English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 19, No. 3 Fall 2013

Perceptions of KETs, NESTs, and Students on Co-teaching*

Hyeok Jin Cheon**
(Chonnam National University)
Jee Hyun Ma***
(Chonnam National University)

Cheon, Hyeok Jin & Ma, Jee Hyun. (2013). Perceptions of KETs, NESTs, and students on co-teaching. ***English Language & Literature Teaching, 19*****(3), 1-26.**

With the escalating number of NESTs in Korea, how to operate a co-teaching system could have a considerable influence on achieving communicative ability. This study explored the perceptions of KETs, NESTs and students on general practice, planning, and implementation of co-teaching through questionnaires and face-to-face interviews. 57 KETs, 31 NESTs, and 261 students participated in this study. The major findings are the following. Firstly, all the three groups are generally satisfied with co-teaching class, although students show their slight liking for it over KETs' solo-teaching. The top three effective parts shared by all the groups are listening, speaking, and culture. Secondly, some qualities including understanding Korean English education, teaching method knowledge, cooperation with KETs, and understanding Korean culture are generally perceived necessary for NESTs. Thirdly, in planning co-teaching, there is low KETs' and high NESTs' participation, indicating much greater KETs' efforts need to be made. Next, personal propensity is more considered as an obstacle than cultural factors for effective co-teaching. Finally, when implementing co-teaching, all the groups consider students' interest and participation important, although they, in reality, show much less interest and participation in co-teaching class than should be. Based on the findings, pedagogical implications and suggestions are also made.

[co-teaching/perception/co-teaching practice/planning/implementation]

I. INTRODUCTION

In the era of globalization, English has taken a dominant place in the world as a means

* This paper is part of the first author's master thesis
** First author
*** Corresponding author

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

of communication not only with English native speakers but with a greater number of nonnative English speakers (Graddol, 2006). Even in English as foreign language (EFL) contexts, for example, in Republic of Korea, Japan, China, Russia, Brazil, Vietnam, and Egypt, the opportunity to talk with foreigners in English is continuously increasing. With growing interest in English use, the priority in English education around the world has been placed on developing communicative ability. To keep pace with the worldwide phenomenon and to enhance students' communicative competence, the Ministry of Education of Korea has tried numerous English policies in the last few decades and one of them is co-teaching in which a Korean English Teacher (KET) and a Native English-Speaking Teacher (NEST) teach together.

In EFL settings where not many chances to use English are offered, involving native speakers of English in class could be greatly helpful to teach students English more effectively in terms of communication. Even though its origin could be traced back to 1966 when the Peace Corp members worked together with Korean teachers, co-teaching has not been popular until recently due to the problems of recruiting and financing (Shim & Kim, 2010). The situation has changed, however, with the establishment of the English program in Korea (EPIK) which was created to facilitate international exchanges, to reform teaching methodologies, and to improve the English speaking ability of both teachers and students in Korea. According to the timeline of the EPIK website, at the outset, in 1995, 54 NESTs were recruited, and ever since then, 4,818 NESTs have been recruited and trained until 2010.

With the escalating number of NESTs, the question of how to most effectively operate a co-teaching system should be raised and properly answered. In addition, in order to give more benefits of co-teaching to students and establish more effective co-teaching system, the perceptions of major stakeholders – KETs, NESTs, and students – about co-teaching should be reflected on the system. Although quite a few attempts have been recently made to discover the perceptions of KETs, NESTs, and students on co-teaching, few studies explored and compared the perceptions from all the three groups of co-teaching participants – KETs, NESTs, and students simultaneously. The present study, therefore, is designed to find out how KETs, NESTs, and students perceive co-teaching at the same time mainly focusing on the three parts: the practice of co-teaching on the macro level, planning for co-teaching, and implementing co-teaching by applying mixed research methods. To draw practical pedagogical implications on co-teaching in Korea, the three research questions were formulated:

1. How do NESTs, KETs and students perceive the practice of co-teaching in general?
2. How do NESTs and KETs perceive the practice of co-teaching in terms of planning?

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

3. How do NESTs, KETs and students perceive the practice of co-teaching in terms of implementation?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. The Definition of Co-teaching

In English education, the teaching performed by a KET and a NEST as a team has several different names such as co-teaching, team teaching, collaborative teaching, and cooperative teaching. These various names can cause some confusion since they do not clearly refer to the teaching of two language teachers having their own native tongues. Rather, those terms can be used in many teaching situations in which two instructors of different disciplinary areas teach together; for example, one in science and the other in mathematics, or two teachers in specialized education giving lessons to disabled students.

In general education, on the macro level, co-teaching is defined as the teaching "involves a group of instructors working purposefully, regularly, and cooperatively to help a group of students learn" (Buckely, 2000, p. 4), the instruction in which more than two teachers as a team integrate and instruct two different disciplinary subjects such as literature and history (Lee, 2009), and "a form of teacher collaboration" (Kim, 2010a, p. 215). It can be defined in English language class, on the micro level, as a type of class in which a KET and a NEST, as a team, play their own roles in planning, teaching, and evaluating class and cooperate with each other (Kim, 2011) and an instruction in which several instructors teaching together plan, conduct, and evaluate the learning activities for the same group of students (Goetz, 2000).

To summarize, in the case of the English education field in Korea, it refers to the joint instruction in which a KET and NEST take charge of their own part in the whole process of co-teaching including planning, implementation, and follow-up work for students' better English capability.

2. Previous Studies

A lot of issues concerning co-teaching, for example, the current status of co-teaching practice, the development of a co-teaching class model, strategies for co-teaching, the effectiveness of co-teaching, and the interactions between co-teaching participants, have been studied for the last fifteen years. The perceptions of co-teaching participants are also considered important to function as a basis of policy, model, and success for co-teaching.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Yeon's study (1996) looking into the students' awareness of co-teaching concluded that through co-teaching, learners increased their confidence in communicative ability, interest in English, and cooperative attitudes among themselves, removing their vague fear of foreigners. These results demonstrated that the areas co-teaching has a good influence on are not merely cognitive but affective domains. With the data of 277 KETs and 184 NESTs, Chung at al. (1999) discovered that co-teaching class is not effectively being implemented at present due to the different view of KETs and NESTs. They also found that KETs are requested to have a good command of English and rich knowledge of English-speaking culture for better co-teaching practice. In the study of Kil (2004), 40 students taking co-teaching English classes were examined for sixteen weeks. Results showed that 75% of the students responded affirmatively to the questions about motivation, more than 80% of them did so regarding self-confidence and risk-taking, and finally more than 50% of them thought their affective filters were lowered after taking co-teaching classes. Yoo (2009) handled complicated issues such as conflict or complaint factors between KET/NEST and a local school, co-teaching obstacles, and the ways to deal with conflicts through the responses from 41 KETs. Based on the responses, the following suggestions are made: (a) how to utilize NESTs should be preplanned in detail at a local school, (b) NESTs should be guided on class procedures, their contract, and local school's regulations or system, (c) co-teachers should regularly meet and discuss co-teaching class, (d) co-teachers should understand each other's cultures, and (e) the burden of KETs in charge of NESTs should be lessened. Won et al. (2008) researched into the NESTs' teaching stress and the stress caused by the teaching performance ability was the highest, followed by students, physical aspects, working conditions, mental parts, supervisors, and treatment respectively. In elementary school settings, Park (2010) investigated the co-teaching practice using the mixed methods research including survey for 33 KETs, face to face interviews with fifteen KETs and seven NESTs, and twelve 40-minute classroom observations. The findings revealed that there were not enough clear role distributions between co-teachers, the roles NESTs played were restricted, the obstacles against successful co-teaching were KETs' English proficiency, paper-work overload, and cultural misunderstanding, and the most critical factor was the attitudes or personalities of both parties. Jeon (2010) explored the co-teaching practice through classroom observations and teachers' interviews, finding out different teaching styles were carried out at the primary and secondary school level, and both KETs and NESTs benefited from their co-teaching in that language knowledge, teaching skills, cultural understanding, and collaborative partnerships were increased. Kim (2010b) examined one KET's co-teaching perspective through a narrative inquiry by using face-to-face interviews and follow-up email interviews. After a semester of co-teaching, the participant refined her initial view on the KET's role from a helper to a various-role

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

performer, and suggested ideas for the grading system and diverse classroom tasks to make co-teaching better. In 2011, from 304 KETs' responses, Kang and Kim suggested a stronger screening system for employment, four periods of co-teaching class per week for each class, and sufficient investment for improving KETs' English ability. Another research was conducted on 1,311 students by Kim (2011). The following were two main results. In spite of students' affirmative evaluation on NESTs' teaching competence, they did not expect the improvement of their English proficiency, and both advanced students and primary school students showed a high preference for co-teaching. In Nam's study (2011), three NESTs' perceptions were studied through interview. The researcher suggested more systematic support should go toward NESTs and KETs at the government level by making efforts to reduce administrative work or teaching hours, and recommended having mutual feedback and sharing opinions by holding regular conferences and extending it to the school district level.

III. METHOD

1. Participants

The participants of the study were 57 KETs, 31 NESTs, and 261 students at elementary through middle to high school levels in Seoul and Gwangju. Among the 57 KET participants, seventeen were male and forty were female. Concerning age, eighteen were in their twenties, twenty-two in their thirties, fourteen in their forties, and three in their fifties. The participants' whole teaching experiences ranged from three months to 34 years. 24 KETs had teaching experiences of less than five years, ten KETs 6−10 years, eight KETs 11−15 years, six KETs 16−20 years, and nine KETs more than 20 years. In the case of co-teaching experiences, 31 KET participants were in their first or second year of co-teaching, sixteen were in 2−5 years, and ten were in 6−13 years. On the aspect of school level, eight teachers worked at elementary schools, 23 at middle schools, and 28 at high schools.

Out of the 31 NESTs, fifteen males and sixteen females, 22 were in their twenties and nine in their thirties. 27 NESTs had less than five-year teaching experiences and four of them 6−10 year teaching experiences. In terms of the co-teaching period, 24 NESTs were in their first or second year of teaching and seven had 2−4 years of co-teaching experiences. Eleven teachers work at primary school, seven at middle schools, and thirteen at high schools. Concerning certificates, three NESTs had the teacher certificate, five TESOL, and sixteen TEFL.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

As for the students, a total of 261 students were surveyed and they consisted of 69 elementary, 75 middle, and 117 high school students. 176 of them were male and 85 were female. 145 students had less than two years of co-teaching experience and the rest of them (116 students) had 3−5 years.

TABLE 1

Demographic Information of the Participants

		Participants		
		KET *N*(%)	NEST *N*(%)	Student *N*(%)
Gender	① Male	17(29.8)	15(48.4)	176(67.4)
	② Female	40(70.2)	16(51.6)	85(32.6)
Age (yr.)	① 10−12	0	0	69(26.4)
	② 13−15	0	0	75(28.7)
	③ 16−18	0	0	117(44.9)
	④ 20−29	18(31.6)	22(70.9)	0
	⑤ 30−39	22(38.6)	9(29.1)	0
	⑥ 40−49	14(24.4)	0	0
	⑦ 50−	3(5.4)	0	0
Teaching experience (yr.)	① 0−5	24(42.1)	27(87.1)	N.A.
	② 6−10	10(17.5)	4(12.9)	
	③ 11−15	8(14.1)	0	
	④ 16−20	6(10.5)	0	
	⑤ 20−	9(15.8)	0	
Co-teaching experience (yr.)	① 0−2	31(54.4)	24(77.4)	145(55.6)
	② 3−5	16(28.1)	7(22.6)	116(44.4)
	③ 6−13	10(17.5)	0	0
School level	① Elementary	8(14)	11(35.5)	69(26.4)
	② Middle school	23(40.4)	7(22.6)	75(28.8)
	③ High school	26(45.6)	13(41.9)	117(44.8)

Note. N.A. stands for not applicable.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

2. Instruments

To probe into the participants' perceptions toward the co-teaching practice, questionnaires and interview questions were designed. Firstly, questionnaires were made for all the three key co-teaching participants: KETs, NESTs, and students. For KETs, the questionnaire with total 73 questions was posed and it includes three major parts concerning co-teaching practice, planning for co-teaching, and implementing co-teaching. To complement the limitations of closed questions, the questionnaire includes open-ended questions and additional sections for extra writing on their opinions. All the same questions in the English version were given to NESTs except one item regarding the number of KETs who work together. For students, the questionnaire consists of two major parts: co-teaching practice and co-teaching implementation. In the practice of co-teaching part, included are two new items concerning whether to prepare for co-teaching class and the most confident area after taking co-teaching class. In the part of co-teaching implementation, added are six items about translation, participation, speaking opportunity, frequently-taught linguistic parts and comparing co-teaching with the KET's solo-teaching.

In all the three questionnaires, however, some key questions will be dealt with in this study. To ensure the internal consistency reliability of the questionnaires, we computed Cronbach α coefficients for the items of multi-scales and Likert scales. On the items of 69 for KETs', 70 for NESTs', and 54 for students', the Cronbach α coefficients are 0.829, 0.934, and 0.831 respectively, which indicates that the reliability of all the questionnaires for the three participant groups is nearly guaranteed.

Secondly, we conducted interviews with nine participants. For interviews, three people were randomly selected from each KET, NEST, and student participating group. For clear understanding of the interview questions, the KETs and students were interviewed in Korean and the NESTs in English. The following three semi-structured interview questions were utilized to draw the participants' more detailed opinions on the co-teaching practice: (a) What is your opinion about the practice of co-teaching at school in general? Tell me any ideas about the co-teaching practice including problems, suggestions, or anything to be considered; (b) What is your opinion about planning for co-teaching at school? Tell me any ideas you may have, including any problems, suggestions, or anything else to be considered when preparing for co-teaching. Please give me specific examples, if you have any; (c) What is your opinion about implementing co-teaching at school? Tell me any ideas you may have, including any problems, suggestions, or anything else to be considered during co-teaching classes.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

3. Data analysis

To analyze the data collected, we used the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 18.0. First, measures of frequency as one type of descriptive statistics was used to indicate how many respondents answer to each question. Second, the perceptions between the two (the KETs and NESTs) or among three (the KETs, NESTs, and students) groups were compared. The significance level was set at $\alpha < .05$, nondirectional. Furthermore, when comparing the (three) groups, if any significant difference was found, the post hoc tests using Bonferroni test were executed. The reason we employed the Bonferroni post hoc test is that it can be used even when sample sizes are small and different (Baek, 2012). After the quantitative analysis, the data from interviews with KETs, NESTs, and students were also illustrated and analyzed in order to back-up the results of the survey questions mainly focusing on the points they have in common.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Perceptions on Co-teaching Practice

Satisfaction with co-teaching

Table 2 shows the three groups are generally satisfied with their co-teaching classes; 57.9% of the KETs (*N*=33), 74.2% of the NESTs (*N*=23), and 54.7% of the students (*N*=143). According to the ANOVA results, no significant difference is shown, indicating no remarkable awareness gap among them.

Through open-ended questions, several participants provide their opinions about the reasons why they are satisfied or not. Here are some representative responses from each participant group. Firstly, KETs on the satisfied side say that they recognize the improvement of students' English speaking ability and less fear of talking with foreigners in English. KETs also state that the success of co-teaching depends on co-teaching teachers' teaching skills and NESTs more need to be accustomed to class implementation. Secondly, NESTs on the satisfied side emphasize the importance of cooperativeness of both teachers and positive attitude Korean culture. Some responses from NESTs are "I have a good relationship with my co-teachers," "I'm open-minded and adaptable to Korean culture," and "Co-teachers are helpful and informative." In the same vein, several NESTs on the dissatisfied side point out some KETs' unsupportive and uncooperative manner as the reason of dissatisfaction with co-teaching. One NEST also mentions that both teachers need to have a clear idea of what should be taught for creating contentable co-teaching classes. Finally, satisfied reasons presented by students

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

are they can learn about foreign cultures from NESTs and they can reduce anxiety of speaking with foreigners. Some students' responses are "My speaking ability is improving," "I can lessen my anxiety," and "My NEST teaches foreign cultures." On the dissatisfied side, students note that the class is often very noisy and they feel difficulty to follow what the NEST says.

Judging from the participants' responses, across the board the satisfaction with co-teaching is above par, and all three participant groups are well aware of the effectiveness of co-teaching in affective domains as well as cognitive ones.

TABLE 2

Satisfaction with Co-teaching

Question	Options	Responses		
		KET	NEST	Student
		N(%)	*N*(%)	*N*(%)
Are you satisfied with co-teaching at your school?	① Strongly agree	4(7)	2(6.5)	27(10.3)
	② Agree	29(50.9)	21(67.7)	116(44.4)
	③ NA / ND	20(35.1)	6(19.4)	90(34.5)
	④ Disagree	4(7)	0	20(7.7)
	⑤ Strongly disagree	0	2(6.5)	8(3.1)

Note. NA / ND stands for 'neither agree nor disagree'.

Effective parts of co-teaching

In order to analyze 'effective areas of co-teaching,' categorical multiple responses analysis was used. As shown in Table 3, the number of responses is twice as many as original participant numbers since they are asked to select two choices among eight exemplars. KETs consider speaking as the most effective part, followed by listening and culture. In the case of NESTs, they select listening as the most beneficial part, and then culture and speaking. In students' responses, they also think of listening as the most effective part, followed by speaking, and culture. Both NESTs and students think students taking co-teaching classes could improve their listening ability most effectively while KETs believe that speaking is the area that co-teaching classes provide most help. Although the ranking of their choices is a bit different, they all agree that the three parts of listening, speaking, and culture can be much more effective than the other options. Considering the leading position of English as an intercultural language as well as an international language, the top three areas chosen could be crucial for students to be equipped to have the qualities for becoming global citizens in their future.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

TABLE 3

Multiple Responses Analysis on Effective Parts of Co-teaching

Question	Options	Responses		
		KET *N*(%)	NEST *N*(%)	Student *N*(%)
What parts do you think are most effective **for students** in co-teaching? **(Choose two exemplars.)**	① Reading	1(0.9)	0	28(5.4)
	② Listening	32(28.1)	19(30.6)	174(33.3)
	③ Speaking	44(38.6)	12(19.4)	154(29.5)
	④ Writing	1(0.9)	1(1.6)	16(3.1)
	⑤ Vocabulary	2(1.8)	6(9.7)	28(5.4)
	⑥ Grammar	2(1.8)	3(4.8)	12(2.3)
	⑦ Culture	28(24.6)	18(29.0)	104(19.9)
	⑧ Others	2(1.8)	1(1.6)	6(1.1)

Beneficial parts of successful co-teaching

In line with the question asking effective parts of co-teaching, the participants are asked to present their perceptions for 'beneficial parts' provided that co-teaching is crowned with success. As for the question of 'increasing students' English capability', both teacher groups and students display significantly different responses (F=9.405, *Sig.*=.000). Both groups of KETs and NESTs think students can improve their English ability through co-teaching; 42 KETs (73.7%) and 20 NESTs (64.6%). Students' responses, by contrast, do not show strong confidence in the co-teaching benefits; 146 students (56%). Kim (2009) also reveals students' low expectation for improving their English ability; among 349 students, half of them or more than half of the students showed negative responses to the expectation of raising their English ability. Yet it may be possible that such differences are caused by the different perspectives on language proficiency. That is, English capability can be differently defined to each group. For instance, teachers can refer to it as a wider range of English competence including pragmatic, lexical competence, or general English ability while students can restrict it to specific parts of the language such as listening and reading or test scores.

'Promoting students' learning motivation' is another area that shows different views between two teachers groups and students (F=20.809, *Sig.*=.000). Many of the KETs (44, 79%) and NESTs (25, 67.8%) believe that co-teaching promotes students' motivation a

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

lot while students' responses illustrate they do not to a great degree perceive the advantage of co-teaching in terms of their motivation, contrary to a previous study of Kil (2004). There is also a significant difference in 'promoting students' class participation' (F=7.815, *Sig.*=.000). The two teacher groups show their positive awareness of the benefits of co-teaching facilitating students' active participation while students do not; 44 KETs (77.1%), 25 NESTs (80.6%), and 133 students (50.9%). With the results, it can be inferred that at first, students might be interested in the presence of NESTs which may make their motivation high and class engagement active. As times go by, however, this effect would gradually decrease and thus there should be other essential and educational factors to stimulate students' interest in co-teaching classes. Teachers need to be aware that co-teaching itself does not promote students' motivation and participation in class, and they should make additional efforts to get those benefits from co-teaching. Concerning 'raising students' cross-cultural awareness', the higher percentage of the teacher groups think students can raise their cross-cultural perspectives than the student group do so; approximately 80% of KETs (44, 79%) and NESTs (26, 83.9%), and 57.9% of the students (*N*=151). All the participant groups, however, are generally likely to share the idea that NESTs can act as real live informers of foreign culture and can impart their cultural knowledge or experiences to students more vividly and accurately.

Overall, the two teacher groups seem to have more positive beliefs on co-teaching as providers than the student group as recipients of it.

Qualities needed for NESTs

First, the two teacher groups consider 'understanding Korean English education' more important than the student group; 52 KETS (91.3%), 27 NESTs (87.1%), and 139 students (53.3%). These findings may result from a deeper understanding of teachers on the importance of overall education policies and educational systems, which could lead to their decision to plan and implement co-teaching class. It is thought that students do not need to much consider those educational factors because of their position as educational consumers. In order to develop this quality, opportunities to learn Korean English education should be offered to NESTs as well as KETs through teacher training programs, e-learning education, or guidance books. Such information will help teachers grasp a main stream of Korean English education, which can lead to well-organized preparations and implementation for co-teaching classes.

On the quality of 'knowledge on teaching methods', teachers generally regard it as one of the much needed qualities of NESTs; 52 KETs (91.9%), 24 NESTs (77.5%), and 148 students (56.8%). These responses may come from the fact that the most NEST participants of this study have less than five years of teaching experiences (27, 87.1%)

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

and less than two years of co-teaching experiences (24, 77.4%). In addition, many of them do not have language-related major backgrounds even though they have completed some certificate courses, which might be a sign of not having enough knowledge on teaching methods. In the same context, Kang and Kim (2011) also support the idea that a stronger screening system checking the quality of language theory and teaching methods should be executed. Since both groups of teachers recognize the importance of possessing the knowledge of teaching methods as one of the much needed qualities of NESTs, diverse teaching methods need to be trained for NESTs by providing a variety of well-planned workshops, programs, and demonstrations of successful teaching cases. Regarding the co-teaching trainings, 27 NESTs (87.1%) respond they have taken some programs in Korea. Even though it is a small portion, the figures of those who have not taken co-teaching training programs cannot be ignored in that in most cases they are in their first or second year of teaching, which implies that they are not usually accustomed to education and teaching in Korea. Furthermore, among the people who participated in training programs, less than 50% of NESTs (13 out of 27) give their preference for the programs. Given the responses, it can be inferred that co-teaching programs have not been provided systematically and practically to NESTs.

As for 'cooperative attitude for KETs', 84.2% of the KETs (N=48), 100% of the NESTs (N=31), and 58.6% of the students (N=162) express their views on ① very much or ② much. One noticeable point here is that all the NESTs, without exception, perceive a supportive attitude toward their Korean co-teachers as a necessary quality for NESTs. It is encouraging that NESTs themselves are very conscious of the magnitude of two teachers' cooperation, which can results in successful co-teaching practices. Lastly, no big differences in awareness on the importance of 'understanding Korean culture' as a quality for NESTs is shown among the groups; 45 KETs (78.9%), 19 NESTs (61.3%), and students (62.1%) respond positively. Other qualities necessary for NESTs suggested by KETs through the open-ended question are awareness of teachers' duty, self-confidence, understanding students, devotion to class preparation. One NEST presents 'adaptability in the classroom' as another quality for them.

Obstacles against successful co-teaching

There is some different awareness between KETs and NESTs about culture as one of the obstacles of co-teaching practice. While only 35.1% of the KETs (N=20) think that cultural difference does have a negative influence on co-teaching, almost twice percentage of the NESTs (23, 74.2%) do so. This difference might be led by the fact that many KETs think that NESTs need to become familiar with Korean culture and follow it since it is the host culture but it is challenging for many NESTs who have had little chance to know about Korean culture to absorb the new culture within the short period

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

of time. Despite the KETs' low expectations on cultural difference as an obstacle in this study, as Kim (2010) says, well-organized orientation about both Korean culture for NESTs and NESTs' culture for KETs would help to understand each other better.

In 'communication problems', NESTs' responses reveal that they are far more cognizant of the importance of communication than KETs (29, 50.8%); all of the NESTs (31, 100%) give their answers to 'very much' or 'much'. The result can also be associated with lack of 'interaction time' between the two teacher groups. 44 KETs (77.2%) and 22 NESTs (71%) respond that not enough interaction can be a substantial constraint. Clearly, in order to understand each other better, both KETs and NESTs should more focus on their communication and secure enough time to interact with each other. It is, however, not easy to improve the current situation mainly due to a huge amount of administrative, other preparatory activities for class, or other school work. Nam's study (2011) as well shows that local teachers undergo difficulties in dealing with an overwhelming amount of administrative work as well as teaching duties, and suggests district-level systematic support for teachers in charge of co-teaching classes should be provided.

'Different predilections for teaching methods' is also perceived as a problem to many KETs and NESTs: 35 KETs (61.4%) and 24 NESTs (77.4%). These responses suggest if some meeting time is secured, more discussion time for mutual understanding on teaching methods should be allocated. Concerning 'dispute over a leading role in class', different perceptions exist between KETs and NESTs. 14 KETs (24.6%) think it as a big difficulty and a much higher percentage of the NESTs (14, 45.2%) consider it as a serious obstacle. This seems to be caused by a lack of discussion time, which leads to unclear roles between teachers and, in turn, could give much burden to NESTs who have been in different educational environments from their own countries. Without the agreement on clear roles between co-teachers, NESTs who are not accustomed to the new culture or environment of the Korean education are more likely to have difficulties.

Interviews on co-teaching practice

Three participants in each three groups were randomly selected and interviewed. Only in the student group were the participants for the interviews chosen semi-randomly based on school level: one in elementary school, another in middle school, and the other in high school. They were asked to answer the question of their general opinion about the co-teaching practice and to provide any ideas about the co-teaching practice including problems, suggestions, or anything to be considered.

The following is the response from a KET and she says that "...and they (NESTs) have used games, stimulating students' interests without any systematic plans. I think it is a big problem in that NESTs plan and implement co-teaching class without any

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

understanding of overall Korean English education and its curriculum". While KETs mostly point out the problematic teaching methods of NESTs in an interview, NESTs express the difficulties of class management and communication problems caused by not enough interaction time. A NEST says, "... I think that it would be much more difficult to manage my classroom, if I didn't have co-teacher with me helping me keep the students in chat. It is possible in smaller groups. But the classes I teach during the day are around 36-40 students I guess. ... I guess the main problem is sometimes not enough communication between co-teachers which is hard because of scheduling ".

In the interviews, one elementary student replies, "Well, I like my NEST very much. Sometimes, I do not understand English well. But when translation is given by the KET, I feel good ..." while the other two students from one middle school and one high school display somewhat negative responses toward co-teaching classes. The middle school student says that "I do not comprehend the NESTs at all and when the KET translates them into Korean, I understand them. I prefer the KETs' solo-teaching which makes me much more comfortable. The high school student is aware of the advantage of co-teaching but he seems to be more sensitive its contribution to his academic performance. He says, "... I am not sure this co-teaching class helps my English ability to develop. I think it has nothing to do with academic reports. Anyway, the class is interesting but it is not beneficial to my grade."

2. Perceptions on Planning for Co-teaching

Perceptions on participation of KETs and NESTs

As shown in Table 4, as for the 'KETs' participation', only 31.6% of the KETs (N=18) and 22.6% of the NESTs (N=7) perceive KETs' active involvement in planning co-teaching. On the other hand, the result of 'NESTs' participation' is quite different. 40 KETs (70.1%) and 29 NESTs (93.5%) evaluate NESTs' contribution to planning co-teaching 'high' or 'very high'. It is noticeable that almost all the NESTs themselves perceive their efforts to plan co-teaching as a high level and consider themselves active agents of co-teaching. In sum, both teacher groups agree on the views of KETs' and NESTs' participation when planning for co-teaching; that is, low KETs' and high NESTs' participation in planning for co-teaching, indicating that much greater effort for preparing co-teaching by the KETs is required.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

TABLE 4

Perceptions on KETs' and NESTs' Participation

Questions	Options	Responses	
		KET	NEST
		N(%)	*N*(%)
KETs' participation	① Very much	1(1.8)	6(19.4)
	② Much	17(29.8)	1(3.2)
	③ NM / NL	22(38.6)	19(61.3)
	④ Little	16(28.1)	5(16.1)
	⑤ Very little	1(1.8)	0
NESTs' participation	① Very much	8(14.0)	16(51.6)
	② Much	32(56.1)	13(41.9)
	③ NM / NL	16(28.1)	2(6.5)
	④ Little	1(1.8)	0
	⑤ Very little	0	0

Note. NM / NL stands for 'neither much nor little'.

This tendency emerges in 'material preparation' and 'lesson planning' as well. 61.3% of the NESTs (*N*=19) are aware that they often or very often prepare materials for class, whereas 22.8% of the KETs (*N*=13) do so showing significant differences (F=22.498, *Sig.*=.000). Similarly, while 25 NESTs (80.6%) perceive that they write lesson plans often or very often, only thirteen KETs (22.8%) respond they write lesson plans for co-teaching classes (F=22.498, *Sig.*=.000.). This problem of lack of KETs' participation can naturally be solved by having enough pre or follow-up discussions and making clear role distributions between KETs and NESTs. There might also be a possibility that other causes such as a bad relationship between co-teachers, KETs' heavy workload, and lack of time block discussions, thus posing the problems. Therefore, the education authorities and local schools should also try to figure out what obstacles block KETs' engagement in such preparation activities and reformat the situations by uprooting those problems.

Frequency and length of discussion between KETs and NESTs

Not many discussions for planning co-teaching are made between KETs and NESTs. 56.1% of the KETs (*N*=32) and 41.9% of the NESTs (*N*=13) have discussions for co-teaching once a week, and 22.8% of the KETs (*N*=13) and 38.7% of the NESTs (*N*=12)

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

have two or three discussions a week. Only three KETs (5.3%) and NESTs (16.3%) each have discussion on their co-teaching classes more than four times a week. In addition, nine KETs and one NEST respond that they do not have any pre-discussion for co-teaching, which can cause serious problems on overall co-teaching practice, not only on planning aspects. As for the discussion time at a meeting, both KET and NEST groups respond that they spend about 30 minutes for one meeting.

An interesting point is that even though more than half of the KETs respond they discuss with NESTs just once a week, the similar number of KETs (30, 52.7%) perceive they have pre-planning talks with NESTs often or very often. Unlike KETs' responses, the opposite remains true in the NESTs' responses. Similar to the response of discussion frequency, quite a few NESTs (19, 60.3%) think they make discussions little or very little. From the findings above, it can be inferred that KETs think both teachers exchange their opinions sufficiently, while NESTs do not. To bridge the awareness gap, teachers themselves ponder over the frequency and content quality of the meetings and if not sufficient or adequate, the level of talks and meeting frequency should be raised up to the extent to which both groups feel satisfied. In a similar vein, Nam (2011) emphasizes on providing clear guidelines for NESTs who have no proper channel to share their teaching experiences or to exchange ideas on co-teaching.

Obstacles for co-teaching planning

The responses confirm that NESTs (18, 58.1%) more seriously perceive the problem of 'not enough communication' than KETs (20, 35.1%) do, showing statistically significant difference (F=6.314, *Sig.*=0.14).

Both KETs and NESTs consider 'NESTs' personal predisposition' as a more grave constraint than 'NESTs' culture'. 29 KETs (50.9%) and sixteen NESTs (51.6%) think of personal propensity as a big obstacle whereas 22 KETs (38.6%) and eleven NESTs (35.5%) consider NESTs' culture as a major obstacle for effective co-teaching. Interestingly, the similar results appear in the questions of 'NESTs' lacking knowledge of Korean culture' and 'NESTs' lacking knowledge on KETs' personal propensity'. 31.6% of the KETs (N=18) and 35.5% of the NESTs (N=11) think that in planning co-teaching, Korean culture can function as a disturbing factor, while around 15% higher KETs (26, 45.7%) and NESTs (17, 53.8%) aware that KETs' personal propensity can impede planning for co-teaching. These findings suggest that it could be helpful for both KETs and NESTs to aware that many of the challenges can be caused by individual differences. By giving some guidance books or training courses containing the problems related to not only cultural differences but also personal propensity, both teacher groups can widen their understandings on each other's differences. It is also encouraged that

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

both groups of teachers should be more open-minded about individual differences and also more adaptable attitude toward each other's culture.

In the question of local school culture, more NESTs (16, 51.6%) think of local school culture as a serious barrier than KETs (17, 29.8%). For a better co-teaching planning, NESTs need to be informed of their own local school culture. It would be helpful for NESTs to have ideas on what they can do or not at school, what school atmosphere they will be in, and what educational aims or values the school pursues after. Especially in early days of NESTs' school life, it is necessary for KETs to give the information on the local school culture, which could to a great extent help NESTs plan for co-teaching. In the same context, Park and Kim (2000) also emphasized systematic training programs to help NESTs' understanding of local school culture and students, which can be naturally related to the quality of co-teaching.

Interviews on planning for co-teaching

On planning for co-teaching, only teachers (KETs and NESTs) are interviewed since students are not applicable in this area. They were expected to provide their own opinions about planning for co-teaching and to tell any ideas including problems, suggestions, or anything to be considered when preparing for co-teaching with specific examples, if possible.

Almost the same problems or suggestions are pointed out in interviews as presented in the survey results. First of all, in interviews with the KETs, all of them point out not enough discussions or communication as a big problem in planning for co-teaching. Other than insufficient communication between KETs and NESTs, KETs also think KETs' low English ability and educational authorities' responsibility evasion are other obstacles for co-teaching planning. More specifically, a KET responses, "At my school, much time cannot be spent on discussions with the NEST because all KETs take charge of administrative work or homeroom teacher duty. In many cases, NESTs are asked to plan co-teaching classes and KETs just listen to how the classes will proceed. Then, KETs suggest their opinions or advice to NESTs".

NESTs present a variety of opinions about planning co-teaching such as the importance of matched-up scheduling for planning co-teaching, feeling comfortable when KETs let the NEST plan for co-teaching as he pleases, difficulties resulted from no rules for planning co-teaching, and calling upon more active involvement of KETs. The following is the response from one of the NESTs. He states that "Not sure if there's one set of rules for a proper plan for co-teaching. Each school is different. Each school has their own agenda as far as teaching materials ... Be open to listen to their [NESTs'] ideas and past experiences. ... Go down the middle with the NESTs, go 50–50 with your ideas. That usually works best. You might have to meet more than once a week, two or three

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

times a week, but later if you guys have good techniques for teaching, then once a month or twice a month will be enough".

3. Perceptions on Co-teaching Implementation

Factors to be considered during co-teaching implementation

The participants consider 'students' interest' and 'their participation' important, marking the highest or next highest factor to be considered in implementing co-teaching. 54 KETs (94.7%), 28 NESTs (90.3%), and 206 students (78.9%) count students' interest to be highly considered, and 54 KETs (94.7%), 31 NESTs (100%), and 203 students (77.7%) think students participation should be considered. In fact, students in general self-perceive their class participation as pretty active. 137 students (52.5%) reply that they participate in their co-teaching classes actively and less than a fifth of the students (50, 19.1%) select little or very little. That is, many of the students (203, 77.7%) do have awareness of the importance of their participation in co-teaching class, whereas their actual participation (137, 52.5%) is much lower, reflecting the existing gap between ideal and reality. Likewise, concerning students' interest in co-teaching class, despite their perceptions on the importance of interest in class, students do not show strong interest in co-teaching (151, 57.9%). The results represent that the current co-teaching practice has not proven to be effective in terms of students' interest. Thus, there can be much room for promoting students' utilizing various measures such as introducing new class activities, changing teaching methods, and developing interesting materials.

As for 'the level of students' English capability', there are opinion gaps between NESTs and the other groups. 74.2% of the NESTs (N=23) think that they need to consider students' English level much or very much during co-teaching class, while much lower portion of the KETs (28, 49.1%) and students (100, 38.3%) think like that way. It may be because students feel they can rely on KETs even if they do not understand NESTs' talks, and KETs think they can help students by giving Korean translation, or other kinds of feedback or guidance. For these reasons, it appears that students' low level of English do not much matter to KETs and students themselves. In the case of NESTs, however, they have to heavily count on students' English responses during classes in order to proceed with the class because most of them do not know much about Korean.

Almost all of the teachers and a lot of students are well aware of the importance of 'cooperation between participating teachers'; 91.2% of the KETs (N=52), 100% of the NESTs (N=31), and 66.7% of the students (N=172). Given the results, the two teacher groups seem to be more aware of the importance of their cooperation during co-teaching than the student group. In 'teachers' ability to control class', all the participating groups

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

consider both KETs' and NESTs' class management ability important. On each KETs' and NESTs' class control ability, 40 (70.1%) and 40 (70.1%) KETs, 29 (93.5%) and 24 (77.4%) NESTs, and 164 (62.9%) and 175 (67.1%) students respectively respond positively to their importance. Differently from the results of previous studies which put an emphasis only on KETs' role of controlling class (Kim & Kim, 2010; Park, 2010), it is suggestive that NESTs as well as KETs need to develop their ability to control co-teaching class as a main teacher.

Opportunity to speak English and co-teaching in comparison with KETs' solo-teaching

Students' answers on 'actual opportunities to speak English' during co-teaching class are as follows: ① very much (11, 4.2%), ② much (60, 23.0%), ③ neither much nor little (113, 43.4%), ④ little (56, 21.5%) and ⑤ very little (21, 8.0%). Even though students are well aware that speaking skill can be one of the most effectively handled areas compared to other areas such as reading, grammar, and writing (refer to Table 2), they perceive that not many chances to speak English are actually given. Only 71 students (27.2%) perceive that they have many chances to talk in English, answering to very much or much. In order to meet students' expectations, more opportunities to speak English should be given to students.

In comparison with KETs' solo-teaching, approximately half of the students (136, 52.1%) are satisfied with co-teaching responding to very much or much. This shows students' slight liking for co-teaching over KETs' solo-teaching. Similar results are also shown in Kang and Kim's study (2011) even though they investigated only KETs' opinions. Although students are generally more content with co-teaching than KET's solo-teaching, we should not ignore that fact that around 40% of the students (101, 38.7%) feel not much difference between co-teaching and KETs' solo teaching and 24 students (9.2%) even express their negative thoughts on co-teaching over KETs' solo teaching. The students' responses are somewhat disappointing considering the characteristics of EFL settings where fewer chances of authentic use of English and the ultimate purpose of co-teaching for enhancing students' communicative competence. Without much effort from education authorities and all the co-teaching participant groups to make better co-teaching lessons, fewer affirmative responses would be expected in the coming years.

Obstacles in co-teaching implementation

First of all, NESTs (26, 83.9%) more believe than the other groups (KETs: 24, 42.1%, students: 96, 36.8%) that co-teaching class would be very difficult without KETs' control ability. On the other hand, a slightly lower number of NESTs (23, 74.2%) and

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

much higher number of KETs (36, 63.1%) and students (131, 50.2%) think that it is not easy to implement co-teaching without NESTs ability to manage class. This implies that NESTs tend to rely on KETs' class management ability partly because of their lack of Korean ability. All the participant groups, however, including even the NEST group think that NESTs' class controlling skills need to be enhanced.

As for 'students' low English capability', there is a large gap between the teacher groups and the student group. 57.9% of the KETs (N=33) and 67.7% of the NESTs (N=21) show their perceptions of difficulty in implementing co-teaching class when students have low English ability. Around three-quarters of the students (190, 72.9%), however, respond that their low English level is not a big problem in implementing co-teaching. The students seem to feel that it is their teachers' responsibility, not the matter of their own English proficiency, to make better co-teaching classes.

In response to the open-ended question, one KET emphasizes the impromptu communication and decision-making ability, saying "Co-teaching class does not always proceed as planned. So, spontaneous communication and decision-making is necessary during class". One NEST points out misunderstanding between teachers mainly caused by KETs' low English ability as another obstacle in co-teaching implementation, and one student writes down that the current university entrance exam system itself makes it hard to implement conversational-oriented classes.

Interviews on co-teaching implementation

Regarding co-teaching implementation, the randomly selected participants of KETs, NESTs, and students were required to give their opinions about implementing co-teaching at school including problems, suggestions, or anything else that they feel should be considered during co-teaching classes.

The interviews conducted show the different perceptions between teacher and student groups. While KETs and NESTs commonly points out the possibility that students can disturb co-teaching implementation due to their low English ability and misbehaviors such as making noises, students think the success of implementation depends on teachers' roles related to classroom activities, teaching procedures, and KETs' translation. A KET respondent strongly insists that students should have a more serious attitude for co-teaching class. She mentions that a lot of students tend to think co-teaching classes as their break time rather than regular classes. This may diminish the potentially positive effects of co-teaching for improving students' communicative competence, making teachers spend more time managing the class and less time providing actual opportunities of using English. One NEST puts stress on the necessity of setting disciplines for co-teaching and of KETs' more English use, saying "There is no clear structure for co-teaching. … I didn't see any teachers discuss the rules of the

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

classroom or what punishment they can get. ... They [KETs] only speak in Korean, which I think it is fine, but they need to speak in English as well". In addition, most of the teacher interviewees regardless of KETs and NESTs also suggest that they need to set clearer roles during the class and clearer structures of classroom rules at the beginning of the semester and to share ideas about good co-teaching models.

The elementary school student complains about the difficulty in understanding NESTs' instruction during class and underscores the importance of KETs' translation ability. This is exactly the same as the high school interviewee's response, implying that students taking co-teaching classes regardless of their school levels might be in trouble following what NESTs say and heavily rely on their KETs translation. The middle school student also thinks that how teachers instruct is really matters than anything else. The student from a middle school remarks the importance of interesting classroom activities. She states that "I think classroom activities are very important. When they are fun, students are likely to engage in the activities more actively and present their ideas in English".

V. CONCLUSION

The present study is designed to explore the perceptions of NESTs, KETs and students on general practice, planning, and implementation of co-teaching, which can be a basis on making a better co-teaching practice in Korea. The major findings are presented as follows.

Firstly, all the three groups are in general satisfied with co-teaching class in terms of its effectiveness on affective as well as cognitive domains, although students show their slight liking for it over KETs' solo-teaching. Especially in students' motivation and class participation, their English capability, and cross-cultural awareness, the two teacher groups seem to have more positive beliefs on co-teaching than the student group. The top three effective parts shared by all the participant groups are listening, speaking, and culture. The check is that although speaking skill is one of the effectively handled areas, students perceive that not many chances to talk in English are given in class.

Secondly, some qualities including understanding Korean English education, teaching method knowledge, cooperation with KETs, and understanding Korean culture are generally perceived necessary for NESTs. On the aspect of cooperation, almost equally-shared obstacles by the two teacher groups are lack of interaction time and different predilections for teaching methods. In the areas of cultural difference, communication problem, and leading role dispute, however, KETs do not strongly consider them obstructive on co-teaching than NESTs.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

In planning co-teaching, there is low KETs' and high NESTs' participation, indicating that much greater effort for preparing material and lesson planning. As for the frequency of discussion, while NESTs feel more discussions should be made for the planning phase, KETs think otherwise. Similarly, this tendency is also shown in the obstacles for co-teaching planning; NESTs more seriously perceive not enough communication and local school culture as big problems than KETs. In addition, compared with cultural factors, personal propensity is more considered as an obstacle for effective co-teaching.

Finally, when implementing co-teaching, all the participant groups consider important students' interest and their participation, although students, in reality, show much less participation and interest in co-teaching class than should be. Moreover, all of the groups are well aware of the importance of cooperation between participating teachers and both KETs' and NESTs' ability to control class. They also share the idea that NESTs' class controlling skills need to be improved.

Based on the major findings presented earlier, the following suggestions are made. To begin with, more practical and helpful programs and conferences for co-teachers should be made, which offer opportunities for learning English education in Korea, useful teaching methods, or successful teaching experiences. Second, teachers need to have enough discussions in order to make role distribution clear, to get to know their local school culture, to figure out what students need, and to elicit more active teachers' participation. Third, when recruiting or training NESTs, the three prior qualities should be primarily focused on: teaching method knowledge, cooperation with KETs, and understanding Korean culture. In all these suggestions, the active involvement of the education authorities is required.

Despite the limitation of participant number, this study can be a basis of decision making in co-teaching policies on the following aspects. It investigated and analyzed the responses from all the participating groups (KETs, NESTs, and students), by using interviews as well as questionnaires, and dealt with more detailed parts of co-teaching planning and implementation than other studies. In conclusion, to improve the current co-teaching practice, not only the education authorities should take a variety of opinions from KETs, NESTs and students, but all the co-teaching participants also need to make efforts to establish a better environment beneficial to both teacher and student group.

REFERENCES

Baek, S. Y. (2012). *Use of the SPSS for applied linguistics in English Education.* Chonnam National University Press.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Buckely, F. J. (2000). *Team teaching: What, why and how?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Chung, G. J., Min, C. K., & Park, M. R. (1999). A study of team teaching for the utility of the native English teachers in the elementary and the secondary school. *English Teaching, 54*(2), 201-227.

Goetz, K. (2000). Perspectives on team teaching. *Egallery, 1(*4). Retrieved on June 17, 2012, from http://people.ucalgary.ca/~egallery/goetz.html

Graddol, D. (2006). *English Next.* London: The British Council.

Jeon, I. J. (2010). Exploring the co-teaching practice of native and non-native English teachers in Korea. *English Teaching*, *65*(3), 43-67.

Kang, S. C., & Kim, J. H. (2011). The effects of native English teacher policy and the proper improvement principle of the native English teacher in high schools. *Modern English Education, 12*(2), 49-73.

Kil, I. S. (2004). Effects on English learners' affective factors in team teaching by a native English teacher and a Korean English teacher. *The British & American Language and Literature. 20*(2), 35-54.

Kim, G. Y., & Kim, E. J. (2010). Guest English teachers' perceptions regarding Korean English teachers' practices during team teaching classes. *Foreign Language Education, 17*(3), 297-321.

Kim, H. Y. (2010). *A study on native English-speaking assistant teacher's teaching qualities and qualification*. Unpublished master's thesis. Sookmyung Women's University, Seoul.

Kim, J. O. (2009). Effective Models of English Team Teaching in Korean Middle Schools. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 15(3)*, 105-127.

Kim, J. R. (2011). A meta-analysis of English KT and NT team teaching effects. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society, 10*(3), 91-113.

Kim, M. H. (2011). Exploring native English speaking teachers' voices about co-teaching. *English Teaching, 66*(4), 27-52.

Kim, M. H. (2010a). How do native English-speaking teachers perceive co-teaching? *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics, 26*(4), 213-249.

Kim, M. H. (2010b). A narrative inquiry of a Korean English teachers' first journey through co-teaching. *English Teaching, 65*(4), 179-207.

Lee, H. S. (2009). *The Study of English Language Teaching and Learning.* Seoul: English Moumou.

Nam, H. H. (2011). The challenges native English-speaking teachers face in Korean secondary schools. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 17*(2), 59-77.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Park, H. Y. (2010), An analysis of native and nonnative English teachers' perception on their role in elementary school settings of co-teaching. *English Language Teaching, 22*(4), 133-163.

Park, J. S., & Kim, D. J. (2000). Pedagogical effects of team teaching with native speakers: An experiment to compare alternative teaching models. *Foreign Languages Education, 7*(1), 97-121.

Shim, J. W., & Kim, Y. I. (2010). Students' perceptions of team teaching and participating teachers' role recognition. *Modern English Education 11*(1), 51-67.

Won, E. S., Lee, J. B., & Jeong, D. B. (2008). A survey of teaching stresses of native English teachers: Based on teachers engaged in N university. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 15*(1), 229-249.

Yeon, J. H. (1996). Woneomingwaui hyeopdong sueobeul tonghan uisasotong neunglyeog hyangsang bangan [Suggestions for enhancing communicative competence through co-teaching with native speakers of English]. *English Language and Literature Teaching, 2*, 25-80.

Yoo, B. (2009). Problematic issues experienced by native and Korean English teachers in the process of team teaching at middle schools in Korea. *Journal of the Korean English Education Society, 8*(2), 57-72.

APPENDIX

Examples of Questionnaire for Native English-Speaking Teacher(NEST)

▶ About the practice of co-teaching
Please put a check mark(√) on ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ in the following items.

1.1 Are you satisfied with co-teaching at your school?
① Strongly agree ② Agree ③ Neither agree nor disagree
④ Disagree ⑤ Strongly disagree
1.2 Why do you think so? _____

2. What parts do you think are most effective for students in co-teaching? (Choose two.)
① Reading ② Listening ③ Speaking ④ Writing
⑤ Vocabulary ⑥ Grammar ⑦ Culture ⑧ Others:

3. For a better co-teaching, to what extent do you think the following qualities are needed for you (NEST)?

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

	← very much				very little →
(1) Knowledge on teaching methods	①	②	③	④	⑤
(2) Teaching experiences	①	②	③	④	⑤
(3) Systematic planning for class	①	②	③	④	⑤

4. If co-teaching is successful, to what extent do you think it is helpful to the following parts?

	← very much				very little →
(1) Increasing students' English capability	①	②	③	④	⑤
(2) Promoting students' learning motivation	①	②	③	④	⑤
(3) Promoting Students' class participation	①	②	③	④	⑤

5. To what extent do you think the following struggles between NEST and KET(s) make co-teaching difficult?

	← very much				very little →
(1) NESTs' uncooperative attitude	①	②	③	④	⑤
(2) KETs' uncooperative attitude	①	②	③	④	⑤
(3) Cultural difference	①	②	③	④	⑤

▶ About planning for co-teaching

1.1 To what extent do you think you (NEST) participate in planning for co-teaching?

① Very much ② Much ③ Neither much nor little
④ Little ⑤ Very little

1.2 To what extent do you think KETs participate in planning for co-teaching?

① Very much ② Much ③ Neither much nor little
④ Little ⑤ Very little

2. How often do you meet to discuss co-teaching class per week? If any, how long are they on average?

① more than 6 times ② 5−4 times ③ 3−2 times
④ once ⑤ never

▶ About co-teaching implementation

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

1. To be a successful co-teaching, to what extent do you think the following factors should be considered during co-teaching implementation?

	← very much				very little →
(1) Cooperation between participating teachers	①	②	③	④	⑤
(2) Effective use on material(s)	①	②	③	④	⑤
(3) NESTs' ability to control class	①	②	③	④	⑤

3.To what extent do you think the following struggles in implementing co-teaching make co-teaching difficult?

	← very much				very little →
(1) NESTs' inability to control class	①	②	③	④	⑤
(2) KETs' inability to control class	①	②	③	④	⑤
(3) Students' low English capability	①	②	③	④	⑤

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Primary & Secondary

Hyeok Jin Cheon
SangMu High School
Minjuro 32, Gwangju 502–859, South Korea
Tel: (062) 530–2430
Email: hg-jja@hanmail.net

Jee Hyun Ma
Department of English Education, Chonnam National University
Yongbongro 77, Gwangju 500–757, South Korea
Tel: (062) 530–2445
Email: jeehyun@jnu.ac.kr

Received in July, 2013
Reviewed in August, 2013
Revised version received in September, 2013

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre