Examining teacher talk in a Japanese senior high school oral communication class

Alex Small

The University of Birmingham

MA TEFL/TESL

Open Distance Learning

Module 1 assignment

Submitted: August 2006

Assignment # LT 06 03

Devise and conduct a piece of research which will investigate the amount of talk you do in your classroom. A short introductory section should summarise findings to date in the area you are investigating. You should make a list of expectations/hypotheses before implementing the research. These should be based on the following pre-research self-evaluation.

Amount of time I think I spend talking in class	0-20%	20-40%	40-60%	60-80%	80-100%
Amount of time I think I should spend talking in class	0-20%	20-40%	40-60%	60-80%	80-100%

On analysing your results, do you find your expectations fulfilled. Do you feel you need to make any changes to the amount of (verbal) input you provide for your students? Describe and justify the changes you would make.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

The goals of this action research project were to:

- Use a mixed-method approach of the sort advocated by McConney et al (2002) consisting of quantitative (how many minutes of teacher talk, what percentage of the class) and qualitative (my own impressions, student questionnaire) data in order to analyze the teacher talk that occurs in a public high school classroom.
- Look at the unique aspects of teacher talk in a team-taught environment.
- Devise and carry out a lesson plan to reduce teacher talk in the classroom, and attempt to determine whether or not this was an improvement by employing a student questionnaire.
- Suggest ways of improving this aspect of future lessons based on student feedback and suggestions taken from literature on the subject.

2. Literature Review

The subject of teacher talk in the classroom, and the idea of teacher-centeredness vs. student-centeredness have been covered extensively in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) literature. The official literature of the JET Programme, produced by the Japanese Ministry of Education, bases its methodology for team-taught classes on CLT, while admitting that the classroom situation may not always be conducive to CLT ideals. Table 1 below gives an overview of the assertions made by CLT and JET literature.

Table 1: Summary of Assertions Made Concerning Teacher Talk in Literature

Literature	Evaluation of teacher talk vs. student talk	Evaluation of Learner Autonomy
CLT	Greater student use of L2 in class leads to progress (Nunan 1999, p.48) and increases student motivation (van Lier 2001, p.102), while excessive teacher talk is to be avoided (paraphrase of Nunan and Brown in Warren 2002, p.1).	"Learning is constrained by internal processes" (Skehan 1996, p.18) and in whole-class teaching "students may be lost … [or] held back" (Richards and Lockhart 1996, p.148). "Pedagogical action must be oriented toward increasing … autonomy" (van Lier 2001, p.97).
JET Programme	Teacher talk traditionally dominates lessons (CLAIR 2005, p.88-90), but the trend is toward CLT principles (p.92) where pair work is seen as the basis of increased L2 use (p.106).	Some Japanese teachers may view CLT as chaotic, or feel that their role "has been overtly reduced in the classroom." However, students ideally should "be active participants" and teachers should be facilitators (CLAIR 2005, p.92).

2.1   CLT Literature Review

CLT associates the following benefits with its use:

- *Increased student talk time.* With regards to student talk, Chaudron (1988, quoted in Breen 2001, p.311) revealed in research that "teachers appear to have two-thirds more practice in the target language than all the learners put together" in traditional classrooms. Warren (p.1-2), quoting Nunan (1991) and Brown (2001), shows that

avoiding lengthy teacher talk time is advocated in current CLT literature. In contrast, increased student talk time is positive. As Richards and Lockhart (1994, p.193) point out, the amount (and quality) of student talk "has an important influence on their language development." This is echoed in other CLT sources, such as Nunan and van Lier (see Table 1).

- *Greater learner autonomy.* A low level of learner autonomy associated with traditional classrooms is to be avoided, as Thornbury explains:

  > Learners do not find room to speak as themselves, to use language in communicative encounters, to create text, to stimulate responses from fellow learners, or to find solutions to relevant problems. (1996, p.297)

  Skehan and Richards and Lockhart point out other drawbacks of this approach (see Table 1). In comparing teacher-fronted activities, called "high-structure" and student centered, called "low-structure," Nunan and Lamb (2001, p.32-2) make clear an association with CLT and student-centeredness, and van Lier links high motivation and autonomy, saying:

  > Pedagogical action must be oriented toward increasing levels of intrinsic motivation and hence toward increasing self-regulation and autonomy. (2001, p.97)

  The advantage of greater autonomy is "that information will be more deeply processed and stored" (Nunan 1999, p.139).

One should keep in mind, however, that although student-centeredness is advocated by most current literature, students themselves may not be in agreement. Holland and Shortall (2000, p.63) show that learners' expectations can come into conflict with CLT methods, although they also point out that this can be alleviated if teachers "modify their approach, or … [make] their aims and approach explicit to learners."

2.2   JET Programme Literature Review

The JET (Japan Exchange and Teaching) Programme Teaching Handbook (CLAIR 2005) explains that Grammar/translation methodology was dominant in Japanese English classrooms until quite recently, and continues to have a strong influence on the way classes are taught. The handbook explains that "the examination system is one of the main causes for the continuing use of grammar translation in Japanese schools." (p.88) One effect of this lingering influence is that:

> Classes are teacher-centered. The teacher lectures about a given point of grammar. There is little interaction on the part of the students." (p.90)

This contrasts with current CLT literature, which states that "the belief that a precise focus on a particular form leads to learning and automatization (that learners will learn what is taught in the order in which it is taught) no longer carries much credibility in linguistics or psychology" (Brumfit and Johnson 1979; Ellis 1985, quoted in Skehan 1996, p.18).

For classes team-taught with a Japanese Teacher of English (JTE) and an Assistant Language Teacher (ALT), who must be a native speaker of English, the Ministry supports "student-centered" (MEXT 2002, p.92) CLT as its official methodology. The handbook states that "pair work is essentially the basis of communicative speaking practice," (p.106), echoing CLT proponents such as Richards and Lockhart (1996, p.152). On the other hand, however, it advocates some forms of whole-class teaching which it claims are communicative. One example:

> The traditional pre-class banter between you and your JTLs [Japanese Teacher of Language] can also provide the basis for a communicative activity. (p.104)

Although I am not a member of the JET Programme, the program's methodology is dominant in Japanese public schools, and influences my teaching environment. In my experience, application of the Ministry's CLT prescribed methodology is inconsistent,

and depending on the JTE, the class can range widely between teacher-fronted and highly student-centered, most likely due to the continuing influence of Grammar/Translation (see Table 1, learner autonomy).

3. Methodology

3.1 Class Background

Table 2: Class data

Class title	Institution, grade	Number of students	Age of students	Estimated Level of students	Teachers
Oral Communication II (elective)	Senior High School, 2nd Year	16	16 or 17	Near beginner to upper intermediate	One ALT and one JTE

Table 2 outlines the main details of the classroom in which I performed this research project. As the name of the class suggests, its goal is to improve the students' spoken English abilities. The class is team-taught by one JTE (Japanese Teacher of English) and by me, an ALT (Assistant Language Teacher). Of the classes that I teach in different high schools in Japan, I consider this to be one where positive efforts are made toward student-centeredness. The balance of workload between us is what I would consider ideal, in agreement with what Madeco states in his paper on team-teaching in Japan when he says that it is most effective when both parties plan lessons together, and communicate as much as possible (Macedo 2002). We are both involved in lesson planning, often together. In the classroom, I lead most of the practice, drills, explaining activities, etc., while the JTE helps me out and provides translations The aim of this research project was explained to the JTE, and she was very supportive, allowing me to change the lessons plans to help achieve the research goals.

3.2　　Data Collection Methods

Drawing from Warren's (2002) methodology, two different lessons were recorded and the amount of teacher talk analyzed. A small recording device, kept in my pocket, was used. It picked up my voice well, and the JTE's voice adequately.

Taking into consideration that:

> Collecting and analyzing data on classroom language use is sometimes problematic since the process of obtaining such data can influence the quality of the information collected. (Richards and Lockhart 1994, p. 198)

and what Labov calls the 'observer's paradox' (1970, quoted in Swann 2001, p.324), of which Swann says "the mere act of observing people's language behavior … is inclined to change that behavior," student consent was obtained, and I conducted one recording, not used for this project, as a means of acclimating them to the equipment.

The first recording consisted of a 'typical' lesson, which followed a normal lesson routine, where the amount of teacher talk wasn't taken into consideration at the planning stage. After analyzing the data obtained through recording the first lesson, I accounted for differences between the data and our expectations. I then went on to suggest improvements for the second lesson with the specific aim of reducing teacher talk, and then recorded it.

After the second lesson's data had been analyzed, I compared this to the first lesson to see if, indeed, the amount of teacher talking time had been significantly decreased. Then, in order to supplement (triangulate) the quantitative data, I distributed an anonymous questionnaire to the students in order to get their impressions of whether or not they felt this less teacher-centered lesson improved their learning experience.

3.3   Aspects of Data to be Analyzed

In analyzing the quantitative data gathered in each of the two lessons, I looked at the following aspects, which I considered to be of relevance:

(A) Drawing from Warren (2002), total teacher talk time was analyzed, including periods of silence between teacher utterances. Table 3 defines the criteria used to determine teacher talk. Since the objective in the second lesson was to reduce teacher talk, it was important to record it accurately.

Table 3: Criteria for total teacher talk

Teacher talk	Not teacher talk
Any teacher utterance, of any sort	Any pause between a teacher utterance and a student answer
Any pause between teacher utterances when no student activity was expected (ex. pausing to write on the blackboard while speaking, thinking time)	Any pause between teacher utterances when students were expected to do individual work
Any pause between an unanswered teacher question and the re-phrased question or other utterance (ex. "Are there any questions?" [Silence] "No?" [Silence] "Okay.")	Any student utterance directed to the whole class (Does NOT include student to student chat)

(B) The amount of talk time of the JTE and the ALT was also compared. The hope was to determine if one of us had a more dominant classroom role.

(C) The JTE's role in the classroom was also examined in greater depth by analyzing how much of her talk time was in English and how much in Japanese. The intention of the analysis was to determine what kind of communication she was engaged in; providing a model of English speech, translation of the ALT, or something else.

(D) Finally, the amount of time teachers spent talking to each other was analyzed. This included performing model dialogues in front of the class, asking questions about when to move on to the next stage of the lesson, or making changes in the lesson plan during class. This is another area where it was hoped teacher talk time could be reduced and that more careful planning and discussion before the lesson would eliminate the need for it. Although performing a model dialogue in front of the class is not necessarily a bad aspect of teacher talk, it could perhaps better serve the students if they were given the chance to perform the model dialogues themselves, or if one teacher performed the dialogues with one student.

4   Hypotheses and Expectations

4.1   Teachers' expectations of appropriate talk time

Table 4: ALT's expectations of talk time

Amount of time I think I spend talking in class	0-20%	20-40%	40-60%	60-80% (specifically, 65-70%)	80-100%
Amount of time I think I should spend talking in class	0-20%	20-40%	40-60% (specifically, 40-45%)	60-80%	80-100%

As shown in Table 4, I have the feeling that the total teacher talk, including mine and the JTE's, comprises about 65 – 70% of an average lesson. In our class, most of the instructions are given in English first then followed by further clarification in English, writing on the board, and Japanese translation of the instructions. There is also considerable silence between unanswered teacher questions and question restatement, which despite frequent pair practice and student presentations, potentially results in more than my ideal amount of teacher talk.

Breen supports my view of an ideal amount of teacher talk time:

> Expecting learners to adopt an active and creative role in constructing the text of lessons so
> that at least two-thirds of it is generated by learners rather than the teacher. (2001, p.318)

I would say Breen's suggested ideal is good for students studying ESL, but faced with differing levels of motivation, English ability, and low learner autonomy, this is unrealistic in my EFL context. In my circumstances more teacher talk is necessary, thus the 40-45% in Table 4.

Table 5: JTE's expectations of talk time

	0-20%	20-40%	40-60% (specifically, 50%)	60-80%	80-100%
Amount of time I think I spend talking in class	0-20%	20-40%	40-60% (specifically, 50%)	60-80%	80-100%
Amount of time I think I should spend talking in class	0-20%	20-40%	40-60% (specifically, 50%)	60-80%	80-100%

The JTE believed the total teacher talk time was about 50%, and this was acceptable given our circumstances. She didn't explain her reasons, but Holland and Shortall offer a possible explanation:

> My own contacts with Japanese and Chinese teachers, for example, suggest that, while they
> admire CLT methods, they often feel that such approaches are inappropriate for their own
> teaching environments because:
> - language learning is often exam-oriented;
> - learners expect learning to be teacher-led;
> - learning is seen to involve the imparting of knowledge by the teacher;
> - other teachers will frown on CLT approaches as lacking seriousness and
>   commitment. (p.64)

Hofstede (1986) classifies Japan as a society with "large power distance" and "low individualism," which could explain why students are reluctant to volunteer answers or ask questions during teacher-fronted instruction. These cultural factors may explain why a higher amount of teacher talk is considered acceptable.

4.2   Hypotheses

(A) As seen in Table 4, I hypothesized the total teacher talk time to be between 65-70%, while in Table 5, the JTE thought it close to 50%.

(B) The ratio of ALT talk to JTE talk was hypothesized to be 2:1. According to personal experience, the JTEs often leave the presentation of tasks and carrying out of activities to the ALT. The statement that: "Impromptu ALT explanations can be challenging and interesting to listeners, and can make the class more stimulating" from the Handbook for Team-Teaching (Japanese Ministry of Education 2002, p.19) suggests a possible reason. In the same handbook, two example lesson plans for lessons focusing on speaking skills are given (p.73-81). Of these, the first is ALT centered, with either the ALT alone, or both the JTE and ALT together taking most of the teacher talk time. Although in the second, the teacher talk is closer to 1:1, the tendency in the public school system literature is clearly not toward JTE centered lessons.

(C) Japanese teacher use of Japanese and English was hypothesized to be 1:1. As stated earlier, there are many occasions where instructions are given first in English then translation is provided in Japanese. However, the JTE involved in this research tries very hard to speak English in the classroom, and often restates instructions in English before code switching to Japanese.

Varying opinions on the validity of translation of curriculum are given in Mercer (2001, p.250). Of the sources he cites, Lin, A. considered it to be valid, while Marytn-Jones and Jacobson considered it to be undesirable. Macedo concludes in a survey of ALTs and JTEs that both parties generally feel too much L1 is used in class (p.31). Having witnessed the negative effect on student motivation that refusing to translate can have on beginner-level speakers, my opinion is that translation of instructions students do not understand is acceptable.

(D) Talk between teachers was hypothesized to comprise about 5% of total teacher talk.

5.   First Lesson

5.1   Results

Table 6: First lesson Teacher Talk Time

Lesson 1		
Total Time	45:55 / 2755 seconds	100%
Total TTT including silence	29:55 / 1795 seconds	65.2%
Total ALT talk time	13:56 / 836 seconds	30.3%
Total JTE talk time in Eng.	3:23 / 203 seconds	7.4%
Total JTE talk time in J.	2:47 / 167 seconds	6.1%
Teacher-Teacher talk inc. silence	3:30 / 210 seconds	7.6%

(Note about Total Time: The official length of a lesson in a public Japanese high school is 50 minutes, but students almost always arrive later than the bell, and instruction does not begin until all students are present and the teachers are ready.)

The data obtained through recording of the first lesson compared to the initial hypotheses in the following way:

(A) At 65.2%, the amount of total teacher talk was higher than the JTE's prediction, but within my own predicted range. Of the 1795 seconds of total TTT, 589 were silence, or 32.8% of total TTT.

(B) The ratio of 30.3% ALT talk to 13.5% JTE talk time was close to the prediction of 2:1. The ALT had a more dominant role in the classroom.

(C) Although the JTE spoke more English than Japanese, it was not significantly more, and close to the predicted 1:1 ratio.

(D) Of a total 1795 seconds of talk, 210 seconds were teacher to teacher, making this talk 11.7% of total talk time, which was higher than predicted.

5.2   Discussion

The first lesson, despite intentions to make it as close to a typical lesson as possible, was atypically teacher-centered. I planned the lesson independently with the JTE's consent. The goal was to have students present individually about the job of a family member. Although it was thought to be focused on student performance and thus not include very much teacher talk, it was in fact considerably teacher-centered. A number of activities were conducted by the teacher in front of the class, including a vocabulary exercise checked by the teacher, a model dialogue performed by the ALT and JTE twice, and choral drilling of phrases.

It is unfortunate this lesson was more teacher-centered than usual as this increased the amount of teacher talk in the data, making it difficult to gauge the amount of teacher talk in a typical class, one of the goals of the research. Another problem was that the presentations, which would have increased student talk time in the data, were postponed until the next lesson.

Another variable which may have affected the lesson was that it was conducted two days after the school sports festival, which is physically quite rigorous, thus the students may have had difficulty concentrating. This, I believe, was one factor that contributed to the lack of student responses to whole-class questions.

Fortunately, in reviewing the recording, there were many aspects of the lesson, and teaching style, to improve:

(i)   There were many unanswered questions addressed to the class, which were then re-stated by the teachers, or translated after long pauses. This was most acute in the pre-class 'banter,' in which the ALT attempted to engage the students in casual conversation about the school festival. Student fatigue was perhaps part of this, but it has often been my experience that such banter rarely produces active student responses.

(ii)   The lesson was planned in haste, which left little time for the team teachers to discuss the lesson plan in detail before class, leading to increased pauses between utterances, more difficulty in clearly explaining activities, and more teacher to teacher talk.

(iii)   The choral drilling section included question forms, which wouldn't have been appropriate for students to use in their presentations. Thus these question forms were not directly related to the lesson objective and unnecessarily increased the total teacher talk time.

(iv)   A model dialogue that was performed by the ALT and JTE contributed to the majority of teacher to teacher talk. In review, it appeared a better use of time to replace this with something student-centered, or to have students perform model dialogues.

6.   Areas for Improvement

The second lesson, detailed in Appendix 1, was planned, taking into account the suggestions for improvement outlined in 5.2. Specifically, the problem areas were addressed in the following ways:

(i)   All banter was removed from the lesson, and whole-class teaching activities were chosen that were more straightforward, reducing the necessity for long pauses and rephrasing.

(ii)   The ALT and JTE arranged a 20 minute meeting period before teaching the lesson. It was hoped that this would give the JTE the opportunity to clear up any misunderstandings, which would reduce the need for teacher to teacher talk.

(iii)   In planning the lesson, all activities were designed to use language that was directly applicable to the presentation.

(iv)   No model presentations or dialogues were given by the teachers, and instead, a student-centered game was used at the beginning of the lesson.

Keeping in mind Labov's "observer's paradox," specific aspects of teacher talk that would be examined, such as Japanese to English use by the JTE and teacher to teacher talk were not elaborated on to the JTE. Instead it was only revealed that the goal was to reduce total talk time. The following extract, taken from the bottom of Appendix 1 details instructions given to the JTE:

- Please explain difficult activities in Japanese. This will save a lot of time.
- If the students don't understand what I say, please translate this into Japanese for them.
- Call on students by name to answer questions… don't wait for someone to answer.

With this new lesson plan, the hypotheses were revised in the following ways:

(A) The amount of total teacher talk time and teacher silence would decrease, as there would be less teacher-fronted instruction, less blackboard writing, and fewer unanswered questions.

(B) The ratio of ALT talk to JTE talk would be nearer 1:1 since the JTE would be explaining difficult activities in Japanese, thus taking a greater leadership role.

(C) Japanese use would increase. The JTE would still use English, but Japanese to English would be 2:1.

(D) This would be nearly 0% of teacher talk time.

7.　　　Second Lesson

7.1　　　Results

Table 7: Second Lesson Teacher Talk Time

Lesson 2		
Total Time	40:19 / 2419 seconds	100%
Total TTT including silence	18:49 / 1129 seconds	46.7%
Total ALT Talk time	6:26 / 386 seconds	16.0%
Total JTE Talk time in Eng.	0:57 / 57 seconds	2.4%
Total JTE Talk time in J.	2:39 / 158 seconds	6.5%
Teacher-Teacher Talk inc. silence	0:18 / 18 seconds	0.7%

(Note: the total time of the lesson reflects only that which was actually recorded, as do all other data represented. A more detailed breakdown of the data for this lesson, divided into types of activity, is provided in Appendix 2.)

In comparison to the revised hypotheses, the data showed the following:

(A) Total teacher talk time was reduced by nearly 20%, and was near my ideal 40-45% of total teacher talk as seen in Table 4. However, of the 1129 seconds of total TTT, 600 were silence, or 53.1% of total TTT.

(B) Despite the predictions, the ratio stayed closer to 2:1 ALT to JTE talk time.

(C) More than predicted, the JTE's use of Japanese to English increased to nearly a 3:1 ratio.

(D) Of a total 1129 seconds of talk, 18 seconds were teacher to teacher, making this 0.7% of the lesson, and 1.6% of the total talk time.

7.2   Discussion

In this lesson the students did a good job of the tasks they were asked to perform, and they, as well as I, enjoyed the presentations at the end of the class. Not reflected in the quantitative data was that a considerable portion of the teacher talk during this lesson took place as the students were working individually.

Due to an unfortunate oversight on my part, the recording of the lesson was interrupted. The memory of the recording device became full in the middle of the lesson, and after a short time I noticed this, and was able to re-commence the recording. Unfortunately, some of the lesson record was lost and it is impossible to determine how much was missed. However, the lost data most likely was between 5 and 9 minutes. The part of the lesson not recorded came during the second phase of the lesson, as students worked on the vocabulary worksheet. This included students working individually, as well as a portion of whole-class, teacher-fronted checking of answers, making it difficult to determine how the data was affected by the loss.

One misstep that occurred during the lesson was that the JTE passed out the sheets that would be used when students rated each other's presentations as she explained the initial instructions for giving the presentation. This created a bit of confusion, and made it necessary for the teachers to go around and explain the activity again many times to different individuals. Despite the intention of explaining everything in as great of detail as possible before the lesson to the JTE, this showed that there are things that are missed even in a thorough pre-class meeting. Fortunately, the presentations were not adversely affected.

Several things were observed to account for the data in relation to the hypotheses:

(A) While total TTT was reduced, the total amount of silence between teacher utterances was greater than that of the first lesson (589 seconds in lesson 1 vs. 600 in lesson 2). The high amount of silence is difficult to account for since student-centeredness was higher throughout the lesson, and there was less blackboard work. The

following data, extracted from Appendix 2, show activities which were designed to be student centered, but contained long periods of silence between teacher utterances:

Explanation of Activity	Start of Activity	End of Activity	Total TTT (s)	ALT TTT (s)	JTE English TTT (s)	JTE Japanese TTT (s)	Teacher-Teacher talk (s)
①Students describe famous people	0:48	7:18	165.4	67.7	0.8	0.8	2.4
②Presentations	11:31	20:25	171.5	63.6	12.5	15.4	0

In extract ① silence is 58.1% of total TTT, and in ② it is 46.6%.Despite the fact that students were performing tasks in front of the class in both of these cases, frequent teacher prompting, accompanied by long periods of silence in between, took the 'floor' from the students and reduced their opportunities to use the L2.

(B) The ratio did not change significantly between lessons 1 and 2, which was unexpected. However, further review of the lesson plan shows that although the JTE had a greater role explaining, the ALT maintained the role of 'leader' for most activities.

(C) The JTE was very cooperative with the lesson instructions concerning explanations, and used primarily Japanese. There was little direct translation of the ALT, as instructions had been discussed in the pre-class meeting. As a side-effect the JTE provided less models of L2 use.

(D) This was higher than the predicted 0%, but it was an improvement. Even with a pre-class meeting, it is difficult to avoid signaling the end of activities between teachers who both take an active role in the class, and that unexpected things requiring clarification will almost invariably crop up.

7.3   Student Questionnaire

Table 8: Summary of student responses:

Question	Positive response	Negative response	Response which indicated student affinity for student-centeredness
What did you think of today's lesson?	12 (75%)	2 (13%)	8 (50%)
What do you want to change about the class?	N/A	N/A	4 (25%)
Do you have enough chances to speak English?	10 (63%)	2 (13%)	6 (38%)

(NOTE: All 16 students in the class completed the questionnaire.

The questionnaire consisted of the following questions (extracted from Appendix 3):

- What did you think of today's lesson? Was it better than usual, the same, or worse? Why?
- Is there anything you'd like to change about the class for the second semester?
- Do you feel like you have enough chances to speak and use English in class? Why?

It was given to the students in Japanese after the second lesson was finished. Open-ended questions were used to avoid leading the students toward any particular sort of answers.

The greatest surprise was, without being told what the purpose of this project was, some students responded with answers showing they had a positive view toward having opportunities to speak, and toward more student-centeredness. Examples of what was

included in this category ranged from "I had a lot of chances to speak, so I enjoyed it" to "Everyone said interesting things, so it was fun." This was interesting, because in the literature review I took care to point out that students may not agree with their teachers' CLT methodology, which turned out not to be the case.

Also interesting to note was that no student expressed a desire for more teacher-centeredness. Negative responses to questions included: "There was too much difficult vocabulary" and "I'm not used to speaking English, so most of the time I just speak Japanese."

It was encouraging to note that the changes made to the second lesson were seen mostly as positive by the students, and there is clearly motivation for both teachers to try to improve this aspect of our classes.

8. Conclusion

Table 9: Summary of Findings

Area of Interest	Conclusion
Total teacher talking time	Increasing individual work tasks and student-centered activities can reduce it, but reducing unanswered questions and prompting remains difficult. Greater learner autonomy is needed for true student-centeredness.
ALT talk vs. JTE talk	The ALT talks about twice as much as the JTE, thus providing the majority of the model L2 language as well as having the leading role in classroom management.
JTE's use of Japanese vs. English	No conclusion was reached, because her role in the classroom depended on the lesson plan. However, there was clearly effort made by the JTE to provide a model of English speech, and her role was not merely that of translator or classroom manager.
Teacher-teacher talk	It was impossible to eliminate altogether, even with pre-lesson discussion of the lesson plan, as the need to coordinate lesson steps and confirm instructions remained.
Student attitudes toward student-centered instruction	The students' attitudes were positive toward student-centered instruction. This is very encouraging for carrying out further improvements to the class.

After analyzing all the data, group work appears to require additional attention in the future.

While the majority of the CLT and JET Programme literature advocate pair or small group work as a key element of student centered teaching, implementing group work in high schools is problematic. In both the lessons analyzed I opted for individual work in order to ensure the lesson went well. Reasons for avoiding group work include:

- Students speaking in Japanese to accomplish the task
- Students complete work for other classes.
- Often JTEs do not take an assertive role in keeping students on task during group activities.

The following steps may offer a means to address the above issues:

- Learner training for increased learner autonomy
- Increasing my ability to conduct group work successfully
- Discussing group work with team-teaching partners.

For JTEs still influenced by Grammar/Translation and who consider CLT inappropriate for their particular cultural environments (Holland and Shortall 2000), this could prove difficult. However, Hosfede says:

> If one chooses to try to cope with, rather than ignore (as often happens), the perplexities of cross-cultural learning situations, there are obviously two possible strategies: 1. Teach the teacher how to teach; 2. Teach the learner how to learn. (1986, p.316)

It is my hope that the above steps may lead to students being able to understand how to effectively work in groups, ultimately facilitating acquisition of English. In the end, this will serve the interests of all parties involved in the classroom.

APPENDIX 1: Lesson plan for the second lesson

(Note: The requests I made of the JTE are at the bottom)

PLAN

Brief review of person describing words with famous people pics. (10)

I have 24 pictures of different celebrities printed out on a piece of paper. I will have students come to the front of the class and describe one of three celebrities to the class, who will guess which one it is. This will be a review of the previous lessons' material.

Personality vocab worksheet. (10-15)

We will pass out the worksheet for vocabulary. Students can use dictionaries, but the point is for them to finish this as quickly as possible. This should be checked quickly by asking the students for the correct answers.

Prepare for dream boyfriend/girlfriend speech (10-15)

The goal is for each student in the class to tell everyone about their dream girlfriends or boyfriends. We'll ask them to tell the rest of the class what job, personality, and looks they would like in a boyfriend or girlfriend. They will use their time to write their ideas down, but they will have to memorize this.

Present dream boyfriend/girlfriend, rate (10)

The students will tell the rest of the class about their dream girlfriend or boyfriend. Everyone will listen, and RATE the student's boyfriend or girlfriend on a scale of 1 – 10. We will try to decide who had the best dream boyfriend or girlfriend.

FOR MY RESEARCH PROJECT

The goal of my project is to plan a lesson with LOW teacher talking time, and I have decided to make a student speech because that means the students will be talking more.

Here are some things I'd like you to do for *ONLY THIS LESSON*:
- Please explain difficult activities in Japanese. This will save a lot of time.
- If the students don't understand what I say, please translate this into Japanese for them.
- Call on students by name to answer questions… don't wait for someone to answer.

APPENDIX 2: Detailed Recording Data from the Second Lesson

Explanation of Activity	Start of Activity	End of Activity	Total TTT (s)	ALT TTT (s)	JTE English TTT (s)	JTE Japanese TTT (s)	Teacher-Teacher talk (s)
Greeting	0:00	0:08	8	3.7	0.4	0	0
Asking who various famous people are	0:08	0:48	19.5	6.5	0	0	0
Students describe famous people	0:48	7:18	165.4	67.7	0.8	0.8	2.4
Error correction	7:18	8:37	75.6	15.2	1.8	0	0
Worksheet – passing out	8:37	9:20	2.2	1.2	0.3	0	1.3
Worksheet Part 1 – doing	9:20	16:54	163	46.9	2.1	44.1	2.0
Worksheet Part 1 – answers	16:54	18:56	99.8	39.8	0.5	4.5	0
BLANK IN RECORDING [Time reset to 0:00]							
Worksheet Part 2 – doing	0:00	1:12	4.7	0	0.3	4.4	0
Worksheet Part 2 – answers	1:12	3:56	106.8	89.2	3.6	0.4	0
Recap, pause	3:56	4:33	31	5	0	0.6	0
Begin to prepare for presentation	4:33	10:57	202.9	27	30.9	68.9	3.9
Explain ranking task	10:57	11:31	27.8	0	0	16.5	0
Presentations	11:31	20:25	171.5	63.6	12.5	15.4	0
Ask about rankings	20:25	20:56	25	9.2	1.7	0.8	0
Classroom Management	20:56	21:23	25.4	10.9	2.3	1.4	8.4

TOTAL (seconds)			1129	386	57	158	18

(Note: Totals were rounded to the nearest second.)

(Note: the total time of the lesson reflects only that which was actually recorded, as do all other data represented.)

APPENDIX 3: Student Questionnaire

QUESTIONNAIRE

This is the last part of my research project. Please answer as honestly as you can. I'd like both positive and negative comments, so please write however you feel.

DO NOT write your name on this. Please answer in Japanese.

What did you think of today's lesson? Was it better than usual, the same, or worse? Why?

Is there anything you'd like to change about the class for the second semester?

Do you feel like you have enough chances to speak and use English in class? Why?

[JAPANESE TRANSLATION – GIVEN TO STUDENTS]

アンケート

**このアンケートの結果は、私の研究に用いるものです。感じたままを日本語で
正直に記入してください。**

名前を記入しないで下さい。

**７月４日の２時間目までに[name removed for confidentiality]先生に渡して
下さい。**

● **今日（６月２９日）の授業はいつもの授業に比べて、どうでしたか？どう
してそう思いますか？**

● **後期の授業で、何か変えたいことがありますか？具体的にあげて下さい。**

● **授業で自分が十分に英語で話す機会があると思いますか？どうしてです
か？**

REFERENCES

Breen, M. 'Navigating the discourse: On what is learned in the language classroom'. In Candlin and Mercer (eds.) *English Language Teaching in its Social Context*. (2001) London: Routledge.

CLAIR (Council of Local Authorities for International Relations) (2005) *Resource Materials & Teaching Handbook*. The JET (Japan Exchange Teaching) Programme: Japan.

Hofstede, G. (1986) 'Cultural Differences in Teaching and Learning'. In *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 10: 301-320.

Holland, B. and Shortall, T. (2000) *Classroom Research and Research Methods*. Centre for English Language Studies. Birmingham University.

Macedo, A. (2002) *Team teaching: Who should really be in charge?* Online. Available: http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/macedodiss.pdf

McConney, A et al. (2002) 'Getting to the Bottom Line: A Method for Synthesizing Findings Within Mixed-method Program Evaluations.' *American Journal of Evaluation* 23/2: 121-140.

Mercer, N. 'Language for teaching a language'. In Candlin and Mercer (eds.) *English Language Teaching in its Social Context*. (2001) London: Routledge.

Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) (2002) *Handbook for Team-Teaching: Revised Edition.* Japan.

Nunan, D. (1999) *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Nunan, D. and Lamb, C. 'Managing the Learning Process.' In Hall and Hewings (eds.) *Innovation in English Language Teaching*. (2001) London: Routledge.

Richards, J.C. and Lockhart, C. (1996) *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skehan, P. 'Second Language Acquisition Research and Task-Based Instruction.' In Willis, J. and Willis, D. (eds.) *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching.* (1996). Oxford: Macmillan.

Thornbury, S. (1996) 'Teachers research teacher talk.' *ELTJ* 50/4: 279-288.

Van Lier, L. 'Constraints and resources in classroom talk: Issues of equality and symmetry'. In Candlin and Mercer (eds.) *English Language Teaching in its Social Context*. (2001) London: Routledge.

Warren-Price, T. (2003) *Action Research Investigating the Amount of Teacher Talk in my Classroom.* Online available:
http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/Warren1.pdf