

How Universities Could Support Change in Secondary Education

Kazuaki TSUIDO

Walter DAVIES

Institute for Foreign Language Research and Education

Hiroshima University

This is a discursive article, which focuses on the development of English language education in secondary schools. In it, we consider how a national university could support teacher training and development. In a previous article (Davies & Tsuido 2008), we argued that this is an ongoing process, where teachers need time and space to discuss possibilities for change, and that this is very important in a period of 'reform'. Consequently this article examines ideas on educational change, examines the Japanese situation of both Japanese Teachers of English (JTEs) and Assistant English Teachers (AETs), and suggests possible ways in which a national university might be able to support teacher change and development.

In terms of change, much of the literature has been drawn from educational studies and ideas from the United Kingdom and North America, involving ideas such as 'school improvement' and 'school effectiveness'. Consequently, studies have tended to come from these geographical areas. This raises the issue of relevance to the Japanese situation. For example, Roberts (1998) notes that the professional development principles that he discusses "derive from a Western cultural context as the research is from the USA, Canada and the UK." He argues that a variety of assumptions may not apply in "the more centralised, hierarchical or authoritarian systems" where top-down approaches may be the only viable option. However, he also notes Ghani et al's observation that it is possible for centralised systems to set up support for individual teachers in schools, often in parallel with centralised structures. It is in this spirit that the article is written.

REFORM

Goodman (2003), Hood (2001; 2003) and Schoppa (1991) write about educational reform in Japan. They consider the major reforms, such as in the Meiji and the post-WWII periods. Their focus is on planned change instigated by a centralized authority in the form of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT). Hood (2001) goes further, dividing reform into two models, 'the leap of faith' where there is a rapid implementation of legislation designed to effect considerable change, and 'the *tsunami*' where central institutions define key ideas and arguments, which become unstoppable over long stretches of time. In both instances, reform is seen as a top-down process, with a powerful centre attempting to impose change on an educational system. However, both Hood and Schoppa are careful to point out that central institutions are not homogeneous and there is often considerable internal

debate. Even with the leap of faith examples in Japan it is important to consider the timescale of reform. Regarding Meiji Japan, Passin (1982) identifies liberal reforms starting at the beginning of the 1870s, and developing through the decade. He identifies the 1880s and 1890s as the time of conservative backlash.

As we noted in Davies & Tsuido (2008), Hood uses his *tsunami* model to describe the current reform process, where ideas and concepts have built up over a long period of debate. In the sphere of English language education, specific plans developed on the basis of the reform ideas have been implemented through the 5-year Action Plan to Develop Japanese with English Speaking Abilities, which sets a broad educational goal: "Through instruction, basic and practical communication abilities will be acquired so that the entire public can conduct daily conversation and exchange information in English" (MEXT, 2002, Section I). In relation to this goal, emphasis is placed on communicative activities in the classroom:

Through the repetition of activities making use of English as a means of communication, the learning of vocabulary and grammar should be enhanced, and communication abilities in "listening," "speaking," "reading," and "writing" should be fostered. Such techniques for instruction are necessary. To carry out such instruction effectively, it is important for teachers to establish many situations where students can communicate with each other in English and routinely to conduct classes principally in English. (MEXT, 2002, Section II:1)

Now that this plan has been implemented, it is important to consider the ways in which change in secondary education can be assisted by the resources of tertiary education. In particular, it is useful to consider ideas and concepts on educational change from abroad and how they could be adapted to the Japanese situation.

IDEAS ON CHANGE

A number of authors have examined the idea of change in the literature. Markee (1997) notes the distinction between change and innovation, arguing that innovation is a conscious planned process whereas change is a more unconscious "reworking of familiar elements into new relationships." In this article we focus on the term 'change' as an overarching concept that encompasses both ideas because Markee's distinction may be difficult to sustain in practice. At the level of teachers there are potentially many changes that are unrelated to proposed government reforms. Such changes are initiated by motivated practitioners with clear ideas on improving education in their schools. However, teachers may also be unconsciously making changes due to government reforms. In these cases, the source of the change may be hidden as the reforms percolate down to individual teachers. The key issue is that, wherever the ideas come from, it is important for teachers to be able to think through their merits and weaknesses and develop their teaching in ways that are practical and effective. In this sense, while the Ministry may be able to set an overall direction of change, it is teachers who need to be able to debate and discuss new ways of teaching as it is they who are

responsible for implementing the curriculum in the classroom.

Sikes (1992) notes that “there is nothing new about educational change, indeed change can be seen as the norm, the stable state.” However, she further observes that the interpretation often placed upon imposed change is that teachers are lacking in skills or abilities. Changes are imposed to “remedy deficiencies.” In her view, changes can remove experienced teachers’ motivations when their experience and professional expertise is challenged. Fullan (1993; 1999; 2001) has written extensively on change and notes its complexity:

This new science of complexity essentially claims that the link between cause and effect is difficult to trace, that change (planned or otherwise) unfolds in non-linear ways, that paradoxes and contradictions abound and that creative solutions arise out of interaction under conditions of uncertainty, diversity and instability. (Fullan 1999, p.4)

However, he notes that change requires both top-down and bottom-up processes. In terms of top-down change “mandates provide opportunities for legitimizing the efforts of the local change agents working against the grain.”

School Effectiveness and School Improvement

Regarding positive educational change, key ideas are often categorized under the terms ‘school effectiveness’ and ‘school improvement’. School effectiveness literature tends to work with hard data to provide comparisons and templates for success. In comparison, school improvement literature looks at development as a more organic process that takes local factors and less quantifiable concepts into account.

Fullan’s analyses fall within the school improvement literature, as he argues that change is too complex to be addressed outside its context. He observes that transferability is very difficult between organizations because a great deal of knowledge and expertise is either tacit or too subtly interwoven into an organisation for it to be effectively transferred. Fullan’s (1999) arguments tend to focus on the development of schools through a set of key ideas that allow the schools themselves to link and develop. His thinking consequently leads him to have a particular view of district and state educational reforms in North America, arguing that districts should become advocates for the schools in their areas and that states should become advocates for their school districts. His position is that the best use of state power is to support decentralization, local capacity building, rigorous accountability and stimulating innovation. In relation to local capacity building, Fullan (1999) makes the following observation:

What is involved is directly and indirectly providing opportunities for advancing the knowledge, skills and work of local school and district personnel along the lines of what we know about creating powerful learning communities. (p.57)

Bollen (1996) notes that “in practice, a decentralization policy is often associated with a

centralization policy at higher levels of the system, for instance at the national level where evaluation and assessment is concentrated.” Hopkins and Lagerweij (1996) also observe this paradox, noting that the key issue is to find a balance between the demands of central authorities and the development of local school improvement. The political aspect of evaluating change is noted by Lewkowicz & Nunan (1999), who report on the difficulty of collaborative evaluation in their study of the Intensive English Language Programme (IELP) in Hong Kong.

Hopkins and Lagerweij (1996) identify the school as “the centre of change” and believe that school improvement initiatives need to adopt a ‘classroom exceeding’ perspective in addition to a focus on the classroom. In tracking the development of knowledge concerning the area of educational change in the United Kingdom they identify three historical phases. In the 1960s, there was an attempt to effect change through the ‘adoption of curriculum materials’ (Hopkins and Lagerweij argue that these materials were subverted because teachers simply assimilated them into their own teaching). They describe the 1970s as a period of ‘documenting failure’ whereby researchers came to understand the complexity of the change process and the need to provide teachers with in-service training. The third phase (late 1970s to mid 1980s) is identified as ‘a period of success,’ where general agreement on the characteristics of effective schools was established and large scale studies of school improvement projects were undertaken. They further describe the current phase as ‘managing change,’ where there is a move away from observing change towards active participation in school development.

In terms of specific cases of school development, Stoll et al. (1996) cite a number of studies involving planned change. In their summary of the Halton Board of Education Effective School’s Project they note that

Essentially, ‘top-down’ mandates to schools did not address the issues of ownership and commitment, nor did they pay attention to the process and impact of the changes upon those who worked to implement the policy mandates. (p.116)

They describe how the project developed to include teachers, that the local district created a strategic plan that emphasized three directions: the growth planning process itself, classroom instruction and staff development.

The ‘Improving Quality of Education for All’ (IQEA) project is cited as a case of school improvement. This started in 1991 with nine schools and by 1996 had 40 schools in various areas. All the staff of a school must agree to join the project and a contract is agreed between the local education authority (LEA), the school staff and the project team. In this project a number of conditions that underpinned successful schools were identified: Staff development, involvement, leadership, coordination, enquiry and reflection, and collaborative planning.

The Lewisham School Improvement Project started in the spring of 1993 and involved Lewisham Local Education Authority and London University’s Institute of Education. This project has six dimensions: Leadership development, school projects, indicators creation (used as the framework for evaluating school development), monitoring and evaluation (to assess

whether changes have been successful), governors and effectiveness (where governing bodies have been introduced to school effectiveness and improvement issues), and dissemination (within and beyond the LEA).

In the USA, the Barclay-Calvert project involved the implementation of a curricular and instructional package of a successful private school in an inner city state school. Key factors involved funding, non-fiscal support in terms of commitment by key participants in the project, achievable plans and an emphasis on classroom instruction.

Williams and Burden (1996) report on a project to start an immersion programme at a multilingual primary school in Geneva. The initial stages of the project became successful when the teachers began to get a good grip on the process leading to changes in the initial plan. Williams and Burden note the progress that was made and the readiness of the school staff for the next stage. A key point arising out of the article is the flexibility of the headmaster who supported adaptation of the plan, so that the initial stages of change did not involve an immersion programme, but involved shared project work, outings and craftwork between the French-speaking and English-speaking groups in the school.

All of these projects involve schools that are trying to implement change working with external agents in the form of local government, universities or other schools. These external agents work with the schools over a period of time, so that new ideas and practices can take root.

The Effect of Change on Teachers

As noted above, changes are often perceived as attempts to remedy deficiencies and this can lead to negative effects on teacher morale. Sikes (1992) notes that “the result can be that people lose their sense of meaning and direction, their ‘framework of reality’, their confidence that they know what to do, and consequently they experience confusion and a kind of alienation.” While this is only one possibility, there clearly are theorizers who see teachers as the problem. Howarth (1991) in his support for Japanese education reform makes the following observation: “No doubt the greatest obstacle to improvement will be traditionally-minded teachers determined to preserve the cherished ways of performing their jobs.” However, while we fully accept that in all groups (including theorizers) there may be traditionalists who, for the sake of convenience, do not wish to make changes, there are likely to be many more teachers who know why they teach in a certain way within the constraints of their educational context. Change usually involves a balancing of gains against losses, and individual teachers may place different values on learning areas. For example, so-called ‘traditionalists’ may have arguments for teaching their way in relation to preparing their students for university entrance examinations or have literary ambitions for their students. Older teachers who have experience of older styles of teaching, may also be more aware of potential losses from changing to new ways of teaching.

In her Hong Kong study, Ling (2002) observes that change can lead to conflict. Changes were initiated by a powerful headmaster who wanted to improve the quality of teaching in his school. She notes the effects on two members of staff over five years of the change process.

As change took place, teachers became empowered and serious conflict occurred between groups of teachers and the headmaster. In this case, the change process involved a strong negative element in terms of the divisions that occurred within the school. One of the most interesting effects of the changes was the development of two cultures, one top-down, with a technical perspective on instigating change, the other democratic and collaborative with a practice-based perspective on development. While the crisis was eventually resolved, Ling notes that it was a painful experience for some of the members of staff who went through their own phases of development. What is interesting about this case is the lack of external agents to help mediate the process of change. One possible reason for the intensity of the internal school conflicts may be that, without such agents, who would have been outside the established power structures of the school, there was no one who had sufficient distance from these structures to help resolve the problems.

THE JAPANESE CONTEXT

The ideas discussed in the previous sections are drawn from projects outside Japan with a particular focus on North America and the United Kingdom. In terms of considering their usefulness in a Japanese context, it is important to consider how training and development take place within the Japanese educational system.

Initial Teacher Training (ITT)

Initial teacher training occurs at the undergraduate level. Students wishing to become high school English language teachers join either an education department or an English language and literature department that is approved to undertake teacher training. They attend courses in language, literature and pedagogy, and must spend a basic minimum of two or three weeks at a secondary school to gain practical experience. In addition they are required to participate as volunteers in social welfare institutions for one week, including two days at schools for the disabled. Once they have satisfied these requirements, they can apply for a teacher's license from the board of education. Having obtained the license, a university graduate has the option of applying to the board of education for employment in the state school system or applying directly to private schools. In Lamie's (2000) survey of JTEs, she observed that the vast majority of teachers in the sample (70%) had only had two weeks of teaching practice. This is mainly because the law concerning teacher certification stipulates a minimum two-week practicum, but an additional reason for this limited time period is given by Yonesaka (1999): Because only a small number of undergraduates studying for a teaching qualification will actually join the profession, practising teachers are reluctant to have their teaching schedules interrupted for any length of time by practicum participants. Lamie notes that with such a limited time spent in teaching practice during training teachers tend to reinforce the methodological status quo of established practices within their schools. She further notes that a significant number of teacher trainees received no training in communicative language teaching (CLT) methodology (77%), classroom management (77%) or team teaching

(93%). Shimahara (1998) focuses on the craft side of teachers' professional development: "What characterizes professional development in Japan is the fact that formal teacher preparation provides only minimal grading in teaching." As with Lamie, he observes that student teaching in schools lasts only two weeks. However, he makes a contrast with the structural isolation of teachers in America by citing Lortie's observations, and noting that "Japanese schools are structured around interdependence." Roberts (1998) defines craft/apprenticeship-based teaching as one that "shares the view of teacher learning as essentially " 'imitative' in process and 'model-based' in content." He further notes that it is consistent with a stable society that "values seniority and tradition." This emphasis on craft knowledge and peer collaboration also illuminates the importance of teaching development through peers and offers an insight as to why teachers tend to reinforce each other. However, other articles seem to conflict with Shimahara's (1998) view in terms of knowledge reformulation. Citing Mori & Akita, Takaki (2002) describes "a teacher culture symbolized by a traditionally prevalent teacher attitude of professional isolation and non-intervention." Combined with the pressures of an educational system which focuses on the whole person, Takaki argues that teachers are generally too burdened with professional commitments to focus much on in-service training despite the number of in-service programmes available: "Practically speaking... it is not easy for many teachers to participate in them, except for government sponsored seminars which they are required to attend."

In-Service Education and Training (INSET)

INSET programmes in Japan are provided both by the central and local governments and also by private organizations. In contrast to initial teacher training, Lamie (2000) is more positive in relation to INSET, which involves demonstration classes at schools and a variety of conferences (prefectural, national, overseas) and school seminars.

For JTEs, a three-week intensive English programme is offered to improve their communicative competence and also pedagogical skills by the central government. In addition to this domestic programme, there are also two overseas programmes: a 6-month programme and one-year programme (MEXT, 2002). However, both these domestic and overseas programmes, sponsored by the government, have places for only a very small number of JTEs. Therefore, even though teachers may wish to study abroad, it is extremely difficult for them to gain a place on the programmes. In 2007, out of 29,524 JTEs at public junior high schools, no more than 57 were able to study on these overseas training programmes (MEXT, 2009).

INSET provided by prefectural and municipal boards of education varies in its contents, ranging from teaching a specific subject to using Information Technology to its full potential. Among a variety of these INSET programmes, two specific types of programme should be mentioned here: induction training for recently-qualified teachers and training for teachers who have been practising for more than ten years. Induction training is mandatory for all newly-employed teachers at public schools, who are expected to undergo such training under the guidance of experienced teachers (mentors) for one school year. After working for ten

years teachers must also undergo mandatory training. In addition to these two statutory programmes, a variety of INSET courses are provided by local boards of education, as the teaching profession has been regarded as one of life-long learning for teachers throughout their career.

The Difficulties of Change in the Japanese Context

Given the current situation in Japan, how might a university begin to assist teachers of English in secondary education? The picture of the Japanese system that emerges is one of a strong bureaucracy, where the centre in the form of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology sets the direction of change. For public school education, leadership comes from the centre of the bureaucracy and is passed down via local boards of education to the schools, but each person is expected to fulfil his/her role. A role culture tends to be one of the features of a bureaucratic form of organization, where there is a division of responsibilities into non-conflicting units. Middlehurst (1993) also notes that bureaucracy has a limiting effect on the individual:

In order to reduce the emphasis on individuality and the potential for individual discretion, the bureaucracy is based on a clear division of labour with carefully defined and circumscribed responsibilities. (p.55)

MacGilchrist, Myers and Reed (1997) comment on Handy's analysis of organizational cultures where they identify a role culture with a hierarchical role system involving formal procedures for management within the organization. In relation to the Japanese system, teachers have a specific role, so that they can be transferred suddenly between schools by their local boards, and be expected to fulfill their roles in their new schools with very little time for adjustment. Training programmes are provided to 'upgrade their skills.'

One of the risks of this top-down approach is that teaching concepts and ideas, which seem attractive in theory, are diluted as they are transmitted through the hierarchy, so that by the time teachers return to their schools after training courses, they have acquired a new discourse but there is minimal change in the way classes are taught. For example, Williams and Burden (1997), citing Schon observe that "there is often a discrepancy between what professionals say they believe (their 'espoused theories') and the ways in which they act (their 'theories in action')" (pp.53-54). Teachers may believe that they have made substantial changes to their teaching while in fact maintaining most of their previous classroom practice. As Roberts (1998) notes, a constructivist view of teachers "would not view them as misinterpreting inputs, but as assimilating them, fitting them into their existing personal theories and prior experience."

Another strategy for teachers might be to use the discourse of the new ideas to fulfil bureaucratic requirements while rejecting the new ideas in the classroom. Consequently new syllabus ideas may be rejected. While the Ministry may be able to alter syllabus specifications,

it is worth noting Widdowson's (1991) point that "a syllabus is, so to speak, a set of bearings for teacher action and not a set of instructions for learner activity." He identifies the centrality of the teacher in the process:

What learners do is not directly determined by the syllabus but is a consequence of how the syllabus is methodologically mediated by the teacher in the pursuit of his own course of instruction. (p.129)

A study that illuminates the problem of assimilation of a relatively small amount of new ideas into existing teaching practices is Sato & Kleinsasser's (2004) investigation of English language teachers in a Japanese high school, where they note that there is a tendency for teaching to approach a norm, in this case the Japanese form of grammar-translation (*yakudoku*). They note that the teachers in the case study were most influenced by their own experiences as students, by the views and attitudes of colleagues, and preparing students for university entrance examinations: "Managing students and having students participate in routine activities were the staple means of what teaching meant in the school (technical culture)." according to the study 'normal' English and 'new' communicative classes are surprisingly very similar in how teachers practice English language teaching and learning and they conclude that

"One clearly sees in this presentation that these teachers in this real school did reflect, interpret and socially construct English language teaching, just not in the same way some schools want them to do or think they should." (p.814)

A key factor emerging from the study is how teacher interaction can reinforce the *yakudoku* method. Teachers who attended external training days seemed to find the ideas interesting but not typically applicable. Inside the school, they tended to adopt the same patterns in their classrooms as before, these being communally regarded as effective for exam preparation and for keeping pace, so that all teachers took their classes forward at the same pace. This accords with Rohlen's (1983) observation: "Teacher coordination, both within and between grade levels, depends on every instructor covering essentially the same material at the same accelerated pace."

If individual teachers attend training days, and return to staffroom cultures that operate in lock-step on the basis of well-established procedures that do not accommodate the new ideas, then the new training is likely to have minimal impact. What is clear from the Ministry documentation, cited earlier in this article, is the aim of moving teaching in the direction of communicative approaches. However, how these ideas and concepts are manifested in planning and classrooms may not be clear to teachers working under a variety of pressures.

A further issue that arises is teacher training for Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs). The current programme is known as the Japan Exchange and Teaching Programme (JET) and involved over 4,000 ALTs from 24 different countries as of July, 2008 (CLAIR, 2009,

Introduction). ALTs are generally chosen on the basis of their interest in Japan and on average tend to be young graduates. There is no requirement for previous teaching experience. While the organizers of the programme clearly take many steps to care for ALTs so that they can adjust to living in Japan, they (ALTs) receive very little training in teaching. In addition, they sometimes note the ambiguity of their roles, wondering whether they should serve as assistants to JTEs or work as cultural informants who represent their home cultures (Tsuido 2006). For example, the wording of the APCJEA indicates that the JET programme is seen as an internationalization programme:

Also, a native speaker of English provides a valuable opportunity for students to learn living English and familiarize themselves with foreign languages and cultures. To have one's English understood by a native speaker, increases the students' joy and motivation for English learning. (MEXT, 2002, Section II:2)

However, as ALTs become more involved in planning and teaching classes, a stronger focus on teacher training that is consistent with the ideas being presented to JTEs could help both ALTs and JTEs develop greater understandings of their teaching objectives and a common framework on which to base their classes.

FUTURE POSSIBILITIES

Training: Working with Whole Staffrooms

Under the current system, training is being undertaken by teachers at particular stages in their careers, entailing the development of courses at universities. The successful case studies cited earlier in this article indicate that a more school-based approach that involves teachers as a working group is more likely to help effect change. Courses could be on offer to whole English departments in schools, and involve both JTEs and AETs. As a group, teachers at a school are better able to allocate resources, so that they can plan changes as well as continuing the maintenance activities necessary for the proper running of their schools. In schools, there is often a collective effort to choose appropriate materials to be taught to all students and an effort by all the staff to cover the same material in their classrooms. Where this is the case, the English teaching staff as a body need to debate the issues together, not only working through how to teach in classrooms, but how to use the materials on hand and how to evaluate students. This would be more similar to the school improvement approaches in North America and the United Kingdom, where there is collaboration between a school and an outside body such as a university or LEA. It is also important to note that a precedent has been set within Japan in the case of the Super English Language High School Programme; while the improvement of English teaching in general has been effected through the use of brush-up training for teachers, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology has worked with top high schools to develop new advanced programmes.

Universities could provide training courses during vacation periods prior to the setting

their particular syllabuses, syllabus in this sense being the selection of materials and their allocation to classes throughout the semester. The purpose of the course would be to help staffrooms think about changes they might make, concrete ways of making changes, and decision-making on how to monitor and evaluate the process.

Development in conjunction with Training

Development, as noted by Roberts (1998), covers more divergent aims than training and allows more for individual differences between teachers. Measures to support it need to accommodate the less official forms of development, such as autonomous groups of motivated teachers working on teaching practices and resources. The position we take in this paper is that teachers need access to a variety of theoretical ideas, opportunities to evaluate them in the light of practice, and make decisions on how to utilise them. Once school staffrooms have started to discuss and debate issues, staff need access to ideas and materials that encourage the more communicative directions being proposed by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. In relation to this, universities could set up web-resources. These could provide ideas on teaching and learning as follow-up support for the training courses that set a basic framework for analysing ideas, as well as teaching materials. If web resources could be developed in conjunction with training courses then, this could aid both JTEs and ALTs. Preparing and teaching classes are only two of a variety of important responsibilities for JTEs, who are very pressed for time. In contrast, ALTs tend to have more time and often spend it developing materials for their classroom. If materials produced for junior and senior high schools by practising JTEs and ALTs could be organized and held on a website, this would give busy teachers an accessible resource.

CONCLUSION

In this article, we have discussed two ways in which universities could support secondary schools in their teaching programmes. The focus has been on practical ways in which language teaching in schools could be developed, building on existing resources and commitments. Our argument has mainly focused on INSET and ongoing teacher development, drawing on a variety of ideas from the school improvement literature. While change is likely to occur under the present system, we argue that it will only do so very slowly in a situation where the school is not seen as being central to the change process and where the process of change is seen as being short term:

A general insight is that INSET and teacher development should be perceived as a concerted, long term process, not as a series of discrete events. Another is that the process of INSET is as much if not more significant in determining outcomes as is its content: process determines the degree of teacher participation, perceived relevance and integration of INSET with teachers concerns. (Roberts 1998, p.97)

This is very important in a system where teachers have a considerable variety of commitments to their schools. Tsuneyoshi (2001) argues that a classroom teacher in Japan is regarded as a 'generalist', whereas in the USA the division of labour is distributed more broadly across teaching and non-teaching staff, so that classroom teachers can devote themselves more to teaching. Otani (2008) presents a similar opinion: JTEs are expected to play multiple roles such as a homeroom teacher, a counsellor, a coach for a club activity, or even an administrator in addition to teaching. Consequently, for practitioners with such heavy workloads, INSET and teacher development resources need to be implemented and created very efficiently. Working with teachers at their schools, and organizing courses in periods where teachers have the time to integrate new ideas in their planning for new semesters are important considerations in helping to promote change in teaching practices. Universities, which do not have the managerial responsibilities for secondary schools, have the resources to provide such programmes and support for these teachers.

This article has been used to argue for a shift of focus towards more on-site forms of teacher training supported by accessible resources for those interested in developing their teaching beyond formal courses. Future research needs to consider the content and structure of programmes that would help English departments in schools develop collectively.

References

- Bollen, R. (1996). School effectiveness and school improvement, the intellectual policy context. In Reynolds, D. et al (Eds.), *Making Good Schools Linking School Effectiveness and School Improvement* (pp.1-20). London: Routledge.
- The Council of Local Authorities for International Relations (2009). *The JET Programme*. (<http://www.jetprogramme.org/j/introduction/index.html>).
- Davies, W. and Tsuido, K. (2008). The Vicissitudes of Education Policy: Assessing Top-down Change on English Language Education in Japanese High Schools. *Hiroshima Studies in Language and Language Education*, 11, 1-14.
- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change Forces: Probing the Depths of Educational Reform*. London: Falmer Press.
- Fullan, M. (1999). *Change Forces: The Sequel*. London: Falmer Press.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a Culture of Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodman, R. (2003). The why, what and how of educational reform in Japan. In Goodman, R & Phillips, D. (Eds.), *Can the Japanese Change Their Education System?* (pp.7-30). Wallingford: Symposium.
- Hood, C. P (2001). *Japanese Education Reform Nakasone's Legacy*. London: Routledge.
- Hood, C. P. (2003). The third great reform of the Japanese education system: success in the 1980s onwards. In Goodman, R & Phillips, D. (Eds.) *Can the Japanese Change Their Education* (pp.73-86). Wallingford: Symposium.
- Hopkins, D. and Langerweij, N. (1996). The school improvement knowledge base. In Reynolds, D. et al. (Eds.), *Making Good Schools Linking School Effectiveness and School Improvement*

- (pp.48-59). London: Routledge.
- Howarth, M. (1991) *Britain's Educational reform: A Comparison with Japan*. London: Routledge.
- Lamie, J. M. (2000). Teachers of English in Japan: professional development and training at a crossroads. *JALT Journal*, 22/1, 27-45.
- Lewkowicz, J. A. & Nunan, D. (1999). The limits of collaborative evaluation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33/4, 681-670.
- Ling, L.M. (2002). A tale of two teachers: teachers responses to an imposed curriculum reform. *Teacher Development*, 6/1.
- MacGilchrist, B., Myers, K. & Reed, J. (1997). *The Intelligent School*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Markee, N. (1997). *Managing Curricular Innovation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McVeigh, B. (2002). *Japanese Higher Education as Myth*. New York: East Gate.
- Middlehurst, R. (1993). *Leading Academics*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (2002). *Handbook for Team-Teaching*. Revised Edition. Tokyo: Gyosei Corporation.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (2003). Regarding the Establishment of an Action Plan to Cultivate "Japanese with English Abilities." (<http://www.mext.go.jp/english/topics/03072801.htm>).
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (2009). *Eigokyoiku kaizen jissaiyoukyou chosakekka gaiyo* (The Results of the Nation-wide Survey on English Language Education Reform in the case of Junior High Schools). (http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/20/03/08031920/004.htm).
- Otani, M. (2007). *Gaikokujinshidojoshu to nihon no gakkobunka: nihonjinkyoin to ALT kan niokeru ibunkatekiyoin* (ALTs and Japanese School Culture—Intercultural Factors between Japanese Teachers and ALTs). *Research Bulletin of Faculty of Education*, Shimane University, 41, 105-112.
- Passin, H. (1982). *Society and Education in Japan*. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Roberts, J. (1998). *Language Teacher Education*. London: Arnold.
- Rohlen, T.P. (1983). *Japan's High Schools*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Sato, K. & Kleinsasser, R. C. (2004). Beliefs, practices and interactions of teachers in a Japanese high school English department. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20/8, 797-816.
- Schoppa, L. J. (1991). *Education Reform in Japan: A Case of Immobilist Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Shimahara, N.K. (1998). The Japanese model of professional development as craft. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14/5, 451-462.
- Sikes, P. J. (1992) Imposed change and the experienced teacher. In Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (Eds.), *Teacher Development and Educational Change* (pp.36-55). London: Falmer.
- Stoll, L. et al. (1996). Merging school effectiveness and school improvement. In Reynolds, D. et al. *Making Good Schools Linking School Effectiveness and School Improvement*. London: Routledge.
- Takaki, N. (2002). PIGATE: affecting EFL teacher education change from the grassroots level

- in Japan. *The Teacher Trainer*, 16/2, 5-10.
- Tsuido, K. (2006). *JETpuroguramu niokeru ALT to JTE tonou sougorikai ni kansuru kenkyu* (A Study on Mutual Understanding and Misunderstanding between ALTs and JTEs in the JET Programme). Ph.D thesis submitted to Graduate School of Education, Hiroshima University.
- Tsuneyoshi, R. (2001). *The Japanese Model of Schooling: Comparisons with the United States*. New York: Routledge.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1991). *Aspects of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, M. & Burden, R. (1996). Evaluation as an aid to innovation in foreign language teaching: the "SPARE" wheel model. *Language Learning Journal*, 13, 51-54.
- Yonesaka, S. (1999). The pre-service training of Japanese teachers of English. *The Language Teacher*, 18/11, 9-13.

要 約

中等教育の英語教育改革に大学はどう関与しうるか

築 道 和 明

ウォルター・デイビス

広島大学外国語教育研究センター

本論文の目的は、「『英語が使える日本人』の育成のための行動計画」を代表とする近年の我が国の中等教育レベルにおける英語教育界に生じつつある変化（改革・改善の動き）に高等教育機関である大学がいかに関与し得るか、その可能性を考察することにある。まず、北米や英国で実行されている「学校改善」「学校の効率化」といった流れの背景にある考えやいくつかの事例を概観し、海外における学校単位での教育改革を支えている基本理念を日本の教員養成や教師教育が直面している現状の問題解決にいかに応用しうるかを探究する。諸外国における教育改革を成功に導いた一つの要因として、個々の教員ではなく学校という組織に焦点が当てられた変化・変容、改革であるという点を指摘しうる。翻って、我が国の現職教員研修においては、個人レベルの研修という側面に重点が置かれ、教員相互が学び、育つ「職員室文化」の重要性が軽視されているという問題を指摘する。この点で英語教育の実際（指導方法）に大きな影響を及ぼしていると考えられるのは、文部科学省からのトップダウンの教育改革の方針ではなく、職員室で教員同士が育てている学校文化であるということを再認識する必要がある。英語教育に限ってこの点をとらえるなら、5年間にわたって全国規模で実施された悉皆研修も基本的には、そこでの学びが教員個人に還元されただけであり、職員室で教員同士が英語教育に関する考えや意見を共有したり、一定期間にわたって新たな指導の試み等を行うなどの新たな流れには至っていないと言えよう。現在提供されている多くの英語科教員研修プログラムもある特定の学校の教員全員が参画しうるような内容であれば、その効果も期待しうる。ただ、そうした学校単位での研修を困難にしている一因として学校現場の多忙さという側面が考えられる。従って、大学が有する人的な資源の有効な活用に加えて、web上での情報提供という可能性も今後は探求していく必要がある。