*영어어문교육, 14*권 **4**호 **2008**년 겨울

EPIK and NEST-NNEST Collaboration in Korea Revisited*

Joo-Kyung Park
(Honam University)

Park, Joo-Kyung. (2008). EPIK and NEST-NNEST collaboration in Korea revisited. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 14*(4), 141-160.

English language teaching (ELT) in Korea has gone through a lot of changes and challenges. Recently, team teaching as a form of teacher collaboration has emerged as a solution to meet them in Asian ELT contexts, such as Japan, Korea, Hong Kong and Taiwan. Starting in 1995, team teaching has been implemented in Korea mainly through English Program in Korea (EPIK), a government project to recruit native English language instructors to teach in Korean elementary and secondary schools. However, it does not seem to have been as effective and successful as expected. Based on the review of the literature, this paper examines 1) the definition of collaboration and team teaching; 2) major factors of successful collaboration; 3) major issues and concerns with EPIK; and 4) suggestions for effective NEST-NNEST collaboration. The paper argues that the native-speakerism or the native speaker myth deep-rooted in the Korean society is one of the biggest obstacles in making NEST-NNEST collaboration successful in Korean ELT contexts. It is suggested that the duties and responsibilities, and qualification requirements of NESTs be redefined and both NESTs and NNESTs be provided with proper education for intercultural understanding and collaborative teaching.

[collaboration/EPIK/native English-speaking teacher (NEST)/non-native English-speaking teacher (NNEST)]

I. INTRODUCTION

For the past two decades, English language teaching has gone through a lot of changes, challenges, and paradigm shift which were particularly driven by globalization and the emergence of English as a global language among all the major driving forces. Educational

* The earlier versions of this paper were presented in Park (2007a, 2007b).

goals and approaches have been reshaped for enhancing communicative competence and a lot of innovations have been made and implemented in ELT contexts. They include teaching English in elementary schools, using information technology, English immersion programs, collaborative teaching between the first and the second language speakers, to name a few. English language teachers are demanded to keep abreast of these recent developments on the one hand and to fight against all the ELT-related myths and fallacies deep-rooted in their own teaching contexts and cultures on the other hand, in order to accomplish their professional missions.

In recent years, team teaching which makes foreign and local English teachers work together in English classrooms has been particularly prevalent in several East Asian countries such as Japan, Korea, Hong Kong and Taiwan in response to the impact of English as a global language (Nunan, 2003). For these countries, importation of foreign teachers from English-speaking countries to co-teach with local English teachers is viewed as an educational policy that can bring authentic language input to EFL classrooms, facilitate cross-cultural communication, enhance students' English ability, and promote local teachers' professional development (Carless, 2002, 2004, 2006; Sturman, 1992; Tajino & Tajino, 2000; Tajino & Walker, 1998; Yukawa, 1994, cited in Tsai, 2007).

Team teaching has been implemented in Korean ELT through English Program in Korea (EPIK). EPIK is a government-funded project to recruit native English-speaking teachers (NEST) to teach in Korean elementary and secondary schools in collaboration with Korean teachers of English (KTE). It is co-sponsored by the Korean Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MEST), and the Korean Provincial Offices of Education (POEs). EPIK can be said to be a Korean version of the Japan Exchange and Teaching Program (JET). It was expected that students would get exposed to authentic English input and motivated to learn English by having NESTs in their EFL classrooms. It was formally launched in 1995 with 51 EPIK participants from 6 countries including U.S.A, U.K., Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland. The number increased to 632 in 1996 and then was reduced to 348 in 1998 due to the economic crisis that hit the nation in 1997. In the EPIK, native English teachers are called English Language Instructors (ELI) (Choi, 1996).

After a short-term stagnation, the number of NESTs invited to Korea has been increasing. Recently, the Korean government declared that in order to systematically establish an English education infrastructure in Korea, NESTs will be dispatched to all Korean middle schools by 2010 (Kim & Ko, 2008). However, it has been reported through research, media, and anecdotes that NESTs or ELIs have not only brought some positive effects into our EFL classrooms but also created lots of issues and problems. The purpose of this paper is to review how collaboration is defined and what the literature says about the influencing factors on successful teacher collaboration. Then, based on the literature review, it

examines the major issues and concerns with EPIK and NEST-NNEST collaboration in Korea and makes suggestions on how to make teacher collaboration more effective and successful in Korean ELT contexts.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Definition

According to *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (2001), Third Edition, 'collaboration' is defined as 'the act of working together with another person or group to achieve something, especially in science or art.' Team teaching as a form of teacher collaboration has long been implemented in education. Sometimes synonymous with co-teaching or collaborative teaching, it features teachers' collective efforts aiming to improve teaching quality and students' performance (Tsai, 2007). Team teaching refers to two or more teachers working together in the same classroom for instructional purposes in a particular subject or combination of subject. It is illustrated as "two sides of a coin. Without both, it has no value; team teaching is a piece of fruit cake...it has a lot of ingredients, and takes time to mature" (Shannon & Meath-Lang, 1992, p. 138). The term 'team teaching' is also used to describe collaboration in schools and it is made up of four key components: 1) two or more educators; 2) delivery of meaningful instruction; 3) diverse groups of students; and 4) common settings (Cook & Friend, 1996; Kluwin, Gonsher, Silver & Samuels, 1996). Then, team teaching involves two or more teachers that are collaborating on the design, implementation, and evaluation of the same course (Hatch & Hinton, 1996). For the most part, team teaching requires a team to organize the content and procedures of an entire course and achieve a common instructional goal for an entire course (Wang, 2007).

According to Tsai (1997), the purposes of team teaching suggested in the literature include providing students with authentic language input and culture (Jorden & Walton, 1987), incorporating language and content instruction (Crandall, 1998; O'Loughlin, 2003; Snow, Met & Genesee, 1989), and integrating language minority or ESL students into mainstream classrooms (Becker, 2001; Coltrane, 2002; de Jong, 1996). Anderson and Speck (1998) confirmed its positive effect on student learning as students taught by two teachers collaboratively have more access to teachers' assistance, multiple perspectives on teaching methods and materials, and opportunities of class participation.

2. Types of Team Teaching

Different types of team teaching have been suggested in the literature. Cunningham (1960) suggested four types of team teaching: 1) Team leader type which refers to one team member to have higher status than other members; 2) Associate type in which no one is appointed to be a leader and team members are equal to participate in goal setting and syllabus design and to share ideas to achieve an instructional objective; 3) Master teacher/beginning teacher type in which a novice teacher works with an experienced teacher; 4) Coordinate team type in which two or more teachers participate in different sections of a language course and they jointly design course activities for different groups of students.

Five types of team teaching were suggested in Friend and Reising (1993): 1) Lead and support type in which one teacher leads the whole class and makes all the decisions regarding the lesson objectives and classroom activities, whereas the other teacher supports the leading teacher by working with individual students or small groups in need of extra help; 2) Station teaching in which the class is divided into two groups to be taught by one teacher each and then switched to be taught by the other teacher; 3) Parallel teaching in which the class is divided into two groups and then each group is taught by one teacher independently; 4) Alternative teaching in which one teacher teaches the whole class when the other teacher teaches small groups with material for advanced or remedial students; and 5) Team teaching in which two teachers are equal in planning and teaching the lesson.

According to Bae (1997), team teaching implemented in Korean ELT contexts can be classified into four types: 1) Assistant solo-teaching which refers to teaching done by an assistant teacher of a native English-speaking teacher who teaches some specific section of a unit in the classroom without the head teacher; 2) Co-teaching which refers to teaching done by a Korean head teacher and a native English-speaking assistant teacher together. The head teacher leads the class and the assistant teacher observes the class and plays a role of conversation partner or an informant. In speaking and listening class, however, the assistant teacher leads the class and the Korean teacher serves as an interpreter when necessary; 3) Partial team teaching refers to teaching done by Korean head teacher while the assistant teacher moves around the class and help out groups with practicing English conversation; and 4) Extracurricular activity management which refers to after-school program organized and taught by a native English-speaking teacher, who teaches in several schools in the same educational district. Kim (2007) suggested that teachers need to develop their own team teaching model which reflects their own specific educational situation and the student characteristics in order to make their teaching more effective.

3. Key Factors for Successful Collaboration

De Oliveira and Richardson (2001) showed a successful case of NEST-NNEST collaboration. They claimed that collaboration with a native English-speaking teacher enables the nonnative English-speaking teacher to acquire idioms, vocabulary, and pronunciation as well as to gain sociolinguistic competence. The benefits that a native English-speaking teacher can get from the collaboration include a better understanding of the ESL/EFL learning process, an in-depth knowledge about another culture and insight into the cultural needs of students learning English. Both can reduce their individual planning time and increase their ideas and materials, and grow professionally. They suggested that "successful collaborations tend to involve a blend of personalities; collaborators must work at getting along well and learn to respect one another; both parties must recognize how much they can gain from the collaboration. A native English-speaking educator will gain just as much as a nonnative in this type of collaboration" (p. 129). The key to the success of this case of collaboration is an equally respectful relationship between the co-teachers at both personal and professional levels. They were personal friends and colleagues. They knew well about what they could give and take from each other. They consulted and coordinated together in all the phases of co-teaching.

In the same vein, Shannon and Meath-Lang (1992) suggested that successful collaboration is built on recognizing and appreciating the different gifts, skills, and expertise of the other person. Furthermore, it is built on the abilities of the collaborators to appreciate their respective differences without feeling less competent themselves. Lasley, Matczynski, and Williams (1992) explained that "in collaborative partnerships, power is shared, and goals are set by consensus" (p. 257). Clark and Watson (1998) stated that in order for a collaborative relationship to work, it is essential that the people involved let go of being the one always in power or always in the limelight. The most fundamental and common core of a successful collaboration suggested in these statements is an equal power relationship between the collaborators. Park (2007a) argued that what we need to quest, then, is whether the relationship between the first language speaking teacher and the local English speaking teacher in the educational culture and context where they are is equal or not in reality and/or in their perception.

III. RESEARCH METHOD

In this study, the EPIK information provided on its website (**http://epik.knue.ac.kr** or **http://epik.go.kr**) and the results of a number of studies conducted on EPIK and/or NEST-NNEST collaboration in Korean ELT contexts were reviewed in order to see what

major issues and concerns have been probed and what changes and developments have been made in the area in question in its 13-year history. For this purpose, studies conducted in different time periods were selected. They include Ahn, Park, and Ono (1998), Chung, Min and Park (1999), Choi (2001), Min (2006), Min and Ha (2006), Park (2006a, 2006b), Kim (2007), and Kim and Ko (2008).

IV. RESULTS

1. Duties, Responsibilities, and Qualification Requirements of NESTs

The EPIK website shows that the purposes of EPIK are 1) to foster primary and secondary students' communication ability in the age of information and globalization; 2) to provide English conversation training to English teachers; 3) to develop English textbooks and teaching materials; 4) to improve and expand English teaching methodologies; 5) to encourage cultural awareness; and 6) to better Korea's image abroad. In order to fulfill these purposes, the English language instructors (ELIs) are to take the duties and responsibilities including 1) to conduct English conversation classes for Korean teachers and students; 2) to prepare teaching materials for English language classes; 3) to assist Korean teachers of English to develop English teaching materials; 4) to assist with activities related to English language teaching and other extracurricular activities; 5) to assist Korean teachers with their English class(es) and/or jointly conduct English class(es); and 6) to perform other duties as specified by the host POE. It is obvious that the duties and responsibilities just described can be accomplished effectively and successfully by all and only those who have certain level of knowledge, skills, and experience of English language, culture and its pedagogy.

However, the following basic qualification requirements for EPIK teachers seem so far from recruiting the right people: Without requiring any professional ELT credentials, they are only 1) to be a citizen of a country where English is the primary language. By E2 visa law, EPIK teachers should have a citizenship from one of the following countries: Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States, South Africa. They must have studied from the junior high level (7th grade) and resided for at least 10 years or more in the country where English is the primary language. Ethnic Koreans with legal residency in a country where English is the primary language can apply, but must provide proof of English education beginning from the junior high school level; 2) to hold a 2 year associate degree or have completed minimum of 2 years in university; 3) to be mentally and physically healthy; 4) to have a good command of the English language; and 5) to have the ability and willingness to adapt to Korean culture and living. Recently, some changes have

been made in the requirements as shown in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1
Changes in Requirements

ELI level	Requirements	
	1995-2007	2008
Level 1+	1) Two consecutive years as a Level 1 within the same Provincial Office of Education	1) Same as before
Level 1	1) Basic requirements plus 2) 2 years of teaching experience plus any one of the following: a. Master's degree b. Teacher's/TEFL/TESOL/CELTA(100+hrs) c. Bachelor's degree in Education or English Language/Literature d. Contract renewal as Level 2+within the same POE	1) Deleted 2) Same as before
Level 2+	1) Basic requirements plus 2) Any one of the followings: a. Master's degree in any discipline, with Bachelor's in Education, English Education or English Language/Literature b. Master's degree in Education, English Education or English Language/ Literature, with Bachelor's in any discipline c. Contract renewal as a Level 2 at the same POE	1) Deleted 2) Same as before
Level 2	1) Basic requirements plus 2) Any one of the followings: a. Teacher's/TEFL/TESOL/ CELTA(100+hrs) Certificate b. Major in Education, English Education or English Language/Literature c. Bachelor's degree plus 1 yr full-time teaching experience d. Master's degree in any discipline	1) Deleted 2) Same as before

Level 3	1) Basic Requirements a. Bachelor's degree in any discipline	1) Bachelor's degree in any discipline
Level 4	Not applicable	1) Basic Requirements a. Completed two full academic years or more at a college or university b. Graduated from a two or three year community college

The requirement 1) which concerns the applicant's origin is very restricted, confining it to be the inner circle group (Kachru, 1997) only, whereas all the other criteria, from 2) to 5), are very unlimited, welcoming a wide range of people. In particular, the item 2) was changed from "to hold at least a Bachelor's degree" to the current one in 2008, requiring a lower level of education than before. It is supposed to be the other way around, i.e., the applicants' ELT expertise and experience need to be required, not their citizenship of certain country. It shows how Korean government and policy makers perceive who is and should be a 'native English speaker,' which seems to stem from 'native-speakerism.' It will be discussed more in detail in the next section.

As a result of these requirements, the majority of ELIs is the level 3 with little or no English teaching and training experience. According to Min (2006), there were only 20% of level 1 among the 2004 EPIK participants and more than 50% were level 3. It then brought up an issue of unqualified NESTs, which was pointed out in all the studies I reviewed (Ahn et al., 1998; Choi, 2001; Chung et al., 1999; Kim, 2007; Kim & Ko, 2008; Min, 2006; Min & Ha, 2006; Park, 2006a, 2006b). They raised the same issue that the MEST should invest in recruiting well-qualified native speakers, in order to minimize the conflicts and problems related to team-teaching. However, as shown above, the newly changed policy is even more problematic than the old one, inviting even less qualified teachers than before.

2. Native-speakerism or Native Speaker Myth in Korea

Park (2006a) looked at the issue of ELIs qualifications from a critical perspective, noting on the danger or the 'hidden agenda' of hiring 'inner circle group' only. According to her, it reinforces the wrong concept of "English speakers" that the Korean learners have, those represented by 'white, blond, blue eyed' Americans. A single norm for standard English no longer exists, particularly at a global level (Higgins, 2003) and an interest is increasing in the ownership of English and membership as native English speakers in the outer and expanding circles. "The English-speaking culture presented and represented by the teachers

from the inner circle group only will restrict the scope and dimension of Korean learners' understanding of English language and culture and more seriously, imply them the 'hidden agenda' that the untold and unheard culture of other groups are not important, second-class, and not worthy of recognition or appreciation" (Park, 2006a, p. 157). Korean society has built a strong public faith in 'native speakers' or native-speakerism, which will make students feel insecure about their abilities to speak English no matter how high their proficiency (Shim, 2008). Therefore, one of the major goals of Korean ELT should be to educate Korean public to get it over by having a balanced understanding of English speakers and promote an ownership of English users.

According to Holliday (2004), native-speakerism believes that native-speakers are superior both as users of the language and as masters of classroom and curriculum practice. This ideology has given rise to a dominant trend in TESOL which seeks to 'change' and 'correct' the cultures of 'non-native-speaker' teachers and students. He asserts that this ideology has three related roots: 1) the controlling regime of audiolingualism, which demands a particular type of oral behavior, and which still influences current practice; 2) the politics of an unproblematic 'native speaker' self and a problematic, generalized 'non-native speaker' other; 3) and a cultural chauvinism, or culturism, which is akin to racism and is widespread in modern society.

Korea has been an arena of native-speakerism, believing that NE speakers will bring the light to the dark and helpless English language educational situation in Korea. In Korean culture and context, however, NE speakers have meant to be an anglo-saxon American primarily for more than half a century and now include those from 'inner circle' countries, still more or less discriminating against particular ethnic groups. Armitage (1999) states that American culture has been influencing Korean society for over 50 years and this influence has colored Koreans' perceptions of other non-American 'western' societies. Accordingly, Koreans mean 'American English' by 'English' and think they should go to America to learn English (K. Lee, 2000). All these were exacerbated by 'globalization', which as Min (2000) argues, has been misinterpreted as adopting American language and culture one-sidedly in Korea, believing that American standard is global standard (Shim, 2008). This America-centered ELT seems to have misled Korean learners of English by overgeneralizing and stereotyping English speakers and their languages and cultures (Park, 2006b, p. 101).

Native-speakerism took wings as Korea went through a lot of sociocultural, economic, and educational changes and innovations driven by hosting mega world events including 1988 Seoul Olympics, 1986 and 2002 Asian Games, 2002 World Cup, national economy growth, and reforms in English education, to name a few. Reforms in English education were made in early 1990s for the purpose of changing from the ever-dominant structural-syllabus-based, grammar-translation-focused English language teaching to

communicative competence-oriented one. According to Kwon (2003), major reforms in English education include the 6th National Curriculum, adopting a functional syllabus, the College Scholastic Ability Test which emphasized communicative competence, influx of native-speaker teachers, change in the nature of college English from a reading-focused subject to a speaking-focused one, the 7th National Curriculum which also emphasized communicative competence and performance assessment, level-sensitive teaching, teaching English through English, modernization of English classrooms with information and communication technology facilities. Implementation of elementary English education started in 1997 is another most significant educational innovation and ever since then has it made a great impact on overall English language teaching in Korea (Park, 2000, 2002).

However, the results of these reforms have been controversial, creating some washback effects. Kwon said that the problems perceived by the teachers include entrance exam-oriented English teaching, a wide gap between high achievers and low achievers, teachers' lack of confidence, lack of retraining opportunities, the extraordinary fever of private tutoring, over-emphasis on communicative ability at the expense of grammatical ability, large class size, students' low interest and motivation. NE speakers are expected to be 'Midas' to touch all these problems and turn them into gold. However, some of them turned out to be 'problem-makers' not 'problem-solvers', having brought in their own set of issues, concerns, setbacks, and challenges as discussed above.

It is high time that we thoroughly examine what we need to expect from English teachers, regardless of their ethnicity or nationality. Also, it is time when we need to expand our perception of 'native speakers' and invite more diverse groups of proficient English-speaking ELT professionals to teach our students. Kim and Ko (2008) suggested to consider inviting teachers from the outer circle countries such as Philippines and Singapore, proficient English speaking Koreans, and those English speaking parents from multicultural families in Korea.

3. Pre- and In-service Training

The EPIK website shows that a 10-day orientation is conducted for the newly-arrived ELIs. It has been designed and conducted by Korea National University of Education (KNUE) until 2007 when it was transferred to National Institute for International Education Development (NIIED) to provide with some education before they are placed. This orientation is to provide ELIs with both the pedagogical and cultural knowledge needed to effectively adapt to life in Korea, aiming for them to 1) understand the Korean English Curriculum and practice how to use teaching methods so that they can adapt to their role in the classroom effectively; 2) enhance their understanding of Korea through lectures and discussions; 3) experience Korean culture, tradition, and heritage.

In order to provide ELIs with cultural knowledge, the orientation information and lectures are given on the topics such as Korean geography and climate, Korean food and etiquette, Korean education system, Korean history and culture, and Korea's cultural traditions and arts. The pedagogical knowledge is delivered through the lectures on the topics including understanding the English curriculum in Korea, teaching methods and lesson plans for elementary and secondary English classes, team-teaching methods, team-teaching practice, comparison between the Korean and English Language, and the roles of EPIK Participants. Korean language is also taught in two different levels, basic and advanced (Choi, 2001, pp. 104-105).

The aims and content areas of the 10-day orientation seem to be so broad and multifaceted that it is highly questionable if they are useful or efficient enough for providing the participants with the necessary and sufficient information and skills. Ahn et al. (1998), Chung et al. (1999), and Choi (2001) pointed out lack of sufficient training programs in general, and for team teaching in particular as one of the major problems and suggested that training program be modified and team-teaching be fully enforced. The same problem was also found in Min and Ha (2006), Kim (2007), and Kim and Ko (2008). Kim and Ko (2008) reported that offices of education in Seoul and Gyeonggi Province provide ELIs with one-week pre- and in-service training respectively which is far from being sufficient. They suggested that education program for ELIs need to be improved both in its quantity and quality.

4. Intercultural Understanding and Communication

Ahn et al. (1998) examined the early stage of EPIK, comparing it to JET. Having compared the two programs, they concluded that JET has a better system than EPIK and that an effective team teaching [in EPIK] was hindered because of the lack of communication between co-teachers, heavy load of administrative duties, and ELIs' short visits to schools. Lack of communication between the administrators and ELIs isolated ELIs in the school system. The lack of communication between ELIs and Korean teachers of English (KTEs) made it difficult to prepare for an efficient team-teaching. Lack of professionalism and teaching experiences caused ELIs to have problems in class management. More communication between the two parties was considered to be essential. Both parties should work together throughout the teaching phases, from planning to evaluation. On-going workshops or teacher training in team-teaching was highly recommended.

The problems of intercultural understanding and communication between Korean and foreign teachers were found in other studies as well. Chung et al. (1999) stated that ELIs were not effectively utilized due to a lack of systematic planning and implementation of the

program. They also found out that the collaboration between KTEs and ELIs was not successfully done due to the differences in understanding of collaboration and expectations on each other. Min and Ha (2006) also showed that the problems that KTEs had with their foreign co-teachers were a lack of ELIs' sense of responsibility as a teacher, a lack of ELIs' efforts to understand the Korean educational system, a lack of communication between the co-teachers, and conflicts caused by the cultural differences between the co-teachers. On the other hand, the problems that ELIs perceived about teaching in Korean schools included a large class size, lack of respect as a teacher from Korean students and teachers, lack of their own understanding of Korean educational system and teaching ideas. The problem areas they pointed out include: 1) There isn't enough weight on the ELI's class which sometimes has a negative effect in the way students behave in class; 2) The supervisors of MOEs think that the ELI is just a tool not a person; 3) There are lots of "face time", when the ELI has to be at school even though the ELI may have no work to do. The guest teachers suggested that the Korean hosts should better understand them and that more meaningful cooperation between ELIs and KTEs should be made. As shown in all three studies mentioned above, it seems that EPIK has kept the same fundamental problems throughout its implementation over a decade without much improvement.

5. Thoughts on NEST-NNEST Collaboration

Min and Ha (2006) conducted a questionnaire survey with 129 KTEs and 92 EPIK native ELIs. It was found out that the majority of KTEs were in favor of inviting ELIs. The Korean teachers thought that the benefits for the students to have ELIs were that they can motivate students to study English, help students to develop communicative skills, provide students with authentic expressions and cultural experience. It was also fount out that the ELIs served as the main teacher more often than as an assistant teacher.[1] The KTEs thought that by having the ELIs can they learn authentic English, save time for class preparation, and gain different ideas on teaching methodology.

On the other hand, most of the ELIs in the same study showed that they were satisfied with their positions as EPIK ELIs. The satisfaction was resulted from hospitality of Korean students and teachers, social treatment as a teacher, having teaching experience, having a responsible job, and cultural experience. Most of them perceived co-teaching as effective for students' English learning. It seems to be the case that NEST-NNEST collaboration can

[1] It was not clear in this study how the co-teachers' roles and work loads were allocated. It has been reported anecdotally that a lot of ELIs run the classes without any real partnership or collaboration with their Korean counterparts. It also needs to be examined what types of co-teaching are done, the team leader type, the associate type, the master teacher/beginning teacher type, or the coordinated team type (Cunningham 1960, cited in Chung, Min, & Park, p. 202), in order to identify the most feasible and efficient one in Korean educational context.

be a good solution to many problems in English language teaching and is perceived so by both KTEs and ELIs. However, it takes far more than what it sounds like, in order to be implemented successfully.

As rightly pointed out in Liu (2001), the success of TESOL professionals does not depend on whether they are native speakers or non-native speakers of English; however, non-native speakers might depend on different instructional approaches from those used by native speakers. Medgyes (2005) said that there is no way we can emulate native speakers in terms of their English language competence. However, both NESTs and NNESTs are potentially equally effective teachers. He suggested that NNESTs can 1) provide a better learner model for imitation; 2) teach language learning strategies more effectively; 3) supply learners with more information about the English language; 4) anticipate and prevent language difficulties more successfully; 5) be more empathetic to the needs and problems of learners; and 6) make better use of the learners' mother tongue.

According to Pennycook (1994), the major task for EFL teachers "is not, as some teachers believe, to find ever better ways of making students talk, but to understand in ever more sensitive ways why they talk the way they do, and why they remain silent" (p. 245). Supporting this, Luk (2002) showed that due to the largely L1-based communication strategies of the students and the L1-linguistic and cultural deficiency of the native English teacher, communication in a Hong Kong classroom was not always successful. She concluded that a NEST with little or no knowledge of the students' vernacular language and local culture does not necessarily facilitate target language acquisition of the students. A certain degree of sensitivity to students' L1 linguistic and cultural practices might be necessary. Therefore, it is very important to identify where and how NESTs can serve better than NNESTs and vice versa, and how effectively they can collaborate.

VI. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

As shown above, the major findings of the literature can be summarized as follows:

First, Korean teachers of English acknowledge benefits and necessity of co-teaching with NESTs. NESTs or ELIs are satisfied with EPIK in general and consider co-teaching as an effective way of teaching English in Korea as well.

Second, there have been detrimental factors including

1) A mismatch between the job description for NESTs as teachers, teacher trainers, and assistant teacher and their qualification requirements to fulfill the job successfully, which I speculate resulted from 'native speaker myth' and/or lack of understanding of English language teaching as a professional area among the policy makers;
2) The notion of 'native speaker' that policy makers have confined to 'inner circle only'

and its possible danger of 'hidden agenda';

3) Insufficient pre- and in-service training for ELIs in general and lack of training for both KTEs and ELIs for effective collaboration;
4) Lack of both KTEs and ELIs' intercultural understanding, communication, and hands-on skills to effectively conduct 'team-teaching';
5) Marginalizing ELIs by having them teach classes unrelated to the curriculum, which results in students' misbehavior, disrespect, and de-motivation;
6) Marginalizing KTEs by pairing them up with ELIs who are superior in English language competence and cultural representation without proper training to work with them and accordingly, making them feel intimidated or face-losing, and without any incentives for taking on this risky job;
7) Lack of professional management of administrators due to a lack of English communicative ability, intercultural understanding, and understanding of teaching English language as a professional area;
8) Excessive teaching load, maladjustment or mismanagement of the class caused by misbehaving and unmotivated students, and large class size (Choi, 2001).

It is also important to note that the same problems were pointed out repeatedly throughout the 13-year development of EPIK and NEST-NNEST collaboration in Korea. Furthermore, it seems that the basic requirements for hiring NESTs became even more problematic than before. Based on the discussions so far, the following are suggested in order to make EPIK and NEST-NNEST collaboration more effective and successful:

First, the ELT goals and objectives should be revisited in order to help our learners to efficiently cope with the issues and agendas brought up from the global perspectives of English and English speakers. The decision can be made differently depending on the educational culture and context. However, it is desirable to have more diverse and multicultural representations incorporated into the curriculum (Park, 2006a, p. 157), and create more materials with World Englishes (Shim, 2008), targeting at the development of additive, balanced bilingualism (J. Lee, 2007). Then, more diverse groups of proficient English speaking teachers need to be hired.

Second, the roles and functions of NESTs should be clarified, e.g. whether they are expected to serve as classroom teacher, teacher trainer, an assistant teacher, or other. It should not be the case that they are thrown to the classroom to do everything they want without any guideline or they are simply the walking tape-recorder (Sturman, 1993, cited in Chung et al, 2001, p. 221). Then, the qualification requirements should be well matched with their job description. If we want them to be teachers and/or teacher trainers, they should be required to meet proper qualifications. As suggested by Kim and Ko (2008), a clear policy regarding hiring standards and a training process system needs to be

established to upgrade the quality of NESTs. Also, a variety of ways of securing qualified English teachers should be considered, such as exploiting Korean bilingual teachers who are proficient in English or making use of parents from multicultural families.

On the other hand, if we are going to keep inviting ELIS of levels 3 and 4, their job description needs to be restated in such a way that it does not define them as classroom instructors only but also diversifies their duties and responsibilities depending on their qualifications. For example, they can serve as story tellers, sport coaches, camp coordinators, cooking instructors, and so on. It is true that it will be almost impossible to invite as large number of qualified NESTs as the MEST plans, if we aim at hiring ELIs of levels 1 and 2 only. Shim (2008) argues if qualified native American, British, Australian and New Zealander (NABAN) will come for non-regular jobs with low pay. Therefore, assigning the under-qualified NESTs certain roles that require less professional ELT credentials will not only justify the new basic requirements but also work better for both them and their students. Ahn et al. (1998) also suggested some ways of utilizing the ELIs: 1) Encourage ELIs to use a lot of games or body movements, pair/group work; 2) Have ELIs record for listening tests, correct students' writing, and give an oral test;. 3) Have them join the school events and activities as a regular faculty member; and 4) Have them organize or participate in cultural activities.

Third, both NESTs and NNESTs should be properly trained separately and jointly, in order for them to conduct co-teaching. The current one or two-week pre-service orientation needs to be expanded in its length and more focused in its contents. More specific knowledge and information, and hands-on skills for collaboration need to be provided. On-site orientation and practicum also need to be planned and implemented, in order for both ELIs and KTEs to get familiarized with each other, make lesson plans, and rehearse their teaching. Then, on-going monitoring and regular in-service training should be provided as well. Recently, some regional offices of education and teacher education institutes host workshops or demonstration on team teaching or collaboration. More courses and micro-teaching on collaboration need to be included in teacher education programs where ELIs and KTEs are trained separately and jointly.

Fourth, there should be frequent communication between the participants at all levels, including teachers, students, policy makers, and program administrators. Most of all, KTEs and ELIs need to make sure that they have proper understanding and expectation of each other's role and culture. It was reported that lack of intercultural understanding and discrepancy in teachers' expectation of each other's role hindered successful collaboration (Kim & Ko, 2008). Heavy work load and lack of time for co-teachers to consult with each other was also found out to be one of the main causes of miscommunication. Lack of English (and/or Korean) communicative skill of teachers and school administrators is another cause of miscommunication or lack of communication. Therefore, more support

and incentives should be given to the teachers from the government and schools in all three areas, i.e. finance, administration, and human resources.

Fifth, all the participants should appreciate and respect one another, without feeling inferior (or superior), and accept the fact that collaboration completes every participant, filling each one's voids and defects. The demand of NESTs in many ESL/EFL contexts has been increasing in the age of communicative language teaching and globalization. Teaching English in English (TEE) and the recent discussion of content and language integrated learning (CLIL) (J. Lee, 2007) or English immersion education reinforces the necessity of having them in our English classrooms. In many cases, however, it is based on the presumption that NNESTs are not good enough. What has been dismissed in the NEST-NNEST discussion is the fact that teaching and learning is a very individualistic act and behavior as much as it is a social activity. We can never overgeneralize the educational causes and effects that occur to some groups of people. More hands-on education programs for both NESTs and NNESTs should be developed in order to cater to their individual and collective needs and expectations.

Last and most importantly, now it is a high time to stop labeling and categorizing people as NEST or NNEST. Professional English teachers, that's all we need, regardless of their ethnic background. And it is important to find effective ways for teachers to collaborate in order to enhance teaching efficiency and excellence and to accomplish educational goals together. Collaboration is certainly one good way of empowering teachers and developing their professionalism as well as benefiting their learners. Whoever believes in its power and is willing to be part of it will make a big difference.

REFERENCES

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

Anderson, R. S. & Speck, B. W. (1998). "Oh what a difference a team makes": Why team teaching makes a difference. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14,* 671-686.

Armitage, L-A. (1999). Factors affecting the adjustment of Koreans studying in Australia. Australia-Korea Foundation.

Bae, D. (1997). *Chodeunghakkyo Yeongeokyoyuk (Elementary school English education)*. Seoul: Hankook Publishing Co.

Becker, H. (2001). *Teaching ESL K-12: Views from the classroom*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Carless, D. (2002). Conflict or collaboration: Native and nonnative speakers team teaching in schools in South Korea, Japan, and Hong Kong. Paper presented at The English

in South East Asia Conference (ESEA), Hong Kong.

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

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

Choi, S. -H. (1996). Wenemin yenge kyosa sukup cheykyey kaypal yenku (A study on employing the EPIK teachers). Korean Educational Development Institute.

Choi, Y. (2001). Suggestions for the re-organization of English teaching program by native speakers in Korea. *English Teaching, 56*(1), 101-122.

Chung, G., Min, C., & Park, M. (1999). A study of team teaching for the utility of the native English teacher in the elementary and secondary school. *English Teaching, 54*(2), 210-227.

Clark, M. C., & Watson, D. B. (1998). Women's experience of academic collaboration. In M. Saltiel, A. Sgroi & R. Brockett (Eds.), *The power and potential of collaborative learning partnerships* (pp. 5-11). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Coltrane, B. (2002). Team teaching: Meeting the needs of English language learners through collaboration. ERIC/CLL News Bulletin, Spring 2002. Retrieved April 5, 2005, from the World Wide Web: http://www.cal.org/resources/News/2002spring/team.html.

Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1996). Co-teaching: What's it all about? Retrieved from the World Wide Web: http://www.cise.missouri.edu/publications/innovations/april-2004/lindsey .html

Crandall, J. (1998). Collaborate and cooperate: Teacher education for integrating language and content. *English Teaching Forum, 36*, 2-9.

Cunningham, L. (1960). Team teaching: Where do we stand? *Administrator's Notebook, 8*, 1-4.

De Jong, E. J. (1996, Nov.). Integrating: What does it mean for language minority students? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Bilingual Education, Orlando, Florida, USA.

De Oliveira, L., & Richardson, S. (2001). Collaboration between native and nonnative English-speaking educators. *The CATESOL Journal, 13*(1), 123-131.

Friend, M., & Reising, M. (1993). Co-teaching: An overview of ten past, a glimpse at the present, and considerations for the future. *Preventing School Failure, 37*(4), 6-11.

Hatch, T. & Hinton, B. (1996). Graduate student's perception of university team-teaching. *College Student Journal, 30*(3), 1-8. EBSCOhost. Retrieved Nov. 3, 2002, from the World Wide Web: http://web2.epnet.com/citation.asp. (EBSCO Research Database 01463934)

Higgins, C. (2003). "Ownership" of English in the outer circle: An alternative to the

NS-NNS dichotomy. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(4). 615-644.

Holliday, A. (2004, Nov.). The dangers of native-speakerism and cultural Chauvinism in TESOL. Plenary talk presented at the 2003 Asia TEFL, Seoul, Korea.

Jorden, E. H., & Walton, A. R. (1987). Truly foreign languages: instructual challenges. *The Annal of the American Academy, 490*, 110-124.

Kachru, B. B. (1997). World Englishes 2000: Resources for research and teaching. In L. Smith (Ed.), *World Englishes 2000* (pp. 209-251). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Kim, H., & Ko., K. (2008). Issues in hiring native English teachers in the elementary school: Focused on Gyeonggi Province. *Primary English Education, 14*(2), 23-43.

Kim, Y. (2007). Strategies for effective team teaching between Korean teachers of English and native English teachers. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 13*(3), 177-201.

Kluwin, T. N., Gonsher, W., Silver, K., & Samuels, J. (1996). The E. T. class: Education together-team teaching hearing impaired and hearing students together. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 29*(1), 11-15.

Kwon, O. (2003, Nov.). Narrowing the gaps between ideals and realities in TEFL. Plenary talk presented at the 2003 Asia TEFL, Busan, Korea.

Lasley, T. J., Matczynski, T. J., & Williams, J. A. (1992). Collaborative and noncollaborative partnership structures in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43*(4), 257-261.

Lee, J. (2007). Issues of EFL educational practice in Korea: A conceptual proposal for an alternative. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 13*(3), 41-56.

Lee, K. (2000). What characteristics do students want in their 21C English teachers? *Language Teaching, 12*(1)*,* 337-369.

Liu, J. (2001). Confessions of a non-native English-speaking professional. *The CATESOL Journal, 13*(1), 53-67.

Luk, J. (2002). Communication behaviours of EFL learners in a native English-speaker teacher's class: a case in Hong Kong. In A. Kirkpatrick (Ed.) *Englishes in Asia* (pp. 289-302). Australia: Language Australia, Ltd.

Medgyes, P. (2005, Nov.). Always look on the bright side-being a non-native teacher. Plenary talk presented at the 2005 Asia TEFL Conference, Beijing, China.

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

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

Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific Region. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*, 589-612.

O'Loughlin, J. B. (2003). Collaborative instruction in elementary school: Push-in vs. pull-out. The ELL Outlook, 2. Retrieved April 5, 2005, from the World Wide Web: http://www.coursecrafters.com/ELL-Outlook/2003/Outlook_0403.pdf

Park, J. (2000). Teacher education for ELT in Korean elementary schools. *The 2000 ELTeCS Conference Proceedings on Young Learners' ELT Curriculum in East Asia* (pp. 11-20). National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, Taiwan, ROC.

Park, J. (2002). Teaching young learners English: What to lose, what to gain. *The Proceedings of the Pan-Asia Conference 4* (pp. 130-140). Taipei, Taiwan, ROC.

Park, J. (2006a). Professionalization of TEFL in Korea: The roads behind and ahead. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 3*(4), 113-134.

Park, J. (2006b). Korea-Japan English camp: A case study of English immersion program in Korea. *English Language and Literature Teaching, 12*(4), 91-115.

Park, J. (2007a). EPIK and NE-NNE Teacher Collaboration in Korea. *Proceedings of Hsinchu City's Second Elementary Schools English Collaborative Teaching Conference* (pp. 16-28), Hsinchu City Government, Taiwan, R.O.C.

Park, J. (2007b). Collaboration: The Magic Potion. *Proceedings of the 2007 Jeju Province English Teachers' Workshop* (pp. 52-71). Jeju SETA.

Pearson Education Limited. (2001). *Longman dictionary of contemporary English, Third Edition*. Pearson Education Limited.

Pennycook, A. (1994). The cultural politics of English as an international language. Longman: London and New York.

Shannon, N. B., & Meath-Lang, B. (1992). Collaborative language teaching: A co-investigation. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Collaborative language learning and teaching* (pp. 120-140). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shim, J. (2008, Apr.). Empowering EFL students through teaching World Englishes. Plenary talk presented at the IATEFL 2008, Exeter, U.K.

Snow, M. A., Met, M., & Genesee, F. (1989). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/foreign language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 23,* 201-217.

Sturman, P. (1992). Team teaching: A case study from Japan. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Collaborative language learning and teaching* (pp. 141-161). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

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

Tsai, J-M. (2007). Waltz together or trip each other up: An investigation on team teachers'

interactions and relationships. *Proceedings of Hsinchu City's Second Elementary Schools English Collaborative Teaching Conference* (pp. 68-85), Hsinchu City Government, Taiwan, R.O.C.

Wang, Y-C. H. (2007). The study of NESTs and Non-NESTs on team teaching in an ESL classroom. *Proceedings of Hsinchu City's Second Elementary Schools English Collaborative Teaching Conference* (pp. 38-50), Hsinchu City Government, Taiwan, R.O.C.

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

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Elementary/Secondary

Joo-Kyung Park
Department of English Language and Literature
Honam University
59-1 Seobong-dong Gwangsan-gu
Gwangju, 506-714, South Korea
Tel: (062) 940-5310
Fax: (062) 940-5970
Email: english58@hanmail.net

Received in October, 2008
Reviewed in November, 2008
Revised version received in December, 2008