

Exploring *Integrated Teaching* in a General English Class at a Junior College in Tokyo: Advantages and Challenges

東京の短期大学一般英語クラスにおけるインテグレイテッド・
ティーチングの開発：長所と課題

Kaoru Mita

Professor, Department of English Communication

Anamaria Isticioaia-Budura

Full-time Lecturer, Department of English Communication

Ritsuko Kurita

Full-time Lecturer, Department of English Communication

Tomoko Kurita

Part-time Lecturer, Department of English Communication

Yuko Maurer

Part-time Lecturer, Department of English Communication

Robert Christopher Lavey

Part-time Lecturer, Department of English Communication

David Baldwin

Part-time Lecturer, Department of English Communication

三田 薫

英語コミュニケーション学科教授

アナマリア・イステイチョアイア-ブドゥラ

英語コミュニケーション学科専任講師

栗田 梨津子

英語コミュニケーション学科専任講師

栗田 智子

英語コミュニケーション学科兼任講師

マウラー 裕子

英語コミュニケーション学科兼任講師

ロバート・クリストファー・レヴィー

英語コミュニケーション学科兼任講師

デイヴィッド・バルドウィン

英語コミュニケーション学科兼任講師

Summary:

This paper explores how seven English teachers (three native and four non-native) have implemented collaborative practice into a general English class in their junior college. Pre- and post- grammar examinations, pre- and post- writing examinations and questionnaire concerning collaborative teaching were conducted to teachers and students. The results show the importance of such teaching, highlighting some of its advantages and disadvantages, yielding significant data on how team teaching is one way of teaching that may enhance and motivate students' learning of English. The study calls for a continuous research into collaborative practice from the next academic year.

Key Words : EFL, ESL, collaborative practice, Integrated Teaching, team-teaching, grammar instruction, native teachers, non-native teachers, junior college

抄録 :

本稿では、7名の英語教員（ネイティブ3名、非ネイティブ4名）が短期大学における一般英語のコースで、どのように協働して指導を行ったかを調査した。コース前後に文法とライティングのテストを行い、コース後に学生と教員に協働的指導についてのアンケートを実施した。その結果、ネイティブと非ネイティブの教員による協働的指導が学生の英語学習および意欲を向上させる指導であることがわかった。

キーワード : EFL、ESL、協働的指導、インテグレイテッド・ティーチング、チームティーチング、文法指導、ネイティブ教員、非ネイティブ教員、短期大学

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to explore how seven English teachers (three native and four non-native speakers of English/Japanese nationality) have implemented collaborative practice into a general English class in their junior college. The term “native speaker” in our context is a person who is a foreign national with a native level of English proficiency. This work originated from the school framework in which this general English class is taught.

Collaborative Practice (CP) has its roots in the progressive education in the US in the 1960s, where it started as co-teaching. Co-teaching took place in ESOL (English to Speakers of Other Languages) classes, general education and special education (Cook, 2004). From 1994, it has been practiced in Europe as well, in the “content and language integrated learning” (CLIL). In CLIL, the teachers generally teach in different classes, and set up meetings in which the language teacher (LT) and the content teacher (CT) share each other's knowledge. The LT's goal is to support students in order for them to develop their language skills and identify the

linguistic focus/needs of particular students (Davidson, 2006). CP is an ongoing process that is built upon the development of common goals and the willingness to discuss disagreements and recognize each other's expertise, while continuously learn from one another (Martin-Beltran, *et al.*, as cited in Honigsfeld & Dove, 2012).

According to Cook and Friend (1995), CP is a style of interaction between at least two equal parties voluntarily engaged in shared decision-making as they work toward a common goal. This can be a challenging approach to establishing and sustaining such items, as context, participants, and goal depend on various factors (Friend & Cook, 2010).

As for Japan, team-teaching has been introduced into the classroom of English as Foreign Language (EFL) teaching. This joint instruction by a Japanese teacher of English (JTE) and a native-speaker assistant English teacher (AET) in the same class by taking turns in each task, began at the time when the secondary curriculum was beginning to focus on oral communication (Tajino & Tajino, 2000). This approach has the teacher engaged in communicative activities aiming at developing the students' abilities to understand a foreign language and express themselves. It is also an approach through which they can foster a positive attitude toward communicating in the target language and heighten their interest in that language and culture, hence deepening their international awareness and understanding (Tajino & Tajino, 2000). However, they have also highlighted difficulties when teachers collaborate with each other in Japanese schools. Tanabe (as cited in Tajino & Tajino, 2000), points out several problems: the AET is often not properly trained to manage a class, has little in-depth knowledge of the English language, and regarded as a "human tape recorder" as being too young to be responsible for leading a class.

In our junior college, native and non-native English teachers have been implementing the collaborative practice approach in a general English class, and we would like to name it as *Integrated Teaching*. This term refers to our goal of integrating not only the four skills (speaking, listening, reading and writing) but also incorporating our knowledge and expertise as educators, who have a common goal of supporting our students' language progress and learning in an authentic and friendly environment. Teachers teach the same students in pairs on different days and in different classes. The native teachers (NTs) focus on the four skills, while the Japanese, non-native teachers (NNTs) focus on grammar and the implementation of key structures. The classes are divided by levels from A to D, where Class A is the most advanced and Class D is the basic, based on the results of the school's placement test, conducted at the start of the semester. Through our meetings every semester, teachers noticed that each of their teaching approaches had an impact on the outcome of every respective class. They also found both the advantages and disadvantages of *Integrated Teaching*, along with the importance of effective communication, commitment, and logistical

considerations such as scheduling and planning time for collaboration (Friend & Cook, 2010).

Types of Collaboration in Language Teaching

The literature shows that through the successful use of collaborative practice, planning and evaluation, teams of educators can, not only discover how to improve their lesson delivery, but also offer peer support and engage in formal and informal peer training (Dunne & Villani, 2007). On the other hand, it has also demonstrated the challenges for collaborative practice such as the lack of time to communicate, the lack of a common goal, and division of labor and curriculum/students. Despite these difficulties, several educational institutions have implemented collaborative practice in their EFL classes.

In Miyazaki International College, both LTs and CTs teach collaboratively in teams as equal partners. They are both native speakers, and both are present in the same classroom at all times. They share responsibilities for classroom management, lesson planning, student assessment and course evaluation. From the students' perspectives, team-teaching was believed to improve their understanding of class content and increase their willingness to ask questions. Respect and trust among teachers emerged as the most important aspect of teaching in a team. Another key aspect that teachers considered crucial was the need for partners to avoid presenting students with conflicting instructions. Hence, the teachers placed a great amount of importance on supporting each other in front of the students (Gladman, 2009).

Tajino and Tajino (2000) state benefits of having both JTEs and AETs collaborating with each other. The non-native teachers may serve as an imitable model of successful language learners, providing learners with more information about language and learning strategies. They can also anticipate the difficulties learners may have more easily, and perhaps better assist them through sharing their mother tongue. An ideal EFL environment should maintain a good balance between NTs and NNTs where they complement each other in both their strengths and weaknesses.

Ngo, *et al.* (as cited in Honigsfeld & Dove, 2012), and Morioka and Uchida (2014) have applied electronic communication to facilitate collaboration among English teachers and students, and students and students, in order to enhance the learning experiences of language learners. Although e-collaboration may go against the traditional conceptions of teacher collaboration, the two studies mentioned above highlight the benefits of this innovative integration of education technology. When teachers collaborate via e-collaboration, their expertise in the field and common goals are essential for successful team-teaching. Morioka and Uchida (2014) show how e-collaboration between international and Japanese students can foster effective communication.

Both cases above are informed by the theory of constructivism, or inquiry-based learning (Dewey, 1933; Vygotsky, 1978; Hazari, *et al.*, 2009), in which learners can contribute with their prior knowledge and experiences to a shared context for learning. Socialization is a key element in the learning process in order to create and share knowledge.

In universities across the world, mainstream English as well as EFL teachers or teachers of English as a second language (ESL) have been sharing their expertise, using CP, in order to enhance instruction for their English language learners (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010). When considering collaborative teaching, educators need to engage in “action research and critical reflection with one another” (Davidson, 2006, p.472) in order to achieve effective levels of collaboration.

Advantages and Challenges of Collaborative Practice

According to the literature, collaborative practice has various advantages and challenges. Professional development, teacher leadership and promoting authentic communication in the classroom, are three main benefits from collaborative teaching.

According to Dove and Honigsfeld (2010), due to the ongoing nature of professional development, collaborative practice allows both mainstream and ESL/EFL teachers to practice their new skills and provide methods to debrief and gather new information. As classroom teachers are often held accountable for employing new program initiatives via collaborative practice, educators have the benefit of hands-on, concrete practice or ongoing support from one another.

Teacher leadership may play an important role in sustaining school reform and supporting academic success. Donaldson (2001) suggests that teacher leaders are able to support an overall vision of change by mentoring new teachers, hence developing and enhancing an inclusive curriculum and providing means for continual in-class support.

Lastly, according to Tajino and Tajino (2000), team-teaching may promote authentic communication in the classroom and enable improvement of communicative competence. The writers also suggest that collaborative practice may provide students with opportunities to use the language as a means of communication for learning about diverse intercultural values. It also supports them in fostering a positive attitude towards communicating with native speakers of the language. They emphasize the point that team-teaching may be most effective when it becomes 'team-learning', in which both students and teachers are encouraged to learn from one another by exchanging ideas or cultural values.

As presented by Martin-Beltran *et al.* (as cited in Honigsfeld & Dove, 2012), the lack of time to communicate among teachers, the lack of clarity regarding teaching goals and issues of ownership, and labor and responsibility of students are three main challenges encountered by

teachers while implementing collaborative practice.

When discussing collaborative teaching, both mainstream and EFL/ESL teachers mention the lack of time during their busy workday schedules to communicate with other teachers. They try to utilize email or other online communication tools such as Moodle to overcome it. In the case of our study, checking the teaching partners' progress in class through opening the online education support system *manaba* is one way of making up for the lack of time for communication between teachers. On the other hand, some teachers prefer meeting and discussing face-to-face, as a more productive way of communicating with one another. The communication tools and the time spent for communicating with each other need to be decided at the start of the academic year in order to have teachers effectively discuss and connect with one another (Martin-Beltran, *et al.*, as cited in Honigsfeld & Dove, 2012).

The second challenge mentioned by a wide variety of teachers is the lack of clarity in the teaching goal. As literature has shown (Creese, 2002, 2006; Davidson, 2006), since ESL/EFL and mainstream teachers have different teaching preparations and separate planning groups, they tend to be unaware of each other's instructional goals. The curriculum framework is an important tool around which teachers need to build their lessons in order to manage and address conflicts and confusion.

Lastly, as Davidson (2006) states, division of ownership, labor and responsibility of students are challenges that teachers often find needed to address. Establishing norms are essential for all of them to agree upon on how responsibility and labor might be divided, in order to have fewer obstacles in the future. Some of the examples are using shared rubrics on assessing students' performance on assignments, or sharing notes in a writing workshop to indicate what the team teacher discussed with the students or what the latter needed to focus on for improvement (Davidson, 2006).

If collaborative teachers are successful in working through these challenges and focusing on the advantages, there is a huge potential of collaborative teaching, which may increase students' learning and enable teachers to engage in the lifelong process of learning together.

Research Questions

- What kinds of collaborative practice by native and non-native teachers are effective in collaborative teaching?
- What kinds of grammatical instruction in a non-native-teacher class do students think are effective for learning in a native-teacher class?
- What are the advantages and challenges of collaborative teaching?

Method

Participants

The participants were all first-year Japanese female students, mostly aged 18. All the students in our junior college are required to take a general English course, namely *Integrated English*, consisting of two classes a week, combined into one course. One class is taught by a Japanese teacher, while the other is taken by a native speaker. Students are evaluated on the combined results of both these classes.

In the spring term of the first year, students from the Department of English Communication are required to take this course, and in the fall term of the first year, those from the Department of Japanese Communication are obligated to do the same. Originally, *Integrated English* had only one textbook, where both Japanese and native-speaking instructors taught different parts of it. This was used until the end of the 2013 school year, but from the spring semester of the following year (2014), two textbooks began to be utilized, one for Japanese teachers and the other for native speakers.

Until that time, students had been placed into different classes, based on the results of an in-house English-language placement test. However, in 2014, such a division, based on the students' English proficiency, was not conducted. Since 2015, placement testing using the standardized test *ELPA* has resumed for students, who are placed into four different levels from Class A, which is the highest, to Class D, the lowest.

The participants of this survey were all from the Department of English Communication, consisting of two courses: Tourism and Business, and Global Communication. Regardless of the course to which they belong, the students of the Department of English Communication need to take quite a few English-language learning classes. For example, in the spring semester of the first year, there are four such mandatory classes every week for all first-year students, besides *Integrated English*, and there are also many elective English-language classes open for registration.

In the previous year of the current research, the NNTs of *Integrated English* started a new program with a new textbook titled *Basic Grammar in Use*. The program aimed at enhancing students' autonomous learning by using the textbook designed for self-study. The program is constructed based on the idea of Self-Regulated Learning (Zimmerman, 1990, 1998). The results suggested that students evaluated the program positively, and a significant number of them, completing the book, perceived that their English grammar knowledge improved, and their overall English ability increased (Mita, Kurita & Maurer, 2016).

In 2016, the current year of research, we started using a Japanese version of the same textbook in NNT classes, since the previous year's questionnaire results had shown that 79.46% of the participants responded that it would have been better if there had been

Japanese descriptions attached to it.

As mentioned before, students are evaluated on the combined results of both these classes. In the NNT classes, there are common evaluation criteria shared by all teachers: 'A+' for those who study the textbook up to Unit 80; 'B' for those who study up to Unit 60; and 'C' for those who complete only up to Unit 30. In addition, students need to answer online quizzes covering the units above and gain full marks. Each student can study the textbook and answer the quizzes at her own pace. Prep tests of such quizzes are provided, and teachers can use them in their classes.

In the NT classes, the teachers had discussions at the beginning of the semester on how to implement various teaching practices in order to foster the four skills: speaking, writing, reading and listening. Each of them taught in his/her own way, with a certain originality, though keeping in mind that consistency was needed across the syllabus in order to ensure that students were able to apply the knowledge learned in both the NNT and the NT classes.

During the 15 weeks, teachers focus on teaching about five main countries: the USA, Canada, China, Australia and Japan. Regarding each country, teachers focus on activities to do, places to visit and food and drinks popular in each region. With regard to Japan, teachers focus on having students research on and talk about famous cities, their hometowns and one aspect of Japanese culture. Teachers aim to implement writing as much as possible through regular journal writing on topics taught in class, and they encourage their students to share journal entries at the start of each class as a warm-up. Some teachers also aim at fostering presentation skills, giving students the opportunity to learn and practice how to make effective presentations on the topics taught in class. As an evaluation of the students' progress, teachers conduct a mid-term and final test/presentation, not only to evaluate them but also to give them the chance to apply the knowledge already learned in class.

In the current year of research, we had teachers' meetings in April and June. At the first meeting, held on April 4th, teachers were encouraged to teach *Integrated English* for the year collaboratively with those who teach the same classes, though the way of communication and collaboration were not specified. At the second meeting, held on June 17th, we discussed the results of the students' responses to the trial questionnaires concerning collaboration. Then, the pair teachers communicated how to collaborate in their classes.

Procedures

We conducted 40-minute pre-and post- grammar examinations in the NNT classes, and 10-minute pre- and post- writing examinations in NT classes. The grammar test was an in-house test based on the sentences of the textbook, and the same questions were used for both pre- and post- grammar examinations. The topic of pre-and post-writing examinations

was "Please write about where you would like to visit. Why or why not? Give three reasons." The participants wrote on a sheet of paper, and the word number of each sheet was counted afterwards by teachers.

For grammar examinations, initially, 116 students participated, though 16 were excluded for a number of reasons. The final number of participants was 100 (62 from the Tourism and Business Course, and 38 from the Global Communication Course). The online education support system *manaba* was used for the students to answer multiple-choice questions. For writing examinations, initially, 113 students participated, though 13 were excluded for a number of reasons. The final number of participants was 100 (62 from the Tourism and Business Course, and 38 from the Global Communication Course).

The questionnaire concerning collaborative teaching and the textbook used in NNT classes were administered in July, at the end of the 15th week of the spring semester. The questions were based on the results of the first trial questionnaires administered in the 9th week and examined at the teachers' meeting in June. The online education support system *manaba* was used for the students to answer multiple-choice and open questions. 104 students responded.

After the end of the spring semester, in August 2016, the questionnaire concerning collaborative teaching was conducted to all the NTs and NNTs. They were all open questions: (1) What have you done in your class with your partner teacher? (2) 3 challenges and 3 advantages of collaborative work. (3) Suggestions for improvements.

Results

Scores of pre and post grammar tests are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Scores of Pre and Post Grammar Tests

	<i>n</i>	Pre-Grammar	Post-Grammar	Difference
Class A	28	62.54	70.04	7.50
Class B	19	50.89	58.95	8.05
Class C	26	42.81	53.65	10.85
Class D	27	40.11	46.37	6.26
<i>Mean</i>		49.09	57.25	8.16

Note. Total $n=100$. The test score is from 0 (Min.) to 100 (Max.).

The result of the *t*-Test showed that the pre and post scores differed significantly in all four classes (Class A: $t(27)=4.06$, $p<.001$. Class B: $t(18)=3.81$, $p<.01$. Class C: $t(25)=6.84$, $p<.001$. Class D: $t(26)=3.81$, $p<.01$).

The results of pre and post writing tests are shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Scores of Pre and Post Writing Tests (ten-minute writing)

	<i>n</i>	Pre-Writing	Post-Writing	Difference	>100 words (Pre)	>100 words (Post)
Class A	27	60.74	84.00	23.26	1	7
Class B	22	37.05	53.50	16.45	0	0
Class C	26	45.69	83.08	37.38	0	7
Class D	25	40.48	50.20	9.72	0	0
Mean		45.99	67.69	21.70		

Note. Total *n*=100. “>100 words”= number of students who wrote more than 100 words.

The *t*-Test showed that the pre and post word numbers differed significantly in all four classes (Class A: $t(26)=4.56, p<.001$. Class B: $t(21)=4.63, p<.001$. Class C: $t(25)=5.40, p<.001$. Class D: $t(24)=2.49, p<.05$). In both Class A and D, there were 7 students who wrote more than 100 words in 10 minutes in the Post Writing Test, in contrast to only one student in four classes at the Pre Writing Test.

Table 3 shows students’ answers to the question concerning their impressions about collaborative teaching, i.e., whether what they have learned in their NNT classes is used efficiently in their NT classes. More than 80% of the respondents in the four classes think it is. The questionnaire administered at the final NNT classes is provided in Appendix.

Table 3 Students’ Responses to the Question: “Do you think what you have learned in your NNT class was used efficiently in your NT class?”

	<i>n</i>	Yes	No	No Response
Class A	26	24	2	0
Class B	24	14	7	3
Class C	27	25	2	0
Class D	27	21	5	1
Total <i>n</i>	104	84	16	4
Percent	100%	80.77%	15.38%	3.85%

Table 4 shows the items students have chosen as the reasons why they think what they have learned in their NNT classes was used efficiently in their NT classes.

Table 4 Reasons for Those Who Responded “Yes” to the Question: “Do you think what you have learned in your NNT class was used efficiently in your NT class?”

	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D	Total
1 I can learn grammatical points and expressions from the basics.	16	8	17	17	58
2 I can use the grammatical knowledge I learned in the NNT class in writing or presentation in the NT class.	14	7	15	12	48
3 I have become aware of structural and grammatical points through solving problems in the NNT class.	12	2	4	11	29
4 I feel easier to communicate with my NT because I learned grammar and expressions in the NNT class.	5	4	7	8	24
5 I can easily ask questions in the NNT class which I couldn't ask to my NT.	3	4	8	7	22
6 I feel my listening and speaking abilities have improved in the NT class.	5	2	6	8	21
7 I feel I have acquired what I learned when I get replies from my NT.	1	3	5	9	18
8 I can write messages to my NT on the computer while asking questions to my NNT.	0	2	9	6	17
9 I can ask my NT in English because I learned grammar and expressions in the NNT class.	3	1	4	6	14
10 I feel motivated in writing when I get my NT's replies.	0	0	5	5	10
Total Responses (multiple choices)	59	33	80	89	261
Number of students who chose items	24	14	25	21	84

Note. The respondents could choose multiple items.

The top four reasons are associated with grammar acquisition: “*I can learn grammatical points and expressions from the basics*” (58), “*I can use the grammatical knowledge I learned in the NNT class in writing or presentation in the NT class*” (48), “*I have become aware of structural and grammatical points through solving problems in the NNT class*” (29) and “*I feel easier to communicate with my NT because I learned grammar and expressions in the NNT class*” (24). No.5 and 8 reasons show that students feel easier to ask questions to NNTs than to NTs: “*I can easily ask questions in the NNT class which I couldn't ask to my NT*” (22) and “*I can write messages to my NT on the computer while asking questions to my NNT*” (17). No.6, 7 and 9 reasons reveal students' confidence about using English learned in NNT classes: “*I feel my listening and speaking abilities have improved in the NT class*” (21), “*I feel I have acquired what I learned when I get replies from my NT*” (18) and “*I can ask my NT in English because I learned grammar and expressions in the NNT class*” (14). The last item is only chosen by students of Class C and D, both of which had the same NT who often replied to the students' messages online: “*I feel motivated in writing when I get my NT's replies*” (10).

Table 5 shows the items students have chosen as the reasons why they do not think what they have learned in their NNT classes was used efficiently in their NT classes.

Table 5 Reasons for Those Who Responded “No” to the Question: “*Do you think what you have learned in your NNT class was used efficiently in your NT class?*”

Reasons for “No”		Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D	Total
1	<i>As I have learned just the basics of grammar, it is not enough for the NT class.</i>	2	4	0	1	7
2	<i>As I don't understand precisely the grammatical points I have learned in the NNT class, I cannot use them in the NT class.</i>	2	0	1	2	5
3	<i>As I don't talk much with my NT in class, I don't have an opportunity to use what I have learned in the NNT class.</i>	1	1	1	0	3
	No response	0	2	1	2	5
	Total Responses (multiple choices)	2	7	2	5	16
	Number of students who chose items	2	7	2	5	16

Note. The respondents could choose multiple items.

There were 16 respondents in total. The top two reasons concern their perception that they have not acquired grammar necessary for communicating in NT classes: “*As I have learned just the basics of grammar, it is not enough for the NT class*” (7) and “*As I don't understand precisely the grammatical points I have learned in the NNT class, I cannot use them in the NT class*” (5). The third reason mentions scarcity of using English in NT classes: “*As I don't talk much with my NT in class, I don't have an opportunity to use what I have learned in the NNT class*” (3).

Table 6 shows students' responses regarding grammatical items which were very useful at the NT classes.

Table 6 Students' Responses to the Question: "Which grammatical items were very useful when you attended the NT class?"

	Grammatical Items	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D	Total
1	<i>Distinction of the copula and transitive/intransitive verb</i>	6	8	15	18	47
2	<i>Distinction of tense (present, present progressive, past, present perfect, etc.)</i>	14	6	14	11	45
3	<i>Distinction of parts of speech (noun, verb, adjective, adverb)</i>	2	5	11	19	37
4	<i>The first/second/third person and corresponding verb forms</i>	7	5	10	14	36
5	<i>How to make WH questions</i>	6	4	9	16	35
6	<i>The word order of sentences (subject, verb, object)</i>	7	3	11	13	34
7	<i>Distinction of the passive voice of the present progressive form and the passive voice of the present perfect form</i>	9	4	10	7	30
8	<i>How to make negative and interrogative sentences</i>	5	3	11	10	29
9	<i>Active voice and passive voice</i>	3	1	13	5	22
10	<i>How to make existential sentences (there is/are/ was/ were, etc.)</i>	7	3	7	3	20
11	<i>How to make sentences using modal auxiliary verbs (might, could, must, should, etc.)</i>	7	1	6	4	18
12	<i>Subjective/objective cases of relative pronouns</i>	4	5	4	2	15
	Total Responses (multiple choices)	77	48	121	122	368
	Number of students who chose items	26	24	27	27	104

Note. The respondents could choose multiple items.

Interestingly, the top 6 items chosen by over 30 respondents concern basic grammar: "Distinction of the copula and transitive/intransitive verb" (47), "Distinction of tense (present, present progressive, past, present perfect, etc.)" (45), "Distinction of parts of speech (noun, verb, adjective, adverb)"(37), "The first/second/third person and corresponding verb forms"(36), "How to make WH questions" (35) and "The word order of sentences (subject, verb, object)" (34).

Table 7 shows students' responses to the question whether they have had a better understanding of English grammar by using the textbook *Basic Grammar in Use* (Japanese version). More than 81% of respondents answered either "Strongly Agree" or "Agree."

Table 7 Students' Responses to the Question: "Do you think you have had a better understanding of English grammar by using Basic Grammar in Use (Japanese version) as a textbook?"

	<i>n</i>	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Response
Class A	26	3	20	1	2	0
Class B	24	1	17	3	0	3
Class C	27	12	14	0	1	0
Class D	27	1	17	5	1	3
Total	104	17	68	9	4	6
Percent	100%	16.35%	65.38%	8.65%	3.85%	5.77%

The main reasons for "Agree": Eighteen of the students who agreed mentioned that the textbook contained detailed and comprehensible explanations of grammar points. Seventeen of them claimed that they had been happy to have the opportunity to review basic grammar points, which they had learned in junior and senior high school. Some other opinions included that they had been satisfied with the large number of exercises, which the textbook provided and that the organization of the textbook allocated the left side of the unit for an explanation of grammar points while the right one for exercise questions. Two students mentioned that handwriting in the exercise sections helped their overall learning of grammar including memorizing vocabulary.

The main reasons for “Disagree”: Four students replied that although the questions in the exercise section were easy at the beginning parts of the textbook, they became quite difficult toward the end. The explanation in the latter part of the textbook did not help them very much to understand the grammar points. Three of them claimed that the textbook had so many pages which were to be covered in a semester, that it discouraged them to finish it, not to mention completely understanding its contents. One student mentioned that the beginning sections of the textbook were too basic, thus not useful for her. Another student felt that her English ability did not improve by using the textbook.

The good points of the textbook, *Basic Grammar in Use*: Thirteen students stated that the explanations in the textbook were easy to understand and well thought out. They claimed they had acquired new grammatical knowledge through using the textbook. They also liked the colorful illustrations in it. Twelve students appreciated the variety of exercise questions as it helped them to understand grammar points. They also liked a large number of questions that helped grammar knowledge to sink in. Twelve students liked the fact that the textbook covered the very basic grammar points to more advanced ones. They appreciated the fact that they could review the English grammar they had learned in junior and senior high school. Six students liked the design of the units: left side for explanation and the right for exercise questions. The same number of students appreciated repeating the answers to similar types of questions as these helped them master the contents. Three students said the textbook contained easy and everyday English so that it helped them to improve their writing skills as well as to express themselves in English. Two students liked the fact that all the grammatical items were covered in one book. Two students said the textbook helped them to clarify what they hadn't understood before. Two students appreciated the great number of example sentences, given in the book, which helped them to understand grammar.

Points that need improvement in the textbook *Basic Grammar in Use*: Twenty-seven students expressed distress about the large amount, which had to be covered in the textbook in one semester. Fourteen students complained that the writing space for the exercise sections was limited. Eight of them felt inconvenienced by the answer key section located at the end of the book, which couldn't be detached, thus making checking answers tedious. Seven students did not like the glossy paper of the book as it was hard to write on with a pencil. Five claimed the letters were too small. Three said the answer key section did not provide enough explanations and so, they were not sure of the reasons for their mistakes. Others pointed out the monotonous patterns of exercise questions throughout the textbook. One student mentioned that she could finish the exercise questions without really understanding the contents. Another student felt that it was more practical and beneficial by focusing only on the points they were not sure of instead of doing everything in the textbook.

Table 8 shows students' responses to the question if they are going to use *Basic Grammar in Use* (Japanese version) for their self-study after the end of the course. 58.65% replied "Use" and 34.62% replied "Not Use."

Table 8 Students' Responses to the Question: "Are you going to use *Basic Grammar in Use* (Japanese version) for your self-study after the end of this course?"

	<i>n</i>	Use	Not Use	No response
Class A	26	10	16	0
Class B	24	13	7	4
Class C	27	24	2	0
Class D	27	14	11	2
Total	104	61	36	6
Percent	100%	58.65%	34.62%	5.77%

The main reasons for "Use": Twenty students said the textbook was easy to understand. Fifteen stated they would like to use it to review purposes when needed. Eleven students wanted to use the textbook because it included basic English grammar. Ten wanted to keep on using the textbook until they felt they had mastered the parts they were not confident of.

The main reasons for "Not Use": Eight students said they didn't like the book because it was too heavy, had too much content, was hard to read and write in, etc. Six preferred other textbooks.

Table 9 concerns the version of the textbook, either English version of the Japanese version. 85.58% replied it was a good choice to use the Japanese version.

Table 9 Students' Responses to the Question: "Last year, students of *Integrated English* used the original English version of the textbook *Basic Grammar in Use*, but this year you used the Japanese version. Do you think it was a good choice to use the Japanese version?"

	<i>n</i>	Good Choice	Not a Good Choice	No response
Class A	26	22	4	0
Class B	24	18	3	3
Class C	27	25	1	1
Class D	27	24	1	2
Total	104	89	9	6
Percent	100%	85.58%	8.65%	5.77%

The main reasons for "Good Choice": Sixty-six students said that if it were in Japanese, they didn't think they would have understood the content. The main reasons for "Not a Good Choice": None.

Collaborative Practice in Class A

(NNT: Reiko, NT: Annie) Throughout the classes, they focused on strengthening students' writing skills as well as grammatical competence. In Reiko's class, after reviewing grammar points from a textbook, students were given the opportunity to ask questions that had come

up during their self-learning to which the teacher answered individually. They were asked to make sentences using the grammar they had just learned. For example, after reviewing the difference between 'has to' and 'had to', students were requested to make at least five sentences to explain what they had to do or had had to do (e.g. "*She has to finish her homework today.*" "*She had to go to the dentist yesterday.*"). In order to help students deepen their understanding on grammar points, they were requested to revise their sentences according to Reiko's feedback and were also asked to write short essays on a designated topic, such as introducing their hometown and famous cities in the world, using the fixed expressions, which were utilized in Annie's class. Reiko posted on the online education support system *manaba*, grammatical points she was teaching in class and the exercises she was using in composition so that Annie could check what students had learned in Reiko's classes. Annie prepared several handouts on reviewing grammar in her classes. In this way, students were able to reinforce the grammatical knowledge they had acquired and also learn how the grammar could be used in actual communication. In Annie's classes, students had many opportunities to write about students' favorite countries/cities, which they would like to visit, through regular journal writing. In the process of writing, students were encouraged to apply the grammar and expressions they had already learned.

Collaborative Practice in Class B

(NNT: Yumi, NT: Daniel) Yumi did not collaborate very much until mid-term, which is the 3rd week of May. She had students write their self-introduction on *manaba* and asked Daniel to give comments on their writing. He gave answers to all of them and she was sure it took him quite a long time. She went over some of the students' self-introductions and his comments in class to share in the learning of some grammar points and expressions after which, she had them upload to *manaba* sentences, using "*I have...*", "*I've got...*", "*used to...*" and the present perfect tense. Yumi asked Daniel to make comments on them as a group as she thought it would be easier and less time consuming for him to answer to a group instead of to each student. He made comments on *manaba* to each group and she went over them in class. For the rest of the semester, she sent an email every week, letting him know which units she had covered in class and he responded that he was trying to use them in a class project and homework. Yumi and Daniel worked on different days and he was very busy with four new classes added to his schedule that year. Twice, Yumi told him which grammar lessons she had covered and told him twice about a *manaba* assignment.

Collaborative practice in Class C

(NNT: Takako, NT: Charles) As *Integrated Teaching* in Takako's class, she took 10 to 15

minutes to do writing activities in every class. She had her students write passages on *manaba* and shared these with Charles. The topics of the writing assignment were “*self-introduction*,” “*how to learn English outside of class*,” and “*the last time when you were surprised*.” Those topics allowed the students to use basic grammar rules, which were covered by Units 1 to 30 on *Basic Grammar in Use*, including the “be” verb and the “do” verb, and the present and past tenses.

In class, Takako encouraged students to try to write, using their English knowledge and answered their questions individually. Her students had to finish posting their writing by Charles’ next class. He, then, responded to each of their posts on *manaba*, which provided them with English interactive experience in a real context. Charles’ replies focused on meaning rather than form and if the students had made any mistake, he tried to answer with correct grammar, hoping they would notice their own mistakes. After his replies, Takako asked the students in her next class to revise their text according to Charles’ and her feedback. However, before their revision, she taught grammar points and organization by showing some examples of their common errors and problems in their writing of the previous week and asked how it should be corrected. In the revision, they needed to write longer and better passages than they had done the first time. Charles gave them opportunities to present on various topics in front of the class, or group discussions. For example, he chose random pairs and had the students introduce their partner. He talked about the “studying out of class” topic and wrote all of the different ideas on the board. After that, the students formed into groups and talked about each idea. Charles sometimes used sentences, which they had posted on *manaba*.

Collaborative practice in Class D

(NNT: Keiko, NT: Charles) As an attempt to teach collaboratively, they started the NT’s replying to the students’ posting on *manaba*. Keiko emailed the topics to Charles and had her students write about them every time, so that he could comment on their postings. The writing topics corresponded to the grammatical points she had taught in class. For example, after teaching the present perfect, students were asked to fill in the blanks of “*I have been to (). I have lost my ().*” After the lesson on WH questions, they were asked to use the previous comments by Charles and make questions like “Dear Charles, You said, ‘*I have also been to Okinawa many times.*’ *When did you go to Okinawa most recently?*” The exchanges between the students and Charles were held four times: as a group of 4 members at first, and then between each student and Charles. The time allocated for writing and posting in Keiko’s class was just 5 to 10 minutes, since the students were at the lowest level according to the placement test, and they needed special grammar reinforcement. They used a supplementary grammar textbook most of the class time. In

Charles' class, he gave them many opportunities to present on various topics or give group poster presentations. At times, he used sentences which students had posted on *manaba*. Moreover, he gave several grammar instructions such as the past and future tenses, comparatives, superlatives and probability. He also encouraged them to use correct grammar.

Challenges of Collaborative Practice in our Classes

The greatest challenge for teaching collaboratively was the lack of time for communication between the NT and NNT pair. Yumi and Daniel worked on different days of the week and never saw each other during the term (Daniel was too busy teaching his classes to join the occasional teachers' meetings). Yumi said that, *"Communicating face-to-face works better unless both teachers know each other well and communicate frequently and smoothly by investing about an equal amount of time and commitment toward communication between the two."* The other pair also had the same problem even though they worked on the same day, at least once a week. Reiko said that, *"It is difficult to take time to discuss the progress of each class with the native teacher."* The teachers used email to contact each other, but Keiko said that, *"I sometimes felt this way of communication was not enough."* Lack of communication led to various consequences, such as lack of *"Solving problems and brainstorming ideas together"* (Charles). They had to be careful about *"Making sure not to step on their/each other's toes when correcting assignments. I don't want to contradict what the other teacher may have told students"* (Daniel). If there had been some common syllabus between the teaching pair, it would have helped to overcome the lack of time for communication, which they did not have. Annie pointed out the importance of *"Time management of the syllabus so that the native teachers are able to include the review of the grammar points taught in the Japanese teacher's classes."* Keiko said, *"The grammar instruction in my class would have been used more effectively in the NT class if I had known the lesson plans of the pair teacher's class."* Yumi and Reiko noted the difficulty caused by not sharing the same textbook between the pair: *"We used different textbooks. This made it very difficult to work collaboratively to enhance the students' English proficiency"* (Yumi), and *"We used different textbooks with different purposes, which made it difficult to have consistency in the class contents"* (Reiko). During the term, teachers used the online education support system *manaba* to check students' essays or the pair teachers' class information. The operational performance of this system was not necessarily perfect, which bothered the teachers who used *manaba* frequently in class. Takako had her students write essays and asked Charles to comment on them, but *"manaba was not suitable for a two-way interaction to keep the thread"* (Takako), i.e., even though her students replied to Charles' comments on *manaba*, it was not easy for him to find their replies and make comments again on the *manaba* pages. As *"responding on manaba is time consuming"* (Charles), the *manaba*

system should be revised for a smoother two-way interaction. Time consuming activity is not just for NTs'. As an attempt to collaborate, Takako asked her students to write and revise a certain amount of sentences and send them to some school outside Japan, and *"It took a long time to revise the draft and it was a challenge to have the students learn how to write"* (Takako).

Advantages of Collaborative Practice in our Classes

According to the participating teachers, the greatest advantage of collaboration was that the students were provided with both discreet grammar instructions and opportunities for practicing them; *"We can use our strengths in lessons. That is, Japanese teachers can use students L1 (first language) so that students don't have problems understanding the Japanese teacher in class. Native teachers can provide authentic input to students"* (Yumi), *"In the native teacher's classes, students can review what they had studied in the Japanese teacher's classes, which helps them reinforce their learning. Students can learn how to utilize their grammatical knowledge in actual communication in the native teacher's classes. Both the Japanese and native teachers are in a complementary relationship in teaching English, taking advantage of their strengths toward the common goal"* (Reiko). Keiko added a similar note that: *"If the lesson plans of pair teachers are effectively linked, they can make use of the grammatical points in writing essays in NT's classes"* (Keiko). Some of the teachers also commented on the students' opportunity of learning from different perspectives; *"Not only the language advantages, two teachers can provide students with different perspectives not only in approaching language learning but also in cultural points of view"* (Yumi).

Another advantage is that the teaching pair can share ideas and solve problems together; *"We teachers were able to communicate and share the problems of students with each other"* (Takako), *"By collaborating with another teacher, we can learn from each other and improve our teaching"* (Yumi), *"If the collaboration works well, it would give both teachers great hints on teaching, and it would improve the students' skills considerably"* (Keiko) and *"Collaborative teaching allows ideas to be shared, 'two heads are better than one'"* (Charles). In both classes, the pair can also instruct students not to make the same mistakes; *"If we see common mistakes happening we can have the other teacher address them in his/her class"* (Charles).

As Takako and Keiko let their students write messages to the pair NT (both NT classes were taught by Charles), they found how motivated the students were when they read the NT's comments, which is considered another advantage of collaboration: *"Students got highly motivated in communicating with the native teacher"* (Takako), *"Students were so excited about reading the comments by the pair teacher"* (Keiko) and *"Replying to each student on manaba is good for the student because they get to interact with a native English-speaker in a non-threatening way, and the teacher gets a window into each student's motivations for studying"*

(Charles). Through the opportunities of writing in a real situation, students can also internalize the English; *"Students had good opportunities to internalize English expressions by writing in the real situation"* (Takako). Students can take more time to learn about each topic too: *"Collaborative teaching allows the students more time on each topic"* (Charles).

Suggestions for Improvements in our Classes

The participating teachers' suggestions for improvements of collaborative teaching are as follows: Firstly, they suggested to set up more opportunities for communication between the teaching pair, which would be face-to-face meetings, or posting information on *manaba* if the system becomes more user-friendly; *"Team teachers need to see each other on a regular basis so it would be ideal to have the schedule of two team teachers set accordingly in order to meet their needs"* (Yumi), *"Conducting regular meetings between Japanese and native teachers (at least once a month) so that teaching consistency among teachers may develop, leading to a more productive learning experience for students"* (Annie), *"It may be useful if manaba had a message board to be reviewed only by pair teachers to exchange information about students' progress in learning, which may enable them to give more specific instructions to each student,"* and *"Even though it is logistically difficult for pair teachers to meet on a regular basis, some good SNS system should be introduced for enhancing their communication"* (Charles).

Secondly, they suggested that the teaching pair should think about the common goal, and make the syllabus together; *"At the beginning of the semester, it would be ideal to share the specific goal regarding what skills students should attain by when between the native and Japanese teachers"* (Reiko), *"I would like to make the syllabus together so that it would let each of us have ideas about better collaboration"* (Keiko), *"The Japanese and native teachers should work more closely on syllabus design and the grammar to be focused on"* (Charles). There was also a suggestion that the pair teachers should use the same textbook; *"Using the same textbook between two team teachers will dramatically improve the effectiveness of collaborative teaching, thus students' learning will be enhanced. Finding a good textbook designed for that purpose is necessary"* (Yumi).

They also suggested that grammatical points and journal topics should be linked; *"The native teacher could coordinate journal assignments with the grammar lesson. For example, assignments from the native teacher should supplement the grammar lesson"* (Daniel), or *"include 'grammar days' in the native teachers' syllabus so that students have the opportunity to review what grammar points they have learned in an all-English environment as well, hence leading to a more productive acquiring of grammar terms"* (Annie).

Daniel suggested some concrete ideas; *"Make it conducive to more original answers e.g. from the sentence in the textbook, 'If you hadn't started college, what would you be doing now?'"* you

can ask students to write about 'If I hadn't started college I would be...' or 'What are you going to be doing in 5 years?' These types of questions can give them a chance to answer real questions using the grammar they have just studied with a different teacher" (Daniel). He also proposed that if the native teachers wanted to connect the journal topics with the class contents, they could use questions such as: "What might you do in China?' This way students are able to use the adverb 'might' that they learned in class, in their report on China" (Daniel).

Another suggestion for collaboration is to take more time on each topic and activity and let them internalize the information in English. This would also decrease the workload of each teacher; *'Personally I intend to slow down the pace and organize better. I really need to express to the students the importance of getting things done correctly the first time so we can build on what we have learned. Because some of the students put so much effort into the posters, I think it's a waste to jump straight into the next presentation. I would have them expand their presentations, add more information and present again. This should help to really internalize the information and give them more time actually to speak "real" English' (Charles), and "It would be good if there were one or the other: manaba or journals. I used journals in class and Yumi used manaba. I would occasionally get on to comment, but it was very time consuming. Occasionally checking in on manaba is good. Maybe the Japanese teacher could set three specific assignments for the native teacher. Or the native teacher could arrange to get on manaba three times to go through all student responses. But each week is too much, in my opinion" (Daniel).*

Discussion

There seemed to be two main factors that led to the prominent improvement in both grammar and writing tests in Classes A and C. Firstly, in these classes, NTs and NNTs played distinctive roles by making use of each other's expertise toward the common goal: NNTs provided students with explicit knowledge of grammar points and writing strategies using their native language. They could also anticipate the difficulties more easily that learners may have and perhaps better assist them through sharing their mother tongue, whereas NTs encouraged students to utilize their grammatical knowledge in authentic communication through implicit feedback on how to use the grammar in appropriate contexts.

It should be noted that NNTs in both classes attempted to strengthen students' grammatical knowledge by answering students' questions on an individual basis and asking them not only to write sentences but also revise their writing according to the teachers' feedback, which resulted in the reinforcement of students' understanding of grammar. In the meantime, NTs motivated students to write English sentences and journals on various topics and taught them the subtle nuances of English expressions, which NNTs were not necessarily aware of in the process. The effectiveness of this collaboration of the pair teachers was realized by students,

as seen in Tables 3 and 4. It can be inferred that, as Ellis (2006) suggested, this balanced combination of explicit and implicit feedback on grammar enabled students to boost their grammatical competence overall.

Secondly, in Class C where the progress of students was most noticeable, pair teachers shared ideas and solved problems together; *"We teachers were able to communicate and share the problems of students with each other"* (Takako) and *'Collaborative teaching allows ideas to be shared, "two heads are better than one"'* (Charles). By sharing information on students' mistakes and weaknesses, the pair explained the common errors from different perspectives; *"If we see common mistakes happening we can have the other teacher address them in his/her class"* (Charles), preventing students from making the same mistakes. This case supports Tajino and Tajino's (2000) discussion that team-teaching is most effective when teachers as well as students are encouraged to learn from one another by exchanging ideas or cultural values.

Although the benefits of sharing information and mutual learning in *Integrated Teaching* was recognized by teachers in other classes; *"By collaborating with another teacher, we can learn from each other and improve our teaching"* (Yumi), *"If the collaboration works well, it would give both teachers great hints on teaching, and it would improve the students' skills considerably"* (Keiko), it may not necessarily bring the most effective results unless the complementary role of NTs and NNTs, stated earlier, is achieved in a balanced manner.

Despite the challenges noted by the teachers in their feedback, such as lack of communication and a common goal, and time consuming tasks, the extent to which the pair teachers can perform as like a team seems to be the key to bring successful results in students' grammar competence.

Conclusion

This is a brief and limited study relevant to our junior college. However, it stresses the importance of collaboration between teachers in order to attain the same goal of helping students better their English skills. We hope that *Integrated Teaching* classes provided students with a genuine, safe and friendly environment where they could make use of their acquired skills and learn new ones. Owing to its benefits, collaborative practice will be implemented in the *Integrated English* classes from next year as well, as a continuous approach to teaching English in our junior college.

References

- Cook, L. (2004). Co-Teaching: Principles, Practices, and Pragmatics. New Mexico *Public Education Department Quarterly*. Special Education Meeting (Albuquerque, New Mexico, April 29, 2004). [Participant's Guide]. New Mexico Public Education Department.
- Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1995). Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices. *Focus on exceptional children*, 28(3), 1-16.
- Creese, A. (2002). The discursive construction of power in teacher partnerships: Language and subject specialists in mainstream schools. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 597-616.
- Creese, A. (2006). Supporting talk? Partnership teachers in classroom interaction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(4), 434-453.
- Davison, C. (2006). Collaboration between ESL and content teachers: How do we know when we are doing it right? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(4), 454-475.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: a restatement of the relation of reflective practice to the educative process*. Chicago IL: Henry Regnery Co.
- Donaldson, G. A. (2001). *Cultivating leadership in schools: Connecting people, purpose, and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Dove, M., & Honigsfeld, A. (2010). ESL co-teaching and collaboration: Opportunities to develop teacher leadership and enhance student learning. *TESOL Journal* 1(1), 3-22.
- Dunne, K. & Villani, S. (2007). *Mentoring new teachers through collaborative teaching: Linking teacher and student learning*. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83-107.
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2010). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals*. (6th Ed.) Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Gladman, A. (2009). *Collaborative interdisciplinary team teaching in Japan: A study of practitioner and student perspectives*. Doctoral dissertation, Macquarie University.
- Hazari, S., North, A., & Moreland, D. (2009). Investigating pedagogical value of wiki-technology. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 20(2), 187.
- Honigsfeld, A. & Dove, M.G. (2012). *Coteaching and Other Collaborative Practices in the EFL/ESL Classroom. Rationale, Research, Reflections, and Recommendations*. Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing Inc.
- Martin, S., Frattura, E., Schneider, K.A. & Capper C. A. (2012). Bilingual students within Integrated Comprehensive Services- Collaborative Strategies. In Honigsfeld, A. & Dove, G. (Eds.), *Coteaching and Other Collaborative Practices in the EFL/ESL Classroom. Rationale, Research, Reflections, and Recommendations* (pp.3-13). Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing Inc.
- 三田薫, 栗田智子 & マウラー裕子. (2016). 短期大学必修英語教育科目における自己調整学習プログラムの実践—メタ認知能力を高めて自律した学習者を育てる英文法学習指導. 実践女子大学短期大学部紀要 = *The Bulletin of Jissen Women's Junior College*, 37, 15-44.
- Ngo, L., Goldstein, S. & Portugal, L. (2012). E-Collaboration. Connecting ESL Teachers Across Contexts. In Honigsfeld, A. & Dove, G. (Eds.), *Coteaching and Other Collaborative Practices in the EFL/ESL Classroom. Rationale, Research, Reflections, and Recommendations* (pp.101-110). IAP.
- Morioka, A. & Uchida, C. (2014). Collaborative lessons through a blended learning approach. *Bulletin of Higher Education*, 10, 79-91. Okayama University.
- Risko, V. J., & Bromley, K. (2001). *Collaboration for Diverse Learners: Viewpoints and Practices*. International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Road, PO Box 8139, Newark, DE 19714-8139.
- Tajino, A., & Tajino, Y. (2000). Native and non-native: what can they offer? Lessons from team-teaching in Japan. *ELT journal*, 54(1), 3-11.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1990). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview. *Educational Psychologist*, 25(1), 3-17.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1998). Developing self-fulfilling cycles of academic regulation: an analysis of exemplary instructional models. In D. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning: From teaching to self-reflective practice* (pp.1-19). Guilford Press: New York.

Appendix

インテグレートッド・イングリッシュ授業アンケート

「日本人とネイティブの授業の関係について」

1) インテグレートッド・イングリッシュは、日本人授業とネイティブ授業から成り立っています。日本人授業で学んだことがネイティブ授業で活かされていると思いますか。

- ① 活かされている
- ② 活かされていない

2) 1) で「活かされている」と答えた人は、その理由を選んでください。(該当するものをすべて選んでください。) その他の理由がある場合は記入してください。

- ① 日本人授業で、今までわからなかった文法や表現を基礎から丁寧に学べるから
- ② 日本語授業の文法説明によって理解が深まり、その知識をネイティブ授業の英作文や発表などで活用できるから
- ③ 日本人授業で文法を学んだことで、ネイティブ授業でより正確に英語を聞き取り、話せるようになったから
- ④ 日本人授業で文法や表現を学んだことにより、ネイティブの先生にコミュニケーションをとりやすくなったから
- ⑤ 日本人授業で文法や表現を学んだことにより、ネイティブの先生に質問できるようになったから
- ⑥ ネイティブ授業でわからなかったことや、英語で聞けなかった質問を、日本人授業で気軽に質問でき、正しく理解できるから
- ⑦ 日本人授業でわからないところを教えてもらいながら、manaba でネイティブの先生に英文を書いたり、話したりできるから
- ⑧ 日本人授業で小さな疑問が解決することにより、今まで意識していなかった文章の作り方や文法に気をつけられるようになったから
- ⑨ manaba 上で作成した英文に対してネイティブの先生からの返事があったので、学習したことが身についた感じがするから
- ⑩ manaba でのネイティブの先生とのやりとりがあると、英作文にもやる気が出てくる

その他の理由：()

3) 上記1) で「活かされていない」と答えた人は、その理由を選んでください。(該当するものをすべて選んでください。)

- ① 基礎的なことしかまだ学習していないので、ネイティブの授業に生かしきれていない
- ② 日本人授業で学習したものが明確に理解できていないから、ネイティブ授業で生かせない
- ③ ネイティブの先生と会話をする機会が、ネイティブの授業中あまりないので、学んだことを

使用することが少ない

その他の理由：()

4) 日本人授業で学んだ文法事項で、ネイティブ授業で実際に英語を使う際に役立ったなあと感じたものはどれですか？ (該当するものをすべて選んでください。)

- ① 品詞の区別 (名詞、動詞、形容詞、副詞)
- ② **be** 動詞と一般動詞の区別
- ③ 時制の区別 (現在形、現在進行形、過去形、現在完了形などの形と意味)
- ④ 主語の人数によって動詞が変わるしくみ (**I am You are** 複数 **are** その他は全部 **is, I do you do** 複数 **do** その他は全部 **does** など)
- ⑤ 基本的な肯定文の作り方 (英語は 「～は」「～する」「～を」の語順)
- ⑥ 否定文や疑問文の作り方
- ⑦ **WH** 疑問文の作り方
- ⑧ 能動態と受動態の区別 「～する」と「～される」の区別
- ⑨ 現在進行形の受動態 (**be** 動詞 + **being** + 過去分詞) と現在完了形の受動態 (**has/have** + **been** + 過去分詞) の区別
- ⑩ 法助動詞 (**might, could, must, should** など) を用いた文の作り方
- ⑪ **there** + **be** 動詞構文 (**there is/are/ was/ were** など) の作り方
- ⑫ 関係代名詞の主格と目的格

その他：()

「教科書について」

5) 『マーフィーのケンブリッジ英文法』を使うことで、英文法が分かるようになりましたか。

- ① とても分かるようになった
- ② まあまあ分かるようになった
- ③ あまり分かるようにならなかった
- ④ ぜんぜん分かるようにならなかった

6) 上記5) の理由を書いてください：()

7) 教科書『マーフィーのケンブリッジ英文法』の良かった点と悪かった点を書いてください。

良かった点：()

悪かった点：()

8) 教科書『マーフィーのケンブリッジ英文法』を今後も自習教材として使用しますか。

- ① 使用する
- ② 使用しない

9) 上記8)の理由を書いてください：()

10) 今年度は日本語版のテキスト（『マーフィーのケンブリッジ英文法』）ですが、昨年度はこのテキストの英語版（**Basic Grammar in Use**）を使用しました。今年度は日本語版でよかったと思いますか。

- ① 日本語版でよかった
- ② 英語版の方がよかった

11) 上記10)の理由を書いてください：()