

JTEs' and ALTs' Views on Textbook Usage and Teaching Materials

日本人教師と外国語指導助手の教科書使用と教材に関する視点

Keywords: team teaching, ALT (AET), teaching materials

Gregory C. Birch

グレゴリー・C・バーチ

1. Introduction

This study further expands upon earlier research (Birch, 2008) into the state of team teaching (TT) in Japanese junior and senior high schools by examining textbook usage, lesson preparation and materials selection in team-teaching contexts, with the primary focus being Assistant Language Teachers' (ALTs) and Japanese teachers' of English (JTEs) reasons for using their own teaching materials rather than relying solely on a textbook.

During the Skills Development Conferences (SDC) in two prefectures in November 2013, surveys were completed in English by 120 junior and senior high school JET-sponsored ALTs and in Japanese by 80 Japanese Teachers of English (JTEs). Follow-up interviews were conducted with ALTs to better understand survey results.

This study was undertaken to coincide with the introduction of the new Course of Study (CofS) by The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), allowing for comparisons with Birch (2008; unpublished survey results, 2010). The CofS (MEXT, 2011; MEXT, 2012), emphasizing communicative activities rather than grammar explanation, is ambitious (Tahira, 2012), but questions remain as to how it can be implemented, particularly in team teaching (Glasgow, 2013), as the goals contrast considerably with how classes have been taught (Gorsuch, 2001; Kikuchi & Browne, 2009), and MEXT-approved textbooks may not reflect these goals (Gorsuch, 1999).

To incorporate Communicative Language Teaching into team teaching, researchers have explored the beliefs JTEs and ALTs have about English Education in Japan (Inoi, S., Yoshida, T., Mahoney, S., & Itagaki, N., 2001), the degree to which JTEs and ALTs agree on their respective roles (Mahoney, 2004), good practices of successful team-teaching pairs in Asia (Carless, 2006), and ALT utilization (AJET, 2012). This study builds on this research and reports general trends in team teaching (TT) since the introduction of the new CofS by identifying differences in the most commonly-taught TT classes, division of lesson preparation duties, and the degree to which textbooks are used. However, the author is unaware of research that focuses on how JTEs and ALTs fill the gap between the textbook, which may not be particularly communicative, and the official syllabus, which is. Teachers are both expected (McGrath, 2013) and encouraged in the CofS (MEXT, 2011, p. 7) to adapt and supplement textbooks to meet CofS goals. JTEs' and ALTs' reasons for using their own teaching materials in team-taught lessons were therefore elicited. The results will be of interest to educators involved with team teaching, and those planning and participating in training programs, such as the Skills Development Conferences, and following the implementation of the new Course of Study.

2. Literature Review

2.1 JET Programme

Through the JET Programme, thousands of young men and women have come to Japan to work as Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs). The ALTs' main duties are assisting in classes taught by Japanese Teachers of English (JTEs) and preparing teaching materials. While a majority of

Birch, G. (2017). JTEs' and ALTs' Views on Textbook Usage and Teaching Materials. *Journal of the Chubu English Language Education Society*, 46, 9-16.

participants are recent university graduates with no teaching qualifications or experience (Inoi, Yoshida, Mahoney, & Itagaki, 2001), some are very qualified for the position, possessing both TEFL certification and Japanese proficiency (Birch, 2008, p.104). Expectations of and experiences among participants vary widely. Some ALTs are given significant responsibility in curriculum and materials development, while others are not (CLAIR, 2014, p. 81). In a survey of 971 JTEs, Mahoney (2004) found that JTEs, particularly in SHSs, expect ALTs to prepare the lesson plan, the fifth most common response when asked what an ALT's role is. This seems to be the experience of ALTs. AJET (2012, p. 7), a survey of 399 JET participants, reported that 77% of SHS ALTs feel 'highly or well involved' in the teaching process, compared to 26% of JHS ALTs. Training is provided primarily at annual Skills Development Conferences that last 1 to 5 days, and are run at the prefectural level based on MEXT guidelines. It has been argued that the training needs to be improved (Crooks, 2001; Kushima & Nishihori, 2006). This, however, is challenging given the diversity of teaching contexts and ALT and JTE qualifications and experiences, and the current lack of Japan-based, TT-focused research.

2.2 The Course of Study

The CofS, "now considered official principles for English education in Japan's public schools, providing overall goals and appropriate curricula" (Tahira, 2012, p. 3), implemented primarily through CofS-informed textbooks, was introduced into all grades in JHS in 2012, and from the first year of SHS in 2013. At the JHS level, changes include an increase in class hours and vocabulary size to encourage a focus on communication rather than grammar instruction (see MEXT, 2011); in addition, "a balance in the teaching of the four language skills is stressed" (Tahira, 2012, p.5). The SHS CofS is more ambitious, with the most radical departure being the call for classes to be conducted in principle in English, and grammar instruction that is "given as a means to support communication" (MEXT, 2012, p.7), thus taking a less central role. This focus lies in stark contrast to how classes have been taught to date (e.g., detailed explanation in Japanese of reading passages and related grammar) (Glasgow, 2013; Gorsuch, 2001; Kikuchi & Browne, 2009). The new CofS also calls for activities to be at the center of language teaching, emphasizing that all four skills "should be interlinked for comprehensive learning" (MEXT, 2012, p.2).

It is unclear how familiar JTEs and ALTs are with the new CofS. However, all teachers are familiar with the MEXT-approved textbooks, the most concrete embodiment of the CofS. It has been argued that these textbooks may not be effective tools for implementing the CofS (Glasgow, 2013; Gorsuch, 1999). This remains true, as 'Vision Quest' (Nomura, 2012), a MEXT-authorized English Expression textbook which has by far the highest market share in the category, is essentially a grammar workbook which does not reflect the communicative spirit of the CofS (Shiokawa, 2014). This criticism is not limited to Vision Quest. Perhaps in recognition of this, the CofS acknowledges the importance of adapting and supplementing textbooks in terms of methodology - "teachers should innovate various learning formats, incorporating pair work, group work", and content - "teachers should take up a variety of suitable topics in accordance with the level of students' development... and interests" (MEXT, 2011, p. 7). Exploring the reasons teachers adapt or supplement the textbook may uncover what teachers see as the inherent weaknesses of the official textbooks to fulfill CofS goals.

2.3 Teaching Materials: Adaptation and Supplementation.

Earlier research by Birch (2008) has indicated that the textbook is not central to team-teaching lessons, and adaptation and supplementation of teaching material are encouraged in the Course of Study. Teachers' reasons for adapting and supplementing textbook materials, according to McGrath (2013), is to make the material more meaningful and interesting for the learners and address any

intrinsic deficiencies with the textbook. To achieve this, teachers will omit, change or add material. The focus may be on the language, level, context, content or process (e.g., activity type), and can be a part of lesson planning (proactive) or occur while a lesson is in progress (reactive). Changes to materials are usually justified by reference to one or more of the following principles. "Materials need to be perceived as relevant by learners (localization), be up-to-date (modernization), cater for differences in learning styles (individualization), encourage learners to speak / write about themselves and their own experiences (personalization), engage the whole person (humanizing), be appropriate to learners' level / offer an appropriate level of challenge (simplification / complexification / differentiation), and be varied (variety)" (McGarth, 2013, p.66). In addition to adapting a textbook, teachers may supplement it. The distinction, according to McGrath (2013), is that adaptation involves working with textbook content, while supplementation involves introducing something new, usually in reference to a gap between the textbook and an official syllabus (e.g., the Course of Study), demands of a public examination (e.g., university-entrance examination), or students' needs. This material may come from other textbooks or resources (e.g., Internet), or be original material produced by the teacher.

3. Method

The current study continues earlier research (Birch, 2008) into textbook usage and lesson preparation, as well as JTEs' and ALTs' reasons for using their own teaching materials. During the Skills Development Conferences (SDC) in two prefectures in 2013, surveys were completed in English by 120 junior and senior high school JET-sponsored or board of education-hired ALTs and in Japanese by 80 Japanese Teachers of English (JTEs). (See Table 1 for relevant survey excerpt).

<p>Question 4: Textbook Usage.</p> <p>(a) Which classes do you currently teach? (√) = I teach this. (X) = I don't teach this.</p> <p>(b) How often do you teach the same group of students?</p> <p>(1) Once a week or more / (2) Once every 2 to 3 weeks / (3) Once a month or less</p> <p>(c) How much is the textbook used in this class?</p> <p>a) We follow the textbook precisely with little deviation.</p> <p>b) We usually use the textbook, but regularly modify the textbook activities.</p> <p>c) We use the textbook for about half the class and then other prepared activities.</p> <p>d) We rarely use the textbook. We use other materials.</p> <p>5: Who typically prepared the lesson?</p> <p>6: When I am not using the textbook, I use teaching materials</p> <p>a) I developed myself b) the JTE provided + 4 more options.</p> <p>7: Please explain reasons for using these materials instead of the textbook. If you use the textbook, please explain why.</p>

Table 1: Question guide (partial)

To identify possible changes in the state of team teaching, ALTs were asked through multiple-choice questions (i) which courses they teach, (ii) how often they teach the **same** group of students, and (iii) how much the textbook is used in each class. As the survey was conducted in 2013, all JHS students were already studying under the new Course of Study while only the first-year SHS students were. By comparing these results with Birch (2008; unpublished survey data 2010), we can see which SHS courses replace *Oral Communication I (OCI)* and *OC II* as the most commonly team-taught courses.

ALTs' and JTEs' views on lesson preparation and reasons for using their 'own' materials were elicited through open-ended questions. Data concerning teaching materials were analyzed following Mahoney (2004), where categories were not pre-determined, but arrived at after two researchers

Birch, G. (2017). JTEs' and ALTs' Views on Textbook Usage and Teaching Materials. *Journal of the Chubu English Language Education Society*, 46, 9-16.

analyzed responses independently. Researchers also noted answers that had been qualified or were particularly illustrative. Eight follow-up interviews, lasting between 45 and 90 minutes, were conducted with ALTs working in JHS (3) and SHS (5). ALTs were provided with their surveys and asked to expand upon their answers. Later, the ALT reviewed the interview notes taken by the researcher to ensure their accuracy.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 The state of team teaching in JHS and SHS

How often: ALTs see the same group of students on a regular basis. At least 72% of JHS ALTs reported teaching 'the same group of students once a week or more', as did at least 65% of SHS ALTs. However, results varied according to prefecture. Only 65% of ALTs in Prefecture 1 (P1) reported seeing JHS school classes on a regular basis, whereas 78% of P2 ALTs did.

SHS classes: In 2008, the most commonly taught SHS courses were *Oral Communication 1 (OC1)* and *OC 2* (Birch, 2008). In 2013, ALTs spent most of their time in *English Communication 1* (70%), followed by *OC2* (57%), *English Expression 1* (43%) and *English 2* (40%). (Only first-year courses, denoted by '1' after the name, followed the new Course of Study in 2013). Interestingly, ALTs / JTEs did not see *English Expression I* as a replacement for *Oral Communication 1*. Instead, *English Communication I* is now the most commonly team-taught course.

Textbook usage: Textbooks are not always central to TT lessons, particularly in SHSs. In most contexts, over 50% of ALTs reported using their own materials for at least half the class (ALTs who choose option c or d in Question 4: textbook usage). This tendency was much higher in SHS (66%) than at the JHS level (48%). Again, results between prefectures varied greatly. Approximately 56% of P1 JHS ALTs reported using materials they prepared compared to only 40% of P2 JHS ALTs.

Perhaps, the results concerning textbook usage are an encouraging sign. Materials teacher produce may be more communicative. It must be noted that the analysis regarding textbook usage is based on self-reports. Materials were not examined to see if they were closely linked to textbook content, a form of adaptation, or unrelated to it (i.e., supplementation).

4.2 Lesson Preparation

In **JHS**, about 58% of JHS ALTs and 53% of JHS JTEs reported that lessons were prepared primarily by the JTE. A further 25% of JHS ALTs and 10% of JHS JTEs mentioned that lesson preparation was divided equally, with a third of these teachers clarifying their roles; namely, that JTEs prepared a grammar-related activity and ALTs prepared a communicative one. Interestingly, 30% of JHS JTEs stated that it was primarily the ALT who did the preparation, a much higher total than the 12% of ALTs who reported so. It appears this preparation was done with JTE input, as can be seen in the following survey excerpt. "*The JTE will inform the ALT of the plan and goal for the lesson, and the ALT will then produce worksheets and teaching materials (e.g., cards)*" (JHS JTE: Translated).

In **SHS**, however, about 65% of SHS ALTs and 70% of SHS JTEs reported that the lessons were prepared primarily by the ALT, with a number of ALTs indicating that this was done with JTE guidance and feedback - "*ALT mainly prepares for classes. JTEs give him some advice from grammatical viewpoint on which students should focus. Sometimes they (JTEs) give advice on the content or the management to ALT. ALT usually has feedback from JTE*" (SHS JTE Survey). Only 8% of ALTs and 9% of JTEs reported that the JTE primarily prepared the lesson.

In summary, ALTs in SHS have more latitude to design their own lessons, while JHS JTEs assume this responsibility to a greater degree, confirming the findings of AJET (2012). ALTs should be

Birch, G. (2017). JTEs' and ALTs' Views on Textbook Usage and Teaching Materials. *Journal of the Chubu English Language Education Society*, 46, 9-16.

encouraged to take an active role in lesson preparation or class management as most students have limited time with the ALT. However, this practice should be encouraged for the right reasons. The wrong reason would be basing this decision on the fallacy that a native speaker is simply the more capable teacher (Miyazato, 2009).

4.3 Sources of 'own' teaching materials

When asked about their 'own' teaching materials (i.e., when not using the textbook), ALTs reported using a wider variety of sources (i.e., Resource books, Internet, and previous ALT conferences) than JTEs. Furthermore, SHS JTEs provided ALTs with more opportunities to plan lessons (see previous section) and develop materials than JHS JTEs. For example, only 15 SHS JTEs reported providing their own materials for TT lessons, but 44 SHS JTEs reported using materials provided by the ALT.

When not using the textbook, I use teaching materials (Multiple answers allowed)	JHS ALTs	SHS ALTs	JHS JTEs	SHS JTEs
I developed myself.	55	58	26	15
the (JTE / ALT) provided.	28	13	33	44
my predecessor left.	26	24	-	-
taken from resource books.	12	13	2	1
from the Internet.	33	35	5	5
from previous ALT conferences.	20	21	0	1

Table 2: Sources of 'other' teaching materials

4.4 Reasons for using 'own' teaching materials

Through open-ended questions, ALTs' and JTEs' reasons for using their 'own' materials were elicited. Following Mahoney (2004), two researchers analyzed responses independently before agreeing on the categories. The two main categories that emerged were comments concerning (a) the textbooks (Table 3) and (b) 'own' materials (Table 4). Within each category, there were numerous sub-categories to accommodate a wide range of answers. Lengthy responses typically covered two or more sub-categories. For example, "*Textbook activities often follow the same patterns and lack variety. My teachers want me to make different styles of activities*" (JHS ALT), was categorized into 'Textbook activities inappropriate', and 'JTE wants different activity / method'.

One drawback of surveys is that respondents tend to write very general comments that may not reflect their experience of working with a wide variety of teachers and contexts. This was a common theme in the interview data.

"In JHS, I approach JTE to see what they need. Some offer clear guidelines / directions, others do not. However, each JTE has very different preferences. Sometimes, I have to design different types of activities for the same unit / reading passage" (JHS ALT Interview).

Therefore, interview data will also be used introduced, both to illustrate general concepts and provide a more nuanced picture.

Before reporting the results, it is important to note that adapting or supplementing textbooks is not only encouraged in the CofS, but many teachers see this as necessary. This sentiment was expressed well by one ALT who felt that the value of their contribution is that it introduces diversity, by both complementing the textbook and addressing its weaknesses.

"The textbook is not the sole source of input. That (closely following the textbook) would negate the purpose of having ALTs in the classroom. Therefore, ALTs must depart from

the textbook. Textbooks are very US-centric. A variety of ALTs offer diversity that needs to be introduced". (JHS ALT Interview)

Textbook-related comments in the survey data were categorized according to whether they were critical of textbooks in general, or an aspect of the textbooks (e.g., content). On the whole, ALTs were more critical of the (ii) level (e.g., too easy), (iii) textbook activities (e.g., difficult to use), (iv) content (e.g., dated), and (v) the number of activities (e.g., too few). Only in the category, (i) textbook boring, were JTEs slightly more critical. Table 3 contains these rankings and examples representative of each category.

Textbook-related.	ALTs 114	JTEs 76	Example representative of category.
(i) Textbook boring	12%	13%	<i>"The textbook is very dry"</i> (JHS ALT).
(ii) Level inappropriate	12%	8%	<i>"Some textbook content does not match student level."</i> (Translation) (SHS JTE).
(iii) Activities inappropriate	11%	8%	<i>"Textbook activities often follow the same patterns and lack variety"</i> (Elem. ALT).
(iv) Content inappropriate	11%	3%	<i>"The textbook has too many abstract words to use easily in class. No practical language"</i> (SHS ALT).
(v) Activities: Too few.	9%	4%	<i>"The textbooks don't provide enough activities for students to apply what they're learning in face-to-face communication"</i> (JHS ALT).
(vi) No textbook	7%	-	

Table 3: Reasons for not using textbooks.

With respect to their 'own' material (Table 4), both groups agreed that two of the most important reasons for using their 'own' materials were that they were (i) more engaging, and (ii) encouraged more interaction. These results echo Dunford (2004), a survey of 29 Native English Speaking Teachers (NESTs) working for the Shane School of English in Japan. The NESTs agreed that 'Our coursebooks need adapting and supplementing to become more *involving* (72% of respondents) and *interesting* (71%)'. Other categories include *challenging* (68%), *varied* (57%) and *manageable* (55%).

Researchers in this study distinguished between an 'engaging or interesting' activity and a 'game or fun activity'. For ALTs, (iii) 'fun activities / games' was the third most common response. JTEs, on the other hand, were far less likely to use these expressions when describing activities. ALTs also acknowledged that many (iv) JTEs encourage ALTs to develop materials different from ones that commonly appear in textbooks.

JTEs' responses differ from ALTs' in the frequency with which the textbook and student levels were mentioned. JTEs mentioned the need to (v) 'Support the textbook' by utilizing / reviewing textbook content, grammar, and vocabulary. These results are understandable as JTEs are required to use and are under pressure to finish MEXT-approved textbooks (Gorsuch, 1999, p.7). Furthermore, many JTEs wanted to ensure that the materials (vi) match their students' levels, yet no ALTs mention this. This result supports a similar finding by Mahoney (2004), that one of the JTEs' most important roles is to 'understand students' levels of achievement', which very few ALTs acknowledged. 'Culture' and 'grammar' were also common responses.

Birch, G. (2017). JTEs' and ALTs' Views on Textbook Usage and Teaching Materials. *Journal of the Chubu English Language Education Society*, 46, 9-16.

Own teaching material	ALT (114)	JTE (76)	Examples representative of category.
(i) Engaging / interesting activities	23%	18%	"More interesting and engaging for both teachers and students." (JHS ALT)
(ii) Encourage interaction	12%	13%	"Want to add more student-centered activities, such as speech, discussion and debate" (Translation) (SHS JTE)
(iii) Fun activities / games	11%	4%	"To make the students have enjoyable lessons in between the textbook lessons" (SHS ALT)
(iv) JTE wants different activity type	11%	-	"My teachers want me to make different styles of activities" (Elem ALT)
(v) Support / Review textbook	7%	16%	"Use separate handout to review textbook" (JHS JTE)
(vi) To match student level	-	12%	"Use material according to student level" (Translation) (SHS JTE)
(vii) Culture activities	5%	8%	"To teach culture, authentic materials are better" (Translation) (JHS JTE)
(viii) Practice grammar	5%	7%	"Even if we do not use a textbook, worksheet / activities incorporate 'Grammar Point'" (SHS JTE)

Table 4: Reasons for using 'own' teaching materials

5. Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to re-examine the state of team teaching in Japan after the introduction of new Course of Study in 2013. Results show ALTs, particularly in SHS, play an active role in lesson preparation, and developing and utilizing teaching materials they feel are more engaging and communicative than textbook activities. JTEs appear to support ALT involvement, but stress the importance of utilizing materials that review textbook content and are matched to student levels. Results must be interpreted with caution as this study was based on survey data alone, only reflected teachers' experience in the early stages of the Course of Study's implementation, and was limited to JET-Programme and ALTs hired by local boards of education. That said, the results may be useful when planning seminars for ALTs, and responding to calls to improve the training currently offered (Crooks, 2001; Kushima & Nishihori, 2006).

Training focused on materials development would be beneficial as many lessons are prepared and taught using material provided by the ALT, particularly in SHS. While this focus might be considered less appropriate for seminars limited to teachers working at the JHS level, where JTEs plays a more central role in lesson preparation and materials selection, such a focus would not be inconsistent with the Course of Study (MEXT, 2011, p. 7). Furthermore, teacher-prepared materials might reflect the spirit of the guidelines better than the textbooks, as teachers report that their materials are more interesting and communicative.

(Seisen Jogakuin College)

References

- Association for Japan Exchange and Teaching (AJET). (2012). *Utilization of ALTs in the workplace*. Retrieved from http://ajet.net/downloads/reports/2012/AJET-ALT_utilisation.pdf
- Birch, G. (2008). ALTs' roles and duties: Official documents versus ALT self reports. *Journal of the Chubu English Language Education Society*, 38, 101-108.
- Carless, D. (2006). Good practices in team-teaching in Japan, South Korea and Hong Kong. *System*, 34, 341-351.

- Birch, G. (2017). JTEs' and ALTs' Views on Textbook Usage and Teaching Materials. *Journal of the Chubu English Language Education Society*, 46, 9-16.
- Council of Local Authorities for International Relations (CLAIR). (2014). *General Information Handbook*. Retrieved from http://www.jetprogramme.org/documents/pubs/gih2014_e.pdf
- Crooks, A. (2001). Professional development and the JET Program: Insights and solutions based on the Sendai City program. *JALT Journal*, 23(1), 31-46.
- Dunford, N. (2004). *How do teachers interpret the need for the adaptation and supplementation of coursebooks, with specific reference to data collected by questionnaire from Shantou English Schools Japan?* Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Nottingham.
- Glasgow, G. P. (2013). The impact of the new national senior high school English curriculum on collaboration between Japanese teachers and native speakers. *JALT Journal*, 35(2), 191-204.
- Gorsuch, G. (1999). Monbusho approved textbooks in Japanese high school EFL classes: An aid or a hindrance to educational policy innovations? *The Language Teacher*, 23(10), 5-15.
- Gorsuch, G. (2001). Japanese EFL teachers' perceptions of communicative, audiolingual and yakudoku activities: The plan versus the reality. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 9(10). Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v9n10.html>
- Inoi, S., Yoshida, T., Mahoney, S., & Itagaki, N. (2001). *An inquiry into JTE and ALT/AET beliefs about English education*. Tokyo: Monbukagakusho.
- Kikuchi, K., & Browne, C. (2009). English educational policy for high schools in Japan: Ideals vs. reality. *RELC Journal*, 40, 172-191.
- Kushima, C., & Nishihori, Y. (2006). Reconsidering the role of the ALT: Effective preparation for the ALTs based on questionnaire survey. *Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan*, 17, 221-230.
- Mahoney, S. (2004). Role controversy among team teachers in the JET Programme. *JALT Journal*, 26(2), 223-244.
- McGrath, I. (2013). *Teaching materials and the roles of EFL/ESL teachers: Practice and theory*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology. (2011). *The Course of Study for junior high school: Foreign languages (English)*. Tokyo: Author. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/micro_detail/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2011/04/11/1298356_10.pdf
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology. (2012). *The Course of Study for senior high school: English*. Tokyo: Author. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/new-cs/youryou/eiyaku/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2012/10/24/1298353_3.pdf
- Miyazato, K. (2009). Power-sharing between NS and NNS teachers: Linguistically powerful AETs vs. culturally powerful JTEs. *JALT Journal*, 31(1), 35-62.
- Nomura, K. et al. (2012). *Vision Quest – English Expression*. Tokyo: Keirinkan.
- Shiokawa, H. (2014). *From interpretation to implementation: The new course of study*. Paper presented at Shinshu JALT event, Hokuto, Yamanashi.
- Tahira, M. (2012). Behind MEXT's new course of study guidelines. *The Language Teacher*, 36(3), 3-8.