

**COLLABORATIVE INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM TEACHING IN JAPAN:
A STUDY OF PRACTITIONER AND STUDENT PERSPECTIVES**

Andrew Gladman, M App Ling,
Grad Dip (Information & Library Studies), B.A. (English)

Research conducted at Miyazaki International College, Japan

Department of Linguistics
Division of Linguistics and Psychology
Macquarie University
June 2009

This thesis is presented as a partial fulfillment to the requirements for the
Doctor of Applied Linguistics degree

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	VI
STATEMENT OF CANDIDATE	VII
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	VIII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	IX
LIST OF FIGURES	XI
LIST OF TABLES	XII
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.2. THE INSTITUTIONAL SETTING.....	2
1.3. RESEARCH STRUCTURE.....	6
1.4. RESEARCH PURPOSE	8
1.5. THESIS STRUCTURE.....	10
1.6. SUMMARY	13
CHAPTER 2: RESEARCH CONTEXT	15
2.1. INTRODUCTION	15
2.2. INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY AND MISSION.....	15
2.3. MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE	19
2.4. FACULTY AND TEACHING	20
2.5. THE STUDENT BODY	23
2.6. RESEARCH RATIONALE	25
2.7. SUMMARY	28
CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE REVIEW	31
3.1. INTRODUCTION	31
3.2. TEACHER COLLABORATION IN GENERAL EDUCATION	33
3.3. TEACHER COLLABORATION IN LANGUAGE EDUCATION	45
3.4. JAPAN AND THE JET PROGRAMME.....	69
3.4.1. Early studies	71
3.4.2. The Tajino studies.....	79
3.4.3. The Miyazato studies	83
3.4.4. Other recent studies	87
3.5. THE CITT MODEL	94
3.6. COMMON FINDINGS	107
CHAPTER 4: FOCUS GROUP STUDY.....	110
4.1. INTRODUCTION	110
4.2. METHODOLOGY	112
4.3. RESULTS	116
4.4. DATA ANALYSIS	118
4.4.1. Category types	118
4.4.2. <i>Respect for one's partner</i>	119
4.4.3. Coordinated student instruction.....	122
4.4.4. Awareness of multiple perspectives	124
4.4.5. Equal power sharing and role agreement.....	127
4.4.6. Openness and flexibility.....	132
4.4.7. Advance joint planning and preparation time	135
4.4.8. Professional development opportunities	138
4.4.9. Priority of student needs	139

4.5. SUMMARY	141
CHAPTER 5: TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY	143
5.1. INTRODUCTION.....	143
5.2 RELEVANT LITERATURE	144
5.3. METHODOLOGY.....	149
5.3.1. Rationale.....	149
5.3.2. Choice of research instrument.....	152
5.3.3. Questionnaire design	154
5.3.3.1. Likert scales.....	154
5.3.3.2. Content specifications.....	155
5.3.3.3. Creating questionnaire items	157
5.3.3.4. Organisation of questionnaire.....	159
5.3.4. Piloting and distribution.....	162
5.4. FINDINGS.....	164
5.4.1. Importance rankings.....	164
5.4.2. Open-ended responses	167
5.4.2.1. Complementary personalities	168
5.4.2.2. Complementary teaching philosophies	169
5.4.2.3. Supporting or correcting a partner	170
5.4.2.4. Different teacher opinions	171
5.4.2.5. Respect for one's partner.....	172
5.4.2.6. Criticism of questionnaire.....	173
5.4.3. Student needs	174
5.4.4. Biographical results.....	177
5.5. DISCUSSION.....	183
5.5.1. Problems and limitations.....	183
5.5.2. Critical aspects of CITT.....	186
5.5.3. Conflicting information and teacher disagreement	188
5.5.4. Adaptability in team teaching.....	190
5.5.5. Openness.....	192
5.5.6. Respect and trust.....	193
5.5.7. Role and power sharing	195
5.5.8. Complementary personalities	196
5.5.9. Question avoidance	198
5.5.10. Student needs	202
5.5.11. Content/Language teacher differences	203
5.6. SUMMARY	207
CHAPTER 6: STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY	211
6.1. INTRODUCTION.....	211
6.2. RELEVANT LITERATURE	213
6.3. METHODOLOGY.....	216
6.3.1. Rationale.....	217
6.3.2. Questionnaire design	219
6.3.3. Data collection.....	223
6.3.4. Data grouping.....	224
6.4. FINDINGS.....	226
6.4.1. Student A.....	226
6.4.2. Student B.....	228
6.4.3. Student C.....	228
6.4.4. Student D.	229
6.4.5. Student E.....	230
6.4.6. Student F.....	231
6.4.7. Student G.	232
6.5. DATA ANALYSIS	233
6.5.1. Common categories	233

6.5.1.1. Team teaching for students.....	235
6.5.1.2. Team teaching for teachers.....	239
6.5.2. Outlier responses	245
6.5.3. Effective teacher/team teacher perceptions	250
6.6. DISCUSSION	252
6.6.1. Changes over time	252
6.6.2. Data interpretation	255
6.7. SUMMARY	260
CHAPTER 7: RESEARCH SERIES DISCUSSION.....	263
7.1. INTRODUCTION	263
7.2. COMPARISON OF FINDINGS	263
7.3. THREE-MODE CITT MODEL	269
7.3.1. Information mode.....	270
7.3.2. Instruction mode	273
7.3.3. Management mode	275
7.3.4. Application of model	279
7.4. STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDIES.....	282
7.5. SUMMARY	289
CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION	291
8.1. INTRODUCTION	291
8.2. RESEARCH COMPARISONS.....	291
8.3 FURTHER RESEARCH.....	303
8.4. IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE BEYOND MIC	307
8.5. CONCLUSION	311
REFERENCES	314
APPENDICES	321
APPENDIX A: MODERATOR’S QUESTIONS FOR FOCUS GROUP STUDY	321
APPENDIX B: INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM FOR FOCUS GROUP STUDY	322
APPENDIX C: COMMON RESPONSES FROM FOCUS GROUP STUDY PARTICIPANTS.....	324
APPENDIX D: INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY	329
APPENDIX E: QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT FOR TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY	331
APPENDIX F: OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES FROM TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY	334
APPENDIX G: INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM FOR STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY	341
APPENDIX H: QUESTIONNAIRES FOR STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY	345
APPENDIX I: CORE GROUP RESPONSES FROM STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY	351
APPENDIX J: SUPPLEMENTAL GROUP RESPONSES FROM STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY.....	363
APPENDIX K: COMMON RESPONSE TYPES IN STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY.....	375

ABSTRACT

The research of this thesis investigates team teaching within a Japanese tertiary context. Miyazaki International College (MIC), Japan, is a liberal arts college using English as its medium of instruction. Within nearly all of its lower-division classes, the college employs an unusual team teaching initiative, called Collaborative Interdisciplinary Team Teaching (CITT). In each CITT class, a specialist in TESOL and a specialist in the academic subject of the class integrate their specialities to team-teach English language and the academic subject in parallel. The team teachers adopt a highly collaborative approach, teaching each course jointly as equal partners, being present in the classroom at all lesson times and sharing responsibility for all aspects of their shared course. I am a TESOL specialist at MIC, and although there has been some CITT research conducted at MIC in the past, I am the only person researching CITT at the present time.

This series of research studies was designed primarily as an exploratory study of CITT, investigating how classroom participants define what CITT is, identifying the important elements of CITT, and describing what they believe constitutes effective or ineffective CITT. The series comprises three small-scale but connected studies: an exploratory focus group study of team teachers, a follow-up questionnaire-based study of team teachers, and an exploratory questionnaire-based study of students from the team-taught classroom. A qualitative data-driven approach was employed, allowing CITT participants to define and describe the processes of CITT on their own terms, and using the data to guide the direction of the research. The data were also used to develop a conceptual model of effective CITT for application by practising team teachers.

In this thesis, the three studies of the research series are presented in their institutional context. The studies are also situated in the context of previous research findings regarding CITT and similar team teaching initiatives in other educational institutions around the world. The findings from this research series are used to identify possible implications for collaborative practice and future research opportunities.

STATEMENT OF CANDIDATE

I certify that the work in this thesis entitled “Collaborative Interdisciplinary Team Teaching in Japan: A study of practitioner and student perspectives” has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree to any other university or institution other than Macquarie University.

I also certify that the thesis is an original piece of research and it has been written by me. Any help and assistance that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself have been appropriately acknowledged.

In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

The research presented in this thesis was approved by Macquarie University Ethics Review Committee, reference number: HE26MAY2006-D04705C on 5 July 2006.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Gladman', with a large loop at the start and a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Andrew Peter Gladman, 31389503

30 June, 2009

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my grateful thanks to my supervisor, Anne Burns. I count myself extremely lucky to have worked with a professor of Anne's calibre. Time and again, I have been amazed by her patience, her expertise and the unfailing dedication she shows for her students. As a supervisor, Anne was strict! But she was also kind and encouraging. That was exactly what I needed to push me into doing my best work. I could not imagine a better supervisor.

If I tried to name all the individuals who gave me assistance in the writing of this thesis, I would embarrass myself by leaving someone out. Instead, I'd just like to offer my gratitude to my students and colleagues at MIC, and my colleagues in my study cohort and at various other colleges and universities in Japan and beyond, who helped me with my research. That includes those who acted as respondents, those who piloted the studies, those who gave me translation assistance or who performed inter-coder agreement checks, and even those colleagues who agreed to rearrange their teaching schedules to accommodate my time constraints! Thanks to all of you. I would, though, like to single out Kyoko Miyazato for a special mention, for taking such a positive interest in my work and giving me her feedback and assistance as a fellow team-teaching researcher.

Finally, my most heartfelt thanks go to my wife, Tehmina, for her unswerving support throughout these years of study. Tehmina got me through the bad times and was always there for me when I needed her patient help or her insightful advice. Quite simply, I could not have written this thesis without her.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AET	Assistant English Teacher
ALM	Audio-Lingual Method (of language teaching)
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
CALP	Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency
CBLI/CBI	Content-based (Language) Instruction
CES	Cambridge English School
CITT	Collaborative Interdisciplinary Team Teaching (of MIC)
CLAIR	Council of Local Authorities for International Relations (Japan)
CLT	Communicative Language Teaching (approach)
CT	Content Teacher (of a CITT partnership)
D App Ling	Doctor of Applied Linguistics (of Macquarie University)
EAP	English for Academic Purposes
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ELT	English Language Teaching
EOP	English for Occupational Purposes
EPIK	English Program in Korea
ESL	English as a Second Language
ESOL	English for Speakers of Other Languages
ESP	English for Special/Specific Purposes
FRC	Faculty Review Committee (of MIC)
JALT	Japan Association for Language Teaching
JET	Japan Exchange and Teaching

JTE	Japanese Teacher of English
L1	First language (learned)
L2	Second language (learned)
LET	Local English Teacher
LT	Language Teacher (of a CITT partnership)
MEI	Miyazaki Educational Institution
MEXT	Japanese Ministry of Education (Full English title: The Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture)
MIC	Miyazaki International College
NEST	Native English Speaking Teacher
NET	Native-speaking English Teacher
NNS	Non-Native Speaker
NNST	Non-Native Speaker Teacher
NS	Native Speaker
NST	Native Speaker Teacher
PNET	Primary Native-speaking English Teacher
SSM	Soft Systems Methodology
TESOL	Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
TRAC	Testing and Research Assessment Committee (of MIC)

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 5.1: Distribution of responses for the two highest-ranked items (teacher questionnaire study)	167
Figure 5.2: Distribution of responses for the two lowest-ranked items (teacher questionnaire study)	167
Figure 5.3: Distribution of responses to student needs statement (teacher questionnaire study)	175
Figure 5.4: Distribution of responses by teacher-type for ‘routinely meet outside class’ item (teacher questionnaire study)	180
Figure 5.5: Distribution of responses by teacher-type for ‘share authority equally’ item (teacher questionnaire study)	181
Figure 5.6: Distribution of responses by teacher-type for ‘routinely communicate with each other’ item (teacher questionnaire study)	182
Figure 7.1: The information mode (inside the CITT classroom)	271
Figure 7.2: The instruction mode (inside the CITT classroom)	274
Figure 7.3: The management mode (outside the CITT classroom)	276
Figure 7.4: The three-mode CITT model with summary of key points	280

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1: Major categories of response from focus group data, with descriptions and examples (focus group study)	120
Table 5.1: Questionnaire items derived from focus group themes (teacher questionnaire study)	161
Table 5.2: Questionnaire items derived from the team teaching literature (teacher questionnaire study)	162
Table 5.3: Respondents' mean scores ranked in importance (teacher questionnaire study)	165
Table 5.4: Questionnaire items showing significant differences between content and language teachers (teacher questionnaire study)	180
Table 6.1: Major categories of response as related to students, with descriptions and example quotes (student questionnaire study)	235
Table 6.2: Major categories of response as related to teachers, with descriptions and example quotes (student questionnaire study)	239
Table 6.3: Prominent outlier responses, listed in context of the complete response (student questionnaire study)	245
Table 6.4: Core group respondents' answers to the question, "Is an effective teacher the same as an effective team teacher?" (student questionnaire study)	250