

令和 3 年 6 月 25 日現在

機関番号：44409
 研究種目：若手研究(B)
 研究期間：2017～2020
 課題番号：17K13501
 研究課題名(和文) Role Perceptions in all Phases of Team Teaching

 研究課題名(英文) Role Perceptions in all Phases of Team Teaching

 研究代表者
 SPONSELLER AARON (Sponseller, Aaron)

 大阪女学院短期大学・英語科・専任講師

 研究者番号：80735978
 交付決定額(研究期間全体)：(直接経費) 3,200,000円

研究成果の概要(和文)：本研究では、英語を母国語とするALTと日本人英語教師(JTE)を対象に、アンケート調査の回答(N = 833)を集めました。教師は、TTの授業計画段階、指導段階、振り返り段階において、明確な役割を認識していると予想されました。しかし、アンケートの回答からは、このようなパターンは見られませんでした。その代わりに、JTEもALTも、時間がないために質の高いTTができないと感じているという回答がありました。JTEにとっては、仕事が多すぎてTTに集中できないことを意味し、ALTにとっては、多くの学校に派遣されることを意味します。

研究成果の学術的意義や社会的意義

Academic significance: This research has added additional, large-scale, mixed-methods evidence on TT roles. It has also produced a reliable version of the SSEC.
 Social significance: The results provide additional evidence that quality TT is thwarted by spreading teachers too thin.

研究成果の概要(英文)：The research collected survey responses (N = 833) from native English speaker ALTs and Japanese teachers of English (JTEs). The survey included questions about respondent background, behavioral and instructional management, self-efficacy in communication, and what roles ALTs and JTEs perceived while team teaching. It was anticipated that teachers would identify clear roles during the lesson planning stage, the teaching stage, and the reflective stage of team teaching. However, survey responses did not reveal this pattern. Responses instead indicated that both JTEs and ALTs feel quality team teaching thwarted by a lack of time. For JTEs this means they have too much work to do and cannot focus on team teaching. For ALTs this means they are often sent to too many schools. Additional work validating two instruments, the BIMS and the SSEC, was also conducted. The BIMS needs further refinement before it can be used reliably in Japan. The SSEC works well and is ready for use.

研究分野：education

キーワード：English education team teaching validation self-efficacy psychometrics

1. 研究開始当初の背景

Japan has invested considerable sums in hiring assistant language teachers (ALTs) for the JET Program since its inception in the late 1980's. ALTs are generally young native English speakers employed to team-teach English with Japanese teachers of English (JTEs) in public schools. JTEs generally have strong pedagogical foundations and much experience learning and teaching English. However, neither ALTs nor JTEs typically have formal training in TT. This novice native speaker and experienced non-native teacher combination, together with the absence of formalized training, leads to strain in team-taught classrooms. Research indicates JTEs are often unsatisfied with their team teaching performance (Miyazato, 2009), a dissatisfaction partly fueled by what Phillipson (1992) calls a 'native speaker fallacy.' Furthermore, Kaneda & Fukazawa (1991) explored role distribution between ALTs and JTEs in team-taught classrooms, identifying common patterns of dominance, passivity, or shared interaction between them. This evidence is critical for the team-taught classroom, but leaves a simple question unanswered: How do ALTs and JTEs define their own role and the role of their TT partner throughout the entire TT process? Considering teaching is a cyclical process consisting of the pre-teaching (lesson planning), teaching (classroom), and post-teaching (reflective practices) phases, there is a huge gap in the research on TT.

Mahoney (2004) investigated and identified roles Japanese Teachers of English (JTEs) and Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs) play during the teaching phase, but no research has been conducted on the pre-teaching or post-teaching practices of teaching teams. The research proposed here aims to fill this gap by investigating team teaching comprehensively through all three phases of the teaching process. Understanding where roles are unclear or unsatisfactory in the three phases of TT critical considering the three phases impact each other. Poor collaboration or dissatisfaction with the lesson planning phase could lead to further dissatisfaction during the teaching phase; dissatisfaction during teaching could have consequences on reflective practice and subsequent lesson planning; and the cycle of teaching may be confounded throughout. An unsatisfactory set of practices at any phase can have consequences for the other phases and the teaching process overall. Because this has the potential to directly impact the efficacy of the final product of team teaching, the student experience, we must explore this area further. The financial cost of maintaining schemes such as the JET Program is substantial. It is worthwhile to comprehensively explore the potential ways in which the team teaching process is positively facilitated or negatively inhibited by looking at what is actually happening in the field.

Sponseller (unpublished MA thesis, 2013) conducted a web-based survey pilot study of ALT and JTE role perceptions and satisfaction during each of the three phases described above. The pilot used both Likert style items and open-ended survey questions incorporating some of the JTE and ALT roles identified by Mahoney (2004). The pilot was also novel in that responses to hypothetical lesson planning, classroom teaching, and post-lesson reflection scenarios were collected. JTEs ($n = 18$) and ALTs ($n = 12$) exhibited a range of unique responses. The most interesting and promising results emerged from the following close-ended Likert item: Planning team-taught lessons is a cooperative activity between my team-teaching partner and me. A one-way ANOVA suggests the difference between JTE and ALT response here was systematic ($F = 9.533$ (1), $p = .005$), with JTEs agreeing with the statement and ALTs expressing disagreement. While acknowledging the small sample, results indicate potential for systematic discrepancy between ALT and JTE perceptions of lesson planning as cooperative; this may negatively impact the efficacy of team taught lessons. Moreover, a lack of cooperation in the planning phase of a lesson may inherently reduce the likelihood that any team-based, post-lesson reflection will happen. These implications remain hypothetical and premature until a more robust investigation of the phenomena via the proposed research can be conducted on a much larger scale.

2. 研究の目的

Most research on team teaching has focused upon the in-class roles of ALTs and JTEs. Teaching a class is the execution of a lesson(s) planned beforehand; this is the pre-teaching phase. Lesson planning is also informed by the reflective practices teachers engage in after a lesson; this is the post-teaching phase. We do not know about these practices in team teaching. Therefore, the research conducted with this JSPS kakenhi grant (17K13501) surveyed JTEs and ALTs regarding all three phases of TT. Analysis of results were expected to further elucidate areas of divergent role perceptions most likely to hinder the efficacy of TT. In order to further examine those divergencies, this research also proposed to conduct interviews/focus groups in a follow-up phase. ALT and JTE voices were expected to inform us about the challenges, how they impact TT practice, and how such challenges are resolved/unresolved. Therefore, the primary objectives of the proposed research were as follows:

- (a) Understand ALT and JTE role perspectives during three phases (pre, during, post) of team teaching;
- (b) Identify common challenges ALTs and JTEs face via survey; elucidate via qualitative interviews;

3 . 研究の方法

The original research plan and methods was as follows:

- A. FY2017:** Negotiate access to JET Program ALTs via MEXT and CLAIR, instrument design, pilot, pilot analysis (Rasch), instrument finalization, and final survey. Backup plan: Convenience sampling.
- B. FY2018:** Develop interview/focus group protocol, pilot and refine protocol, complete all interviews/focus groups, transcription/translation of data, and qualitative data analysis.
- C. FY2018 & beyond:** Dissemination of research via conferences, manuscripts in academic and practice-oriented journals, and Team Teaching Symposium in 2020 at Hiroshima University.

In spring 2017, it became clear that negotiating access to JET Program ALTs via MEXT and CLAIR (see “A. FY2017” above) was going to be so challenging as to be counterproductive. This meant that qualitative interviews of current JET Program ALTs and the JTEs with whom they teach, was probably an unrealistic expectation. Local convenience sampling was considered, but ultimately the PI (Aaron C. Sponseller) decided to amend the research design and generate a single, cross-sectional survey with both traditional survey items (e.g., Likert scale items) and a full-page open-ended response section in which JTEs and ALTs could provide their insights on issues which present a challenge during the pre-, during-, and post-teaching phases of TT. The final surveys (both in English and in Japanese) consisted of the following content:

1. A header with the names and affiliations of the researchers, the date, the JSPS kakenhi grant number (17K13501), and an alphanumeric ID unique to the school to which the survey was sent.
2. A brief letter containing simple instructions, explaining the research agenda, anonymity, and thanking the teacher(s) for taking their time to reply.
3. Demographic questions regarding teaching experience, age, education, etc.
4. 24 Likert-style items for the Behavioral and Instructional Management Scale (BIMS; Martin & Sass, 2010).
5. 8 Likert-style items for the Sojourner Self-Efficacy in Communication (SSEC; Peterson, Milstein, Chen, & Nakazawa, 2011) short-form.
6. 16 Likert-style items developed by the PI (Aaron C. Sponseller) focused on the pre-, during-, and post-teaching phases of TT.
7. An open-ended section prompting teachers with the following question. This question was used in lieu of interviews, which was what the PI (Aaron C. Sponseller) had originally proposed:

We appreciate any additional thoughts you may have regarding team teaching. We are particularly interested in your thoughts concerning ALT and JTE roles during the planning of team-taught lessons, delivering of team-taught lessons, and when engaging post-lesson reflective practices.

その他にチームティーチングに関するご意見がありましたら、お聞かせください。特に、指導案の作成、授業の進め方、授業後の振り返りにおけるJTEとALTの役割について意見がありましたら、ぜひお聞かせ下さい。

With the assistance of Drs. Seiji Fukazawa and Brett R. Walter at Hiroshima University,

a four-page, bilingual, paper-based survey was designed. Survey packages were sent to 560 public junior high schools and 560 public high schools across Japan. In each package was:

1. An introduction letter to the principal (校長先生) explaining the study, assuring anonymity of the respondents and schools, and containing researcher contact information;
2. Three double-sided A3-paper-based surveys (two in Japanese [for JTEs] and one in English [for ALTs]) with the contents as described above; and
3. Three postage-paid (料金受取人払い) envelopes—one for each survey.

Survey packages were sent in January 2018, and all responses were requested by the end of March 2018. Of the total 3180 surveys sent out, 833 were returned (26% response rate total). Survey responses were entered into a spreadsheet and open-ended responses were transcribed in full by a graduate student assistant.

4. 研究成果

Regarding the first purpose of the research, which was:

- (a) Understand ALT and JTE role perspectives during three phases (pre, during, post) of team teaching;

The analytic process was both quantitative. The quantitative approach was to take the survey on roles (the 16 Likert-style items focused on the pre-, during-, and post-teaching phases of TT) and test their ability to separate the TT process into those three phases (pre, during, post). To conduct this test I used Rasch (Rasch, 1960) and the software Winsteps (Linacre, 2018). The results indicated that the survey items did not align with pre, during, or post phases of TT.

Subsequently, those same 16 items were analyzed using exploratory factor analysis (EFA) in JASP (JASP Team, 2018). The EFA revealed that JTEs or ALTs responded to the TT items along the lines of:

- If they are part of a TT partnership(s) where there is teamwork.
- If they or their partner do a majority of the work.
- Who's job it is to lead and if that is appropriate or not.

Regarding the second purpose of the research, which was:

- (b) Identify common challenges ALTs and JTEs face via survey; elucidate via qualitative interviews;

The analytic process here was entirely qualitative and relied upon the open-ended responses provided by ALTs and JTEs. The results are displayed here by ALT, JTE, and JHS/HS teacher status. On the right-most column are the thematic overlaps.

	Junior HS	HS	Overlap
ALTs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responses Focused on Lesson. • Lack of Preparation Time. • Language Barrier. • Undeveloped Working Relationships. • Not Actually Team Teaching. • Lack of Experience. • Team Teaching Forbidden. • Feedback Only When ALT Felt Something Went Poorly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Actually Team Teaching. • Different Depending on Location. • Feedback Based on Teaching Style, Not Content. • No Feedback Because of Fear of Conflict. • Lack of Time. • Lack of Training in Team Teaching for ALT and JTE. • Age Gap/Social Status Concerns. • No Planning Due to Strict Curriculum. 	<p>Not actually TT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Partner in Charge of All Stages • ALT There Only to Read/Pronounce • JTEs Only There for Discipline <p>Lack of Time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JTEs are Too Busy • ALT Works in Too Many Locations <p>Fear of Conflict or Poor Working Relationship</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALTs Uncomfortable Bothering Busy JTEs • Fear of Hurting Feelings JTEs Cultural Passiveness
JTEs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of preparation / reflection time. • Bridge between elementary and junior high school. • ALTs as idea bank for designing activities and materials. • ALTs more collaborative and familiar with Japanese culture and education • More communication needed between JTEs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of preparation / reflection time. • Relating to students by learning Japanese and crosslinguistic differences. • More ALTs understanding Japanese and school system • Some ALTs drawing a line between personal and work • Gap in beliefs about teaching, language education • JTEs should explain the goals/purposes clearly 	<p>More ALT-centered TT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALTs playing more active roles • ALT more than reading model replacing CD • Teaching grammar in Communicative Way <p>Lack of Time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JTEs are Too Busy • ALT Works in different schools • No working allowed after contract hours <p>Building collegiality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building favorable

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • and ALTs. Game = interesting/fun activities? • Contract-bound ALTs; having no say in teaching. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract-bound ALTs; JTE having no say in team teaching. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relationship Making quality lessons rather than fun lessons • Sharing Course of Study regulations, students' abilities
--	---	--	---

Focusing on the overlap between JHS/HS ALTs, and the overlap between JHS/HS JTEs, we can see some commonality. First and foremost, regardless of ALT/JTE status, or JHS/HS context, the theme of **lack of time** consistently emerges from teachers. JTEs and ALTs have clearly identified time as a major challenge to quality TT. Moreover, they've specifically, and unanimously pinpointed the lack of time as primarily attributable to JTEs having too much to do and ALTs being spread across too many schools.

Another commonality concerns **working relationships**. JTE responses trended in the direction of wanting to establish more collegial, professional relationships. ALT responses, on the other hand, revealed a wariness or uncertainty about how to avoid having a poor relationship with their JTEs. I tentatively conclude that these unfulfilled relational desires between ALTs and JTEs are rooted in the lack of time issue previously identified. Lack of time, from the JTE perspective, might be preventing them from building professional relationships with ALTs. Lack of time, from the ALT perspective of being required to teach at too many locations, might be the major impediment to them establishing better relationships with the numerous JTEs with whom they must engage in TT with.

Finally, both JTEs and ALTs addressed roles in TT, but their foci differed. ALTs largely responded in a manner which indicates they do not feel they are engaged in "team" teaching. They are either the leader or a follower, but typically not an equal partner. JTEs, on the other hand, indicated they wanted ALTs to do more and be more involved in TT classes. While these responses seem contradictory, they are not. I highly suspect sample bias is to blame. It is challenging to draw conclusions without looking at specific JTE/ALT relationships nested within real contexts; this survey did not do that. Moreover, it is highly possible the results have response bias; Those who replied to the survey, or at least the open-ended question, may have been particularly dissatisfied with the state of TT in their context at the time of their response. The responses gathered can thus be both true and appear contradictory.

Regarding additional and/or incidental findings

The primary additional findings consist of work done validating two scales.

1. The Behavioral and Instructional Management Scale (BIMS): I attempted to validate the BIMS for use in the Japanese context using the data provided by JTEs (*N* = 581). While exploratory factor analysis revealed the presences of two factors (behavioral management; instructional management), Rasch analysis and follow-up confirmatory factor analysis revealed the instrument might need further refinement to establish its reliability before being adopted for further use.
2. The Sojourner Self-Efficacy in Communication Scale (SSEC): Substantial progress has been made using the short-form (8 item) SSEC responses from survey respondents (*N* = 876). See Kabir and Sponseller (2020) for full results. The SSEC short form is currently being used in multiple other studies at the time of composing this report.

5. 主な発表論文等

〔雑誌論文〕 計3件（うち査読付論文 3件/うち国際共著 2件/うちオープンアクセス 3件）

1. 著者名 Sponseller, A.C., & Kabir, R.S.	4. 巻 2
2. 論文標題 Validating the Sojourner Self-Efficacy in Communication Scale (SSEC) for Japanese University Students	5. 発行年 2018年
3. 雑誌名 Stretching Boundaries. Papers from the Third International Psychology of Language Learning Conference	6. 最初と最後の頁 97-101
掲載論文のDOI（デジタルオブジェクト識別子） なし	査読の有無 有
オープンアクセス オープンアクセスとしている（また、その予定である）	国際共著 -

1. 著者名 Kabir, R.S., Sponseller, A.C.	4. 巻 11
2. 論文標題 Interacting with Competence: A Validation Study of the Self-Efficacy in Intercultural Communication Scale-Short Form	5. 発行年 2020年
3. 雑誌名 Frontiers in Psychology	6. 最初と最後の頁 1-15
掲載論文のDOI（デジタルオブジェクト識別子） 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.02086	査読の有無 有
オープンアクセス オープンアクセスとしている（また、その予定である）	国際共著 該当する

1. 著者名 Walter, B.R., Sponseller, A.C.	4. 巻 -
2. 論文標題 ALT, JTE, and team teaching: Aligning collective efficacy	5. 発行年 2020年
3. 雑誌名 Teacher efficacy, learner agency	6. 最初と最後の頁 25-31
掲載論文のDOI（デジタルオブジェクト識別子） 10.37546/JALTPCP2019-04	査読の有無 有
オープンアクセス オープンアクセスとしている（また、その予定である）	国際共著 該当する

〔学会発表〕 計6件（うち招待講演 1件/うち国際学会 5件）

1. 発表者名 Sponseller, A.C., Kabir, R.S., & Gentry, R.
2. 発表標題 Validating a Japanese Sojourner Self-Efficacy in Communication Scale
3. 学会等名 KOTESOL International Conference（国際学会）
4. 発表年 2019年

1. 発表者名 Walter, B.R., & Sponseller, A.C.
2. 発表標題 ALT, JTE and Team-Teaching: Aligning Collective Efficacy
3. 学会等名 JALT International Conference (国際学会)
4. 発表年 2019年

1. 発表者名 Sponseller, A.C., & Kabir, R.S.
2. 発表標題 Validation of the Sojourner Self-Efficacy in Communication Scale (SSEC) for Japanese University Students
3. 学会等名 International Association of Psychology in Language Learning (IAPLL) (国際学会)
4. 発表年 2018年

1. 発表者名 Sponseller, A.C., & Gentry, R.
2. 発表標題 Validation of a Japanese Behavioral and Instructional Management Scale (BIMS)
3. 学会等名 2018 KOTESOL International Conference (国際学会)
4. 発表年 2018年

1. 発表者名 Sponseller, A.C., Walter, B.R., & Fukazawa, S.
2. 発表標題 Roles in Team-Teaching: Nationwide Survey Results
3. 学会等名 JALT2018: Diversity & Inclusion (国際学会)
4. 発表年 2018年

1. 発表者名 Sponseller, A.C.
2. 発表標題 How JTEs and ALTs Can Work Together for the Benefit of Students
3. 学会等名 Presentation given at Yamaguchi Prefecture JET Program Skills Development Conference (招待講演)
4. 発表年 2020年

〔図書〕 計0件

〔産業財産権〕

〔その他〕

-

6. 研究組織

氏名 (ローマ字氏名) (研究者番号)	所属研究機関・部局・職 (機関番号)	備考

7. 科研費を使用して開催した国際研究集会

〔国際研究集会〕 計0件

8. 本研究に関連して実施した国際共同研究の実施状況

共同研究相手国	相手方研究機関