EXPLORING TEAM TEACHING AND TEAM TEACHERS IN KOREAN PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Jaeyeon Heo and Steve Mann

Introduction

Team teaching has become a widespread phenomenon in the EFL classrooms of several East Asian countries such as Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan. Such team teaching usually takes place on NEST (Native English Speaking Teacher) schemes. These are backed by government educational policies advocating the deployment of foreign teachers (NESTs) from English speaking countries to co-work with local English teachers (Beniot & Haugh, 2001). There has been an increasing number of NESTs recruited, trained and deployed at public schools every year (EPIK, 2013; FETIT, 2012; JET, 2012; NET, 2010). This has resulted in different areas of concern and critical voices (e.g. Wang, 2012). There has been attention to how best to mitigate the challenges for collaborating teachers and wide-ranging discussions about how to improve current schemes and team teaching practice (Carless & Walker, 2006; Jang et al., 2010; Liu, 2008; Marchesseau, 2006; Park, 2008). This paper presents main findings of research conducted in Korean primary schools. It details some of the features of these collaborative relationships (including the challenges) and considers the implications for teacher training and development in these EFL contexts.

EPIK and other NEST schemes in EFL contexts

Contextual background

In 2005 the Korean Ministry of Education announced a 'Five Year Plan for English Education Revitalization'. This had a strong focus on the CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) and prioritised the facilitation and fostering of students' English communication ability. As part of its efforts to facilitate English education, the Ministry of Education planned to encourage English Only Classrooms in all schools by 2011. It also wanted to place a conversation instructor in every primary school by 2012, as well as promoting a 'one NEST per school policy' at primary and secondary school levels (Jeon & Lee, 2006). It is interesting to note the way in which the Ministry of Education sees the goal of 'Teaching English Through English' (TETE) as being particularly facilitated by the use of NESTs. At the same time, it is also is also worth noting the recommendation that non-native primary teachers should use English as a medium of instruction in the classroom (Kang, 2008; Shin, 2012). This recommendation causes particular problems when teachers are not confident or sufficiently trained to use English and such problems have been highlighted by Copland et al (2014). The Ministry of Education recommendation in Korea frustrated a majority of local English teachers, since few had the proficiency to meet the demand. Partly to alleviate these concerns, the nationwide EPIK scheme was enhanced in 2007.

EPIK

As mentioned earlier, team teaching in Korean EFL classrooms mostly takes place through the EPIK (English Programme in Korea) scheme. EPIK is a government-funded project to recruit NESTs to teach in Korean primary and secondary schools in collaboration with local KETs. It is co-sponsored by the Ministry of Education and the 17 Korean Provincial (Metropolitan) Offices of Education (POE). EPIK was launched in 1995 with 54 NESTs from six countries including Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (EPIK, 2011). NIIED (National Institute for International Education and Development) is the institute under the Ministry of Education, which has operated EPIK, organising recruitment of NESTs and training programmes for KETs and NESTs. It was reported that the total number of new NESTs trained and allocated to schools through NIIED totalled 1,714 in 2009, 2,008 in 2010, 3,193 in 2011, and 3,477 in 2012 (NIIED, 2013).

Other NEST schemes

There are similar NEST schemes, government sponsored ELT programmes (e.g. the 'Japanese Exchange and Teaching' (JET) programme in Japan, the 'Native-speaking English teachers' (NET) programme in Hong Kong, and the 'Foreign English Teachers in Taiwan' (FETIT) programme). Although these schemes have some

differences (e.g. scheme objectives and NESTs' required levels of qualification) they all share a basic assumption that a form of collaborative team teaching between native and local English teachers is an advantageous teaching model which best fulfils learners' needs in EFL contexts in these countries (Carless & Walker, 2006). Despite some differences, the schemes share the common purposes of providing authentic language input in EFL classrooms, facilitating cross-cultural communication, enhancing students' English ability, and promoting local teachers' professional development (Carless, 2002, 2004, 2006a, 2006b; Carless & Walker, 2006; Liu, 2009; Park, 2008; Tajino & Tajino, 2000; Tajino & Walker, 1998; Yukawa, 1994).

Issues related to NEST vs. NNEST
The schemes listed above all share the assumption that there is potential in the in-class collaboration of native English speaking teachers and local English teachers'. This assumption is supported by early contributions in the literature that in the partnerships between a NESTs and a non-NEST, as well as their strengths and weaknesses, can be largely complementary (Medgyes, 1992). Carless & Walker (2006) put forward the argument that if a NEST and a non-NEST harness their respective strengths and minimize their weaknesses, team teaching (through a collaborative NEST and non-NEST relationship) can have a positive and effective impact on an EFL classroom. However, this view has proved to be overly optimistic and perhaps idealistic. The whole notion of the employment of 'native-speakers' has become tinged with controversy, not least in the simplistic divisions between notions of 'native' and 'non-native' English speakers. Although we note the problems associated with the stigmatization of the term 'non-native' (e.g. Rampton, 1990; Cook 2010), we believe that these terms are still widely used. In using them in this paper, we recognize that other terms have been put forward (e.g. 'competent users of English') but that when state funded schemes still use them to allocate roles and identities and therefore it is difficult to avoid their use. In summary, we recognise the ongoing debate on 'native speakerism' and 'myth of the native speaker' as a valuable literature (see Holliday, 2005; Kubota, 2002; Park, 2008; Pennycook, 1994; Phillipson, 1992; Seindhofer, 2003). However, this paper is concerned with the description and analysis of key factors in the construction of team-teaching relationships and communication. It aims to contribute to our understanding of these team-teaching relationships in Korea and provide suggestions for the improvement of training for such teachers.

Methodology
For this study, a qualitative case study was employed to provide an 'the in-depth study of instances of a phenomenon in its natural context and from the perspective of the participants involved in the phenomenon' (Gall et al., 2003: 436, cited in Duff, 2008: 22). Such a case study is suitable for clarifying teachers' understanding of their work and responding to the problems encountered in their professional lives (Stoynoff, 2004).

Methods
The study was conducted during a period of six months and involved multiple data collection methods (interviews, classroom observations, document analysis); for the classroom observations, 42 lessons were observed and 28 hours of data were collected). In the main study, non-participation observations were primarily used to explore team teaching implementation in natural settings (the classroom) and individual interviews provided sufficient data to investigate team teachers' personal experience, perspective, interaction and insights into collaboration and relationships. Field notes, interview scripts, video summary notes and a research journal were used in order to provide a thick description. The multi-method data collection process enabled the generation of in-depth description, explanation and interpretation.

Participants
The participants were mainly KETs and NESTs who were assigned to conduct team-taught lessons in Korean primary schools on a regular basis in the 2010 school year. Data was also collected from Korean instructors and native English speaking instructors at the onsite orientation programme in NIIED (National Institute for International Education and Development), principals, senior KETs, KETs and NESTs with team teaching experience in Korean primary schools, and new NESTs participating in the onsite orientation. Schofield (1990, cited in Duff, 2008) mentions that conducting multi-site or multiple case studies can enhance the potential generalizability and credibility of research. In this study, four cases, that is, four pairs of team teachers in four different primary schools were selected and four cases had unique and diverse characteristics in many aspects (Appendix 1).

Data analysis

Qualitative data analysis is the synthetic process of systematically examining, describing, summarizing, analysing or reconstructing the data so as to address the research questions (Miles & Huberman, 1994). This study employs a data-driven inductive approach, and combines several data analysis approaches and processes: open, axial, and selective coding (Straus & Corbin, 1998: 101), thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), steps and modes of interview analysis (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009), categorization and coding (Richards, 2003), and cross-case analysis (Merriam, 1998; Creswell, 2007; Duff, 2008).

This is a multiple case study (consisting of four pairs of team teachers) and a cross case analysis was conducted seeking to 'build a general explanation that fits each of the individual cases, even though the cases will vary in their details' (Yin, 2003: 121). Even though each case had contextual variables and a diversity of teachers' backgrounds, a cross-case analysis approach was valuable for exploring the particularity or differences and similar or common features among the four cases as well as between the two groups (KETs and NESTs). Within this framework, the general approach to data analysis for the study was inductive analysis, which implied that patterns, themes and categories of analysis emerged from the data.

Findings and discussion

Diversity in team teaching implementation

One of the key findings in this study is the diverse styles of team teaching implemented by the four pairs of team teachers and this confirms the findings of a similar study in Taiwan (Tsai, 2007). Each pair of team teachers had distinctive characteristics with a view to their personal and professional backgrounds, motivation, and perspective on and involvement in team teaching. This is partly due to their different co-working conditions and contexts. Important contextual aspects included classroom facilities, allocated time for solo or team taught classes, the number of team teachers, and school atmosphere (e.g. principal or vice-principal's interest in English education, a specialized activity or subject in the school).

Other studies (e.g. Carless, 2002) have detailed the unequal nature of some team-teaching relationships. This study was particularly interested in whether the NEST or the KET tended to be dominant in the classroom. The two pairs of team teachers in Case One (Jessica and Matthew) and

Case Two (Mary and James) tended to share roles and responsibilities in the classroom as much as possible. However, in these cases, the KETs tended to guide and support their NESTs throughout the whole team teaching practice (e.g. lesson planning, instruction, classroom management and discipline). In contrast, Case Three (Rona and Kevin) and Case Four (Kate and Robert) showed differing relationships. Here the NESTs largely dominated lessons, whereas their Korean team partners had limited or rare engagement in class, exclusively acting like teaching assistants or living translators.

Despite this fundamental contrast, it is fair to say that the study demonstrated a great deal of variety in team teaching patterns and collaborative styles exhibited between the team teachers. As such, the data cannot be explained or accounted for with reference to fixed models of team-teaching. Our findings support the view of Eisen (2000: 9) that 'no two teams are exactly alike because they operate along a continuum presenting countless variations'. It is clear from the present study that team teaching implementation is both flexible and diverse.

Positive experiences

In general, the team teachers in this study experienced some advantages of team teaching and learning from their team partners. Again though, these positive features varied from case to case. Taken together, the KETs reported that they benefited from team teaching with NESTs in the following ways:

- having more opportunity to be exposed to English input by working with the NESTs;

- getting English support such as classroom English or writing assistance from the NESTs;

- gaining material resources.

In particular, in a follow-up interview, Jessica pointed out three advantages of team teaching with Matthew:

> (.) perfect preparation, this can be a key advantage of team teaching I believe ... I have well-prepared instruction everyday organised by two teachers ... I must have improvised the lessons from time to time without team teaching (.) secondly I can be constantly in a good mood by the end of class without being exhausted ... as you know it is quite challenging to discipline 5th and 6th grade boys while teaching (.) thirdly a native English teacher complements my insufficient classroom English fully Matthew is a kind of my personal tutor sitting next to me.

These findings are in line with the positive reports of previous research (Kim & Lee, 2005; Min & Ha, 2006; Park, 2008).

In addition, the inexperienced NESTs (Matthew, James) gained a wide range of knowledge and learnt a variety of skills (e.g. lesson planning, teaching practice, material design, classroom management) from their more skilled Korean partners (Jessica, Mary), particularly in terms of classroom procedures but also in terms of context and cross-cultural insight. In reflecting on his first year as a teacher, Matthew stated:

> (.) it has been a very good year ... I was very very lucky to have Jessica (.) she was very good at English and professional, very dedicated to making very high quality materials ... basically I learned routines from her (.) particularly making lesson plans and the order of the class and homework checking.

All of the team teachers in this research succeeded in completing team teaching implementation with their partners by the end of the academic year (2010), and currently, they still teach primary students in the same or different schools with the exception of Robert (Case Four). All of the cases were basically positive about the collaborative experience and felt that it had stimulated teacher learning and development (Hargreaves, 1997; Mann, 2005), as well as creating more of a sharing culture in the schools. In at least two of the cases there was evidence that both experienced and novice teachers promoted their career development through collaborative interaction and learning (Jang, 2006; Letterman & Dugan, 2004). Interestingly, Matthew became responsible for supporting new NESTs in a district office of education in 2012.

What was especially noticeable about two of the pairs of the team teachers (Jessica and Matthew, Mary and James) was that they gradually learned about individual and cultural differences from their team partner and also learned how to maintain a good relationship through a process of collaboration, problem-solving, decision-making and sharing ideas. Interviews confirm that they became more sensitive to and serious about exploring their teaching partnerships and more aware of the importance of relationship management and communication with their teaching partners. As was stated previously in the article, all the team-teaching relationships were emergent and co-constructed but these two pairs broadened their interpersonal understanding and sensitivity in explicit ways. Interestingly, this is seen as a key element in intercultural team teaching (Carless, 2004, 2006a).

Challenging experiences

Overall, the findings of this study confirm that the challenging experiences which the team teachers faced were similar to the challenging issues in other NEST schemes. These included lack of intercultural understanding between team teachers; inexperienced and unqualified NESTs; KET's lack of confidence; and discrepancy in role expectations.

Firstly, all of the team teaching cases in this study experienced conflicts and tensions between the team teachers. These were caused by misunderstanding, miscommunication, disagreement or discrepancy in opinions. Such problems are often closely associated with a lack of intercultural understanding (Carless & Walker, 2006; Park, 2008) and the resulting interpersonal conflicts have been identified as one of the common challenges that a majority of team teachers face in Korean contexts (Ahn et al., 1998; Carless, 2002; Choi, 2001; Kim & Kwak, 2002).

Secondly, two of the NESTs (Matthew and James) had little knowledge and no teaching experience regarding ELT pertinent to the primary school context. However, in contrast to the reports on NESTs' limited roles in the JET programme (Kobayashi, 2001; Macedo, 2002), Matthew and James were engaged in more extended roles than the 'animator' or 'living tape recorder'. In these cases, the KETs (Jessica and Mary) supported their NESTs in a number of aspects, in order to include them and extend their roles. Both Mary and Jessica (KETs) played proactive roles in guiding and directing their less experienced team partners. Jessica emphasised the importance of a KET's role as a host teacher in school, stating

> (.) regardless of the personality and qualifications of native English teachers (.) how to guide them at the beginning of a new semester can result in success or failure of team teaching during the rest of the year.

Jessica also insisted that both team teachers needed to learn and develop their own approach to team work outside the classroom as well as inside the classroom. However, Jessica was willing to do so whereas Mary was slightly passive and reluctant to actively engage in such a situation and the other KETs were not involved in supporting their NESTs.

Thirdly, Rona, a novice KET, was urgently assigned to be an English teacher in school. She had the most challenging experience among the KETs due to her lack of confidence caused by a lack of teaching experience and her lack of confidence in English level. Moreover, she

confronted additional challenges as a non-native novice teacher of English (Mann & Tang, 2012). The following extract describes her hardship in her team teaching context:

> I am a newcomer (.) I need time to get accustomed to the environments (.) I need to learn the systems operating in the school (.) however I am swamped with work every day … what's worse, I don't know even what team teaching is but I have to teach English with Kevin and provide him with administrative support (.) it is a tremendously huge burden on me

Fourthly, discrepancy in role expectations in team teaching was one of the noticeably challenging experiences. While team teachers experience confusion or conflict regarding the sharing of roles and responsibilities (Kim & Go, 2008; Mahoney, 2004; Liu, 2009; Tajino, 2002), Rona had difficulties in dealing with the discrepancy in roles between the expectation of the school and the real classroom situation. That is, while the principal, the vice-principal, and senior teachers asked her to mainly lead a lesson and be assisted by a native teacher, every lesson was actually dominated and organised by Kevin, an expert in English language teaching. Without KETs' voluntary engagement or willingness to team teach English with NESTs, it is difficult to expect a full-fledged and collaborative style of team teaching.

Implications

On the basis of the challenges discussed above, we will propose some practical implications for teacher training and development in team teaching contexts that may be helpful to others engaged in supporting or training team-teachers.

Teacher training for team teachers

There are three different types of training programmes organised by NIIED:

1. a mandatory online pre-orientation programme which consists of 15 hours to support new NESTs before their arriving in Korea or directly after school placement;

2. an onsite orientation for 30-45 hours as pre-service training which is designed for new NESTs who are new to Korea or to public school teaching by introducing them to areas such as teaching methodologies and to Korean culture before they are dispatched to primary schools;

3. an online in-service training programme for both NESTs and KETs for 15 hours.

The NESTs in this study agreed that these programmes were supportive for new NESTs and helped them to settle down in new environments. However, Matthew and Kevin mentioned there were limitations in the training in how to implement team teaching with KETs appropriately. In addition, Jessica pointed out that onsite orientation was not sufficient to make up for a lack of knowledge and skills in ELT. This is also the view taken by Park (2008) who argues that the 10 day orientation is not sufficient to provide the participants with the necessary and specific information and skills. Many researchers (Ahn et al., 1998; Chung et al., 1999; Choi, 2001; Min & Ha, 2006; Kim, 2007; Kim & Go, 2008; Park, 2008) point out that training programmes need to be improved both in their quantity and quality so as to offer more specific knowledge and information relevant to team teaching. In a similar vein, Wang (2012) emphasises sufficient pre-service training for NESTs and NNESTs with more opportunity to practise team teaching in classroom settings in order to explore how team teaching can best serve pedagogy. Moreover, it would be critical to systematically develop in-service training for both KETs and NESTs with a focus on team teaching. As team teaching needs two teachers who share responsibilities, it is necessary to train two teachers together before a new semester or during a vacation. A majority of in-service training programmes on team teaching or collaboration between team teachers tend to be one-off workshops or seminars. Needless to say, regular in-service training should be designed for and provided to team teachers to promote their learning and professional development by interacting with a team partner and by creating a network of other KETs and NESTs to share and exchange new ideas and to find solutions to overcome difficulties in team teaching. By pre- and in-service training programmes, KETs and NESTs should be trained separately and jointly (Park, 2008) and well prepared for team teaching with a better understanding of their partner, learners, curriculum, materials, and teaching contexts.

Collaborative support in school

Along with training programmes outside the school mentioned above, team teachers need continuing and practical support in their teaching context. It would be beneficial for team teachers, especially novice teachers, to get 'support given by one (usually more experienced) person for the growth and learning of another' (Malderez, 2001: 57), that is, through some kind of mentoring

relationship. For example, Mary and James (Case Two) were often supported by a veteran senior KET and an experienced NEST separately and jointly in the same school. When Mary faced problems related to James or teaching practice, she got advice from a senior KET. Meanwhile, James relied on Paul, his more experienced native colleague, to overcome difficulties in teaching and managing his relationship with Mary. This support should be 'official' rather than be left to happen on an 'ad hoc' basis. In addition, these two pairs of team teachers (Mary and James, a senior KET and an experienced NEST) maintained a close relationship with one another and they tried to conduct team teaching with a different partner after swapping each team teacher. Through this process, they had time to discuss some problematic issues, to exchange opinions and ideas with each other, and to find solutions together. Mary and James had mentors in the form of a 'critical friendship' (Farrell, 2011: 368) in their context. As for Jessica and Matthew's relationship, Jessica played a role in mentoring Matthew, who had no teaching experience, offering a wide range of support despite some features of 'hierarchical apprenticeship' (Carter & Francis, 2001, cited in Mann & Tang, 2012: 484). Considering that a majority of NESTs are less experienced or less qualified in teaching English, more experienced KETs should be proactive in supporting them. Matthew stated that he learned more from Jessica through team teaching than through training programmes, which emphasises the importance of more experienced KETs' guidance. Moreover, Jessica supported another inexperienced KET who took charge of English team teaching with Matthew. As Richards and Farrell (2005: 169) suggests, veteran team teachers need to guide, support and mentor novice teachers. Team teachers themselves need to be willing to take advantage of mentoring adapted for their own teaching contexts.

Team strategy and management

Among the four cases, Jessica and Matthew (Case One) had a high level of satisfaction with their situation, both in terms of their team partner and the positive experience of their team teaching implementation. In particular, they had clearly distinctive team operation skills, that is, a team strategy that they had mutual understanding about as well as agreement on pedagogical approaches. The team strategy developed by Jessica and Matthew enabled them to organise their team teaching effectively and harmoniously from lesson planning to follow-up work. For example, they

had their own implicit tactic to discipline students, which was called the 'angel and devil role-play'; in other words, Jessica played the role of an evil person by handling punishment issues or scolding individual students, whereas Matthew had the role of rewarding students like an angel. Jessica and Matthew described their different roles for discipline respectively in the following extracts:

> to the students (.) I am the devil and he is an angel as I am the only one to ask them disciplines in Korean in most cases (.) he doesn't have to scold them (.) I am the person asking them 'why do you miss your homework?' (.) or 'you should behave well in class'… but he usually conducts only exciting activities and just says hello in gentle smile (.) they are favorable to him and love him but they can have limit to share their problem with him when necessary … finally (.) I must be involved in any situations (Jessica)

> do you know the concept 'good cop and bad cop'? (.) it's … it's an old idea in police work (.) if you're going to interrogate someone (.) you will have one person being their friend and one person being their enemy (.) and I feel they may have done that with us … like Jessica is the strict person (.) she is the discipliner (.) she is the bad person but I am the nice one (.) I'm the one who makes the games (.) I give out the snacks, you know? I am the loved one (Mathew)

Jessica and Matthew made good use of their team strategy developed by themselves in their context. As Smith (1994) argues, the success of particular approaches implemented by some team teachers may not be the best way for other team teachers or applicable to other contexts. In that sense, Jessica and Matthew were successful in exploring, creating, and applying their own approaches and they felt mutually satisfied with them. Moreover, through the team strategy which they settled on, they developed an interactional relationship in terms of sharing roles and responsibilities, attitudes towards students and a teaching partner, and pedagogic principles in team teaching implementation.

The official website of NIIED currently posts video records and essays (KETs and NESTs) which are selected in the contests to introduce good models of co-teaching practice and to share teaching and living experiences. Such resources or a prescribed handbook can be helpful to new NESTs and novice KETs at an initial stage. Even though trainers, educators, and scholars can propose guidance or suggestions for good practices or successful team teaching, ultimately team teachers need to explore, create, and develop their own team strategy suitable for their teaching conditions and contexts. To do this, team teachers themselves will be aware of the necessity of their team strategy and make good use of reflective

practice or case studies on team teaching with team partners and other colleagues.

Conclusion

It is difficult to generalise from research into four pairs of team-teachers. Neither do we believe that success of particular approaches evident in one case are necessarily transferable or appropriate for other team teaching cases. However, through sharing of case studies, other team teachers can exchange ideas and information, share teaching practice and experience, develop sensitivity and solve problems together. We believe that there should be greater use of vignettes and data in the training and preparation process. Team teaching perspectives and experiences should inform the training process to a greater extent. Such vignettes and cases can help team teachers to be aware of problematic issues or constraints which they confront in their situations. They can then discuss them with team partners, diagnose issues inherent in their teaching practice. This process might be facilitated by themselves or with the help of other colleagues who have more team teaching experience. Along with support from outside the school, ultimately, teachers taking charge of English team teaching need to be proactive in changing, learning, and developing their team teaching. Furthermore, as mentioned in the practical implementation section, there should be communication between the participants involved in the EPIK scheme (e.g. EPIK administrators, recruiters, policy makers, trainers, educators, team teachers, etc.) in order to improve the current schemes and teaching practice.

References

Ahn, S., Park, M. & Ono, S. (1998). A comparative study of the EPIK and the JET Programme. *English Teaching* 53/3: 241-257.

Benoit, R. & Haugh, B. (2001). Team teaching tips for foreign language teachers. *The Internet TESL Journal* 10, 2–4.

Carless, D. (2002). Conflicts or collaboration: Native and nonnative speakers' team teaching in schools in South Korea, Japan and Hong Kong. Paper presented at the English in South East Asia Conference.

Carless, D. (2004). JET and EPIK: Comparative perspective. Paper presented at the Busan Chapter KOTESOL Conference, Korea.

Carless, D. (2006a). Good practices in team teaching in Japan, South Korea and Hong Kong. *System* 34/3: 341-351.

Carless, D. (2006b). Collaborative EFL teaching in primary schools. *ELT Journal* 60/4: 328-335.

Carless, D. & Walker, E. (2006). Effective Team Teaching between Local and Native-speaking English Teachers. *Language and Education* 20/6: 463-477.

Copland, F., Garton, S. & Burns, A. (2013). Challenges in teaching English to young learners: Global perspectives and local realities. *TESOL Quarterly* Advanced version published on-line (27 DEC 2013 | DOI: 10.1002/tesq.148)

Duff, P.A. (2008). *Case Study Research in Applied Linguistics*. New York: Routledge.

Eisen, M.J. (2000). The many faces of team teaching and learning: An overview. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education* 87: 5-14.

EPIK (English Programme in Korea) in Korea: http://www.epik.go.kr/EPIK/

FETIT (Foreign English Teachers in Taiwan) Project in Taiwan: http://english.moe.gov.tw/

Holliday, A. (2005). *The Struggle to Teach English as an International Language*. Oxford: OUP.

Jang, H.S., Nguyen, B.H. & Yang, Y. (2010). Enhancing pedagogical roles of ESL/EFL native and non-native teachers through team teaching: How to make this 'international partnership' successful. *The International Journal of Learning* 17: 249-257.

Jeon, M & Lee, J. (2006). Hiring native-speaking English teachers in East Asia countries. *English Today* 22/4: 53-58.

JET (Japan exchange and teaching) Programme in Japan: www.jetprogramme.org

Kang, D. (2008). The classroom language use of a Korean elementary school EFL teacher: Another look at TETE. *System* 36: 214-226.

Kim, K. & Lee, C. (2005). The effects of team teaching on elementary school students' affective domains and the directions for effective team teaching. *Primary English Education* 11/2: 133-171.

Kim, S-H. & Kwak, B-K. (2002). The effects of the native English teacher program on high school English education. *Foreign Language Education* 9/3: 211-241.

Kubota, R. (2002). The author responds: (Un)raveling racism in a nice field like TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly* 36/1: 84-92.

Liu, L. (2008). Co-teaching between native and non-native English teachers. An exploration of co-teaching models and strategies in the Chinese primary school context. *Reflections and English Language Teaching* 7/2: 103-228.

Liu, T. (2009). Teachers' Narrative Understandings of the Taiwanese Foreign English Teachers Recruitment Project. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Manchester, UK.

Mann, S. (2005). The language teacher's development, *Language Teaching* 38/3: 103 –118.

Mann, S. & Tang, E.H.H. (2012). The role of mentoring in supporting novice English language teachers in Hong Kong. *TESOL Quarterly* 46/3: 472-495.

Marchesseau, G. (2006). The state of the JET programme, team teaching and English education in Japan. *Research Bulletin of Naruto University* 21: 168-173.

Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: who's worth more? *English Language Teaching Journal* 46/4: 340-349.

Medgyes, P. (1994). *The Non-native Teacher*. London: Macmillan.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks: CA. Sage.

Min, C. (2006). Role-balanced team teaching in elementary English classrooms. *KAPEE Newsletter* 20: 11-15.

Min, C. & Ha, M. (2006). The effectiveness of EPIK. Paper presented at 2006 Asia TEFL, Fukuoka, Japan.

NET (Native English Teacher) Scheme in Hong Kong: http://www.edb.gov.hk/

Park, J. (2008). EPIK and NEST-NNEST Collaboration in Korea Revisited, *English Language & Literature Teaching* 14/4: 141-160.

Pennycook, A. (1994). *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. London: Longman.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: OUP.

Richards, J.C. & Farrell, T.S. (2005). *Professional Development for Language Teachers: Strategies for Teacher Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, K. (2003). *Qualitative Inquiry in TESOL*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Seidhofer, B. (2003). *Controversies in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: OUP.

Shin, S-K. (2012). "It cannot be done alone?": The socialization of novice English teachers in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly* 46/3: 542-567.

Smith, R.C. (1994). Contents and activities in team teaching: Lessons from observation. In Wada, M. & Cominos, A. (eds.) *Studies in Team Teaching* (pp. 72-89). Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

Stoynoff, S. (2004). Case studies in TESOL practice. *ELT Journal* 58/4: 379-393.

Tajino, A. & Tajino, Y. (2000). Native and non-native: what can they offer? Lessons from team teaching in Japan. *English Language Teaching Journal* 54: 3-11.

Tajino, A. & Walker, L. (1998). Perspectives on team teaching by students and teachers: Exploring foundations for team teaching. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 11/1: 113-131.

Tsai, J-M. (2007). Team teaching and teachers' professional learning: case studies of collaboration between foreign and Taiwanese English teachers in Taiwanese elementary schools. Unpublished PhD thesis. The Ohio State University, USA.

Wang, L.Y. (2012). Preparing NESTs and NNESTs for team teaching at the pre-service level. *Studies in Literature and Language* 4/1: 32-37.

Widdowson, H.G. (1994). The Ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly* 28/2: 377-389.

Yukawa, E. (1994). Team teaching and changes in teaching routines in a Japanese high school reading classroom. In Wada, M & Cominos, A (eds.) *Studies in Team Teaching* (pp. 42-60). Tokyo: Kenkyusha Publishing.

Appendix 1. Team Teachers in Four Cases.

Team teacher	Case 1		Case 2		Case 3		Case 4	
	Jessica	Matthew	Mary	James	Rona	Kevin	Kate	Robert
Age	39	24	29	29	25	36	30	28
Gender	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Nationality	Korea	UK	Korea	USA	Korea	USA	Korea	USA
Educational background	BA in General primary education, MA in TESOL in Korea, Training programme in the USA	BA in Health science in the USA, online TEFL course	BA in Korean Language education, Ongoing MA in Korean Language, education in Korea, Training programme in Canada	BA in Communication in Greece	BA in General primary education	BA in Management in the USA	BA in General primary education, Ongoing MA in Counseling Psychology in Korea	BA in Finance in the USA, Intensive training sessions for teaching English
Certificate	1st teacher license in primary school, TESOL certificate, TEE Master	N/A	2nd teacher license in primary school, TESOL certificate	N/A	1st teacher license in primary school	ESL certificate	1st teacher license in primary school	N/A
Previous teaching experience	15 years: working in primary schools (8 years: English teaching including 3 years: team teaching)	7 months in this school (since Feb. 2010)	2 years: team teaching with NESTs	1 year: a high school in Korea	6 months for a substitute teacher	2 years- ESL class for immigrants and different age groups, 4 years – teaching in primary schools in Korea	4 years (2 years teaching English with NESTs)	2 years (1 year: private institute, 1 year: a boys' high school)
Cultural background	Participating in several training programmes abroad	Living in the USA for 6 years	Teaching students in Nepal for 2.5 years	Living and studying in Greece, staying in Korea with his parents	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Teaching context	5th grade – twice a week (team teaching with NET) 3rd grade – once a week (solo teaching)	Teaching with another co-teacher (6th grade) 5th & 6th grades: 24 classes	4th & 6th grades – twice a week 4th grade- 8 classes, 6th grades- 10 classes	4th & 6th grades - 18 classes, Morning English class by School radio broadcasting (Tue. – Fri.)	6th grade: 20 classes a week 10 classes: team teaching 10 classes: solo teaching	5th & 6th grades (22 classes a week) Working with two team teachers (two KETs including Rona)	6th grade: 20 classes a week 8 classes: team teaching 12 classes: solo teaching including Ethics classes	5th & 6th grades (21 classes a week) Working with two team teachers (two KETs including Kate)
Special comments	Demonstrating her team teaching practice to other teachers, writing an English textbooks for primary students since 2011	Working since 2010 up to 2013 present, Taking charge of supporting new NETs as a NET head teacher in the District Office of Education since 2012	Awarded as the 3rd place of good team teaching model by the District Office of Education in Gyeonggi province in 2010	Working in the same school for another year (working in this school from 2009 to 2012)	A novice teacher starting teaching in the primary school from 1st Sep. 2010 to present	Awarded as a good NET in the District Office of Education in 2010 (working in this school from 2009 to 2012)	N/A	Returning the USA in 2010 after completing a contract (2009 - 2010)