



KEY THEMES FROM TEACHER-TRAINEE PERCEPTIONS ON TEAM TEACHING IN A READING METHODOLOGY COURSE

Todd Jobbitt

Associate Professor, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.20251609.0089>

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 18th August 2025

Received in revised form 27th August 2025

Accepted 13th September 2025

Published online 28th September 2025

Key words:

Team teaching, professional development, teacher-trainees, higher education, perceptions

ABSTRACT

Although there is a nearly three-decade history of team teaching between NESTs and NNESTs in Korean public-school English-language courses, many Korean graduate-school teacher-trainees still lack awareness of and practice in team-teaching approaches. The aim of this research was to gain insight on what graduate-school trainees in a reading methodology course thought about the team-teaching approach of co-teaching. After being introduced to co-teaching (*teaming*), students made teams, prepared and taught a reading lesson to peers, and then completed reflective questions about the experience. Results showed that while trainees responded positively to the co-teaching approach, and would try it again if given the opportunity, they also viewed co-teaching as more of a 'stepping stone' to stronger solo-teaching obligations in Korea's traditional educational system. In sum, more exposure and practice in team-teaching approaches is needed to boost trainees' professional development opportunities at the graduate school level in Korea.

Copyright© The author(s) 2025, This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

Team teaching (TT) has been practiced in Asian public-school English language classrooms (like Japan, Korea, and Singapore) for nearly three decades. Such TT (also known as *teaming* or *co-teaching*) typically involves one Native English Speaking Teacher (NEST) and one non-native English-speaking Teacher (NNEST) working collaboratively in an English-language teaching (ELT) classroom. The focus of this paper is to better understand teacher trainee perspectives on the introduction and application of the TT approach in a reading methodology course by having students co-teach a reading lesson. Themes on the process will be identified and juxtaposed against a backdrop of professional development. Team teaching is supported by sociocultural theory due to its dependence on interaction with others via collaborative teamwork processes. Thus, TT has been shown to foster peer learning, increase motivation, and "stimulate reflection on experiences as a basis to undertake action to improve professional behavior" (De Backer, et al, 2021, p. 2), as well as impact many other areas related to professional development (Kim & Lee, 2020).

*Corresponding author: **Todd Jobbitt**

Associate Professor, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies

Traditional team teaching may involve two professional teachers or one professional paired with one student practitioner. Trainees in this study, however, had either zero teaching experience, or up to several years of teaching at an academy or public school. In addition, wholesome graduate school students may have had past exposure to team teaching as a public-school student, memories fade, and such TT observation might support, but does not equal training in TT. There was likely limited-to-zero exposure to explicit training in either team or peer teaching practices for these students. For these reasons, and to boost students' sense of professional development, this author introduced TT to these students. The primary research questions were:

1. What do teacher trainees know about TT approaches?
2. What about the team-teaching process would be seen as helpful or challenging to students?
3. Would students see value in using TT in future language classroom contexts?

This study contributes to research in the field of team teaching in relationship to graduate school teacher trainees' perspectives on a TT approach used to teach a reading lesson to peers in a reading methodology course.

Definition of Team Teaching

Team teaching is a teaching model which has students working in pairs to prepare, teach, and evaluate a course. Barahona (2017) defines team teaching as “two or more teachers engaged in the process of teaching including preparation, planning, material design, [and] actual teaching and assessment” (p. 144). Friend et al (2010, as cited in Alvarez et al. (2024) offers six approaches to team teaching:

1. *One-teach, one-observe.* One (or more) teacher(s) instructing the class and an observer keeping records of student participation and progress to be used in follow-up discussions. Teachers may alternate between these roles.
2. *Station teaching.* Students rotate to be taught in groups by different teachers.
3. *Parallel teaching.* Several teachers teach (individually or with another teacher) the same material, following the same teaching arrangements with different student groups.
4. *Alternative teaching.* One teacher works with a small group for specific purposes, the other teaches the rest of the class.
5. *Teaming. (Team teaching / Co-teaching).* Contrastive joint co-teaching to same group.
6. *One teach, one assist.* One teacher leads the teaching, while the other assists and offers support to students.

There are many responsibilities within each approach for which teachers are required to share expertise, clarify, negotiate, plan, and evaluate, amongst other steps, making TT a truly interactive process for professional and student teachers alike.

History of Team Teaching in Korea

Korean public school English classes began in 1996 with the implementation of the English Program in Korea (EPIK). EPIK was established to bring NESTs into Korean public schools to team teach with Korean English teachers (KETs) due to the “input-poor environment where learners have little opportunity to hear or read the language outside or even inside the classroom” (Kourago, 1993, as cited in Park & Lee, 2015, p. 92). EPIK continues to this day using a TT approach while background English saturation remains similar to past decades. Although fairly successful overall for boosting NNESTs’ motivation via English exposure and support (Heo & Mann, 2015), increased awareness and use of translanguaging orientation (Park et al, 2020) and providing exposure to a native English speaker, some past challenges with team teaching, such as unclear role expectations and communication problems (Kim, 2010), and shades of willingness to cooperate (Jeon, 2010) seemingly persist. Additionally, some teacher pairs may just not know how to implement nor evaluate their co-teaching (Su, 2021).

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The participants were a small class of 12 graduate school teacher trainees. All were English education majors aged from early-20’s to early-30’s. About half the students had non-public school teaching experience or zero teaching experience.

Students in this program generally complete a master’s degree, and then obtain an education-related job (academy or after-school teaching, publishing house, etc.).

Limitations and Challenges

There were several minor challenges to the study. One was the number of students. With only twelve students participating initially, no pre-questionnaire on team teaching was used, hence the narrow focus on perceptions and themes related to team teaching. Incidentally, one student dropped the course soon after the team-teaching activity for reasons unknown. A second challenge was time. PDP sample lesson practice, late-semester solo microteaching demands, and individual student internships meant that the entire class would only be present for about half of the term for each 90-minute class. To ensure that all students participated, TT was introduced and performed over a two-week period. Another challenge on the student-side was that not all students had teaching experience. Random grouping alleviated some of this problem, but not all students were paired with an experienced teacher. A final limitation was that there was no evaluation section of the co-teaching. Although students taught in English, the group-teaching context was inauthentic, meaning that peers were taught, not the targeted contexts (middle and high school students) presented in the ARM plans.

Procedure

This procedure is focused on how students were prepared for the team-teaching practices used in the course and their implementation of team teaching. Early in the semester, students were introduced to sample reading lessons using an adapted version of Scrivener’s (2009) Activity Route Map (ARM) framework. The ARM framework can be conveniently chunked into Pre (lead-in), During (main stage), and Post (close) stages. The focus of team teaching was on only the pre and during stages in this PDP lesson presentation.

The introduction to team teaching and student preparation took approximately two weeks. In the first class, students watched a short video (Co-teaching and teacher collaboration) featuring the six team-teaching approaches. Because the teaching context would be their classmates and not mixed-ability EFL learners, TT (co-teaching) was chosen as the preferred approach. Then, students made ‘teams’ of two. Students then participated in a TT workshop, which had students preparing or choosing a reading topic and text (either from a prepared text, via AI, an original source online, etc.). The text length could be from 200-400 words. Finally, students created their respective mini-PDP lesson using the ARM framework, as well as materials (text and worksheets, etc.).

There are a few differences between a full PDP lesson and a mini-PDP lesson. Note that a full PDP lesson would feature two-to-three lead-in tasks, three-to-five main stage tasks, and a close stage with three steps (close, feedback, and post-activity). However, the prepared mini-PDP lessons were shortened with basic criteria due to the 90-minute time constraint: students were told to plan two-to-three Pre (lead-in) tasks and two-to-three During (main stage) tasks only. So, these were ‘mini-PDP lessons’ due to the potential shortening of main-stage task work and the absence of the close/post stage. Some teams taught two tasks for each stage while other teams taught two

lead-in tasks and three main-stage tasks. To remind, the focus here was less on the PDP lesson planning, and more on the co-teaching process that students would experience within a constrained amount of time – 90 minutes for three pairs of teachers.

In the second class, students co-taught their PDP lessons. The class was split into two groups of six students. Each pair took turns co-teaching to the other four classmates (the ‘students’). Teams decided beforehand who would teach which task. Students were given 15-20 minutes to co-teach their mini-PDP lesson. Both the teaching procedure and amount of time for teaching seemed to be convenient and comfortable processes for students, at least superficially. After co-teaching, a three-part reflection essay of up to 400 words was completed to obtain students’ perceptions about the team-teaching process. First, students individually wrote a short introduction that included their opinion on the two-week process. Second, students answered four reflection questions (see Table 1) for the essay body; then, they concluded the essay by rephrasing their opinion and adding whether they would recommend TT, or not, to other teachers.

Table 1. Team-teaching essay reflection questions

Team-teaching reflection questions
1. What was helpful to you about team teaching (partner, process, text, template, etc.)?
2. What was challenging or a hindrance to your team teaching?
3. What would you do differently next time for TT? Would you use the same tasks?
4. Would you try using TT in your Korean context? Would this work, or not?

For the essay parts, eight students completed the introduction, and all eleven students completed the reflection questions and the conclusion. A twelfth student, who had helped her partner prepare and had taught, dropped the course and so did not submit the reflection essay. The students’ answers – their perceptions – to these reflection questions, revealed several major themes about their team-teaching experience.

RESULTS

Several major themes became evident based on students’ answers in the reflection essays. A major theme is defined as a response that demonstrates a feeling, observation, or opinion that a majority of the class evinced. To avoid repetition, the student responses below will be representative of the majority of the students’ opinions. Again, the reflection essay had three major parts: an introduction, a reflection-response section, and a conclusion, and the results are presented sequentially.

The introduction paragraph results showed wide-ranging thoughts of similarity. In general, although some students initially expressed mixed-feelings about TT, the two-week TT process was seen as positive overall. Student 1 (S1) gave a response indicative of the majority, stating, “When I first heard about team teaching, I honestly had mixed feelings. It sounded exciting, but also a little stressful. After (teaching)...I can say that overall, it was a really valuable learning opportunity.” Student 8 (S8) and Student 10 (S10), however, expressed initial

hesitation due to a lack of actual teaching experience. Student 8’s statement mirrored Student 10’s, which was, “I started worrying immediately...because I haven’t taught anyone in English before.” Whereas, Student 11 (S11) confessed to not having had any exposure to team teaching in her educational history. S11 said, “It was not a common concept for me to teach in team (sic), since there had been always sole teacher in my classroom.” This latter response answered a curiosity that this author had in regard to these students’ past language learning classroom experiences, which was one reason for this study.

The essay body section featured responses to the four reflection questions, which helped revealed themes about the students’ experience with the team-teaching process more clearly. The first question was, “*What was helpful to you about team teaching (partner, process, text, template, etc.)?*” A major theme that emerged from question one responses was that ‘having a supportive or experienced partner was a great benefit’. For example, S10, who had never taught in English before, stated:

I worked with a partner who was already working as an English teacher. She gave me many helpful tips how to prepare teaching materials and how to plan on ARM. Through this experience, I was able to learn many things that I had not known before. (S10)

This response is an explicit example of Vgotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) (Vgotsky, 1980) in action, where individuals learn through interaction (socializing) with others, usually where a more-experienced individual provides scaffolding assistance to a less-experienced individual. Other students’ comments showed that same peerwork benefit. For instance, Student 2 (S2) expanded on S10’s comment, saying that TT, “gave me the chance to learn from my partner’s teaching style and classroom management”, but S2 also commented on the emotional effects of teaming, stating:

Sharing ideas and working together created a supportive atmosphere, making the teaching process more enjoyable and less stressful...dividing the responsibilities with another teacher reduced the overall pressure. I didn’t have to handle everything alone, which allowed me to focus more on my parts of the lesson. (S2)

Finally, Student 9 (S9) commented on her partnership:

Having a partner was a big help. We each created a brief outline of the lesson and then shared our ideas to choose the activities that suited our goals best. Sharing the workload made things easier and gave us more creative ideas. (S9)

A second theme that emerged from question one was the ‘usefulness of different materials.’ Prior to TT, students participated in PDP reading lessons, were given a summary sheet of common pre-reading and during reading activities, practiced strategy training (skimming for previewing, predicting, and main idea; scanning for details, inferencing), and also summarizing, and lastly were introduced to the ARM organizational framework. Students commented positively on these materials and processes. For example, Student 3 (S3) said, “By participating in team teaching, I was able to apply many reading-related activities that I had learned in class”, while Student 6 remarked on materials design, maintaining, “Working with existing worksheets provided new insights into

how I could design more effective materials in the future.” No such insights were offered by S6, but finally, remarks from Student 4 (S4) were summative for those of Student 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, and 10. S4 mentioned that,

One of the most helpful aspects of TT was the ARM template itself. The structured format helped me to organize ideas clearly and divide tasks logically. It was also beneficial to have a set process to follow, as it kept the lesson flow smooth and coherent. By using the ARM template, I found it easier to align activities with objectives and ensure that students stayed engaged throughout the lesson. (S4)

It was encouraging to this author to see that the prior PDP lessons and materials used for training were of benefit to students in their TT demonstrations.

The second reflection question was, “*What was challenging or a hindrance to your team teaching?*”. A third major theme that was revealed from question two responses was that ‘managing time’ was of utmost importance. Time aspects were split into two categories: time for proper lesson planning and time for task management during co-teaching. To illustrate, Student 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10 all commented on aspects of time challenges related to lesson planning.

An important comment on timeliness was related to communication about preparation for the lesson plan. If students cannot communicate clearly in a timely manner about their teaching ideas, things can go poorly. Although in a study on co-teaching with multilingual learners, Dove and Honigsfeld (2023) reported supportively similar results to this study’s respondents in that, “Lack of time for collaboration was most noted in the research for not co-planning lessons” (p. 21). For example, Student 2 (S2) stated, “One of the biggest difficulties was scheduling time to discuss and plan the class together. Since both teachers were busy, it was hard to find a time that worked for both of us.” Graduate students are generally busier than undergraduate students, and several of the students in this class work full-time. Thus, due to work schedules and distance – living in different areas of Seoul – Student 5 (S5) and their partner communicated via text messages, but admitted that this was less than satisfactory:

It was a little difficult because we couldn’t have deep discussions face-to-face, and it was hard to talk about the lesson plan or adjust our ideas perfectly. Next time, I would like to have better teamwork during the preparation process. (S5)

That final comment from S5 is perhaps a sentiment that all students would prefer, as setting clear meet times for lesson planning, in any format, is vital to successfully teaching a lesson. For instance, although Zoom was used for planning with her partner, Student 9 (S9) admitted that time was still limited because both students worked full time.

In preparing the lesson, Student 4 (S4) mentioned that, “coordinating the ideas and balancing the division of labor took more time and effort than I had initially expected” and that, “the planning phase required strong patience and flexibility. It taught me the importance of clear communication and detailed planning.” This latter point of ‘communication’ may relate to a possible heightening of Student 4’s attitudinal awareness about her own teaching as contrasted to how her peer taught.

Additionally, Student 8 (S8) remarked on time challenges related to task planning prior to the co-teaching demonstration. S8 stated:

There were several challenges...such predicting the duration... and the specific content of the lesson. Even though we went through a thorough discussion to predict the duration of the lesson, it was slightly challenging to divide the timeline for each activity. (S8)

Students also had challenges with time management during the lesson, both in predicting task length and task management. More expansively, Student 6’s (S6) response is comprehensive of the group’s overall comments on timeliness problems for the lesson planning and during-teaching stages. S6 wrote:

Time management proved to be particularly difficult. My partner and I, concerned that our worksheet activities might be too time-consuming, eliminated several tasks during preparation, leaving only what we considered essential. However, during the actual class, we still struggled to complete even half of the material within the allotted time. This was a recurring issue during practice sessions as well, where we frequently found ourselves running over time despite efforts to speed up. (S6)

These comments may illustrate a variety of factors: a lack of experience with the ARM framework or the context level being taught, appropriate task work for the text, classroom management (task instructions, giving materials, etc.), or teaching styles, etc.

Another comment about ‘time’ had to do with lesson pacing. The ‘flow’ between tasks for a smooth lesson can be affected by a teacher’s experience, instructional language choices, or other factors. For Student 3 (S3), it was about time management. S3 stated that one of the biggest challenges when teaching, “... was managing time. Although we planned the lesson according to the time limit beforehand, it was not easy to stick to the schedule during the lesson. Especially, in a team-teaching setting, I couldn’t control everything by myself.” The final comment about ‘control’ may be a juxtaposition of Student 3’s traditional teaching experience against this new team-teaching experience or simply discomfort with TT roles. Relatedly, another point mentioned in the during-teaching stage by students was peer communication when transitioning between tasks. For example, Student 2 (S2) observed, “There were also a few small mis communications such as misunderstanding how to transition between activities or what materials we could use.” Again, this may reflect teaching inexperience, but could also be related to the shortened TT group format.

There were two other challenges that students mentioned aside from time. One was a difference in teaching styles. For new teachers, finding a teaching style can take time, but they may have observed a favorite teacher in the past who exhibited certain features, such as language usage, use of humor, directness, etc. For Student 2 (S2), such thoughts were presented positively. S2 commented, “Additionally, each teacher might have a slightly different direction or teaching style which made it a bit difficult to create a smooth, unified lesson. But at the same, it helped me to see things from another perspective as well.”

The third reflection question, “What would you do differently next time for TT? Would you use the same tasks?”, brought

mixed responses that supported a theme of ‘positive reflective change’. Answers were generally shorter with no clear majority of similarity, yet there was agreement in smaller student clusters. Student 1, 2, and 4, for example, stated that they would make a greater effort on practicing before the lesson to boost lesson flow or coherence. Student 1’s (S1) response sums up all of the students’ answers: “I would definitely spend more time practicing together. I’d make sure that both teachers know exactly when and how they will step in during the lesson.” This is a practical reply. Indeed, meetings between teachers, particularly NESTs and NNESTs is strongly recommended, according to Carless (2006b, as cited in Park and Lee, 2015), not only to practice, but “to define their roles to their strengths” (p. 99).

Another point of convergence was on changing the task work. Student 4, 5, and 8 said that they would modify or change tasks used in the lesson. Student 4’s (S4) response was, “I would also consider using slightly different tasks – perhaps more interactive or game-based activities – to further boost student engagement and ensure a dynamic class atmosphere.” Such task types would likely be best-suited for the lead-in stage, perhaps for a lexis task. Student 8 (S8) mentioned that, “creative practice questions would have been more helpful for the learners”. This response may have been related to the main-stage comprehension questions. Regardless, one option for students to enhance lesson materials in their future language learning classrooms, as well as save time, may be the use of AI applications. In a recent study on the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI), Weng & Fu (2025) found that GenAI can help “individualize instruction to save teachers’ time on preparation tasks and provide better learning experiences to students” (p. 409).

A final aspect related to task work is that both S8 and S9 would incorporate more visual materials in the lesson, likely in the lead-in stage for predictive task work. Other responses varied, with students mentioning that they would: keep the same tasks (S1); add additional tasks (S5 and S6); wish to try a different TT approach (S3); plan a more detailed lesson (S 4); and modify teacher’s own behavior or style during the lesson; as Student 7 put it, “to interact more with the students”. This last remark may be a personal preference or a nod to a familiar speaking method used in Korean contexts, like Communicative Language Teaching.

The fourth reflection question was, “*Would you try using TT in your Korean context? Would this work? Why/why not?*” This is a clear opinion-upon-reflection question rooted either in students’ traditional past learning experiences only (for those with no teaching experience), or combined with recent classroom teaching experience. A general theme of ‘willingness to participate’ in team teaching in a Korean language classroom context was evident. All 11 students expressed such a will, but about half the class had conditions attached to this opinion. In the clear affirmative were Student 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 11, and a variety of reasons were offered. For example, Student 2 (S2) and 9 (S9) gave responses supporting co-teaching, but S2 also stated that they would like to try different team-teaching approaches. S2’s response covers both student’s comments:

I would also like to try different types of team teaching, such as parallel teaching or supporting teaching (One Teach, One

Assist). I would definitely try team teaching in the Korean context. I believe it could work well in Korea because the other teacher could help cover for any mistakes I make or support me if I have difficulties. Also, Korean schools emphasize teamwork among teachers, so I think this method would be accepted. (S2)

Student 2’s comments appear to tangentially touch on the concept of ‘learning behavior’ (Van den Bosch et al, 2006), which is defined as, “the interaction among members of the group and the characteristics of their discourse” to build mutually shared cognition among group members, albeit in a very pragmatic projection of peer support in future contexts (p. 495). Working with a peer may better help one see how their own teaching compares to another, perhaps, but it seems that TT was engaging for Student 2. Likewise, Student 5’s (S5) positivity toward teaming also had comments focused more on teacher collaboration but disclosed an awareness of common TT pitfalls, too:

I would like to try team-teaching in Korea, too. In Korea, teachers often have less time and feel stressed when preparing lessons. Team-teaching would let teachers share ideas, think about different ways to teach, and pay more attention to the students. However, for this to work, teachers would need to have a more equal way of working together and practice good communication and cooperation. (S5)

A final observation by Student 6 (S6) offered a sobering perspective on group-teaching processes in Korean classroom contexts:

I believe TT holds significant potential for improving education in Korea. However, given the tendency of students in Korean classrooms to participate passively in group activities, it is crucial for teachers to act as facilitators who actively support and encourage student-led engagement. (S6)

To be fair, it can be said that reading lessons are not always exciting for students, especially in the Korean ‘cram school’ context, where students are primarily taught to ‘read for the test’ versus to read for comprehension or enjoyment. That said, the comments above by the majority of the class were heartening to read as such comments illustrate a predilection by these trainees to try team teaching in either their present or future Korean classroom contexts.

Of the remaining five class members - Student 1, 4, 8, 10, and 11 – all but S11 responded. This group of four also offered positive assertions of using teaming but were mainly concerned about limitations in the public- school sector on TT approaches. S4’s response exemplifies the general sentiment of this smaller group:

In the Korean educational context, I believe TT would not easily work under the current system. Due to large class sizes, strict curriculums, and limited flexibility, it could be difficult to implement TT smoothly. However, if some structural changes were made, such as smaller class groups, co-teaching training, or project-based classes, team teaching could definitely become an effective and enriching approach. (S4)

The comment on making structural changes (to public school policy) was a common thread throughout these four students’ responses. Such a comment is not unusual given the

Korean educational system's very traditional teaching style. Such a context, though, again reinforces the need to introduce alternate teaching approaches for teacher trainees to boost their professional development. This traditionalism is illustrated somewhat in Student 1's (S1) comments:

I do think it could work, especially in English classrooms where having two teachers could model real conversations for students. However, the traditional system here where I work in high school is a bit strict, and it might be hard to fit team teaching into the schedule unless the school is very open to new methods. Still, if it's possible, I think it could be a really powerful way to make lessons more dynamic and fun. (S1)

A further acknowledgement of such conformity is shown in the final comments related to question four, but along with an additional concern. Student 8 and 10 were positive on co-teaching, but their responses also made it questionable as to whether the students had actually ever observed NNEST and NEST team teaching in Korean public schools as a student, or were simply unfamiliar that KET-NEST arrangement is specifically used in English language learning classrooms. Student 8's (S8) lengthy comments are illustrative for both respondents. S8 stated:

While team teaching is an effective way to teach in certain contexts and I would love to try this method out, realistically, there are limitations to the public school system. A lot of Korean schools do not have a second instructor for every class. Most of the time, second instructors or assistant teachers are only present when students are very young or need additional support. Especially, if it is at a public school, suddenly having a second instructor for each class would need a lot of realistic adjustments in terms of timeline, schedule, division of work, etc. (S8)

This response, though favorable on TT, implies that more background knowledge on team teaching, specifically in Korean language classroom contexts, be taught to trainees upon introduction to TT approaches. This point again implies the importance of introducing TT approaches to graduate students. One challenge to such training, however, was revealed in a study by Carless (2006, as cited in Park & Lee, 2015), where it was found that NNESTs had difficulty planning team teaching classes due to their own demanding workload. Such demands on KETs are unlikely to have diminished since this study, but more recent research on the Korean context would be helpful.

After offering their opinion in the closing paragraph of the reflection essay, students were to add a short recommendation on team teaching based on their TT experience. Regrettably, nearly all of the students failed to give a recommendation, but Student 6's (S6) concluding paragraph best sums up the collective sentiment of the class on recommendations as based on the positive responses to question four, above. S6 stated:

Through this team-teaching experience I learned how important it is for teachers to work together and how it can make lesson planning easier. Team-teaching is a great way to combine ideas and strengths from different teachers, which makes the lessons better. I think team-teaching would be helpful in Korean too, and I would recommend it to other teachers. (S6)

This response is hopeful in that, although the team teaching took place over a short two-week period, students ultimately

found value in the process.

DISCUSSION

The findings in this study were both positive and negative, thematically speaking. All of the major and secondary themes presented above paralleled those found in other studies throughout Asian contexts. In their 2019 study focusing mainly on difficulties in team teaching for NESTs and NNESTs' collaborative experiences in a Chinese context, Rao and Chen (2019) found five major constraints: "lack of training in team teaching, lack of mutual understanding, conflict of teaching styles, unclear role distribution, and little time for and expertise in planning team teaching" (p. 1). The 'lack of training' and 'little time for and expertise in planning' were most prevalent in this author's study. The two-week time span in which TT was introduced, a reading ARM lesson was prepared, and then taught, was very tight and could be the reason why students responded as such. An ideal teaching context would be to have students teach in a public-school language classroom over an extended period of time with proper orientation in team-teaching approaches beforehand. In another study by Jung (2020), two team-teaching pairs "expressed generally positive perceptions of team-teaching," but noted challenges with a "lack of guidelines and in-service training on how to efficiently collaborate with an NES teacher through team-teaching", a theme revealed in this paper's responses from students (p. 54-55).

Further, although student responses indicate a willingness to try TT in a Korean classroom and view TT as helpful in enhancing their professional growth and values (like peer support), many students noted that the more traditional Korean public-school contexts may, in the words of Alvarez (2024), relegate "TT practices being ad hoc initiatives delivered by individual faculties and teaching staff, but not part of bigger educational plans supported by relevant policies" (p. 73). This point aligns with research by Carless (2006b, as cited in Park and Lee, 2015), who found that TT would reach a greater potential if it were implemented with the "system-wide curriculum and assessment priorities" (p. 100) versus being treated as a one-off course.

Additional challenges to team teaching in public schools can be an unwillingness by KETs to participate, a lack of clear role distribution, or several disadvantages revealed by Benoit and Haugh (2001, as cited in Park and Lee (2015), these being poor training and a reluctance "to share the class with others or to be observed by colleagues" (p. 95). This last point is not dissimilar to results found by Tajino and Walker (2010) which reported that team teaching development in Japanese secondary school contexts between Japanese teachers of English (JTEs) and Assistant English Teachers (AETs or NNESTs), as "ambiguous, or perhaps even displaced" [Abstract]. Fortunately, this last point was not an issue for these graduate students, but role distribution was challenging for some of the respondents due to miscommunication or lack of teaching experience.

CONCLUSION

Team teaching has a nearly thirty-year history of implementation in South Korean public school language classrooms. Despite different research approaches on TT over this time period, results show that significant progress in using TT outside of

language classrooms has not been wholly successful. While Dove and Honigsfeld (2020) note that “there is no magic in co-teaching”, there are benefits to co-teaching that can be found in “the sustained, meaningful opportunities to collaborate and support students to develop their sense of belonging and efficacy to succeed.” This author concurs and agrees that implementing even a shortened version of TT for his graduate students can be of benefit to trainees, as evidenced by the themes revealed in this study: positive peer collaboration for planning and teaching; usefulness of different materials when teaching; time management related to lesson preparation and during-teaching processes; and positive reflective change in relationship to professional development. A further effort, too, needs to be made on clarifying which of the six team-teaching approaches are to be used by practitioners and what the roles are within the approach used (Kim & Moodie, 2023). Lastly, perhaps an in-service development model of team teaching reported by Canaran and Mirici (2020) would be another way to approach TT education for trainees.

It can be challenging to focus on the positive benefits when there are equally strong detriments to the TT process, unfortunately. Going forward, trainees will have to evaluate their own professional needs and the needs of their students in future teaching contexts to determine how best to meet such needs. Based on their present experience level with language teaching context, AI application knowledge and use, as well as peer collaboration, the road ahead will feature much new landscape in each trainees’ career and professional development. As Canrinus et al. note (2012, as cited in De Backer et al., 2023), “professional identity is not a fixed construct but rather a dynamic one created and recreated by experiences and various influences and evolving over time” (p. 2). This author is hopeful that, based on the students’ responses in this study—about this TT experience of pairing, planning, teaching, and reflecting on these processes—students will be better prepared to teach on their own, as well as assist their peers should the opportunity arise in their language learning classrooms.

References

1. Álvarez, I., Fuertes Gutiérrez, M., & Gallardo Barbarroja, M. (2024). Team teaching in languages: a scoping review of approaches and practices in higher education. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 18(1), 59-77.
2. Barahona, M. (2017). Exploring models of team teaching in initial foreign/second language teacher education: A study in situated collaboration. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online)*, 42(12), 144-161.
3. Canaran, Ö., & Mirici, İ. (2020). A new model of team teaching for teacher professional development: A case study of in-service English teachers. *Education and Science*, 45(201), 247-271.
4. De Backer, L., Simons, M., Schelfhout, W., & Vandervieren, E. (2021). Let’s team up! Measuring student teachers’ perceptions of team teaching experiences. In *Teacher education: new perspectives/Kayapinar, Ulas [edit.]* (pp. 1-22).
5. De Backer, L., Schelfhout, W., Simons, M., Vandervieren, E., & Rivera Espejo, J. (2023). Impact of Team Teaching on Student Teachers’ Professional Identity: A Bayesian Approach. *Education Sciences*, 13(11), 1087.
6. Dove, M. G., & Honigsfeld, A. (2020). Is there magic in co-teaching. *Co-teaching for English learners: Evidence-based practices and research-informed outcomes*, 61-78.
7. Heo, J., & Mann, S. (2014). Exploring team teaching and team teachers in Korean primary schools. *English Language Teacher Education and Development Journal*, 17(3).
8. Jeon, I. J., (2010). Exploring the Co-teaching practice of Native and non-native English teachers in Korea. [Abstract] *English Teaching*, 65(3), 43. Retrieved from: https://openurl.ebsco.com/EPDB%3Aged%3A8%3A8359880/detail-v2?sid=ebsco%3Aplink%3Ascholar&id=ebsco%3Aged%3A54710068&crl=c&link_origin=scholar.google.com
9. Jung, Y. (2020). Perceptions of team-teaching between native and nonnative English teachers in Korean secondary schools., 21(2), 49-61.
10. Kim, M. (2010). How do Native English-speaking Teachers Perceive Co-teaching? [Abstract]. Retrieved from: <https://www.dbpia.co.kr/Journal/articleview>
11. Kim, S. Y., & Moodie, I. (2023). The models of co-teaching and a spectrum for assessing collaboration: Examining English language co-teaching practices in South Korea. *Language Teaching Research*, 13621688231218816.
12. Kim, T., & Lee, Y. (2020). Principal instructional leadership for teacher participation in professional development: evidence from Japan, Singapore, and South Korea. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 21(2), 261-278.
13. Park, H., & Lee, H. (2015). Some Problems in Team Teaching in Korean EFL Contexts and Their Solutions. , 23(1), 91-105.
14. Rao, Z., & Chen, H. (2020). Teachers’ perceptions of difficulties in team teaching between local and native-English-speaking teachers in EFL teaching. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 41(4), 333-347.
15. Scrivener, J. (2011). *Learning Teaching: The essential guide to English language teaching*. Oxford Macmillan
16. Su, W. (2022). Two heads better than one? Exploring the co-teaching of intercultural competence by NES and NNS teachers. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 31(3), 297-306.
17. Tajino, A., & Walker, L. (1998). Perspectives on team teaching by students and teachers: Exploring foundations for team learning. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 11(1), 113-131.
18. Van den Bossche, P., Gijssels, W. H., Segers, M., & Kirschner, P. A. (2006). Social and cognitive factors driving teamwork in collaborative learning environments: Team learning beliefs and behaviors. *Small group research*, 37(5), 490-521.
19. Vygotsky, L. (1980). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
20. Weng, Z., & Fu, Y. (2025). Generative AI in language education: Bridging divide and fostering inclusivity. *International Journal of Technology in Education*, 8(2), 395-420.
21. Yi, Y., & Jang, J. (2020). Envisioning possibilities amid the COVID19 pandemic: Implications from English language teaching in South Korea. *Tesol Journal*, 11(3), e00543.