

Students' Perceptions of Team Teaching and Participating Teachers' Role Recognition*

Jae -Woo Shim, Yearn- Im Kim

Chonbuk National University

Shim, Jae-woo & Kim, Yearn-Im. (2010). Students' perceptions of team teaching and participating teachers' role recognition. *Modern Language Education*, 11(1), 51-67.

Team teaching in Korea has been emphasized as a dominant teaching method since 1990s. The objectives of this study are to analyze perceptions of team teaching held by students in a middle school and to understand what types of roles were played by or allocated between the two participating teachers, one Korean teacher of English and the other native English teacher. The participants of the study were the students of a small-sized school located in a rural community. The study began in April 2007 and ended in October 2008 during which 174 team teaching classes were observed and students' perceptions on team teaching were collected. Quantitative analysis based on the Rasch model analysis indicated that the participants were likely to approve interactions with the native English teacher, while finding it difficult to mark positively on items related to instruction and their affective states. Triangulized data also revealed the participating teachers had distinctive roles during the classes and tried to contribute to the students' development of English ability and their positive attitudes toward English and native speakers.

[team teaching /Rasch model analysis/communicative competence/협동수업/레쉬 분석/의사소통능력]

I. INTRODUCTION

There is no doubt that English as a world language enjoys its popularity in various fields including commerce, business, education, politics, engineering, medicine, and so on. According to Graddol (2006), more than two thirds of world population is exposed to the language. In line with this trend, the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology

* This study was supported by the Overseas Research Fund of Chonbuk National University in 2009.

released a new English education policy that puts much emphasis on developing secondary school students' communicative competence. Accordingly, it is expected that at least one native speaker of English will be assigned to all the secondary schools by 2010. Following this new policy, it is inevitable for Korean English teachers to design lesson plans workable with their native counterparts in a cooperative team teaching.

Therefore it is worthwhile to study native English speakers' interaction with Korean counterparts and learners. Since not many of this kind of researches have been conducted, the present study tries to find students' perceptions on team teaching practices. Even though the sample of this study is quite a small number, the study covered two-year team teaching classes that have been instructed for the learners quite consistently; the results, in spite of the limitation, can be meaningfully interpreted to understand what is going on in EFL context, especially in small sized schools in rural areas. Along with the more aggressive policy to hire native speaker teachers and the implementation of intensive team teaching at the classroom level, it seems worthwhile to study interactional aspects between native speaker teachers, Korean teachers of English, and students. Accordingly, the present study attempts to understand various aspects about team teaching classes perceived by students and Korean teachers of English from the data gathered from 2007 and 2008.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Communicative Competence and Teaching English in English

Since the late 1980s, communicative competence has been emphasized as an ultimate goal of language learning in the SLA (Second Language Acquisition). The government of Korea's 7th national curriculum has begun to address the need for students' attainment of English ability with which they can use English in various social contexts. Communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1979) consists of grammatical, sociolinguistic/pragmatic, discourse, and strategic competence. In fact, various approaches were designed to improve the language learner's communicative competence as can be observed in classes from the whole language approach, natural approach, CLT (Communicative Language Teaching), Task-based Language Teaching, and Content-Based Language Teaching. Criteria for judging whether or not a language class fosters communicative competence in the learner were provided by Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983) as follows:

- (1) comprehensible pronunciation
- (2) ability to use the linguistic system effectively and appropriately
- (3) fluency and acceptable language(for effective communication)

- (4) contextualization
- (5) judicious use of L1

As a way to encourage the use of communicative approach, our government adopted TEE (Teaching English in English) since 2001, which does not mandate 100% use of English but recommends the use of the language for instruction except for explaining difficult grammatical features. According to 2006 release by the Ministry of Education, TEE has been applied consistently across all school types (See Table 1). According to Table 1, in all school levels, TEE has been applied despite the different dominance since 2002. In addition to the policy, previous pilot studies (Kysuso Sun & Jeongmi Park, 2002) have suggested the effectiveness of communicative approach for improving students' communicative skills.

Table 1
Annual Status of TEE by Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (2006)

	2002				2003				2004				2005			
	P	M	H	T	P	M	H	T	P	M	H	T	P	M	H	T
More than 1 hour a week	16.5	28.4	25.5	19.9	17.2	32.7	32.5	22.3	16.3	27.9	24.8	19.9	15.9	21.7	18.1	17.6
Together with in Korean	71.6	70.6	66.7	70.6	71.4	65.8	61.7	68.7	70.8	70.1	64.4	69.4	70.1	74.6	64.2	69.5
Mostly in Korean	11.8	1.0	7.8	9.5	11.4	1.5	5.8	9.0	12.9	2.0	10.8	10.7	14	3.7	17.7	12.9
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*P: Primary Schools, M: Middle Schools, H: High Schools, T: Total

2. Team Teaching

1) What is team teaching?

Most ESL/EFL teachers have had some experience with team teaching. In terms of the general definition of team teaching, it is "a term used for a situation in which two teachers share a class and divide instruction between them" (Richards, Platt, & Platt, 1992, p. 375). Since team teaching involves two or more teachers collaborating to teach a group of students together, it is important for the participating team teachers to share educational

principles and appreciate professionalism and skills of each other. Therefore team teaching is not just instructing a class but what matters is the constant and consistent interaction between the teachers to improve the class.

2) Types of team teaching

Many researchers have tried to classify different types of team teaching according to the dynamics of the participating teachers or the procedure of the class. According to Cunningham (1960), there are four types: the team leader type, the associate type, the master teacher/beginning teacher type and the coordinated team type. In the team leader type, one team member has a higher status than the other member; contrarily there is no designated leader in the associate type and the members share equal power. The master/beginning teacher type aims to encourage the beginning teacher to get help from the master teacher. In the coordinated team type, the members have no joint responsibility but they plan the curriculum together to separate groups of learners.

It can be also differentiated from the procedural perspective. The participating teachers need to collaborate before the class (pre-class collaboration), during the class (in-class collaboration) and after the class (post-class collaboration). Whatever the type is or how it is classified, the teachers' collaboration and commitment to the class is the key to successful team teaching performance.

3) Team teaching in Korea

Team teaching has gained its momentum as a curriculum innovation since the introduction of EPIK (English Teachers in Korea) program in 1995. The main purposes of EPIK program have been to provide English conversation training and opportunity for English teachers while interacting with native speakers of English and to foster elementary and secondary students' communicative ability in the age of information and globalization. As of March 2009, 3,379 guest English teachers have joined the program. Although team teaching can be traced back to the times when Korea accepted Peace Corp members for working together with Korean teachers in 1966, team teaching has been relatively less popular among English teaching profession perhaps due to recruiting and finance. In Japan, however, more than 5,500 AETs (Assistant English Teachers) are working in secondary schools through JET (The Japan Exchange and Teaching) program since 1987. With the new policies such as TEE (Teaching English in English) and TaLK (Teach and Learn in Korea), and its advantages in pedagogical contexts, team teaching is to be prevalent in Korea.

4) Team teaching tips for foreign language teachers

Establishing a successful team teaching class is not an easy task. It takes lots of investment by the teachers. Since team teaching is, by its nature, more than individual teacher's instruction, it is important for teachers to be aware of some preparations for practicing this particular type of classes. Benoit and Haugh (2001) recommended that the participating teachers consider following dimensions: planning, individual roles, timing and pacing, classroom management, discipline, evaluation and so on. Also, it would be a good idea to take into account following questions when devising team teaching.

- (1) Isn't the primary concern for the teaching material for the teachers' role assignment?
- (2) Is there any inconsistency in the instruction?
- (3) Is the comprehensive evaluation on students possible?
- (4) Is the overall time management efficient?
- (5) Is there any possibility for students to get confused?
- (6) Is there any conflict between the participating teachers?
- (7) Is the role assignment for the teachers fair and appropriate?

These reflective questions will be useful for teachers who are engaged in team teaching and also for the newcomers for this method.

In order to better understand students' perceptions on team teaching practices and different roles taken by participating teachers, the present study aims to answer the following research questions.

1. What kinds of perceptions do students have on team teaching?
2. What are the general patterns of roles taken by a Korean teacher of English and a native assistant English teacher?

III. RESEARCH DESIGN

1. Design

The design of the present study combined both the quantitative and qualitative research. In the quantitative research, the participants' perceptions about team teaching were analyzed in descriptive statistics and Rasch model analysis, while in the qualitative research section teachers' different roles were observed and analyzed.

2. Participants

The sample of the present study was 78 middle school students between 2007 and 2008. 43 of participants were male and 35 were female students. The yearly breakdown of participation is as follows; 21 boys and 17 girls for 2007, and 22 and 18 for 2008 respectively. They were all the students from first-year to seniors of a small school located in the school district of Jeonbuk province.

The participants had a Korean English Teacher (KET) and a Native Assistant English Teacher (NAT), who was hired on part-time basis to work with the KET in teaching English every Wednesday. The KET had been teaching English for 11 years. The NAT had a two-year experience in teaching English in Korea and no teaching experience in his home country, Canada. Each grade was provided with a total of 3 English class sessions a week by the KET, while the two teachers using team teaching method taught 1 class session a week. Most of the participants had mid-low scores on English achievement tests that were administered nationwide by the government in 2008. And they had been studying English for three to six years since fourth-grade of elementary school. None of them attended private institutions for extra English study during the two years.

3. Data Collection and Analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected to survey perceptions of the participants on team teaching classes and to understand roles played by the KET and the NAT. The quantitative data was gathered through a set of 13 questionnaire items inherent to team teaching in terms of teacher-student interaction, instruction, and affective aspects. The questionnaires were administered to the participants at the end of each term in 2007 and 2008 and their responses were collected together across school years. The 13 items were submitted to Winstep, a Rasch model analysis program.

The qualitative data consisted of observations made between April of 2007 and October of 2008 and interviews of the two team teaching teachers. Over the two years, a total of 174 team teaching classes were observed. It has been done quite regularly every Wednesday, and three team teaching classes were observed each day. Mainly the participating teachers' roles were analyzed according to Harmer (2001)'s seven roles of ideal teachers in the CLT classes; a controller, an organizer, an assessor, a participant, a resource provider, a tutor and an observer. This aimed to find specific roles during the team teaching classes by the two teachers.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Quantitative Results of the Present Study

1) The Rasch measurement analysis

The quantitative data was analyzed with Winstep, software based on Rasch measurement theory. According to McNamara (1996), Rasch measurement is better solution to traditional analysis of dichotomous or polytomous data as quoted below:

Rasch measurement enables estimates of candidate's underlying ability to be made by analyzing the candidate's performance on a set of items, after allowance has been made for the difficulty of the items and how well they were matched to the candidate's ability level. Thus the ability estimates are not simply dependent on the items that were taken; we have avoided the trap of assuming that ability is transparently visible from raw scores. Similarly, the underlying difficulty of items can be estimated from the responses of a set of candidates, by taking into account the ability of the candidates and the degree to which there was a match between the ability of the candidates and the degree to which there was a match between the ability of the trial group and the difficulty of the item. Central to this approach is the way in which candidate ability is related to item difficulty: this is done by estimating from the data the chance of a candidate of a given ability achieving a certain score on an item of given difficulty. The Rasch model proposes a simple mathematical relationship between ability and difficulty, and expresses this relationship as the probability of a certain response. (p. 152-153)

To answer the first research question, which was "What kinds of perceptions do students have on team teaching as revealed in person and item comparisons based on Rasch measurement theory?", descriptive statistics for Likert-type perception questions, item difficulty, item fit, person fit, person-item maps, and general fit indices were studied.

2) Descriptive statistics

The 13 items related to general practice of team teaching were made by the two authors of this paper and tested on the participants for the Rasch analysis. As shown in Table 2, the items of the 5 point-Likert scale (strongly disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, and Strongly agree) were about participants' perceptions of classroom interaction between the team teaching teachers and student participants (items 5, 9, 12, and 13), the affective state held

by student participants (items, 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6), and classroom instruction processes (items 7, 8, 10, and 11).

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for the 13 Items Related to Team teaching

Item		Mean	SD
1	I feel confident when I speak in English	2.7	.81
2	I am interested in speaking English	3.0	.81
3	I want to develop my English speaking skill	2.9	.93
4	I think English is necessary for my future	2.3	1.0
5	I want to participate in English-related activities	2.7	1.0
6	I don't feel nervous with native speakers of English	2.3	.90
7	I feel confident that I can do well in team teaching classes	3.1	.93
8	I enjoy team teaching classes	3.2	.90
9	I can express myself in English in team teaching classes	3.5	1.0
10	I can grasp topics in team teaching classes	3.4	.85
11	I can understand what the native English teacher says in team teaching classes	3.3	.97
12	I can ask questions to the native English teacher	3.4	1.0
13	I can answer questions made by the native English teacher	3.9	.95

According to descriptive item statistics in Table 2, respondents positively responded in the order of item 13, 9, 10, 12, 11, and so on. In general, they seemed to appreciate team teaching not so highly; given the maximum rating scale point was 5. Their responses to each item varied significantly as indicated by high standard deviation of each item.

3) The initial Rasch analysis

The descriptive data saved on SPSS version 17 were transported to Winstep for the Rasch analysis. It was found from the initial analysis that items 1, 5, 6, 11, and 12 were misfits following the criteria of infit MnSq values between 0.6 and 1.4 and infit ZSTD values between -2.0 and +2.0 as the acceptable goodness-of-fit statistics. These infit statistics indicate the degree of fit of observations to the Rasch modeled expectations, weighted to give more value to on-target observations (Bond & Fox, 2007). More specifically, infit MnSq is transformation of the residuals, the difference between the predicted and the observed, while infit ZSTD is the standardization of fit values to a distribution with a mean of 0 and variance of 1 (Bond & Fox, 2007). Accordingly, the items were discarded as bad items for measuring the participants' perceptions on team teaching practice. 14 persons (or participants) misfitted the Rasch model.

4) The second Rasch analysis

After discarding misfit items, the second Rasch analysis was made, which was slightly more satisfactory than the initial analysis. Item 4 was the only item that did not fit well with the expectations of the Rasch analysis model with Infit MnSq value of 1.43 and infit ZSTD of 2.6. With the total of 8 items, RMSE (Model) was .17, adjusted SD .76, separation 4.53, item reliability .95 respectively. And chi-square was 1238.64 with 516 degree of freedom ($p = .001$). Overall, the evaluation of the model was acceptable as evidenced by the presence of most items within the acceptable fit statistics, a high separation value above 2, and a high item reliability coefficient.

5) Hierarchy of items

As can be seen in Table 3, item map indicated that the items can be grouped into three types of difficulty, each type forming unique concepts within the uni-dimensional frame. The items related to the interaction between the native English teacher and students were easiest ones (i.e., item 13 and 9). In other words, the participants tended to answer more favorably to the side of agreement than the other two types of concepts. This result indicated that the participants appreciated their interactions with their native English teacher. The next set of items with medium difficulty (i.e., item 7, 8, and 10) were related to the concept of classroom instruction. That is, about half of the participants had difficulty agreeing positively with instruction itself. The hardest items for the participants to agree consisted of items related to affective state or affective variables (i.e., item 2, 3, and 4), indicating that there was less growth in affective states such as language learning efficacy, interest, and motivation.

Table 3
Item Map

Logit Measure	Items
2	Item 4
1	Item 3 Item 10
0	Item 2 Item 7 Item 8
-1	Item 9
-2	Item 13

2. Qualitative Analysis of Teacher Roles

1) The typical routines of team teaching classes

The following section reports some of the classroom procedures and characteristics of team teaching classes observed for the present study. Every Wednesday, the NAT arrived at school around 9 a.m. Before the team teaching sessions, the KET explained to the NAT what and how they would teach for the day and answered any questions from the counterpart.

The main purpose of the classes was to improve the learners' communicative skills with the medium of instruction was English. The instruction took place in a so-called English-only zone where the learners were supposed to speak only in English whenever they were in. The room was equipped with a computer and a data projector. The main format of the classes was group work in which the teachers divided the students into three or four groups based on their levels of English. The teaching materials were chosen from the textbooks and modified into communicative activities and the KET usually did this work. The communicative activities were conducted in various forms including jigsaws, information-gap and problem solving tasks. The students were free to speak even in broken English and they didn't hesitate to join in activities. Since the students went through the same kindergarten, elementary school and now middle school in a small community, they seemed to have developed strong bond among themselves. They helped each other in communicative tasks.

2) The roles undertaken by the two team teaching teachers

Following Harmer (2001), teachers' roles were identified through triangulization of observations and direct interviews with the participant teachers. Each of the big questions was explored by what the teachers did practically in classes.

(1) Who is more dominant as a controller?

- . Who usually takes attendance?
- . Who usually gives the students homework?
- . Who usually makes a lesson plan?

Before the class began, the NAT had small talks with the students since the teacher stayed in the English-only zone while the KET stayed in the teachers' office during breaks. At the beginning of the class, the KET checked if there was anyone absent. It was the KET

who gave homework and made lesson plans for every class. For 174 classes, the NAT helped the KET devise the lesson plans twice for the class demonstrations, which were supervised by the local educational authority. Since the NAT was not good at Korean, and not a regular staff of the school, the teacher didn't try to check the attendance. And when it comes to assignment, the KET took the total responsibility; it was because the teacher was quite well aware of the curriculum compared to the NAT. In sum, the KET was more dominant as a controller of a class.

(2) Who is more dominant as an organizer and a tutor?

- . Who usually controls the time allotment?
- . Who usually decides the group formation?
- . Who usually suggests the lesson objectives?
- . Who usually explains the tasks or directions?
- . Who usually explains (teaches) the teaching points?
- . Who usually answers questions when the students have a problem about the lesson?

The KET was in charge of managing time throughout activities: the KET tried to stop the students or sometimes extended certain activities. The KET also gave the learners what they were to study for the day in the beginning of the class and then the KET let the NAT retell the objectives to the students in order to emphasize the teaching aims. In contrast, both of the teachers were involved in the decision of the group formation. They devised a speaking test for placing the students into appropriate groups of level. As mentioned earlier, the teachers divided the students into three or four groups based on their levels of English, but the group formation has rarely changed with only one or two students have moved into another group. While the KET was more dominant as an organizer of a class, the KET and the NAT were cooperative in instruction. After the NAT explained directions of tasks, the KET put them into easier English for the learners to understand them better. When there was a need to emphasize important teaching points, both of the teachers invested more time in explaining the concept and elaborated on them in detail. When they were asked some questions about the lesson, due to the students' imperfect English, the KET happened to answer them more often than the NAT. However, during the activities, they wandered around the classroom, and helped the students with the answers right on the spot. Therefore, the KET and the NAT shared the tutor role in a very similar and equal way.

(3) Who is more dominant as an assessor?

- . Who usually corrects the students' errors?

- . Who provides the criteria of the evaluation?
- . Who usually evaluates the students performance?

It seemed that the NAT tried to correct the students' errors more often and more explicitly. However, in terms of evaluation, the KET scored the students performance during class and gave them marks. When it comes to the criteria of the evaluation, the KET elaborated all the details of the assessment to the students. During the observed classes, the KET had a score sheet to score the students' performance, and the students were fully aware that they were being evaluated by the KET not by the NAT. As mentioned, regarding the accuracy of the students' utterances, the NAT took more control. Therefore the role of an assessor was relatively assigned to the KET.

(4) Who is more dominant as a participant?

- . Who usually participates in students' activities as a member?

Since the number of the students in this study was quite small, both of the teachers joined every activity as a member. This role was fairly and equally shared by both of them. The classes hugely consisted of games and communicative activities, the participating teachers were engaged in them as a member of an activity, and they tried to help the learners with possible difficulties during the activities. It made it unclear that their roles as participants because they were involved in the activities and at the same time, their existence could impose them on the roles of tutors or facilitators.

(5) Who is more dominant as an observer and a facilitator?

- . Who usually encourages the students who are shy or hesitant?
- . Who usually makes the students pay attention and discipline them when they don't concentrate on the lesson?
- . Who usually gives feedback for the students' performance?

As stated, the atmosphere of classes was very friendly; the interaction between the teachers, between the students and between the students and the teachers were collaborative. The KET and the NAT were observers and facilitators in proceeding with the classes. However, when the participating teachers noticed some misbehavior, it was usually the KET who disciplined the students and their misconducts were submitted to their performance record by the KET. Since the level of the students was not quite high, some of them showed shyness or hesitance, which were overcome by the help of the both

teachers. The NAT tried to boost the shy students with very simple English while the KET encouraged them with some pep talk both in Korean and English. As stated earlier, the KET had more responsibility about the evaluation on the students' performance; the KET gave more feedback than the NAT did.

Alexander and Raymond (1989) suggested desired skills and attitudes of the participating teachers to make team teaching more successful:

- (1) A willingness and ability to argue publicly with a colleague, including acceptance of the risks involved. Also needed is the skill to engage in constructive arguments so that different points and counterpoints are made without developing animosity.
- (2) Skill in knowing when and how to interrupt your colleague and conversely, the skill of tolerating and properly handling interruptions from your colleague. When interruptions occur they tend to trigger dialogue between two co-teachers and then further questions and comments from the students. It is desirable to have this free flow, but necessary to manage it so that the different thoughts are integrated and the discussion is kept on the main track.
- (3) Defensiveness and destructive competition must be avoided. If either person feels a need to win every point, the process will deteriorate. When the different perspectives cannot be fully reconciled, you agree to disagree and move on.
- (4) Sensitivity to the reactions of the students and the performances of your co-teacher is needed so that you can intervene in the best way and at appropriate time.
- (5) An ability to balance assertiveness and advocacy of each teacher with the ability to compromise, reconcile, and cooperate. A mutually respectful degree of conflict and creative tension seems desirable. (p. 79)

It is true that teachers' attitudes and skills are very crucial in team teaching. Based on the criteria above, the participating teachers were collaborative and well-balanced throughout the classes. Given there is a risk of uncertainty in every class, teamwork of the teachers is a critical factor for successful team teaching classes. The teachers willingly engaged in argument in a timely manner when it was necessary. They did not get involved in a competition in front of the students. They were quite respectful for each other. Their amicable relationship contributed to the friendly atmosphere of the classes and made the students comfortable.

As Naoki and Adams (2005) suggested, team teaching, even with its strong support, is open for some discussions since the participating teachers sometimes confuse the learners without complete agreement before the actual classes. Team teaching has been found useful for learners to develop more positive attitudes toward English learning and their willingness to use English (Kysoo Sun & Jeongmi Park, 2002), it is considered to have

pedagogical advantages in EFL context (Jonghee Kim, 2005) and teachers provide a much richer environment for students by interacting in the classroom (Alexander & Raymond, 1989). However, not many research studies have been able to define the teachers' roles in team teaching classes. In this intrinsic study, findings showed that the KET and the NAT actually had distinct roles: The roles of the KET were dominant as a controller and an assessor whereas the KET shared the role of a tutor, a participant, and a facilitator with the NAT. However, they did not have enough time to interact with each other or negotiate plans and ideas for their classes.

As a result, more specific guidelines and teachers' training for team teaching need to be developed and more time and interaction should be invested for team teaching classes to be more effective. Also, when the relevant authorities implement training programs for NATs, they need to consider what KETs and students want from NATs. Youngjoo Bang (2007) found that KETs and students had different opinions and attitudes towards the characteristics of effective NATs.

According to Merenbloom (1996), there is another aspect to consider as quoted below:

Many schools and districts cannot make the financial commitment to a team planning period. Teachers, ideally, should have a team planning period as well as a personal planning period within the regular work day. Teams should meet at least several times per week. Central office personnel, board of education members, and parents must be aware of the benefits of team planning periods for both students and teachers. Some schools, unable to schedule team meetings during the day, have altered contracts and/or provided a stipend for meetings that have been scheduled before or after the student day. (p. 52)

It is also worthwhile to consider some of the problems that NATs have in an EFL context. Cheryly and Yuh-show (2010) suggested that one common problem is students' doubtful appreciation about NAT's accent. Even though Korean learners are exposed to various English accents, American English is still dominant. Some other challenges of NATs include how to cope with large number of students in one class and how to take care of misbehaved learners. They are also not sure about what to teach because teaching topics are somewhat unfamiliar to them. Gingerich (2004) defined 'pedagogic context knowledge' as the ability to see and understand the interrelated contexts of the classroom, the school and the society and this knowledge is developed by teachers' ability. NATs are rarely affluent with the knowledge; they have to struggle in a new teaching context.

Research indicates that it takes three to five years to fully implement all aspects of the team process (Merenbloom, 1996). For successful team teaching, various aspects should be taken into consideration with appropriate time.

V. CONCLUSION

With more emphasis put on communicative goals of language instruction, most English teachers in teacher seminars and workshops have been guided to reflect on their practices and seek approaches that might fit their students with different levels of language learning motivation, attitudes, self-autonomy, learning styles, language learning strategies, and so on. To be sure, one of the recent developments in English teaching that brings together communicative goals and instructions targeted for various learners has been team teaching, a cooperative teaching of English with shared responsibilities between a KET and a NAT.

The present study found that students in team teaching classes appreciated positively with interactions with their NAT and that they were less likely to recognize instructional goals and processes and also less likely to keep high their levels of affective states. Accordingly, more collaborative efforts made by team teaching teachers for those two areas of instruction processes and low affective states would contribute to making team teaching of English more effective. The qualitative analysis of roles shared by the team teaching teachers in this study indicated that there may be some roles that are best suited for either KETs or NATs. Future research studies on teachers' roles in team teaching situations would clear teachers of any confusion over how a team teaching class should proceed and what content of English can be effectively dealt with by either of the teachers.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, F., & Raymond, W. (1989). Interactive co-teaching: theory and practice. *Journal of Management Education, 13*(3), 75-86.
- Bang, Young-Joo. (2007). Perceptions toward native speakers of English as effective language teachers in an EFL class. *Modern English Education, 8*(3), 341-265.
- Benoit, R., & Haugh, B. (2001, October). Team teaching tips for foreign language teachers. *The Internet TESL Journal, 7*(10). Retrieved May 23, 2005, from the World Wide Web: <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Benoit-TeamTeaching.html>.
- Bond, T., & Fox, C. (2007). *Applying the Rasch model: Fundamental measurement in the human sciences (2nd ed.)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Canale & Swain. (1979). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 1-47.
- Cheryl, W., & Yuh-show, C. (2010). A case study on foreign English teachers' challenges in Taiwanese elementary schools. *Science Direct System, 38*, 41-49.
- Cunningham, L. (1960). Team teaching: Where do we stand? *Administrator's Notebook, 8*, 1-4.

- Finocchiaro, M., & Brumfit, C. (1983). *The functional-notional Approach: From theory to practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gingerich, R. R. (2004). *Learning to teach: A study of teacher knowledge in English as a foreign language*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, USA.
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English next: Why global English may mean the end of 'English as a foreign language'*. London: The British Council.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*: Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Kim, Jong-Hee. (2005). A study of team teaching English education for college students. *Modern English Education*, 6(2), 119-133.
- McNamara, T. (1996). *Measuring second language performance*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Melrenbloom, E. (1996). Team teaching: Addressing the learning needs of middle level students. *National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 80, 45-53.
- Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (2006). *The status analysis on primary and secondary English education*, Policy Project Issue 4.
- Naoki, F., & Adamson. (2005). A Comparison of the roles of two teachers in a team teaching classroom in a Japanese junior high school. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 2(1), 75-101.
- Richards, J. C., Platt, J. & Platt, H. (1992). *Longman dictionary of language and applied linguistic*. Harlow: Longman.
- Sun, Kyu-Soo, & Park, Jeong-Mi (2002). Effects of team teaching on English learning of elementary school students. *Language Teaching*, 14(1), 163-168.

Jae -Woo Shim

Department of English Education, Chonbuk National University

644-14 Ga Deokjin-Dong Jeonju-City Jeonbuk South Korea

Tel: (063) 270 -2729 / H.P.: 010-2686-7065

Email: shimjw@jbnu.ac.kr

Yearn- Im Kim

Department of English Education, Chonbuk National University

644-14 Ga Deokjin-Dong Jeonju-City Jeonbuk South Korea

Tel: (063) 241-0125/H.P.:010-2592-1185

Email: icdekyy@hanmail.net

Students' Perceptions of Team Teaching and
Participating Teachers' Role Recognition

67

Received 3 February 2010

Revised 26 March 2010

Accepted 9 April 2010