown in the data because not signalled as 'activities' separate from the communicative drills themselves). Although the mechanical drills in lesson 4 were not given 'separate activity' status, their perceived importance along with clear explanation and demonstration in 'priming' students was nevertheless emphasised in comments AET 4 made during interview.

In lesson 5, on the other hand, non-communicative drills *were* signalled as independent activities, with JTE 5 emphasising during interview the language learning value in their own right of such activities, as well as recitation. Given the awareness of different methodologies shown by this teacher during interview, and in view of the fact that lesson 5 also had 'communicative' aspects (e.g., 5/8 and 5/9), this lesson might be viewed as an example of 'principled eclecticism', involving 'traditional' (e.g., 5/4), mechanical and communicative elements. Research in second language acquisition has yet to reach firm conclusions regarding the 'ideal' activities for language learning (c.f. Gebhard et al., 1990, p. 16), and an aware,

eclectic approach in team teaching might therefore appear to be justified. Certainly, an open mind should be kept regarding activities such as drama, songs and recitation which do not fit into neat classifications such as the one presented above. In the light of our results, then, it would appear that mechanical and other 'pre-communicative' activities may in practice have a more valuable role to play in team teaching than has often been recognized, whether as preparation for more communicative activities later in the same lesson, or as activities included for their own intrinsic value in promoting language learning.

Finally, we would like to suggest that our decision to describe the lessons observed in terms of contents and activities rather than with reference to single 'methods' (cf. Lee, 1987; Garant, 1992) was justified in view of the considerable diversity we discovered in these areas, not only between different lessons but also within lessons themselves. Lesson 5, in particular, with its eclectic variety of activity types and mix between textbook-based and 'supplementary' teaching serves as a good illustration of the difficulty of describing the complexity of actual practice in terms of method labels (cf. Swaffar et al., 1992, p. 31), especially in view of the fact that our accounts of lessons above exclude reference to yet another complicating factor, namely the means by which contents and activities are actually realized in teaching. Ways ('techniques') of presenting contents and activities designed to achieve certain purposes might serve either to enhance or contradict these purposes (as we observed, for example, a communicative activity might be initiated through use of either demonstration or extensive translation). We hope to consider this issue in future work, along with results relating to the respective roles of AETs and JTEs in the planning and teaching of the lessons we observed.

Conclusion

The diversity we have described between and within the five lessons observed is, in itself, considered to be a noteworthy result, especially in view of the fact that during interview all five team teaching relationships were judged to be relatively 'successful' by the JTEs and AETs concerned. The concept of team teaching 'suc-

cess', of course, involves not only 'getting on as a team' but also, importantly, the effectiveness of lessons from the point of view of students (a factor which we did not set out to evaluate in this research). However, the very fact that different team teachers may be satisfied with different kinds of arrangement seems to argue strongly against the plausibility of prescription along the lines 'this is how everyone should be team teaching' (a point also made by Shimaoka & Yashiro, 1990, p. 23). On the JET Program in particular, teaching situations vary widely (in terms, for example, of regularity of AET visits and student age), and there are a wide variety of possible aims on which teams may decide to base their teaching (cf. Smith, 1988, p. 13). Add to these the fact that every teaching team is different in terms of match or otherwise of ideology, personality, age and previous (team-) teaching experience, and it seems inevitable that different JTEs and AETs are going to have to reach different kinds of compromise in order to team teach effectively. More concrete guidelines on how to team teach, lesson plans such as those prescribed for teachers on the smaller scale and less 'disparate' British Council/Koto-ku and LIOJ/Odawara projects (cf. Sturman, 1992; Kahny, et al., 1992), or even anecdotal evidence of the 'success' of particular approaches may therefore *not* be the best way forward for the JET Program, since as Fanselow (1990, p. 196) suggests, even helpful prescriptions can stop exploration by teachers themselves, and such exploration would appear to be vital in the light of the varying contexts JET Program team teachers are operating in.

What, then, *are* the best ways forward for the improvement of team teaching in Japan? It would appear to us, on the basis of the lessons we have observed, together with personal experience of team teaching and discussions with other AETs and JTEs, that a variety of team teaching methodologies may have "emerged in Japan at the local level" (Garant, 1992, p. 25), and that the absence of official guidelines on the JET Program does *not* necessarily entail that "most Japanese and native speaker teachers are confused about how best to work together" (Nunan, 1992, p. 118). Instead, it might be hypothesized that, following a period of initial confusion and tension, team teaching partners tend naturally to settle into a variety of more or less satisfactory compromise 'solutions', and that these

compromises may then have a tendency to become fossilized. For the improvement of team teaching, then, the following suggestions might be made: (i) fundamentally, more research needs to be carried out into how team teaching is currently practised, and the process by which compromise solutions are arrived at, in order to prepare for (ii) dissemination of information on and provision of opportunities for guided observation and discussion of a variety of *possibilities* in team teaching (especially for 'beginner' AETs and JTEs), and (iii) provision of similar opportunities for guided exploration of *alternatives* to current, potentially fossilized team teaching practices during in-service education.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Mr. Kaoru Yokosawa, Mr. Yasutaka Takano, Mr. Hiroshi Igarashi and Ms. Lee Link of the International Relations Division of the Gunma Prefectural Government for arranging the school visits, the authorities of the schools we visited, and in particular the JTEs and AETs who welcomed us into their classrooms. You (the teachers) must remain nameless, but your co-operation was much appreciated, and this article is dedicated to you.

REFERENCES

- Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brumby, S., & Wada, M. (1990). *Team teaching*. London: Longman.
- Cominos, A. (Ed.). (1992). The JET Program and team teaching [Special issue]. *The Language Teacher*, 16 (11).
- Edge, J. (1988). Natives, speakers and models. *JALT Journal*, 9 (2), 153-157.
- Ellis, G., & Sinclair, B. (1989). *Learning to learn English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fanselow, J. (1990). 'Let's see': Contrasting conversations about teaching. In J. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 182-197). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fox, C., & Sturman, P. (1987). *The Koto-ku project*. Tokyo: The British Council.
- Garant, M. (1992). Traditional, semi-traditional and non-traditional team teaching in Japanese junior high schools. *The Language Teacher*, 16 (11), 25-29.
- Gebhard, J., Gaitan, S., & Oprandy, R. (1990). Beyond prescription: the student teacher as investigator. In J. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language*

- teacher education* (pp. 16-25). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, K. (1982). *Communicative syllabus design and methodology*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kahny, J., Olivieri, D., & Maybin, D. (1992). Six aspects of a successful team teaching program. *The Language Teacher*, 16 (11), 41-45.
- Lee, S. (1987). The team teaching method. *JALT Journal*, 8 (2), 175-178.
- Malamah-Thomas, A. (1987). *Classroom interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mitchell, R. (1988). *Communicative language teaching in practice*. London: CILT.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Understanding language classrooms*. London: Prentice Hall International.
- Nunan, D. (Ed.). (1992). *Collaborative language learning and teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peck, A. (1988). *Language teachers at work: A description of methods*. London: Prentice Hall International.
- Richards, J., Platt, J., & Weber, H. (1985). *Longman dictionary of applied linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Richards, J., & Nunan, D. (Eds.). (1990). *Second language teacher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shimaoka, T., & Yashiro, K. (1990). *Team teaching in English classrooms: An intercultural approach*. Tokyo: Kairyudo.
- Smith, R. (1985). Listening. In R. Smith (Ed.), *The BETS handbook* (pp. 69-74). Tokyo: The British Council.
- Smith, R. (1988). Team teaching in perspective. *The Language Teacher*, 12 (9), 11-16.
- Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sturman, P. (1992). Team teaching: A case study from Japan. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Collaborative language learning and teaching* (pp.141-161). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swaffar, J., Arens, K., & Morgan, M. (1982). Teacher classroom practices: Redefining method as task hierarchy. *Modern Language Journal*, 66 (1), 24-33.
- van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. London: Longman.
- Yohay, J. (Ed.). (1988). Team teaching [Special issue]. *The Language Teacher*, 12 (9).
- Yukawa, E. (1992). Team teaching and changes in teaching routines. *The Language Teacher*, 16 (11), 9-13.
- Wada, M. (1987). *Kokusaika jidai ni okeru Eigo kyoiku*. Tokyo: Yamaguchi Shoten.