



Collaborative teaching from English language instructors' perspectives

Hanife Taşdemir ^a * , Tuğba Yıldırım ^b 

^a *Istanbul University, Beyazıt, İstanbul 34126, Turkey*

^b *Karabük University, Demir-Çelik, Karabük 78050, Turkey*

APA Citation:

Taşdemir, H., & Yıldırım, T. (2017). Collaborative teaching from English language instructors' perspectives. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13(2), 632-642.

Submission Date:27/07/2017

Acceptance Date:01/10/2017

Abstract

Collaborative teaching, a significant concept in the field of English language teaching, involves teachers in sharing expertise, decision-making, lesson delivery, and assessment. It is a common practice for instructors in many schools and universities where English is taught as a foreign/second language (EFL/ESL) in intensive programs or departments to be involved in collaboration in many ways ranging from co-planning to co-constructing and co-teaching their language classes. The present study concentrated on collaborative practices of English language instructors planning the EFL program together at a private university in Istanbul, Turkey. It aimed to elaborate on the ways they were engaged in collaboration in language teaching, their beliefs on it, and which conditions they perceived as necessary to sustain successful collaboration. The results gained from written pre-interview protocols, focus-group and individual interviews shed light on the characteristics of collaborative teaching practice for the participants, the factors that might foster or hinder successful collaboration in teaching English, and the ways to improve collaborative teaching for all parties involved in such an experience of teaching.

© 2017 JLLS and the Authors - Published by JLLS.

Keywords: collaboration; co-teaching; collaborative teaching; EFL instructors; language teaching

1. Introduction

Collaborative teaching initially emerged as a tool to provide support for the inclusion of students with learning disabilities (Hudson & Glomb, 1997), and special education needs (Mastropieri, McDuffie & Scruggs, 2007) in the United States in the 1970s (Jeon, 2010). It referred to a general education teacher being paired with a special education teacher in an inclusive classroom and working as partners to teach a diverse group of students (Friend, 2008).

Collaborative teaching, which is defined by Friend and Cook (1995) as style of interaction between at least two parties voluntarily engaged in shared decision- making as they work toward a common goal (as cited in Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010), is now a popular and significant concept within the field of language education. In the form of co-teaching, teachers share responsibility for the development, implementation, and evaluation of classroom instruction designed to meet students' needs (Jeon,

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +90-212-440-0000
E-mail address: hanife.tasdemir@istanbul.edu.tr

2010). Collaborative teaching, or in other terms, co-teaching or team-teaching, has been implemented differently in many contexts either as an intercultural team work of one native English teacher and non-native English teacher working together in a classroom setting in the process of planning, instruction, and evaluation (Luo, 2014; Park, 2014; Jeon, 2010; Igawa, 2009; Carless, 2006) or as an interdisciplinary team teaching between content-area teacher and ESL teacher to enhance students' learning (Gladman, 2015; Bell & Baecher, 2012; Baecher & Bell, 2011; Davison 2006). Sometimes it also takes place for professional development purposes (Luo, 2014). As Nunan (1992) claims, teachers collaborate for a number of reasons such as wishing to experiment with alternative ways of organizing teaching, to promote a philosophy of cooperation rather than competition, to create an environment in which they teach and learn from each other.

Perry and Stewart (2005) describe collaborative teaching as a part of a continuum of collaboration that varies depending on the levels of coordination and shared responsibility. At the low level of collaboration, courses are planned by a group of faculty and later taught and evaluated individually by the members of the group, whereas at the highest level of collaboration, courses are co-planned, co-taught, and evaluated by a pair or a group of teachers. In the light of this, in the present study, co-teaching referred to two or more instructors working together in the process of planning the content of the courses, discussing how to deliver instruction, preparing instructional materials as well as testing and assessment tools for the same group of students but teaching them separately.

1.1. Literature review

In the literature, collaborative teaching is also referred to as co-teaching, team-teaching, cooperative teaching, and partnership teaching. According to Buckley (2000) there is no universal approach to team-teaching leading to different definitions of it. To exemplify, Buckley (2000, p.4) puts forward that “team teaching involves a group of instructors working purposefully, regularly, and cooperatively to help a group of students” (as cited in Perry & Stewart, 2005, p.564). As Bourne (1997) claims partnership teaching builds on the concept of co-operative teaching by linking the work of two teachers, or indeed a whole department with plans for curriculum development and staff development across the school. One specific form of team teaching is having two teachers in the classroom teaching simultaneously (Benoit & Haugh, 2001). It is a process in which two or more teachers share the responsibility for planning the class or course, teaching a class, and evaluating and assessing it including “team planning, team teaching, and team follow-up” (Richards & Farrell, 2005, p.159). Gately and Gately (2001) summarize the components of co-teaching relationship as ‘interpersonal communication, physical arrangement, familiarity with the curriculum, curriculum goals and modifications, instructional planning and presentation, classroom management and assessment’ (p.40).

Sandholtz (2000) categorized team teaching into three: (1) two or more teachers loosely sharing responsibilities; (2) team planning, but individual instruction; and (3) joint planning, instruction, and evaluation of learning experiences (as cited in Perry & Stewart, 2005). Under this categorization, the collaboration in this study is an example of team planning, but individual instruction. As Friend (2008) suggests, in co-teaching the amount of contribution each teacher makes can differ; however, in the end, the instructors together create such a learning environment that no teacher can produce on his/her own. This can contribute to such advantages of co-teaching as instructors' combining their knowledge and skills to create learning environments where instruction is both rigorous and flexible, and accommodated to each student's unique learning needs (Friend, 2008) as well as “using diverse areas of expertise to differentiate instruction, enabling smaller group instruction that is coherent, and providing a common instructional experience on which the co-teaching partners can reflect and make subsequent improvements” (York-Barr, Ghore & Sommers, 2007, p.305). It is also acknowledged

that two teachers' being involved in the process reduces the ratio of teacher-pupil, and it enables learners with opportunities to be exposed to various methods of teaching that cannot be achieved with one teacher (Ken-Maduako & Oyatogun, 2015). As a result, it improves student achievement as students benefit from the increased quality of the lessons (Benoit & Haugh, 2001).

In addition to students, successful collaborative teaching also benefits teachers. First, it promotes teacher growth by creating an opportunity for teachers to learn from another professional on a regular basis (Mandel & Eisarman, 2016). The collaborative practice provides teachers with a partner to help them in the process of setting objectives, making plans, delivering lessons and evaluating the outcomes. It also provides them with a person whom they can gain inspiration from and who can offer constructive feedback on their teaching (Benoit & Haugh, 2001). Teachers participating in collaborative practices report "increased feelings of worth, renewal, partnership, and creativity" (Gately & Gately, 2001, p.40).

The studies which aimed to investigate the views, beliefs, and perceptions of the teachers involved in co-teaching processes, have revealed some challenges as well as advantages. Research has shown that the most frequently mentioned problem is lack of sufficient common preparation and planning time (Carless, 2006; Park, 2014). Co-teachers do not have enough time to appropriately and effectively pre-plan every aspect of their lessons (Wilson, 2016). Moreover, difficulties arise due to the lack of administrative support. It has been acknowledged that co-teachers complain that their administrators do not support co-teaching with their actions and they fail to understand the complexity of creating and developing co-teaching programs (Friend, 2008).

York-Barr, Ghere, and Sommers (2007) have also reported some challenges such as decreased flexibility and creativity, confusion about how to share instructional time and how to share responsibilities, loss of instructional and decision-making autonomy. Besides, as co-teaching involves two or more teachers with different teaching philosophies, and experiences, they may not agree on every issue in planning, implementation, and evaluation of teamwork (Jeon, 2010; Boyle, 1997). Mandel and Eisarman (2016) argue that the biggest challenge to teaming is "to find teachers who are open to learning from one another and to the possibility of adapting their approach to gain a better end product" (p.77). Likewise, Benoit and Haugh (2001) state that teachers are "solitary creatures" who are not willing to share the limelight or refuses to "be observed" by a colleague. To sum up, co-teaching is not without drawbacks and Welch and Sheridan (1995) divide the challenges into four categories: (1) conceptual barriers referring to differences in teachers' perceptions of their roles; (2) pragmatic barriers of problems related to finding time and resources to work collaboratively; (3) attitudinal barriers as teachers' negative attitudes like fear of trying something; (4) professional barriers caused by lack of preparation to collaborate (as cited in Luo, 2014).

Nunan (1992) claims that for collaborative teaching to be successful, three conditions are essential. First, teachers should possess and be supported to develop appropriate skills. Second, they should have time to plan their programs and opportunities to review their teaching. Third, they should receive appropriate administrative or managerial support with the pedagogical innovation. Friend (2008) likens co-teaching relationships to marital relationships in that they both rely on commitment, negotiation, and flexibility. Accordingly, instructors should have a commitment to each other as well as to their students. They should try to nurture their professional relationship and make an effort to reach their students. They should try to develop new strategies, resolve differences of opinion, and try alternative solutions if necessary to solve their problems, which will result in improved outcomes for students and strong teaching partnership. Similarly, Jeon (2010) discusses four elements of successful collaboration: common goal, shared beliefs, harmonious interaction, and cooperative process. Co-teachers must have a clear plan that they mutually agreed on; thus, they can minimize the risk of miscommunication and keep the spirit of co-teaching alive. Sharing similar teaching philosophies or

beliefs may help to have a smooth and effective collaboration. Moreover, teachers who participate in co-teaching need to foster their social interaction like conflict management and creative problem solving. That is to say, cooperative process, which involves such elements as co-planned lessons, mutual problem solving, shared classroom responsibilities, equal work distribution, is an important factor in promoting collaboration.

Honigsfeld and Dove (2016) have identified three components of successful collaborative instruction: trust between co-teaching partners, maintenance of the entire collaborative instructional cycle, which includes co-planning, co-teaching, co-assessment of student work, and reflection, and leadership support. For successful implementation of collaborative practice, teachers should be willing to cooperate, value each other's expertise, like working with and learning from others (Jeon, 2010; Bell & Baecher, 2012). Partner teachers have to be in constant communication with each other to plan, exchange ideas, decide on the roles and responsibilities; therefore, effective teamwork requires common meeting times for communication and cooperation (Ken-Maduako & Oyatogun, 2015). Additionally, it requires administrative support, so administration must develop and support a culture of collaboration by allowing teachers enough time to develop relationships, set goals, and receive training and by providing them with professional development on effective teamwork (Hoffman & Dahlman, 2007). Finally, equal status, clearly defined common instructional goals, compatible working and personality style, and the development of relationships inside and outside the classroom are among other requirements of successful collaboration (Bell & Baecher, 2012; Carless, 2006).

1.2. Research questions

The purpose of this study is to shed light on the characteristics of collaborative teaching and the factors that might foster and hinder successful collaboration in language teaching. The following research questions were asked:

- (1) In what ways do EFL instructors engage in collaboration in language teaching?
- (2) What are EFL instructors' beliefs on benefits and challenges of collaborative teaching in language teaching?
- (3) What conditions do EFL teachers perceive as necessary to sustain successful collaboration?

2. Method

Grounding upon qualitative research paradigm, the current study was described as a case study which is "a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a case over time through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information and reports a case description and case-based themes" (Creswell, 2013, p.73). It is possible to specify this case study as a single instrumental one (Stake, 1995) focusing on a concern: the collaborative practices of EFL instructors and investigating it within a bounded case chosen: the vocational school of a private university during the term 2015-2016 Spring.

2.1. Sample / Participants

The current study was conducted at a vocational school of a private university in Istanbul, Turkey. The four participant EFL instructors planned the English curriculum, prepared materials and exams, and assessed the students' performance together. Although they did not teach the course together being present in the same venue at the same time, they shared ideas for all remaining parts in their teaching either in ad-hoc or organized meetings during the term. They spent summer and semester

breaks to go over the course book and prepare materials when they feel the need. Each of the instructors was assigned specific parts of a unit in the course book and wrote instructions for that part. They followed the same schedule and let each other know about their progress all the time as they taught the same book, the same students by using the same materials collaboratively prepared beforehand. Typical sampling strategy (Creswell, 2013) was employed to decide on the participants.

2.2. Data collection and analysis

The data were collected through written pre-interview protocols (PIP), semi-structured focus group interviews (FGI) and individual interviews (II) (see Appendix A). By employing these tools, the researchers are interested in “understanding of the lived experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience” (Seidman, 2013, p.9). The interviews lasted for approximately one hour each.

After all the data were in written format, the researchers started the actual data analysis process. The first step was memoing and taking margin notes to come up with preliminary codes. Following this, the data were coded by using descriptive codes by assigning summative words or short phrases to the data as the topic shifted (Saldana, 2009). The researchers also looked for patterns and repeating codes to move on to the next phase of data analysis to assign codes into categories ‘to organize and group similarly coded data’ (Saldana, 2009, p.8). Subsequent to division of codes to interrelated categories, themes were constructed. The data were coded through MaxQDA software (Version 12, Release 12.1.4).

Member-checking strategy was utilized to cross check whether the researchers accurately interpreted what the participants meant. Peer checking was also employed since both of the researchers analyzed the data together. Furthermore, the approval of the Institutional Ethical Review Board was obtained and participants were given informed consent forms prior to and debriefing forms after the study.

3. Results and Discussion

First, to find out about the participants’ idea of collaborative teaching in their mind, they were asked to define what collaborative teaching means in their own words and one participant, P1, gave a metaphorical definition by likening collaborative teaching to being and fighting in an army:

Sometimes it is like being in an army. When you fight in an army for example, you fight for a reason and you are in the same part of the army and you are holding the weapons together; you are attacking the enemies. You share the same idea and the same goal. So it kind of gathers you together. It helps you understand each other perfectly. You behave like the parts of the body. One is the arm; the other is the leg. You just fight for the same idea. It is very great to help the students in that way. You just follow each other’s lessons; you just correct their mistakes sometimes, you help them overcome their problems so it is like being in army and sharing the same purpose and working together for the same purpose. (II).

Another participant, P3 described it as ‘a platform where you can get lots of information from other people and you can see your deficiencies and to improve yourself’ (FGI). When the definitions made by the participants were analyzed, some key words stood out like ‘working together’, ‘sharing the same purpose’, ‘sharing a class’, and ‘learning from others’. It is also supported in the literature that sharing a mutual goal and working to achieve it (Friend and Cook 1995 as cited in Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010) is a part of collaboration in line with what P1 acknowledges us in her metaphorical

definition. Furthermore, it is possible to track in P3's utterances that collaborative teaching has been a way of professional development (Luo, 2014), which manifests itself as adding to each other's knowledge, pinpointing areas to be improved and taking action accordingly in the context of this study. Based on the coordination of shared responsibilities, collaboration also takes place in different levels of continuum of bearing features of high level of collaboration where the instructors co-plan, co-teach, and co-evaluate. In line with this, the participants stated that they worked together in preparing instructions for the topics in the course book, designing instructional materials, preparing evaluation and assessment tools as well as observing one another's class showing sample instances of collaboration in the continuum of it (Stewart & Perry, 2005).

Regarding the purpose of instructors' collaborative teaching practice, one participant, P2, reported that their purpose was to provide 'equality in instruction' by writing instructions and following them almost all the time further adding that it is important for teachers to do the same activities and cover the same materials as suggested in their instructions as otherwise, 'some group of students may lack the information necessary for the exam' (FGI). According to P1, their aim was to provide 'variety in instruction for students' so that they could enrich their learning experiences (FGI). Instructors engage in collaboration, especially in designing their lesson plans and instructional materials to ensure that all students receive the same kind of instruction and input so that it will not create a problem for the assessment and evaluation of the learning. Besides, they aim to provide students with variety in instruction and enrich their learning experiences by sharing and teaching the same classes. The way the instructors defined collaboration, the reasons why they adopt a collaborative teaching style, and in which ways they are involved in collaboration make it clear that collaboration or team teaching in this study's context falls in the category of team planning but individual instruction (Sandholtz, 2000).

3.1. Benefits of collaboration

Collaborative teaching practice was argued to help to enrich the learners' experience by interacting with and learning from different teachers with different personalities and teaching styles as suggested by P2 as 'a chance to benefit from different styles - different teachers mean different styles, different teaching techniques for them' (II) and by P1 as 'students learn from different instructors with different styles of teaching and experience' (II). In addition to being exposed to different learning methods, students also had the chance to work with teachers with different personalities that 'they can feel connected to one teacher and they may not feel the same with another teacher. In this way, we also give them a much variety of [...] and personalities' (P1, FGI). As can be inferred from the instructors' statements, collaboration is a platform with plenty of benefits for students such as making use of a fruitful combination of knowledge and skills (Friend, 2008) from teachers inherently assuring different styles, different teaching techniques, and being exposed to different learning methods even to 'learn from their experience', which seems improbable to achieve without collaboration (Ken-Maduako & Oyatogun, 2015).

Collaborative teaching had also some benefits for teachers such as reducing their workload, learning from their colleagues, and designing better lessons. Below is an example of how P2 benefited from collaboration:

One of my weaknesses is I am not that good at using or benefitting from technology. And one of my colleagues is really good at using technology in teaching English and when I observed a class, I saw a program, Kahoot or something like this, so you can write or download your questions into that program; then, students can do it like... they feel like playing a game; not like an English course for them. For such things I need to have more observations to see my colleagues' classes. (P2, II)

As stated by Mandel and Eiserman (2016), professional growth of instructors is promoted by being a part of collaboration, sometimes showing itself as adding to each other's knowledge about technology by making them aware of that tool, or sometimes as grasping the opportunity to incorporate something new into your instruction as in P2's example above. Acting together and learning from each other could also be found in the participants' comments as in P1's words 'the part that I am very pleased about is you share everything; you share ideas and you share the burden of teaching a single classroom' (II) or for P2 as a means to improve their time management skills (FGI). Taking advantage of different perspectives underscores the importance of collaboration identified by Benoit and Haugh (2001) as to team members' assisting one another in setting up goals, the agenda to reach them, delivery of instruction, and in the assessment procedure. It is without doubt that collaboration could be turned into a path where inspiring others and being inspired by them to better one's teaching skills come alive (Benoit & Haugh, 2001) as also advocated by P1: 'It helps to create better lessons because we share opinions with each other and brainstorm ideas on how to teach a specific topic' (PIP). Similarly, it could also be turned into an area to give constructive feedback to one another (Benoit & Haugh, 2001) as found in P3's utterances: 'we can show, tell each other our positive sides and negative sides. Sometimes we cannot see our mistakes, but another person can see our mistakes better, and give us really useful feedback' (II).

3.2. Challenges in collaboration

It was also revealed that collaborative teaching practice has some challenges for instructors. First, it might affect the relationship between the instructors and the students in a negative way as illustrated in the following quotation:

The students sometimes compare the teaching styles of the instructors and they tell you "X teacher teaches this part better by doing this" and you say "Oh, great! Let's do it that way." You change your method on the spot. You just add something new to it. It is sometimes beneficial, but when they do it in a way that is not intended to help you, it is sometimes very annoying. They compare you for example on your look, on how you speak, or how you behave them. They expect everybody to be the same, but you are not robots. We cannot be the same, so sometimes it is annoying (P4, II).

As the instructors taught the same classes, it sometimes created problems in their relationship with their students since the students had a tendency to compare them with their colleagues in terms of their teaching style, their approach to students, and even their look, which caused some instructors to feel disappointed as in P3's case:

Students do not see you as their main teacher. They treat you as an outsider who comes and teaches for 2 hours or like that. So it becomes more difficult for you and the students too to accept each other. As students and teachers you cannot develop that relationship. This directly affects not only your teaching style [...] also the students' appreciation of it (II).

Another challenge was that instructors had different educational background and some were less experienced than others, and they did not share the same teaching beliefs. This resulted in dissatisfaction with co-teaching and more workload for the instructors. One of the participants, P2, gave an example for this situation by narrating her experience during the course preparation that there was a misunderstanding for a reading activity because of instructors' lack of knowledge of 'what a jigsaw activity is' (II). It was probable to face challenges until they reach a mutual understanding of what they are to implement in their teaching (Jeon, 2010). P1 mentioned the same problem to state the fact that it is not easy to be of the same idea with each other (Boyle, 1997) all the time in their experience as deciding on whether to teach grammar in 'a communicative way or a traditional' (II). Overall, they faced challenges that can be categorized into three as lack of flexibility, irresponsibility

of some instructors, and problems regarding interaction among colleagues. Some of the instructors felt that they did not have the flexibility to teach a subject however they wanted.

I expected to be freer while teaching “my” hours because I am a totally different instructor and I have my own style of teaching certain topics. However, when you make plans with another person, your role is sometimes pre-determined and it may not be flexible. I also expected other colleagues to be more responsible when it came to letting know which page they covered, which topics the students had difficulty in learning (P1, PIP).

Under Welch and Sheridan’s (1995 as cited in Luo, 2014) division of challenges of collaboration, the findings put forward that the instructors face conceptual barriers as their perceptions on their roles which could be ‘pre-determined and may not be flexible’ as stated by P1, attitudinal barriers in P3’s assertion, and professional barriers of having insufficient command over teaching or different perspectives as exemplified by both P2 and P1.

Participants’ descriptions of their ideal collaborative partner suggested that they would like to work with instructors who are willing to cooperate, friendly, energetic, positive, tolerant, flexible, and confident. These attributes validate that for successful collaboration instructors should possess some certain features and skills (Nunan, 1992) as can be deduced from P4’s and P2’s statements as follows: ‘needs to be friendly. I personally don’t like it when people tend to be bossy or like don’t care about your ideas’ (FGI) and ‘being open to flexibility is the case, it is important not to adopt self-centred attitude towards your colleagues’ (II). Two participants stated that they would prefer to work with more experienced colleagues so that they can learn from them. For instance, P2 expressed her preference by giving a reason ‘if possible, I want to work with more experienced colleagues, I mean more experienced than me because I don’t think I learnt something new this year about preparing materials or about teaching (II).

In addition, participants described their ideal collaborative teaching environment revealing some necessary conditions for collaboration. Among these is respect and trust between colleagues, mutual agreement and support. Being open to communication (P1, II), and supporting each other (P3, II) were found vital. It is pretty much similar to what Friend (2008) indicates by drawing a parallel between marriage and collaboration both of which noted as grounding on commitment to each other by ‘backing up’ (P3, II), honoring communication to ‘overcome everything by’ (P1, II) as a way of creative problem solving (Jeon, 2010), as well as negotiation and flexibility in the context of this study. Moreover, interaction among partners is essential. As the participants reported, they had to ‘regularly give feedback to each other, including the needs of students and the points to practice more’ (P3, PIP) and ‘inform the other colleague about the topics you have covered, extra materials you have made use of and whether you lagged behind’ (P1, PIP). Therefore, partners needed to be in touch all the time, which led the instructors to use an application called SLACK to communicate easily. Being in constant communication is valued to achieve successful collaboration (Ken-Maduako & Oyatogun, 2015) and making use of a technological tool in this study’s context seems a way of doing this.

4. Conclusions

This study aimed to explore collaborative teaching practice of EFL instructors and findings suggest that instructors engage in collaborative practices for evaluation, material development with the purposes of providing variety and equality in instruction. It is informed that observing each other’s classes, assisting their professional development, and decreasing the workload are among the benefits for instructors. Students are reported to benefit from being taught collaboratively as they get the opportunity to be instructed by instructors utilizing different methods and styles, besides a unique

combination of their instructors' knowledge and skills. However, it is needed to mention that collaboration is not without challenges. Personality differences, excessive number of partners leading to imbalanced teaching hours, power relations, irresponsibility of colleagues, and lack of flexibility imposed by following a pre-set schedule are the issues that require constant and direct attention. Components of successful collaboration are also elaborated on and both colleague and environment related factors are mentioned. It is further suggested that an ideal collaborative partner should be flexible, open to communication, tolerant, respectful, honest, energetic, supportive, and willing to cooperate just to name a few to create a positive atmosphere for collaboration. In addition to these, collaborative practice should be strengthened by having more meetings, assigning different skills to different instructors, benefiting from more experienced colleagues according to the instructors participating in this study.

References

- Baecher, L. H., & Bell, A. B. (2011). A "Continuum" model of collaboration in ESL. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 15(1), 56-61.
- Bell, A. B., & Baecher, L. (2012). Points on a continuum: ESL teachers reporting on collaboration. *TESOL Journal*, 3(3), 488-515.
- Benoit, R. & Haugh, B. (2001). Team teaching tips for foreign language teachers. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 7(10). Retrieved April 6, 2016 from <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Benoit-TeamTeaching.html>.
- Carless, D. (2006). Collaborative EFL teaching in primary schools. *ELT Journal*, 60(4), 328-335.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Davison, C. (2006). Collaboration between ESL and content teachers: How do we know when we are doing it right?. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(4), 454-475.
- Dove, M., & Honigsfeld, A. (2010). ESL coteaching and collaboration: Opportunities to develop teacher leadership and enhance student learning. *TESOL journal*, 1(1), 3-22.
- Friend, M. (2008). Co-teaching: A simple solution that isn't simple after all. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 2(2), 9-19.
- Gately, S., & Gately, F. (2001). Understanding co-teaching components. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 33(4), 40-47.
- Gladman, A. (2015). Team teaching is not just for teachers! Student perspectives on the collaborative classroom. *TESOL Journal*, 6(1), 130-148.
- Hoffman, P., & Dahlman, A. (2007). Together we are better. Retrieved April 6, 2016. from: [https://www.tesol.org/read-and-publish/journals/other-serial-publications/compleat-links/compleat-links-volume-4-issue-3-\(september-2007\)/together-we-are-better](https://www.tesol.org/read-and-publish/journals/other-serial-publications/compleat-links/compleat-links-volume-4-issue-3-(september-2007)/together-we-are-better).
- Honigsfeld, A., & Dove, M. G. (2016). Co-Teaching ELLs: Riding a tandem bike. *Educational Leadership*, 73(4), 56-60.
- Hudson, P., & Glomb, N. (1997). If it takes two to tango, then why not teach both partners to dance? Collaboration instruction for all educators. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 30, 442-448.

- Igawa, K. (2009). EFL teachers' views on team-teaching: In the case of Japanese Secondary school teachers. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture*, 47, 145-172.
- Jeon, I. J. (2010). Exploring the co-teaching practice of native and non-native English teachers in Korea. *English Teaching*, 65(3), 43-67.
- Ken-Maduako, I., & Oyatogun, A. T. (2015). Application of team teaching in the English language class. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(29), 178-181.
- Luo, W. H. (2014). An inquiry into a collaborative model of teaching English by native English-speaking teachers and local teachers. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 23(3), 735-743.
- Mandel, K., & Eiserman, T. (2016). Team teaching in high school. *Educational Leadership*, 73(4), 74-77.
- Mastropieri, M., McDuffie, K. A., & Scruggs, T. E. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A meta-synthesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional Children*, 73, 392-416.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Collaborative language learning and teaching*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Park, J. E. (2014). English co-teaching and teacher collaboration: A micro-interactional perspective. *System*, 44, 34-44.
- Perry, B., & Stewart, T. (2005). Insights into effective partnership in interdisciplinary team teaching. *System*, 33(4), 563-573.
- Saldana, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Wilson, G. L. (2016). Revisiting classroom routines. *Educational Leadership*, 73(4), 50-55.
- York-Barr, J., Ghere, G., & Sommerness, J. (2007). Collaborative teaching to increase ELL student learning: A three-year urban elementary case study. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 12(3), 301-335.

Appendix A. Instruments

A.1. Pre-Interview Protocol

- 1) How would you describe your experience of teaching English?
- 2) What is collaborative teaching in your own words?
- 3) What are your responsibilities when you co-teach a class?
- 4) What were your expectations of collaborative teaching before you got involved in it? Have they changed in any ways?

A.2. Focus-Group Interview

- 1) What parts of your teaching could be considered as collaborative teaching? In which ways are you engaged in collaboration?
- 2) Is your collaboration formally or informally shaped? Do you share ideas in organized or ad hoc meetings?
- 3) Do you perceive any benefits of collaborative teaching?

- 4) How would you describe an ideal collaborative teaching environment?
- 5) Can you give a successful sample of collaboration from your own experience?

A.3. Individual Interview

- 1) Can you share your ideas about your satisfaction or dissatisfaction from being involved in collaboration?
- 2) Are there any challenges that you face during collaborative teaching? (e.g., communication issues between partners, personality differences and differences in teaching styles)?
- 3) What are the necessary things for successful collaboration?
- 4) What are the characteristics of an ideal collaborative partner?
- 5) Are there any areas that you want to improve in your collaborative teaching? If yes, how would you address to them?
- 6) Could you comment on the effectiveness of collaborative teaching in your context?
- 7) What are the effects of collaborative teaching on students; on your delivery of instruction / classroom interactions; on you as a teacher; on your relations with your colleagues that you co-teach with?

İngilizce dil okutmanlarının perspektifinden işbirlikli öğretim

Öz

İngiliz dil öğretimi alanında önemli bir kavram olan işbirlikli öğretim, öğretmenlerin karar verme, ders anlatımı ve değerlendirmede uzmanlıklarını paylaşımlarını içerir. İngilizcenin ikinci ve yabancı dil olarak yoğunlaştırılmış program ve bölümlerde öğretildiği birçok okul ve üniversitede dil sınıflarını birlikte planlamadan, oluşturma, ve öğretmeye değişen yollarda işbirliği içinde olmak İngilizce okutmanları için yaygın bir uygulamadır. Bu çalışma İstanbul, Türkiye’de özel bir üniversitede İngilizce programını birlikte planlayan İngilizce okutmanlarının işbirlikli uygulamalarına odaklanmıştır ve dil öğretiminde işbirliği içinde olma yollarını, bu konudaki inançlarını, başarılı bir işbirliği sağlamak için hangi koşulları gerekli gördüklerini araştırmayı amaçlamıştır. Mülakat öncesi yazılı formlar, grup ve bireysel mülakatlardan elde edilen sonuçlar katılımcılar için işbirlikli öğretimin özelliklerini, İngilizce öğretiminde başarılı bir işbirliğini geliştiren ya da engelleyen faktörleri, ve böyle bir uygulamada yer alan herkes için işbirlikli öğretimi geliştirmenin yollarını açıklığa kavuşturmuştur.

Anahtar sözcükler: işbirliği; birlikte öğretim; işbirlikli öğretim; İngilizce okutmanları, dil öğretimi

AUTHOR BIODATA

Hanife Taşdemir is a research assistant in English language teaching in the Department of Foreign Language Education at İstanbul University in İstanbul, Turkey and a former Fulbright Foreign Language Teaching Assistant. Currently, she is a PhD student at Middle East Technical University (METU) in Ankara, Turkey. She holds a BA degree from İstanbul University and an MA degree from METU in the English Language Teaching. Her research interests include teacher education, qualitative research, classroom research and instructional technologies.

Tuğba Yıldırım is an instructor at Karabük University School of Foreign Languages, in Karabük, Turkey. She has been teaching English at tertiary level for 8 years. She is a graduate of BA in Foreign Language Education from METU, Ankara. From the same university, she also holds an MA degree in English Language Teaching. Her research interests are teacher development, teacher and learner autonomy, instructional technology, and teaching English to adults.