

Developing a Teacher Training Program for English Teachers in Japan: Enabling Nonnative English Speakers to Teach Solely in the Target Language

Naomi Ueno

Introduction

In March 2009 the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) announced the new Course of Study for upper secondary schools to be implemented in April 2013. In section eight: Foreign Languages, Article Three of the new Course of Study states, “...classes, in principle, should be conducted in English ...” After this announcement, a debate arose between those in favor of using English exclusively as the language of instruction and those in favor of occasional use of English in the language instruction. Yamada (2010, p. 50) reported that “41.2% of the JTE (Japanese Teachers of English) completely or mostly agreed that JTE would have difficulty speaking English all the time, and 93.9% of the JTE said they intend to improve their English in order to conduct their classes in English.” The main reason many teachers disagree with the new English teaching policy is because they have insufficient confidence in using English to teach English, not opposition to this policy. (Hiramatsu, 2005)

This paper does not argue for or against this policy; rather it addresses the urgency for developing a new teacher training program which could be applicable for any English teachers whose native languages are not English. The present study surveys English teachers on what kind of training they would like for in-service teacher training.

Language Teacher Training

Wallace (1991, p. 52) distinguished between received knowledge and experimental knowledge in his reflective model, defining the former term as “facts, data, theories, etc. which are either by necessity or by convention associated with the study of a particular profession.” He defined the latter term as “a professional action which has to be the major experiential focus.” Woodward (1991, p. 141) introduced Widdowson’s and Prabhu’s terms:

Widdowson’s distinction between *education* and *training* and Prabhu’s distinction

between *equipping* and *enabling* procedures, both borrowed from the field of language teaching, can be applied to language teacher training to give us the questions: Is it training or education that language teachers require? Is it equipping or enabling procedures that are needed? Prabhu feels that only true *enabling procedures* in teacher training encourage professional activism and increase the teacher's ability to interpret experiences and to relate perceptions to practical problems.

Japanese teachers of English tend to have significantly less experimental knowledge and enabling procedures compared to received knowledge and equipping procedures. They need more enabling procedures to acquire experimental knowledge to be confident in teaching English using the target language.

Richards (1998, pp. 1-13) stated: "The field of second language teacher education (SLATE) is concerned with determining appropriate curricular content and effective instructional processes in language teacher education programs." He divided SLATE into six domains: theories of teaching, teaching skills, communication skills, language proficiency, subject matter knowledge and pedagogical reasoning skills and decision making.

Sasajima (2008, p. 115) presented four recommendations to develop EFL teacher education programs for secondary-school teachers in Japan:

1. Practical EFL teacher education programmes should be provided to teachers: e.g. knowledge and skills, classroom management and opportunities to use English.
2. The current EFL teacher education in Japan should focus more on ESP, vocational languages and CLIL in addition to the traditional whole-person development approach.
3. Teaching English should be strongly related to students' future careers; the concepts in ESP, vocational languages or CLIL are useful and helpful to change EFL teacher beliefs.
4. The standards (e.g., CEFR) should be introduced into ELT in Japan: EFL teachers can establish their own professionalism.

Many other proposals exist for developing teacher training programs (Hüttner, Mehlmauer-Larcher & Schiftner, 2011; Richards & Nunan, 1990; Tarone & Allwright, 2005). Since possible participants are not students, but professional teachers, their needs should be fully considered.

Needs Analysis

Needs analysis is commonly used when a curriculum or program with a specific purpose is expected to be improved. However, researchers use this term with slight differences among themselves. The definition of needs analysis used in this study is

taken from Iwai et al. (1998, p. 6) as follows:

In general terms, needs analysis (also called needs assessment) refers to the activities involved in gathering information that will serve as the basis for developing a curriculum that will meet the learning needs of a particular group of students.

Long (2005, p. 31) introduced needs analysis procedures: (1) expert and non-expert intuitions (2) structured and unstructured interviews (3) surveys and questionnaires; (4) language audits (5) ethnographic methods (6) participant and non-participant observation (7) classroom observation (8) diaries, journals and logs (9) role-plays and simulations (10) content analysis (11) discourse analysis (12) register/rhetorical analysis (13) computer-aided corpus analysis (14) genre analysis (15) task-based, criterion-referenced performance tests (16) triangulated methods. Among these procedures, a questionnaire survey was adopted in this study because, as Long said (2005, p. 38), “Questionnaires, especially if mailed ~ can procure sizeable amounts of focused, standardized, organized data, potentially from a large sample of respondents, and do so relatively quickly and cheaply.”

Purpose and Research Questions

A teacher's certificate is required to teach English at junior high or high school in Japan. The minimum MEXT requirements related to English for a teacher's certificate to teach English are 1 unit in each of the fields of English Linguistics, English and American Literature, English Communication and Intercultural Understanding. The knowledge of these four skills alone is insufficient to afford candidates the received knowledge (as expressed by Wallace) and does not prepare them to teach solely in the target language, although they also take other English classes during their undergraduate studies. Thus, this study investigates what would create an effective program for Japanese English teachers. The following research questions are posed:

1. What do the needs of current teachers establish as very important components for a teacher training program based on teaching English in the target language?
2. What do the needs of current teachers establish as relatively important components for a teacher training program based on teaching English in the target language?
3. What are the differences between the views of experienced teachers and relatively inexperienced teachers?
4. What are the differences between the views of high school teachers and junior high school teachers?

Method

Participants

The participants in this study were 346 Japanese teachers of English who currently teach English either at public junior high or high schools in one prefecture in Japan. A demographic questionnaire was administered to obtain information about the participant backgrounds of 179 junior high school teachers and 167 high school teachers. The participants were 130 males and 216 females, aged 22 to 60 with an average age of 39.08. Of these, 35.78% had taught less than 10 years, 30.50% between 11 and 20, 27.27% between 21 and 30, and 6.45% between 31 and 38. Although the questionnaires were answered anonymously, the return envelopes showed that they were returned from all over the prefecture.

Materials

The author developed a questionnaire, referring to several books on foreign language teacher education (Burns & Richards, 2009; Freeman & Richards, 1996; Richards, 1998; Richards & Nunan, 1990; Robers, 1998; Tedick, 2005; Wallace, 1991; Woodward, 1991). The questionnaire was then revised based on comments from the author's colleagues (see Appendix A). Section I contains four biodata and background information items: gender, age, school type and years of teaching experience. Section II contains 20 closed-response questions, Section III 2 closed-response questions with possible multiple answers and Section IV 1 open-response question. A five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) was used for the 20 closed-response questions in Section II. The core Likert scale questions have a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of .91, which means that these 20 questions are nearly 91% reliable.

Procedures

A needs analysis questionnaire was administered to obtain the data for the present study. A total of 634 questionnaires were distributed in two ways. For high school teachers, the prefectural teachers' consultant for high school English teachers at the Prefectural Board of Education kindly helped us to distribute 338 questionnaires to all 102 public prefectural high schools. If a high school had more than one full-time English teacher, two questionnaires were distributed: if a high school had only one full-time English teacher, one questionnaire was given for each school. For junior high school teachers, 30 out of 44 local education boards assisted us in distributing the questionnaires to local junior high schools in their districts. In all, 296 questionnaires were distributed to 152 out of 234 public junior high schools (65.0%). One questionnaire was distributed for eight junior high schools since those

junior high schools had only one full-time English teacher. For the rest of the junior high schools (144), two questionnaires were given to each school. The questionnaires were provided with a letter to the principal and the head teacher of the English department. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope was included in the package. With the assistance of school boards, the return rate was relatively high (49.4% for high school and 60.5% for junior high school). In addition, random sampling is important in selecting participants. Brown (2001, p. 72) states: "With a sufficiently large number of individuals selected randomly, the resulting random sample can be said to represent the population from which the researcher drew it." In this study, teachers replied and anonymously returned the questionnaires after receiving them from prefectural or local school boards. The results of this study can be generalized to the prefecture, since random sampling was conducted and the sample size was sufficient.

Results

A total of 349 teachers answered the teacher questionnaire, but three of them were eliminated from this study because they failed to answer all of the questions. Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics which include participant numbers (*N*), means (*M*) for each item, a mean for total, standard deviations (*SD*), minimum values (*Min*) and maximum values (*Max*) and is organized in mean order from highest (4.13) to lowest (2.87).

The highest and the second highest rated items are the classes on (1) improving speaking and (2) learning how to teach speaking skills effectively. Both are related to speaking. The next three with the same mean values are concerned with teaching writing and overall teaching techniques, and creating effective teaching materials. British and American literature is the least demanded lesson.

Tables 2 presents the descriptive statistics for high school and junior high school teachers, including participant numbers (*N*), means (*M*) for each item and a mean for total. The table is organized in high school teachers mean order from highest (4.13) to lowest (2.74).

The highest and the second highest rated items are the classes on (1) improving speaking and (2) learning how to teach speaking skills effectively. Both are related to speaking. The next three with the same mean values are concerned with teaching writing and overall teaching techniques, and creating effective teaching materials. British and American literature is the least demanded lesson.

The average age difference between high school and junior high school teachers is slightly over four years (high school: 41.29 and junior high school: 37.02). As the average age of high school teachers is higher, their teaching experience is longer (high school: 17.00 and junior high school: 12.31).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics (All Participants) of Needs Analysis Survey (Mean Order)

Questions	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min	Max
Classes for teachers to improve their speaking	346	4.13	0.85	1	5
Techniques on how to effectively teach speaking	345	4.12	0.73	1	5
Techniques on how to effectively teach writing	345	4.00	0.79	1	5
Classes on methodology focusing on all aspects of teaching English	346	4.00	0.76	1	5
Classes on how to create effective teaching materials	345	4.00	0.76	1	5
Classes on developing overall teaching skills	344	3.98	0.75	1	5
Techniques on how to effectively teach listening	346	3.92	0.79	1	5
Classes for teachers to improve their writing	345	3.85	0.79	1	5
Classes on how to create effective presentations	346	3.83	0.88	1	5
Techniques on how to effectively teach reading	345	3.82	0.84	1	5
Classes in a study abroad program	346	3.82	1.00	1	5
Classes for teachers to improve their listening comprehension	345	3.79	0.93	1	5
Classes on training in debate	346	3.76	1.00	1	5
Classes on testing	345	3.71	0.87	1	5
Classes on cross-cultural understanding	344	3.59	0.92	1	5
Classes for teachers to improve their reading	346	3.56	1.02	1	5
Classes on English proficiency tests for teachers	345	3.45	1.09	1	5
Classes on research methodology	345	3.28	1.00	1	5
Classes on English linguistics	346	3.20	1.00	1	5
Classes on British and American literature	346	2.87	1.00	1	5
Average (Mean)	346	3.73			
Average (age)	346	39.08			
Average (teaching experience)	346	39.08			

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics (High School and Junior High School Teachers) of Needs Analysis Survey (High School Teachers Mean Order)

	HS		JHS		Rank
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	Max
Techniques on how to effectively teach speaking	167	4.13	178	4.12	2
Classes for teachers to improve their speaking	167	4.08	179	4.18	1
Classes on how to create effective teaching materials	167	3.98	178	4.01	6
Techniques on how to effectively teach writing	167	3.94	178	4.05	5
Classes on methodology focusing on all aspects of teaching English	167	3.92	179	4.07	3
Classes on developing overall teaching skills	167	3.89	177	4.06	4
Classes on how to create effective presentations	167	3.84	179	3.82	13
Techniques on how to effectively teach listening	167	3.84	179	3.99	7
Classes on testing	167	3.82	179	3.61	17
Classes for teachers to improve their writing	167	3.81	178	3.88	9
Classes in a study abroad program	167	3.77	179	3.87	10
Classes for teachers to improve their listening comprehension	167	3.73	178	3.85	11
Techniques on how to effectively teach reading	167	3.72	179	3.91	8
Classes on training in debate	167	3.69	179	3.83	12
Classes on cross-cultural understanding	167	3.58	179	3.60	18
Classes for teachers to improve their reading	167	3.42	179	3.70	15
Classes on research methodology	167	3.27	178	3.28	19
Classes on English proficiency tests for teachers	167	3.25	178	3.63	16
Classes on English linguistics	167	3.02	179	3.36	17
Classes on British and American literature	167	2.74	179	2.99	20
Average (Mean)	167	3.67	179	3.79	14
Average (age)	167	41.29	179	37.02	
Average (teaching experience)	167	17.00	179	12.31	

(HS=High School; JHS=Junior High School; Rank=JHS Rank)

In order to investigate patterns in participant answers to the 20 closed-end questionnaire items in Section II, a factor analysis was performed. Principal component analysis and varimax rotation extracted two factors as shown in Table 3.

The two factor areas appear to be skill- and theory-oriented. Factor 1 was named skill-oriented because items were related to improving skills, such as listening, speaking, reading and writing. Factor 2 was named theory-oriented because items were related to learning theories, such as Theories on TESOL and Research methodology. There were four ambiguous items: items 9 (Theories on TESOL), 10 (Overall teaching skills), 11 (Teaching materials creating) and 18 (Testing). Items 9, 10, and 11 loaded on both factors. The teachers either found both skill- and theory-oriented factors in the items, or they could not distinguish them clearly. The component value of item 18 (Testing) was very different from that of other items because both values, factors 1 and 2, were quite low (-0.015, 0.023), which can be interpreted as meaning that the teachers considered this item unrelated to both factors or could not understand the content of this item well.

Table 3
Factor loadings

Item	Component loadings		
	Component 1	Component 2	h^2
Q1. Listening skill improvement	0.514	0.377	0.406
Q2. Listening skill teaching	0.745	0.215	0.679
Q3. Speaking skill improvement	0.652	0.233	0.479
Q4. Speaking skill teaching	0.762	0.128	0.597
Q5. Reading skill improvement	0.654	0.266	0.499
Q6. Reading skill teaching	0.796	0.102	0.735
Q7. Writing skill improvement	0.665	0.333	0.553
Q8. Writing skill teaching	0.769	0.164	0.618
Q9. Theories on TESOL	0.455	0.516	0.473
Q10. Overall teaching skills	0.494	0.480	0.474
Q11. Teaching creating materials	0.422	0.481	0.409
Q12. Creating effective presentations	0.292	0.569	0.409
Q13. Teaching debate skills	0.372	0.553	0.444
Q14. English Linguistics	0.172	0.765	0.615
Q15. British and American literature	0.229	0.713	0.560
Q16. Cross-cultural understanding	0.302	0.627	0.484
Q17. Research methodology	0.092	0.807	0.659
Q18. Testing	-0.015	0.023	0.001
Q19. Proficiency test preparation	0.313	0.610	0.470
Q20. Study abroad program	0.169	0.450	0.232
Percent of Total Variance	39.538	8.625	
Interpretation	skill-oriented	theory-oriented	

(The description of each item is shortened. The highest loading for each variable is in boldface.)

Table 4
Frequency of Desired Program Length

Items	Frequency
Sabbatical (half a year to two years)	176
Long vacation (summer, winter, spring)	157
Weekend	30
After school	18
Others	6
Total	387

Two questions in section III addressed desired program length and places for teacher training. Since multiple answers were allowed, the total number of answers in Table 4 was 387. The most desired length is from half a year to two years and the second choice is a long leave during summer, winter or spring. Teachers would obviously like to attend a program for a longer period of time.

Table 5 shows the location desired for teacher training. The most desired location is a public training center, and the next three are private language schools, graduate schools and others (including overseas).

The completed questionnaires were divided into four groups. Teachers in the EXP I 1-10 group have between 1 and 10 years teaching experience, teachers in the EXP II 11-20 group between 11 and 20 years, teachers in the EXP III 21-30 group between 21 and 30 years and teachers in the EXP IV 31-38 group between 31 and 38 years. Four groups were used

Table 5
Frequency of Desired Program Location

Items	
Public training center	123
Private language school	84
Graduate school	68
Others	42 (overseas 16)
Place of work	37
Total	354

Table 6
Intercorrelations & Coefficients of Determinations of Four Groups

EXP I 1-10				
EXP II 11-20	.92	.96	.93	.85
EXP III 21-30	.86	.85	.92	.84
EXP IV 31-38	.72	.71	.86	.93
	EXP I 1-10	EXP II 11-20	EXP III 21-30	EXP IV 31-38

(Intercorrelations are presented above the diagonal line, and determination coefficients below it.

because teachers in Japan have been renewing their teaching licenses every ten years since 2009, defining ten years as a segment of teaching experience. The youngest possible teacher in Japan is normally 22 years old and the retirement age is 60 at Japanese public junior high and high schools. Therefore, the teacher age ranges from 22 to 32 in EXP I 1-10, 32 to 42 in EXP II 11-20, 42 to 52 in EXP III 21-30 and 52 to 60 in EXP IV 31-38. Table 6 presents intercorrelations (r^2) and coefficients of determinations for the average ratings of the four groups.

Discussion

The first research question concerned the needs of current teachers with regard to the important components for a teacher training program based on teaching English in the target language. The items with averages of 4.00 or greater were improving speaking skills, teaching speaking techniques, teaching writing techniques and creating teaching materials.

The second research question asked what the current teachers establish as relatively important components for a teacher training program based on teaching English in the target language. The items with averages greater than 3.80 were overall teaching techniques, teaching listening, improving writing, creating effective presentations, improving reading and study abroad programs. Of the 11 items mentioned above, seven items are related to productive skills or what Wallace (1991) calls experimental knowledge (experimental knowledge of professional action or practical experience). Teachers seem to want their received knowledge (knowledge widely accepted as being part of the necessary intellectual content of the profession) turned into experimental knowledge by participating in teacher training. Such findings support Hiramatsu's study (2005, p. 132) which reported that "Support for improving the JTE's spoken English and their surrounding environment should remain a priority." These results also partially support the previous research conducted by Sakai in a research group that received a grant from MEXT. The data is as shown in Table 7 (their Table 1) (2003, p. 309).

The third research question asked if experienced teachers differ in their views from relatively inexperienced teachers. As mentioned in the analysis section, all the teachers who replied were divided into four groups and their intercorrelations and coefficients of determinations (r^2) were calculated. The coefficients of determination value between EXP I 1-10 and EXP II 11-20 (.92) are higher than those between EXP I 1-10 and EXP III 21-30 (.86) and the coefficients of determination value between EXP I 1-10 and EXP II 21-30 (.86) are higher than those between EXP II 11-20 and EXP IV 31-38 (.72). The coefficients of determination value between EXP II 11-20 and EXP III 21-30 (.85) are higher than those between EXP II 11-20 and EXP IV 31-38 (.85) and the coefficients of determination value between EXP II 11-20 and EXP IV 31-

Table 7
Descriptive Statistics (All Participants) of Needs Analysis Survey (Mean Order)

Purposes for training	Answers from teachers who have been attending the training program. (N=158)	Answers from teachers who want to attend the training program. (N=186)
Improve communicative skills	49.1	55.0
Improve teaching skills	43.7	51.6
Improve overall English proficiency	45.8	42.1
Improve listening comprehension	18.6	14.5
Understand cross-cultural differences	10.8	9.7
Study TESL	7.0	5.1
Improve reading	5.9	4.7
Improve writing	3.8	3.4
Others	3.4	2.0

(This table was translated by the author.)

38 (.85) are higher than those between EXP II 11-20 and EXP IV 31-38 (.71). These data show that the contents teachers want to include in teacher training differ slightly according to their teaching experience. The coefficients of determination value being comparatively lower between EXP IV 31-38 and two other groups, EXP I 1-10 and EXP II 11-20 (.72, .71), is notable. Three reasons may be considered for this. First, the experienced teachers feel less necessity for participating in teacher training because they think that they have enough experience to address any matter they are concerned with. Second, what they think of as teacher training differs from what the other groups think of. Third, their immediate priority also differs from that of the other two groups.

The fourth research question asked if high school teachers differ in their views from junior high school teachers. The mean average of junior high school teachers was slightly higher than that of high school teachers (3.79: 3.67); junior high school teachers feel more necessity to attend teacher training. One reason is probably that the high school teachers in this study are more confident than the junior high school teachers because they have more experience. Another reason is presumably that the English proficiency of the high school teachers is comparatively higher than that of the junior high school teachers, so the high school teachers feel less necessity for teacher training than the junior high school teachers. According to a survey reported by the MEXT in February 2009, 2186 out of 21,397 high school teachers obtained 730 or higher on the TOEIC and 1021 out of 21,397 high school teachers obtained 550 or higher on the TOEFL. In the same survey, 1581 out of 21,771 junior high school teachers scored higher than 730 on the TOEIC and 1021 out of 21,771 junior high school teachers scored higher than 550 on the TOEFL.

Even though some differences exist between the replies of the junior high and high school teachers, both groups of teachers would like teacher training to include speaking. The other findings demonstrate that the desired locations include public training centers, private language schools, graduate schools, overseas and place of work in this order. The desired lengths include long-term leave from half a year to two years, long vacations (summer, winter, spring), weekends and after school in this order. This partially supports the results of Sakai (2003, p. 312). According to his results, the popularity order for the place and time for training for high school teachers is overseas, weekdays, prefectural training centers, graduate schools and weekends at a private or other training center. Those for junior high school teachers are overseas, weekdays, graduate schools, prefectural training centers and weekends at private or other training centers in this order.

Lastly, many helpful comments were written in the open-response section. Of the 346 teachers, 172 (49.71 %) answered this question. The following are common comments where more than 10 teachers answered similarly. The number in parentheses shows how many teachers answered in this category.

1. I would like to watch a model lesson conducted in English by current teachers at junior high school or high school in person or on DVD or VHS. (47)
2. I would like to study abroad at government expense. (21)
3. I would like to attend a program, conducted by present teachers at junior high school or high school, in which I can learn practical techniques and how to evaluate current textbooks. I would also like to try to conduct English only teaching in the program. (15)
4. I would like to learn practical classroom English. (14)
5. I would like to attend a program in which I can learn how to teach English depending on the levels of students and their needs. (13)
6. I believe that an atmosphere of cooperation and understanding is needed when teachers would like to participate in a program. Teachers often sense resistance from superiors when they want to apply for a program. Paying adequate attention to the teachers is also necessary by reducing their duties at school. (11)
7. I believe that teacher training for English teachers is definitely necessary to improve their English proficiency. (10)
8. I would like to attend a program in which I can learn how to effectively team teach (TT) with Assistant Language Teachers (ALT). (10)

In addition, many helpful comments revealed that the teachers' busy lives often prevent them from participating in teacher training. Their attitude towards training is sincere; going beyond program participation to teachers' attitudes such as educating

themselves in their everyday lives is important.

Conclusion

This needs analysis investigated what kind of training English teachers would like to attend and the results were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. The results show that English teachers would like to have teacher training programs including the following content (items whose averages were over 3.80 out of 5.00): (a) improving speaking, (b) teaching speaking, (c) teaching writing, (d) approaches to TESOL, (e) creating teaching materials, (f) overall teaching skills, (g) teaching listening, (h) improving writing, (i) creating effective presentations, (j) teaching reading and (k) study abroad programs.

Of the three venue possibilities presented in the questionnaire teachers preference was as follows: (1) a public training center (2) a private language school (3) graduate school. Regarding the length of time, the preference were (1) during a long vacation, and (2) during a long term leave.

The factor analysis results indicate that there are two factors: skill-oriented and theory-oriented. Eleven items out of twenty are related to skill improvement, and eleven items out of twenty are concerned with learning theory.

The qualitative analysis clearly reveals the opinions of teachers. Many of them recognize the urgent need to train themselves by attending a teacher training program held in Japan or overseas, watching model lessons conducted in English, working independently on their teaching and English skills every day and more even though they are very busy as teachers.

Implications

Phillipson (1992, pp. 194-199) argues that “the attributes the native speaker brings to the classroom (e.g., cultural familiarity, fluency, idiomaticity, and dependable acceptability judgments) can be developed through teacher training. In addition, the experience of having consciously learned English makes nonnative speakers better qualified to teach the language than those who are born into the culture.” Nemtchinova (2005, p. 238) indicates that “Among the positive attributes credited to nonnative English speakers are their conscious knowledge of grammar, language learning experience that they can share with learners, a good learner model that they may represent, and the empathy they bring to the task of teaching.” Assuming that an English teacher possesses the necessary English proficiency, at least three things must be firmly embedded in their minds to become what the author believes a good Japanese teacher of English should be. First, dispelling the myth that the native English-speaking teacher is always superior to the nonnative teacher should be the bottom line for the starting point of the teacher training program.

Second, working with ALTs (Assistant Language Teacher) to be able to provide meaningful English education and having the confidence that JTEs can understand their students well is also essential. Third, trying to improve their English proficiency as well as their teaching techniques, teachers should show their students that teachers are lifelong learners.

Finally, the results of this study should be interpreted carefully in light of two limitations:

1. Some important items were not in the questionnaire such as questions about watching model lessons, evaluating and creating effective lessons with ALTs. Although the original questionnaire was revised based on colleague comments, a pilot study should have been conducted.
2. Some terms in the questions were not clear to some participants such as *testing* and *presentation*. Those terms could have been described in detail by giving examples.

One possible future study could be based on a questionnaire designed for students who want to become English teachers and distributed to them; the results of the present study and those for such a future study could thus be compared.

Despite its limitations, the author hopes that any nonnative English teachers either teaching in Japan or overseas who read this study will share their ideas with each other, such as how to squeeze time out of their busy lives to improve their communication, teaching and other skills. The author also hopes that the results of this study will help in designing effective training programs for Japanese teachers of English as well as for any nonnative English teachers in the near future.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Professor J.D. Brown at the department of Second Language Studies at the University of Hawai'i and Professor Harris G. Ives at the Department of Contemporary English at Ibaraki Christian University for their help in analyzing the data and their valuable comments. I am also grateful to the people who work at the prefectural and local school boards for their assistance in administering questionnaires to teachers. I would also like to thank the teachers who kindly answered my questionnaire and sent it back to me. Without their help, this study could never have been completed.

References

- Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.

- Burns, A. & Richards, J. C. (Eds.). (2009). *Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.
- Freeman, D. & Richards, J.C. (Eds.). (1996). *Teacher learning in language teaching*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.
- Hiramatsu, S. (2005). Contexts and Policy Reform: A Case Study of EFL Teaching in a High School in Japan. In Tedick, D.J. (Ed.), *Second language Teacher Education: International Perspectives*. (pp.113-134). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Hüttner, J, Mehlmauer-Larcher, B. & Schiftner, B. (Ed.). (2011). *Theory and Practice in EFL Teacher Education: Bridging the Gap*. Multilingual Matters Limited.
- Iwai, T., Kondo, K., Lim, D. S. J., Ray, G., Shimizu, H. & Brown, J.D. (1999). *Japanese Language Needs Assessment 1998-1999* (NFLRC NetWork #13) [HTML document]. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.
- Long, M. (ed.). (2005). *Second Language Needs Analysis*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Technology. (2004). *Eigo Kyouiku Kaizen Jisshi Joukyou Chousa*. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chukyo/chukyo3/015/siryo/04042301/015.htm
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Technology. (2009). *The Course of Study for Upper Secondary Schools*. Tokyo, Japan: Monkasho.
- Nemtchinova, E. (2005). Host Teachers' Evaluations of Nonnative-English-Speaking Teacher Trainees- A Perspective from the Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 235-262.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, J. (1998). *Language Teacher Education*. London, England: Arnold.
- Sasajima, S. (2008) (lead author). *Development of the LSP teacher education system based on a Survey on the Foreign Languages (English) Teacher Education in Japan*. (Report No. 17520395).
- Tarone, E. and Allright, D. (2005). Second Language Teacher Learning and Student Second Language Learning: Shaping the Knowledge Base. In Tedick, D.J. (Ed.), *Second language Teacher Education: International Perspectives*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Teacher Education Research Group. (2003). *A Comprehensive Study of In-Service English Teacher Education in Japan — from status quo to renovations*.
- Teacher Education Research Group. (2001). *A Comprehensive Study of In-Service English Teacher Education in Japan — from status quo to renovations*.
- Tedick, D.J. (Ed.). (2005). *Second language Teacher Education: International Perspectives*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Richards, J.C. (1998). *Beyond Training*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C. & Nunan, D. (ed.). (1990). *Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.
- Wallace, M. J. (1991). *Training Foreign Language Teachers*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.
- Woodward, T. (1991). *Models and Metaphors in Language Teacher Training*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.
- Yamada, H. (2010). "Teaching/Learning English in English at Japanese Senior High Schools: The Debate." in *Academic Journal of Jin-ai University*, 9, 43-53.

Footnotes

- 1 The definition of this term "Ways of presenting the materials and teaching" is from Brown (1995, p. 5).

Appendix A

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING NEEDS QUESTIONNAIRE • Spring 2011

To the teachers:

*This survey is to identify English teacher needs to enable them to teach English solely in the target language and is part of our work to create a teacher training program at Ibaraki Christian University. We value your opinion and greatly appreciate your help. We would appreciate it if you could complete the questionnaire and return it to Ibaraki Christian University with the provided stamped envelope by **July 30, 2011**. Thank you very much for your assistance.*

Directions: Please circle the most appropriate item.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1) School you are currently teaching at:

1. Public High School
2. Public Junior High School

2) Years you have taught English: _____

SECTION II: CLASSES TEACHERS WANT TO ATTEND

Please read each statement and indicate the extent you agree or disagree from among the following:

5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = No Opinion, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree

I believe the following contents should be included in the teaching program to enable teachers to teach English solely in the target language.

- 1) Classes for teachers to improve their listening comprehension
- 2) Techniques on how to effectively teach listening
- 3) Classes for teachers to improve their speaking
- 4) Techniques on how to effectively teach speaking
- 5) Classes for teachers to improve their reading
- 6) Techniques on how to effectively teach reading classes
- 7) Classes for teachers to improve their writing
- 8) Techniques on how to effectively teach writing classes
- 9) Classes on methodology focusing on all aspects of teaching English

- 10) Classes on developing overall teaching techniques
- 11) Classes on how to create effective teaching materials
- 12) Classes on how to create effective presentations
- 13) Classes on training in debate
- 14) Classes on English linguistics
- 15) Classes on British and American literature
- 16) Classes on cross-cultural understanding
- 17) Classes on research methodology
- 18) Classes on testing
- 19) Classes on English proficiency tests (TOEFL and TOEIC) for teachers
- 20) Classes in a study abroad program

SECTION III: TIME and PLACE

When do you want to attend the program? Please choose all that apply for you.

- 1) After school on weekdays
- 2) Saturdays and/or Sundays
- 3) During a long vacation (summer, winter or spring vacation)
- 4) During a half a year, a one-year or two-year leave for teachers
- 5) Other ()

Where do you want to attend the program? Please choose all that apply for you.

- 1) At a working school
- 2) At a public training center for teachers
- 3) At a private language school
- 4) At a graduate school
- 5) Other ()

SECTION IV: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Please explain what kind of teaching program you would like to attend.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.

英語教員のための英語教員研修プログラム開発について：
日本人英語教員が英語で英語の指導行うために

上野 尚美

2009年3月に新しい高等学校学習指導要領が公示されてから、英語で英語の授業をすることが効果的かどうか、白熱した議論が繰り広げられてきた。筆者は、そうした状況下において、あらためて英語教員研修プログラムの開発が必要であろうと考え、現職の英語教員を対象にアンケート調査を行い、ニーズ分析を行った。英語教員の希望が高い順に上位5つの研修内容を並べると次の通りとなった。1) 教員自身のスピーキング能力の向上, 2) スピーキングスキルの指導法, 3) ライティングスキルの指導法, 4) 英語に関する指導法全般, 5) 効果的な教材の作成法。

