

Looking for Common Ground: An Investigation of Motivational Strategies Valued by ALTs and JTEs

Jennie Roloff Rothman¹

Kanda University of International Studies, Chiba

ABSTRACT

Although the JET (Japan Exchange and Teaching) Programme and its Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs) have existed for more than a quarter century, many questions on how and to what extent ALTs ought to be utilized in the classroom still remain. Present research is largely concerned with discussions of cultural differences that impede successful team-teaching, or documentation of issues, such as ALT underutilization, rather than offering tangible solutions or program evaluation. Examining the teaching beliefs and attitudes toward student motivation of both ALTs and their Japanese counterparts (JTEs) is one possible step towards practical solutions to these issues. This paper outlines the results of a survey on the importance of motivational strategies given to ALTs and JTEs while providing concrete suggestions for how to better utilize ALTs in the way that draws from the common beliefs uncovered.

INTRODUCTION

The JET (Japan Exchange and Teaching) Programme is one of the most successful and well-known teaching and exchange programs in the world. Currently, there are roughly 5,000 JET participants (referred to as JETs) from 41 countries within Japan (The JET Programme, 2010). Of this, the majority are Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs), though Sports Exchange Advisors (SEAs) and Coordinators for International Relations (CIRs) are also a part of the program. The ALTs are predominantly from English-speaking countries and teach English in schools, though other languages may be taught. ALTs chiefly team-teach with Japanese teachers of English (JTEs) in junior high and high schools. Recently, however, education policy guidelines have expanded this to include elementary schools as well (Course of Study, 2003). Participants on JET gain real-world teaching experience as well as an opportunity to deepen their understanding of a foreign culture. The program's goal to "promote grass roots internationalization at the local level by inviting young overseas graduates to

1 Jennie Roloff Rothman is a senior lecturer in the English Language Institute (ELI) at Kanda University of International Studies in Chiba, Japan. She received her MA in TESOL from Teachers College Columbia University in 2010. Correspondence should be sent to jennier@kanda.kuis.ac.jp

assist in international exchange and foreign language education in local governments, boards of education and elementary, junior and senior high schools through Japan,” (The JET Programme, 2010) has brought nearly all Japanese students into contact with a JET. The degree of exposure to foreign culture this program has created is something that few countries can match. The success of this program has certainly furthered the EFL field, familiarizing a broader population with the concept of English education overseas, as well as inspiring the development of EFL programs throughout the world.

JET was a truly remarkable experience for me and was the catalyst for my teaching career, ultimately prompting to pursue a Masters degree at Teachers College, Columbia University in Japan (TC Tokyo). I was among the first JETs able to stay for 5 years and did so enthusiastically while pursuing my degree at TC Tokyo. My tenure as an ALT at a public high school in Shizuoka provided me with the opportunity develop my teaching abilities, study the Japanese education system and learn to understand the needs and motivations of Japanese students. While fortunate enough to be placed in a supportive environment with the freedom to test ideas without the fear of reprimand, I soon discovered the limits of my role, a phenomenon common among ALTs. Most ALTs come to Japan with no formal teacher training or experience and are not English majors, and thus have only their own learning experiences in their home countries to draw upon (Kawamura & Sloss, 1988; Adachi, Macarthur & Sheen, 1998). These characteristics of ALTs influence the views of Japanese teachers of English (JTEs), and may limit the utilization of ALTs (Kawamura & Sloss, 1988, Geluso, in press). Consequently, despite vigorous efforts to be taken seriously, constantly expressing a desire to be more involved and becoming more experienced in the school, my responsibility remained limited. Furthermore, the students and teachers did not perceive my oral communication class as relevant because its focus was not university exam preparation. Though it was an academic high school, where students are generally well behaved, many were unmotivated or unwilling to participate in classroom activities. While I took my teaching responsibility seriously, outlining objectives and evaluating materials to ensure they supported course objectives as well as engage students and, hopefully, motivate them, it was generally expected that the content be “fun” rather than “educational.” This friction regarding expectations is identified as typical by Smith (1988, p.11) and as a major cause of problems between ALTs and JTEs. Intuition told me that my teaching beliefs were not all that different from those of my colleagues. This led me to question whether ALTs’ beliefs on teaching differed significantly from JTEs’ and to seek solutions as to how JETs could be better utilized. In an attempt to further explore the subject of student motivation while seeking a method to better utilize ALTs, the following research questions were developed:

- What similarities and differences exist in what ALTs and JTEs perceive as important in motivating their students?
- What are possible explanations for any similarities and differences?
- Drawing from the common ground discovered, what practical action can be taken to give ALTs more credibility in the Japanese education system?

Roloff-Rothman, J. (2012). Looking for common ground: An investigation of motivational strategies valued by ALTs and JTEs. *Accents Asia*, 5(2), pp. 1-20.

The hope is that this study, combined with the insights from my ALT experience, will highlight common ground in the beliefs of both groups in an area of the Japanese education system usually characterized by miscommunication and a focus on differences rather than commonalities. By identifying strategies which both JTEs and ALTs consider important, these findings may be used to improve the team-teaching classroom through better utilization of the ALT, while removing potential learning obstacles. Before describing the research conducted, a review of the research that influenced this study is in order.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This section begins with a survey of the field of second language learning motivation, with specific focus on motivational strategies. It then shifts to the influence of teacher behavior and actions on student motivation levels. From there it moves to research on the JET Programme, defining team-teaching and discussing what the role of ALTs ought to be within the Japanese school system and reviewing research done on ALTs, with particular focus on research regarding their impact on student motivation.

Second Language Motivation & Teacher Behavior

In the field of motivation and second language acquisition, Richard Gardner (1979) once observed that language learning in schools is “often viewed as an educational phenomenon, and ‘second languages’ as a curriculum topic is considered much in the same light as any other school subject,” (Dörnyei, 2001, p. 47) He considered this inaccurate, for it ignored the social element of languages and their related cultures. His socio-cultural theory considers languages key in creating understanding between cultures and communities, and that the drive for greater awareness motivates language students to learn. This model involves two orientations, or types of goals, for motivation: instrumental and integrative, the latter of which is more powerful. An *instrumental* goal is typically practical, in which a language is simply a means to an end such as attaining a promotion at work, while an *integrative* goal compels a person to join a language community or interact with larger society (Gardner, 1985). Around the same time, Deci and Ryan (1985) proposed the similar Self-Determination theory that identifies two types of motivation—*extrinsic* (seeking a reward for effort) and *intrinsic* (seeking knowledge). Benson (1991) created a third type of motivation that specifically applied to Japan, *personal*, which links a student’s motivation to their enjoyment of the activity or a desire for personal development. Intrinsically motivated students are considered better language learners, however research in Asia (Norris-Holt, 2001; Chen, Warden & Chang, 2005) suggests that, in Japan or Taiwan, learners may be more influenced by extrinsic motivation due to the importance placed on exam performance and

academic achievement.

Over time, second language motivation research moved toward the goal of identifying effective motivational techniques and practical strategies for teachers to employ to help their students. Some studies focused on students' perception of their teacher's behavior, but others took the approach of asking teachers which strategies they used were effective. After surveying students, Clément, Dörnyei and Noels (1994) identified classroom activities, classroom atmosphere and self-confidence as having profound influence on student motivation. Several studies linked intrinsic motivation and self-confidence with student perceptions of their teacher as informative or cooperative, while also linking perceptions of a controlling teacher to weakened motivation, decreased feelings of autonomy and increased anxiety in students (Noels, Clément, & Pelletier, 1999; Noels, 2001; den Brok, Levy, Brekelmans, & Wubbels, 2005). Among those who looked at teachers were Dörnyei and Csizér (1998) who surveyed Hungarian teachers on a variety of strategies, asking some participants to rank the items in terms of their perceived importance, and others to rank in terms of the frequency with which they were employed. From the results, 10 commandments to guide teachers were proposed (Dörnyei, 2001). Like the Hungarian study, research by Dörnyei and Cheng (2007) surveyed Taiwanese teachers of English on a variety of motivational strategies that could be implemented to motivate their students. The list of top strategies that emerged in Taiwan largely mirrored the Hungary study, however, there were key differences, particularly with strategies that focused on teacher behavior or promotion of student self-confidence. This focus on how teacher actions affect learner motivation was not without some criticism. Schulz (2001) and Gardner and Berhaus (2008) both found that student and teacher perceptions on the strategies used or their frequency of use were often quite different. Soon after, Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008), comparing student and teacher perceptions of teacher behavior, empirically validated the ability of teachers' motivational practices to raise student motivation levels. Few, if any, studies of this nature have been done regarding ALTs in Japan, but Adachi, Macarthur and Sheen (1998), when investigating perceptions of JET held by students, ALTs and JTEs, found that ALTs and JTEs believe ALTs are having more of an impact on student motivation than the students themselves perceive.

JET Programme Research

When JET was introduced in 1987, it marked the beginning of a clash over teaching methodology. The prevailing system in Japan was *yakudoku*, a traditional, teacher-centered method that emphasizes accurate, direct translation of content, and prioritizes reading and writing skills over speaking or listening (Hino, 1988, Gorsuch, 1998). With ALTs came the communicative language method, in which "fluency and accuracy are seen as complementary principles," (Brown, 2006). This approach focuses on production of the language and was intentionally chosen as the method of use for Japan's oral communication classes.

In addition to the communicative approach, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT, or Monbusho) decided to implement team-teaching, though not in its customary sense. For JET, team-teaching is defined as “a concerted endeavor made jointly by the Japanese teacher of English (JTE) and the assistant English teacher [ALT] in an English language classroom in which the students, the JTE, and the [ALT] are engaged in communicative activities,” (Brumby & Wada, 1991, cited in Adachi, Macarthur & Sheen, 1998, p. 16-17). Conversely, standard definitions of team-teaching include mention of joint responsibility for lesson planning, classroom teaching and follow-up and, most importantly the existence of an equal power relationship (Bailey, Curtis & Nunan, 2001; Richards & Farrell, 2005). The unequal power relationship in JET intentionally places more responsibility on the JTE, while making it less threatening if they lack confidence in their English proficiency. However, it puts the ALT in a position that is difficult to overcome, particularly if they possess no formal teaching experience, which most do not (Smith, 1988; Geluso, in press). Beyond teaching English, the ALT is expected to be a cultural ambassador and help “internationalize” Japan by sharing their home country’s culture with the students of Japan—with some arguing for that to be the only role ALTs should play (Browne & Evans, 1994; Garant, 1994).

Despite twenty six years of history, there is little research on ALTs and the JET Programme and much of that work has been centered on problems. With the same issues having been identified repeatedly, few, if any, practical solutions have ever being offered. Many works highlight differences between ALTs and JTEs, or a lack of cultural understanding by one or both parties of the team-teaching pair (Kobayashi, 1994; Leonard, 1999; McDonnell, 2000; Galloway, 2009); while others identify JTEs’ limited English as a culprit for unsuccessful teaching relationships (Voci-Reed, 1994; Igawa 2009). Amaki (2008) found, when interviewing ALTs, that underutilization of ALTs was the most common reason for ALTs expressing dissatisfaction with their jobs.

There is minimal research on ALTs and their relation to motivation, but that which exists shows that both ALTs and JTEs believe ALTs have an effect on student motivation, (Adachi, Macarthur, & Sheen, 1998; Meerman, 2003). These studies, however, are descriptive and do not produce any clear examples of what actions taken by ALTs are successfully improving motivation. This research aims to provide guidelines for the development of practical steps ALTs can take, steps that JTEs can fully get behind. The following section describes the design of the research conducted.

METHOD

The research described here investigates the perceived importance of various motivational strategies by ALTs and JTEs as measured through a two-page quantitative survey that was distributed and collected in November 2008.

Hypotheses

Based on my experience as an ALT, the following hypotheses have been developed:

- More than JTEs, ALTs will view L2-related values (here, those held within English L1 cultures) and the overall teaching of culture as important
- ALTs will value promoting student self-confidence more than JTEs
- Strategies linked to teaching methodology or experience will be rated as less important by ALTs than JTEs (By teaching methodology and experience, I refer to macro-strategies G and J to be described later)
- ALTs will rank valuing meaning over accuracy as more important than JTEs
- Classroom environment will be important to both groups

For the third hypothesis, regarding strategies related to teaching, macro-strategies G (make the learning task stimulating) and J (promote learner autonomy/independence) were selected because understanding how a task can stimulate or enhance learning and knowing how to encourage autonomy and independence in the classroom are skills for which training is necessary. Untrained teachers may be able to recognize these elements, but it is unlikely they would be able to implement them effectively.

Participants

The survey was conducted in late 2008 at a two-day seminar held in Shizuoka prefecture. In total, there were 149 ALTs and 135 JTEs in attendance and participation in the study was voluntary and anonymous. Surveys were randomly distributed to participants. Of the 200 surveys distributed, 62 were returned (31% return rate), 28 by JTEs and 34 by ALTs.

Instrument Design

The survey instrument was modeled on those of similar studies done by Dörnyei and Csizér (1998) and Dörnyei and Cheng (2007). In these studies, teachers were asked to rank frequency of use or perceived importance of numerous motivational micro-strategies, which are certain actions a teacher can take to enhance student motivation. For this research, only perceived importance was investigated and the number of micro-strategy items strategies was reduced from 40 to 25 so as not to overburden participants. Those chosen were items determined to be most appropriate for the ALT/JTE context, and were selected based on the researcher's experience as an ALT. Additionally, the 10 macro-strategies developed by Dörnyei and Csizér (1998) which guided the creation of the 2007 study's instrument, were used as a structural outline. Care was taken to

guarantee that at least one micro-strategy from each of these macro-strategies was present in this study's instrument.

Both ALTs and JTEs received the exact same bilingual instrument, originally written in English, with a Japanese translation immediately following. Participants were asked to rate how important they perceived each micro-strategy on a five-point Likert scale, one being not important, five being very important. The final section of the survey included biodata questions, four for ALTs and one for JTEs (Appendix C).

Unlike the Dörnyei and Cheng (2007) survey, on which this instrument was modeled, the decision was made to not only group related micro-strategies together, but to display the macro-strategy under which they were contained for ease of understanding by participants. While JTEs are all certified teachers with educational training, most ALTs arrive with little or no formal training and thus are unaware of the field's metalanguage. The macro-strategy categories were intended to provide more information so all participants would be fully aware of what they were ranking. With this same goal in mind, the wording was simplified on several items so that both ALTs and JTEs of all English levels would be able to understand the wording, even though a Japanese translation was provided. As the items were drawn from the Dörnyei and Cheng (2007) survey, the reliability of the instrument was accepted *a priori*, having been validated statistically by those researchers.

RESULTS

Micro-strategy Analysis

While the rankings differed between ALTs and JTEs, there were strong similarities in average ratings (Appendix A), especially among the top ranked items, suggesting these two groups may have more in common regarding their teaching principles than is generally believed. Overall results for both groups were quite high, with no average ratings below 3. The top eight items from both groups are nearly identical in ranking (Table 1) and very similar in rating. Item 5 received the highest average rating from both groups, closely followed by items 1 and 2, which shows that both groups consider teacher behavior and recognizing students' efforts as the most important macro-strategies that affect student motivation. Interestingly, item 3, "show your enthusiasm for teaching" had the same average rating as "recognizing student efforts" by ALTs, but JTEs rated it a bit lower, an average of 4.21, which placed it nearly a third of the way down the total list in terms of ranking.

TABLE 1
Top Ranked Micro-strategies for JTEs and ALTs

JTE		ALT		
Ranking	Item	Average Rating	Item	Average Rating
1	5	4.82	5	4.74

Roloff-Rothman, J. (2012). Looking for common ground: An investigation of motivational strategies valued by ALTs and JTEs. *Accents Asia*, 5(2), pp. 1-20.

2	1	4.64	3	4.74
3	2	4.61	1	4.65
4	9	4.54	2	4.62
5	7	4.46	9	4.53
6	12	4.32	7	4.52
7	14	4.21	12	4.5
8	3	4.21	6	4.41

The lowest ranked items are also similar, in that a few items all appear near the bottom (items 13, 17 and 18), but in general they are less tightly grouped than the highly rated strategies (Table 2). Items 4 (be yourself in front of students), 8 (make clear to students that communicating meaning effectively is more important than being grammatically correct), 19 (encourage students to use English outside the classroom) and 24 (adopt the role of a "facilitator") were all ranked quite low by one group, and much higher by the other (Appendix A). This created the largest differences in average ratings and possible explanations will be discussed later. Despite this, the overall trend in item rating is one of similarity rather than difference, and in some cases nearly identical responses.

TABLE 2
Lowest Ranked Micro-strategies for JTEs and ALTs

JTE			ALT	
Ranking	Item	Average Rating	Item	Average Rating
20	18	3.64	25	3.88
21	13	3.61	24	3.82
22	8	3.54	18	3.73
23	17	3.39	13	3.67
24	4	3.32	11	3.65
25	19	3	17	3.32

Macro-strategy Analysis

After analyzing individual micro-strategies, the top eight (one-third) were grouped according to their rating and their macro-strategy (Table 3) to see if particular macro-strategies emerged. The results for both groups are nearly identical. Three macro-strategies (A, B and C) emerge that could be perceived as the most important to both groups, and four macro-strategies (F, H, I and J) could be perceived as the least important. While macro-strategy B only contained 1 item (recognize students' effort and achievement), it was the highest rated strategy by both ALTs and JTEs. An additional two macro-strategies (D and E) could be considered somewhat important, however few individual strategies within them ranked high enough to warrant closer study.

TABLE 3
Rank Order of Macro-strategies for Both JTEs and ALTs

Macro-strategy	JTE Item	ALT Item
A. Proper teacher behavior	1,2,3	1,2,3
B. Recognize students' effort	5	5
C. Promote learners' self-confidence	7	6,7
D. Creating a pleasant classroom climate	9	9
E. Present tasks properly	12	12
F. Increase learners' goal-orientedness	-	-
G. Make the learning tasks stimulating	14	-
H. Familiarize learners with L2-related values	-	-
I. Promote cohesiveness and group norms	-	-
J. Promote learner autonomy/independence	-	-

Of the four macro-strategies that ranked lowest, H and I are quite unexpected. It is not surprising that ALTs ranked item 19 far more highly than JTES did (4.18 and 3.00 respectively), but rather remarkable that overall, the constituent items of macro-strategy H generally fell in the mid-lower range of the items. H is directly linked to one of the guiding principles of the JET Programme, that of promoting the understanding of cultural values of English speaking countries. Macro-strategy I, was not rated as highly as expected by JTEs (3.71). In my experience as an ALT, the needs of the group were often given as the explanation for the success or failure of certain classroom practices, yet in this study, it was actually given a higher rating by ALTs (4.00) (Appendix B). The results surrounding these two macro-strategies seem to suggest that the goal of promoting internationalization, on which the JET Programme is founded, may not be perceived as important in comparison to other strategies for motivating students.

DISCUSSION

The results of this research are shades of positive, as neither group rated any strategy below an average of 3, however it is clear which strategies are considered most important and which are valued least. What is most encouraging is that both groups agree, strongly, on several strategies. While some agreement was expected, the degree to which it exists was startling, which implies that, in terms of motivating students, having teaching experience or received training may not matter. For example, the top rated micro (1,2,5,7, and 9) and macro (A,B, and C) strategies can be described as universals of teaching that do not require experience to recognize their importance. Furthermore, it could be experience as a learner, rather than as a teacher, that causes ALTs (and possibly JTES) to rate these as important. The difference in rating for item 3, which also appears near the top for both, though in different rankings, is likely explained by cultural differences in terms of what is considered to be “enthusiasm” or appropriate teacher behavior, rather than in terms of experience.

a variety of vocabulary and expressing complex ideas, yet be met with silence. This type of ALT underutilization may be the reason why Japanese students do not perceive the ALT to be a motivator to the degree that ALTs or JTEs do (Adachi, Macarthur & Sheen, 1998, p. 30). Better utilization through increased presence throughout the school, could be a first step, because, as ALTs feel they are becoming more valued, they will almost certainly work harder to motivate students and view their role as more satisfying.

- Strategies linked to teaching methodology or experience will be rated as less important by ALTs than JTEs (macro-strategies G and J)

This hypothesis was mostly correct, with JTEs giving six out of the ten (9,11, 14, 17, 24, 25) micro-strategies from the macro-strategies (G and J) a higher rating than those of the ALTs. Item 24 is likely rated lower by ALTs because many lack the ability to effectively employ this strategy due to a lack of teacher training, and thus do not consider it important. Again, with item 25, while rated low by both groups, JTEs rated it higher, possibly because, as trained or experienced teachers, they know how to effectively incorporate peer teaching or presentations into the classroom, whereas ALTs may not. Another explanation for the low ratings by ALTs is that the metalanguage is unfamiliar to them, causing them to overlook the items and rate them as less important. Given my experience, it is not surprising that item 24 and 25 were rated low by JTEs, as the concepts of learner autonomy or learner independence are sharply in contrast with the traditional teacher-centered Japanese teaching style, *yakudoku* (Hino, 1988, Gorsuch, 1998). This also makes JTE 2's belief that teacher-centered classes are less motivating is, in this context, unusual and promising.

- ALTs will rank valuing meaning over accuracy as more important than JTEs

As mentioned in the discussion of promoting self-confidence, this hypothesis proved to be correct. ALTs did give item 8 a higher rating than JTEs. Communicative language teaching (CLT) values fluency and accuracy equally, while heavy emphasis in schools on entrance exam preparation values accuracy, often at the expense of fluency (Brown, 2006). ALTs are explicitly told to use it in orientation (CLAIR, 2008), so it is logical that they would view this strategy as important. The JET Programme Resource Materials and Teaching Handbook (2008) also instructs ALTs to focus on meaning and warns them that it will conflict with the standard teaching style as well as the goal of preparing students for entrance exams.

- Classroom environment will be important to both groups

This research has shown that both ALTs and JTEs do consider the classroom environment important, however what each group defines as environment may differ slightly. Of the three micro-strategies related to

environment, JTEs, consider it very important (4.54) that a classroom be supportive and allow for risk-taking whereas ALTs consider a supportive classroom important (4.53) and also view the use of humor as important (4.26). For JTEs, creating the right environment is more about supporting the student, while ALTs may consider their individual action just as important.

CONCLUSION

These results provide more support for the belief that ALTs have insights into their school that should be taken seriously (Amaki, 2008). This research has found an encouraging amount of common ground in terms of ALT and JTE beliefs regarding effective strategies for motivating their students, leading to the conclusion that one move towards better ALT utilization is focusing their energies more on motivating students and less on sharing their culture. The handbook provided to ALTs, explicitly states, “it is our job as teachers to provide the missing motivation” (CLAIR, 2008, pg. 60). This could be done by inviting the ALT into other classes, such as writing or reading, to give students more support and increase ALT opportunities to personalize their connections with students. Furthermore, ALTs should make an effort to show they care about the students, encouraging them and acknowledging their achievements wherever possible since both groups in this study feel these strategies are important motivators (Table 1, Table 3). Perhaps ALTs can do this by helping students with certain assignments or creating dialogues through the use of journals. This study clearly showed that the importance of familiarizing students with L2-related values (here those values held in English L1 countries) is less important than other goals. Shifting away from lessons based on ALTs’ home culture could be another step for better utilization. Since the number of foreigners and ALTs has steadily increased over the life of the JTE Programme, it is likely that the goal of internationalization is out of date with the “foreign” no longer novel, thus failing to provide the same motivation is once held for students. Schools should broaden their thinking when it comes to using ALTs to motivate students, expanding possibilities from their limited use in a de-contextualized classroom to include other courses or situations outside the classroom entirely.

However schools choose to better utilize their ALTs, one thing is clear - determining how to implement strategies is a process that the ALTs and JTEs must do together, because, as this study has shown, they largely agree on which strategies to use. More direct and improved communication will, hopefully, lead to better working relationships where the ALT is better utilized and their input is perceived as more valuable. Better relationships would also have the benefit of improving the classroom climate, which is something both sides agree is important. To ensure this process occurs and succeeds, boards of education must provide support, ideally through the development of workshops or other mandatory activities. The long-term outcome of promoting better use of ALTs will benefit, not only the ALTs themselves, but also their colleagues and students.

REFERENCES

- Adachi, K., Macarthur, J.D., & Sheen, R. (1998). *Perceptions of the JET Programme*. Hiroshima: Keisuisha.
- Amaki, Y. (2008). Perspectives on English education in the Japanese public school system: The views of foreign assistant language teachers. *Educational Studies in Japan: International Yearbook*, 3, 53-63.
- Bailey, K.M., Curtis, A., & Nunan, D. (2001). *Pursuing professional development*. Singapore: Heinle & Heinle.
- Benson, M.J. (1991). Attitudes and motivation towards English: a survey of Japanese freshman. *RELC Journal*, 22 (1), 34-48.
- Brown, H.D. (2006). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. White Plains, New York: Pearson Longman.
- Browne, C.M. & Evans, B. (1994). The ALT as cultural informant: A catalyst for developing students' communicative competence. In Wada, M. & Cominos, A. (Eds.), *Studies in team teaching* (pp. 17-27). Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Brumby, S. & Wada, M. (1991). *Team teaching*. London: Longman.
- Council of Local Authorities for International Relations (CLAIR). (2008). *JET Programme: Resource materials & teaching handbook 2008-2009*. Tokyo: CLAIR.
- CLAIR. (2009). The JET Programme. Retrieved from <http://www.jetprogramme.org>
- Chen, J.F., Warden, C.A., & Chang, H.-T. (2005). Motivators that do not motivate: The case of Chinese EFL learners and the influence of culture on motivation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 609-633.
- Cheng, H.-F., & Dörnyei, Z. (2007). The use of motivational strategies in language instruction: The case of EFL teaching in Taiwan. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1, 153-174.
- Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K.A. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence, and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language Learning*, 44, 417-448.
- Cominos, A. (ed). (1992). *The Language Teacher: The JET Program and Team Teaching Special Issue*, 16(11).
- The Course of Study for Foreign Languages*. (2003). Retrieved from Ministry of Education, Culture Sports Science and Technology website <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/shotou/030301.htm>
- Deci, E., L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- den Brok, P., Levy, J., Brekelmans, M., & Wubbels, T. (2005). The effect of teacher interpersonal behaviour on students' subject-specific motivation. *The Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 40, 20-33.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 273-284.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language

Roloff-Rothman, J. (2012). Looking for common ground: An investigation of motivational strategies valued by ALTs and JTEs. *Accents Asia*, 5(2), pp. 1-20.

learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research*, 2, 203-229.

- Galloway, N. (2009). A critical analysis of the JET Programme. *Journal of Kanda University of International Studies*, 21, 169-207.
- Garant, M. (1994). Designing and analyzing materials for Japanese junior high schools. In Wada, M. & Cominos, A. (Eds.), *Studies in team teaching* (pp. 103-118). Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R.C. & Bernaus, M. (2008). Teacher motivation strategies, student perceptions, student motivation and English achievement. *Modern Language Journal*, 92, 387-401
- Geluso, J. (in press.) Negotiating a professional identity: Non-Japanese teachers of English in Pre-tertiary education in Japan. In Houghton, S.A. & Rivers, D.J. (Eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education*.
- Gorsuch, G. (1998). *Yakudoku* EFL instruction in two Japanese high school classrooms: An exploratory study. *JALT Journal*, 20(1), 6-32.
- Guilloteaux, M.J., & Dörnyei, Z. (2008). Motivating language learners: A classroom-oriented investigation of the effects of motivational strategies on student motivation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42, 55-77.
- Hino, N. (1988). *Yakudoku*: Japan's dominant tradition in foreign language learning. *JALT Journal*, 10(2), 45-55.
- Igawa, K. (2009). Teachers' views on team-teaching: In the case of Japanese secondary school teachers. *Journal of Shitennoji University*, 47, 145-172.
- Kawamura, Y. & Sloss, C. (1992). Japanese English teachers and the JET Program: A survey report. *The Language Teacher: The JET Program and Team Teaching Special Issue*, 16(1), 37-39.
- Kobayashi, J. (1994). Overcoming obstacles to intercultural communications: AETs and JTEs. In Wada, M. & Cominos, A. (Eds.), *Studies in team teaching* (pp. 163-177). Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Leonard, T.J. (1999). *East meets west: Problems and solutions – understanding misunderstandings between JTEs and ALTs*. Tokyo: Taishukan.
- Meerman, A. (2003). The impact of foreign instructors in Japanese schools: An analysis of ALT and JLT responses to semi-structure interview protocols. *The Bulletin of the Graduate School of Education, Hiroshima University*, 52 (3), 123-132.
- McDonnell, D. (2000). *Importing diversity: Inside Japan's JET Program*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Noels, K.A. (2001). Learning Spanish as a second language: Learners' orientations and perceptions of their teachers' communication style. *Language Learning*, 51, 107-144.
- Noels, K.A., Clément, R., & Pelletier, L.G. (1999). Perceptions of teachers' communicative style and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Modern Language Journal*, 83, 23-34.
- Norris-Holt (2001). Motivation as a Contributing Factor in Second Language Acquisition. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 7(6).

- Roloff-Rothman, J. (2012). Looking for common ground: An investigation of motivational strategies valued by ALTs and JTEs. *Accents Asia*, 5(2), pp. 1-20.
- Richards, J.C., & Farrell, T.S.C. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schulz, R.A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Colombia. *Modern Language Journal*, 85, 244-258.
- Smith, R. (1988). Team teaching in perspective. *The Language Teacher*, 12 (9), 11-15.
- The JET Programme--Official Homepage of The Japan Exchange and Teaching Programme--. (2010). Retrieved October 24, 2012, from <http://www.jetprogramme.org/>
- Voci-Reed, E. (1994). Stress factors in the team teaching relationship. In Wada, M. & Cominos, A. (Eds.), *Studies in team teaching* (pp. 61-71). Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Wada, M., & Cominos, A. *Studies in team teaching*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

Appendix A

Average rating of micro-strategies by ALTs and JTEs in descending order of ranked importance

JTE RATING	ITEM NUMBER	ALT RATING	ITEM NUMBER
4.82	5)	4.74	5)
4.64	1)	4.74	3)
4.61	2)	4.65	1)
4.54	9)	4.62	2)
4.46	7)	4.53	9)
4.32	12)	4.52	7)
4.21	14)	4.5	12)
4.21	3)	4.41	6)
4.18	15)	4.29	8)
4.18	24)	4.26	10)
4.14	10)	4.18	15)
4.14	22)	4.18	19)
4.11	6)	4.09	16)
3.93	25)	4.09	20)
3.93	20)	4	23)
3.82	21)	3.97	4)
3.79	11)	3.94	21)
3.75	16)	3.94	22)
3.71	23)	3.88	14)
3.64	18)	3.88	25)
3.61	13)	3.82	24)
3.54	8)	3.73	18)
3.39	17)	3.67	13)
3.32	4)	3.65	11)
3	19)	3.32	17)

Appendix B

Micro-strategy descriptive statistics, grouped by macro-strategy

Item Number and Description	JTE		ALT	
	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD
A. Proper Teacher Behavior				
1. Show students you care about them	4.64	0.62	4.65	0.49
2. Establish a good relationship with students	4.61	0.63	4.62	0.49
3. Show your enthusiasm for teaching	4.21	0.69	4.74	0.62
4. Be yourself in front of students	3.32	0.98	3.97	1.00
B. Recognize students' effort				
5. Recognize students' effort and achievement	4.82	0.39	4.74	0.51
C. Promote learners self-confidence				
6. Encourage students to try harder	4.11	0.74	4.41	0.70
7. Design tasks that are within students' ability	4.46	0.64	4.52	0.71
8. Make clear to students that communicating meaning effectively is more important than being grammatically correct	3.54	1.04	4.29	0.94
D. Create a pleasant classroom climate				
9. Create a supportive classroom climate that promotes risk-taking	4.54	0.79	4.53	0.66
10. Bring in and encourage humor	4.14	0.85	4.26	0.83
11. Use a short and interesting opening activity to start each class	3.79	0.99	3.65	1.12
E. Present tasks properly				
12. Give clear instructions by modeling	4.32	0.82	4.50	0.75
F. Increase learners' goal-orientedness				
13. Encourage students to set learning goals	3.61	0.74	3.67	1.11
G. Make the learning tasks stimulating				
14. Break the routine by varying the presentation format	4.21	0.63	3.88	1.05
15. Introduce various interesting topics	4.18	0.77	4.18	0.77
16. Present various auditory and visual teaching aids	3.75	0.80	4.09	0.62
17. Encourage students to create products	3.39	0.79	3.32	1.17
18. Make tasks challenging	3.64	0.91	3.73	0.98
H. Familiarize learners with L2-related values				
19. Encourage students to use English outside the classroom	3.00	0.90	4.18	0.90
20. Familiarize students with the cultural background of the target language	3.93	0.94	4.09	0.83
21. Introduce culturally authentic materials	3.82	0.77	3.94	0.89
22. JTE Only—Increase the amount of English you use in the class	4.14	0.85		
22. ALT Only—Limit the amount of Japanese you use in the class			4.06	0.86

Roloff-Rothman, J. (2012). Looking for common ground: An investigation of motivational strategies valued by ALTs and JTEs. *Accents Asia*, 5(2), pp. 1-20.

I. Promote group cohesiveness and group norms

23. Encourage students to share personal experiences and thoughts 3.71 0.76 4.00 0.90

J. Promote learner autonomy/independence

24. Adopt the role of 'facilitator' (create situations where students learn from each other) 4.18 0.72 3.82 0.87

25. Encourage peer teaching and group presentation 3.93 0.96 3.88 0.82

Appendix C

Qualitative survey instrument

Make the learning tasks stimulating 学習タスクが生徒に刺激を与えるように工夫する

- 14) Break the routine by varying the presentation format 1 2 3 4 5
指導に変化を持たせることによって、教室内での活動の興味さを打破する
- 15) Introduce various interesting topics 1 2 3 4 5
生徒の興味関心にあつたテーマを導入する
- 16) Present various auditory and visual teaching aids 1 2 3 4 5
様々な聴覚教材を利用する
- 17) Encourage students to create products 1 2 3 4 5
生徒が作品を作成するように促す
- 18) Make tasks challenging 1 2 3 4 5
タスクを挑戦的なものにする

Familiarize learners with L2-related values L2に関する価値観をつくることについて

- 19) Encourage students to use English outside the classroom 1 2 3 4 5
生徒に教室以外の場でも英語を使うように勧める
- 20) Familiarize students with the cultural background of the target language 1 2 3 4 5
生徒に英語圏の文化などを親しませる
- 21) Introduce authentic cultural materials 1 2 3 4 5
英語圏の文化を代表する実物教材を紹介する
- 22-JTE Only Increase the amount of English you use in the class 1 2 3 4 5
(日本人英語教師のみ) 教室で使う英語の量を増やす
- 22-ALT Only Limit the amount of Japanese you use in the class 1 2 3 4 5
(外国人指導助手のみ) 教室で使う日本語の量を制限する

Promote group cohesiveness and group norms 適切な集団意識を持った、結束的学習集団を育てることについて

- 23) Encourage students to share personal experiences and thoughts 1 2 3 4 5
生徒の体験談や考えについて話すように勧める

Promote learner autonomy/independence 学習者自律性を促進することについて

- 24) Adopt the role of a 'facilitator' 1 2 3 4 5
(create situations where students learn from each other) 教師が支援者の役割を取り入れる
(指示を出したあとは 生徒の活動を観察し 必要に応じてヘルプする)

- 25) Encourage peer teaching and group presentation 1 2 3 4 5
生徒がお互いに教えあったり、グループで発表するように指導する

Biographical Information 貴方のことについて教えてください。

1) What is your job? 教職の種類は何ですか。

ALT JTE OTHER その他

2) Who do you teach? (circle all that apply) 現在教えているレベルの全てに丸を付けてください。

Elementary Junior High Senior High Adults Other
小学校 中学校 高等学校 大人 その他

ALT ONLY ALTの先生のみ回答してください。

1) What year are you on JET? JETプログラムで何年目ですか。

1st year 2nd year 3rd year 4th year 5th year
1年目 2年目 3年目 4年目 5年目

2) Were you a teacher before you came on JET? JETプログラムに参加する前、教員経験がありましたか。

YES はい NO いいえ
If yes, how many years? _____ Subject? _____
「はい」の場合、何年間 _____ 教科 _____

JTE ONLY 日本人英語教師の先生のみ回答してください。

1) How many years have you been teaching? How many years have you been teaching?

1-5年 6-10年 11-15年 16-20年 20年以上(何) _____

Thank you for participating in our survey! We really appreciate it!
大変お忙しいところ、我々の調査にご協力いただき、心より感謝を申し上げます。