



## The Use of Team Teaching and its Effect on Saudi EFL Students' English Proficiency

\* Abdallah Ahmad Baniabdelrahman

\*\* Abdulaziz A. Abanomey

\* Associate professor, Preparatory Year Deanship/ King Saud University

\*\* Assistant Professor, College of Languages and Translation, King Saud University

### ABSTRACT

*This quasi experimental study is aimed at studying the effect of team teaching on university preparatory year English as a foreign language students (EFL) in Saudi Arabia. Six EFL classes were given the Bell International Placement Test as a pretest to be used as a benchmark to compare a final exam at the end of fifteen weeks of team teaching instruction. Each of the six classes had 20 EFL students from a university preparatory year college. The classes were first year, level two and there are three homogenous male classes and three female classes. The six classes were broken into three groups consisting of one male and one female class in each. The groups were randomly assigned one of the three forms of team teaching being compared in this study. The first was assigned to be taught by a team of local teachers (non-native speakers of English); the second was taught by two native English speakers, and the third group was taught by the mixed method of team teaching - a combination of a native English speaker and a local non-native speaker.*

*The results showed that there was no statistically significant interaction effect between the method of teaching and the students' gender on the students' achievement in the English language proficiency test. However, the results showed that there was a significant difference among the participants' scores in English language proficiency due to the method of teaching at  $\alpha < 0.05$  ( $F = 3.32$ ,  $P = 0.0399$ ) in favor of the mixed method of teaching.*

**Keywords :** Team Teaching, native and non-native teachers, teacher collaboration, teaching methods

### Introduction

In response to the impact of English as a global language, team teaching in which there is a local, nonnative English speaker paired with a native English speaker has grown in popularity over the past decade (Nunan, 2003). The Saudi Arabian Ministry of Higher Education has implemented a policy of recruiting foreign teachers from English-speaking countries to co-teach with local English teachers at the university first year level, known as Preparatory Year (PY). Over the last three years, this team teaching arrangement has become a common phenomenon and is viewed as a strategic way to bring authentic language input to EFL classrooms. The theory is that native English speaking teachers facilitate cross-cultural communication, enhance students' English language ability, and promote local English teachers' professional development (Nunan, 2003).

Team teaching as a form of teacher collaboration has long been implemented in education at all levels. Teaching terminologies of collaboration are often exchanged and used synonymously (Welch and Sheri done, 1999; Welch et al., 1995). Terms like co-teaching (Cook & Friend, 1996; Walther-Thomas et al., 1996; Roth & Tobin, 2001), cooperative teaching (Bauwen & Hourcade, 1995) and team teaching (Welch & Sheridan, 1995; Sandholtz, 2000) refer to a similar instructional delivery system. There are four main components of co-teaching: (1) two educators, (2) meaningful instruction, (3) learners, and (4) common settings. Team teaching has a variety of operational definitions (Cook and Friend, 1996). The term may refer to (a) a simple allocation of responsibilities between two teachers, (b) team planning but with individual instruction or (c) cooperative planning, instruction and evaluation of learning experiences (Sandholtz, 2000). Operational definitions of team teaching result in varying amounts of collaboration among teachers. Not all team teaching approaches offer equivalent opportunities to foster collaboration and enhance teachers' professional development.

Team teaching has been highlighted as an effective way of promoting teachers' professional development and improving the quality of teaching and learning in schools (Knezevic & Scholl, 1996; Smylie, 1995; Talbert & McLaughlin, 1993). Teaming, compared to teachers' open discussion in regular meetings, is a collaborative practice that requires teachers' to have a closer involvement with their teammates' work, such as peer coaching and interdisciplinary teaming. Teachers pair up in teams in order to help each other with teaching problems and improve teaching practice through carrying out such activities as observing each other's classroom teaching, designing curricula, or teaching together. Since team teachers usually work closely and have frequent contact and interaction with each other, this type of collaboration makes intellectual, social, and emotional demands easier on the teachers and creates a partnership that can support their motivation to collaborate (Little, 2003).

Saudi Arabia has a short history of practicing the educational policy of team teaching, which requires foreign and local English teachers to work together in the first year at the university level (the Preparatory Year). This policy is meant to bring authentic language input to English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, facilitate cross-cultural communication, enhance students' English language skills, and promote local teachers' professional development. Since 2007, the Ministry of higher Education in Saudi Arabia has encouraged universities to establish Preparatory Year programs in which the main focus is on improving English language proficiency. The policy states that a minimum of eighty percent of the PY teachers must be native speaker of English. These teachers are paired with another teacher to instruct each class.

Bondy and Ross (1998) and George and Davis-Wiley (2000) discussed and analyzed team teaching. Their main focus was on two essential elements needed for a successful teaching team. They determined that it is necessary to have a clearly

defined and respectful relationship" between team teaching members; and co-teachers must agree on methods of instruction, discipline, supervision of classroom aides, and in some cases even the curriculum. They must also plan together, teach together and assess the students together (Abdallah, 2009).

Yanamandram and Noble (2006) examined students experiences and perceptions about two models of team teaching in Australia. The data were collected from 440 undergraduate students. The findings revealed that the majority of the students liked the concept of team-teaching. The findings suggested that team-teaching could facilitate student learning through the generation of interest and exposure to 'experts', but could hinder student learning if the team fails to act as a cohesive unit and work together to adequately linking learning concepts.

Research has confirmed that collaboration among teachers makes valuable contributions to students' learning progress (Durkin and Shergill, 2000). However, little attention has been paid to EFL students' learning in English classes. To fill the gap, this study is conducted to explore the effect of team teaching experiences of foreign and local English teachers in Saudi Arabia on EFL Preparatory Year university students' proficiency in English.

Second and foreign language researchers (Tsai, 2007; Calderón, 1995, 1999; Tajino&Tajino, 2000; Tajino& Walker, 1998) have also studied the team teaching concept of teachers' professional learning in team teaching arrangements. For these researchers, team teaching in language education creates opportunities for teachers to exchange ideas and cultural values, and encourages them to interact with and learn from one another. Team teachers also have an opportunity to observe how their colleagues teach, reflect and examine their own teaching practices, and make changes to become better teachers.

In second language education in countries like the United States and Britain, team teaching is usually implemented at school level with the purpose of providing students with authentic language input and culture while incorporating language and content instruction (Crandall, 1998; O'Loughlin, 2003), and integrating language minority and ESL students into mainstream classrooms (Becker, 2001; Coltrane, 2002; Creese, 2005; de Jong, 1996). In foreign language contexts, a teaching team, consisting of language teachers with different linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds, is able to better respond to students' needs. In contrast to the traditional language classroom, this situation provides students with more opportunities to use the target language, learn more about diverse intercultural values, and foster positive attitudes towards communicating with native speakers of the target language (Carless, 2004, 2006; Luk, 2001; Meerman, 2003; Tajino&Tajino, 2000; Tajino& Walker, 1998).

In 2007, four of the universities in Saudi Arabia started a process of employing native English speaking teachers to teach 20 hours per week to first year university students in cooperation with non-native English language teachers. The goal was to upgrade the quality of English language instruction in Saudi Arabia. Team teaching involves two or more teachers whose primary concern is the sharing of teaching experiences in the classroom, and co-generative dialoguing with each other. They take collective responsibility for the class while benefiting from the team situation to become better at teaching and providing enhanced opportunities for their students to learn.

Team teaching, in this study, refers to a collaborative model of English instruction in which one foreign English teacher and one non-native English teacher work together to teach English to the same group of first year Saudi Arabian university students. They also share teaching responsibilities in planning the lessons, in-class instruction, and follow-up work. According to the policy of the Preparatory Year colleges in Saudi

universities, native English teachers are identified as speakers of English as their first language, and they come from the United States, New Zealand, Australia, England, and Canada. Non-native English teachers are those English teachers who teach English, but English is not their first language; they may come from Saudi or other Arab countries.

### Team teaching in language education

Team teaching in English as a second language (ESL) has been implemented for different reasons, one of which is to collaborate between ESL and mainstream teachers to integrate ESL students into the "mainstream" of a school socially and academically (Becker, 2001; Creese, 2005). In contrast to traditional teaching which isolates ESL learners from their peers and mainstream curricula, team teaching affords students the opportunity to acquire English through meaningful content and to interact with a native speaker of the target language (Tsai, 2007; Becker, 2001; Coltrane, 2002; O'Loughlin, 2003). In the ESL/mainstream team teaching model, teachers plan lessons together and decide on the roles they should play in class. Content-based instruction through team teaching has increasingly been used in second language education settings (Tsai, 2007 and Kasper, 2000). Bailey et al. (2001) identified five forms of team teaching for content-based instruction based on the degrees of collaboration. These include the direct content model, team content model, subsidiary content model, supplementary content model, and adjunct model (p. 182-183). Among the five types of team teaching, team content model, subsidiary content model and supplementary content model typically involve the co-working of language and content teachers in the same classroom. The integration technique of language and content increases students' motivation to learn a language as well as variations of language input (Crandall, 1998; Grabe&Stoller, 1997).

English for academic purposes (EAP) and foreign language instruction have also similar needs for using team teaching. In EAP, using team teaching is a valuable approach that enables students to obtain content-specific information and to be supported by language teachers when they encounter difficulties in language learning (Todd, 2003). In EFL classrooms, a teaching team combining a native speaker of a target language and another teacher who shares the same mother tongue and similar learning experiences as the students. The teacher sharing the same culture with the students has the ability to handle and explain cultural and analytic components of the target language. This arrangement can best help students acquire both knowledge of the language and skills for using the language (Davison, 2006).

Although team teaching in the ESL context contributes to support for bilingual students, Creese (2005) showed that ESL teachers were generally marginalized within the three schools that she observed. ESL teachers were often relegated to a supplementary role in the classroom in which they often addressed only small groups within their classes. According to Creese (2005), it was rare that subject matter teachers and ESL teachers developed a "cooperative fully fledged teaching partnerships" (p. 202). Another language teaching curriculum associated with team teaching is content-based instruction. As Bailey, Curtis, and Nunan (2001) suggested, "team teaching is a natural format for content-based instruction" (p. 183).

The literature presented here shows that team teaching is a well established teaching method used in many schools around the world and can benefit EFL students' language learning and teachers across a variety of settings and in different ways (Shibley, 2006). Students can obtain benefits from the wealth of knowledge existing in any team, drawing on the skills and expertise of all team members. When team learning works well, it provides benefits for all parties; the student, the practice teacher, the team and service users (Davison, 2006).

There are several types of team teaching common in schools: (1). The Traditional Model in which both teachers share the

instruction of content and skills to all students; (2). The Supportive Model in which one teacher focuses on content instruction while the other teacher conducts follow-up activities or works on skill building; (3). The Parallel Instruction Model where students are divided into groups and each teacher provides instruction in the same content or skills to his or her group; (4). The Differentiated Instruction Model in which students are divided into groups on the basis of learning needs, with each teacher providing instruction based on his or her group's needs. The Differentiated Instruction Model requires dividing a class by ability to provide enrichment activities to the high ability group and extra support to the lower functioning group (Tonks, 2005).

In spite of all the benefits of using team teaching, researchers believe that not enough attention has been given to the power that team teaching can have over an individual student (Creese, 2005 and Durkin & Shergill, 2000). All the studies mentioned in the previous literature held comparisons between team teaching and individual teaching. None of them compared the effect of the different forms of team teaching on EFL students' proficiency in English. The purpose of this study is to study this effect.

**Statement of the Problem, Objectives and Question of the Study**

It is considered very important for Saudi Arabian university students to learn the English language because it is the universal language used as a bridge to communicate across various countries, cultures and peoples; additionally, English is the language most widely used in the fields of business, technology and academic research. Students with strong English skills have the key to communicate with the whole world, and have greater opportunities and choice of careers. In spite of this reality, high schools in Saudi Arabia are graduating students with weak English language skills. One reason could be the methods of teaching being used in the secondary schools. The team teaching method, in which native English speakers work in conjunction with local Saudi or Arab non-native English speaking teachers could be a solution to the problem. The main purpose of this research is to study the effects of team teaching upon university preparatory year EFL students in Saudi Arabia. The study addresses the following question: Does the team teaching method have an effect on EFL students' English proficiency level?

**Description of the English Language Intensive Program of the Saudi Arabia Universities**

Preparatory Year programs have been designed to address the prominence of the English language in education, technology, business, and scientific research by focusing the curriculum on developing English language proficiency in order to prepare Saudi Arabian students for university level studies. The goal of the Preparatory Year programs is to prepare students for higher education study; in doing so, the programs also serve the society in the pursuit of national goals and interests (The English Language Skills Program at King Saud University, 2009).

While taking part in the English-language program, students are subjected to intensive language training for two semesters with an average of twenty hours a week (i.e. six hundred hours in the two semesters). The program aims to develop students' competence in English and provide them with the language skills they need in their academic and professional lives.

The two semesters have constructive goals. The first semester concentrates on general English for communication; second semester builds on these skills and focuses on English for Academic purposes (EAP), which concentrates on reading and academic writing. During this period, students study English for Specific Purposes (ESP) in which the curriculum is geared toward their chosen academic disciplines. Another purpose of the PY is to prepare students for the global standard examinations (IELTS/TOFEL and PET). After successful completion of the program students will take one of the afore

mentioned examinations.

**The Objectives of the Program**

By the end of the two semester PY program, students are expected to meet the following objectives:

- To show an advancement in English language skills and linguistic competence
- To effectively communicate in written and spoken English
- To acquire basic academic skills and strategies necessary for academic success
- To be prepared to meet at least the minimum requirements for the international standard for linguistic competence examinations (IELTS/TOFEL and PET)

The curriculum and materials used for the PY programs take into consideration the local culture and norms. These academic materials have been developed by British and American companies such as, Bell International and Kaplan in partnership with the University of Cambridge University Press and Pearson Longman.

**Program Overview**

At the beginning of the academic year, students are given a placement test to determine their abilities and language skills level. The placement tests are online based, computer based or paper based tests. Based on the result, a student is placed in one of the six levels in the program (levels one through six).

The intensive English language program aims to develop the students' language competence in the basic language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Attention is also given to grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. The overlap of studying these skills in an integrated skills approach is intended to improve students' fluency and accuracy in the target language.

The teaching staff is experienced and dynamic. Eighty percent of the teachers are native English speakers. All teachers are academically and professionally qualified. The minimum qualification is to have earned a bachelor's degree along with certificates in the Cambridge-based English language teaching (CELTA and DELTA) programs. Policy dictates that in addition to the minimum qualifications, no less than forty per cent of teachers hold a PhD and/or a master's degree.

**Procedures and Design**

This study is a quasi experimental study that uses the quantitative design. The test subjects for this study were six EFL classes made up of twenty students each. The test subjects were first year science majors in the PY program and of the six classes participating in this study three were homogenous male and three female classes. The students were given the Bell International Placement Test at the beginning of the semester to determine their current level; all participants in this project tested into level two (out of six). One class of all male students and one of all female students were randomly assigned to be taught by one of the three team teaching arrangements. The first set of classes was taught by two local teachers who were non-native English speakers. The second set was taught by two non-local, native speakers of English. And, the third set was taught by a mixed team consisting of one local, non-native English speaker and one native English speaker. Male classes were taught by male teachers and female classes were taught by female teachers (see table 1 below).

Group	Classes		Total
	Male	Female	
Non-native English speaking teachers group	1	1	20
Native English speaking teachers group	1	1	20
Mixed group teachers (native and non-native English speakers)	1	1	20
Total	3	3	60

Student gender was also considered as one of the variables in the study because in Saudi Arabia, male students have more freedom to interact socially with native speakers of English. Women have fewer opportunities to socialize in society while males leave their houses to work, to go to clubs, to join cultural centers, etc. This greater freedom creates a better chance for male students to be in contact with native speakers of English than female students, and this fact might affect student progress in learning the English language. Therefore, in order to avoid its effect as uncontrolled extraneous variable, it was taken as one of the study variables.

In order to avoid or at least minimize the difficulties which team teaching teachers usually face, such as the lack of time to plan and run individual lessons and poor communication between teamed teachers, the team teaching teachers, as part of their daily schedule and work-load, were given an hour a day to meet and discuss their plans.

Every two teachers of the same class had to prepare their lesson and lesson plans and to carry out the activities of the lessons together. The same teaching materials and the same units were used in the three groups. The study was carried out during the second semester of the academic year 2008/2009 and lasted for 15 weeks. The course materials were the same in all of the classes in this study. The textbooks that were used are titled, Interchange 2, ESP materials for Science major students, and a textbook for PET Test preparation.

**Validity and Reliability of the Placement Test**

The Bell International Placement test is a standardized test produced by Cambridge University. It is considered a valid and reliable exam that the PY program had used several times. In spite of this fact, the researcher asked a number of EFL professors, managers, coordinators and teachers in the English Language program to assess the test and verify its suitability to Saudi University first year students. They evaluated the test in terms of the language used, clarity, relevance to the skill it meant to test, and timing. All of them agreed that the test is valid and reliable. The Cronbach alpha was also calculated and found to be 96.21.

**Data Collection**

At the end of a fifteen week semester all participants sat for the PET test from Cambridge University (an internationally valid and reliable test) to assess their English language acquisition progress. The test covers the four main language skill, listening, speaking, reading and writing which are the focus of the PY program. The speaking part of the test was carried out over three days while all the other three parts were done in one day. The tests were corrected at the Cambridge University testing center then the students' results were converted into scores out of 100 percent to match the Saudi University regulations.

**Data Analysis and Results**

Students' results in the PET test were analyzed, using the SAS software. Means, standard deviations, ANOVA test and the effect size equation:

$$\Delta = \frac{\bar{X}_E - \bar{X}_C}{\left( \frac{\sigma_E + \sigma_C}{2} \right)}$$

were used to find out whether there were significant differences among students' results due to the teaching method and the students' gender.

**Table 2 below presents the means and standard deviations of the students' scores in the placement test of the three groups before the treatment started.**

SOURCE	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
TWO LOCAL TEACHERS	40	33.40	2.45
METHOD TWO NATIVE SPEAKERS	40	33.025	2.25
NATIVE AND NON NATIVE	40	33.075	2.12

MALES	60	33.28	2.26
GENDER			
FEMALES	60	33.05	2.34
<b>METHOD GENDER</b>			
NON NATIVE MALE	20	33.95	2.28
NON NATIVE FEMALE	20	32.85	2.54
NATIVE MALE	20	33.25	2.27
NATIVE FEMALE	20	32.80	2.26
MIXED MALE	20	32.65	2.13
MIXED FEMALE	20	33.50	2.26

**Table 2 shows that the mean scores of the three groups were very close to each other. The same thing is true regarding the mean scores of the male and female students.**

p	F Value	Mean Square	Type III Squares	DF	Source
0.73	0.32	1.66	3.32	2	Method
0.58	0.31	1.63	1.63	1	Gender
0.16	1.87	9.86	19.72	2	Method*Gender
		5.26	600.00	114	Error
			624.67	119	Grand Total

Table 3 shows that there was no statistically significant difference among the mean scores of the three groups in the English language proficiency test before the study started (F-value = 0.32, P = 0.73) which means that the three groups were homogenous and equivalent. The results also show no significant differences between the male and female students (F-value = 0.31, P = 0.58).

Source	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Two local Teachers	40	60.43	7.37
Method Two Native speaker	40	61.60	7.22
Native and Non native	40	64.98	9.62
males	60	61.83	9.25
Gender			
Females	60	62.83	7.29
Method Gender			
Non Native Male	20	60.70	8.86
Non Native Female	20	61.15	5.72
Native Male	20	61.25	8.03
Native Female	20	61.95	6.50
Mixed Male	20	63.55	10.85
Mixed Female	20	66.40	8.25

Table 4 shows that there are observable differences among the mean scores of the students of the three groups. The mean score of the non-native team teaching group is 60.43 with a standard deviation of 7.37; the mean score of the native team teaching group is 61.60 with a standard deviation of 7.22; and the mean score of the mixed team teaching group is 64.98 with a standard deviation of 9.62. In order to test if the differences were significant, the ANOVA test was run. The results are presented in table 5 below.

P	F Value	Mean Square	Type III Squares	DF	Source
0.0399	3.32	223.16	446.32	2	Method
0.5057	0.45	30.00	30.00	1	Gender
0.6455	0.44	29.58	59.15	2	Method*Gender
		67.31	7673.20	114	Error
			8208.67	119	Grand Total

Table 5 shows that there is no statistically significant interaction between the method of teaching and the students' gender. The results also show that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the male and female students (F=0.45, P= 0.5057). The mean score of the male students was 61.83 and the mean score of the female students was 62.83. On the other hand, the results show that after treatment there is a statistically significant difference among the participants' scores in the English Language proficiency due to the method of teaching at  $\alpha < 0.05$  (F= 3.32, P= 0.0399). The difference is attributed to the method of teaching because the other extraneous variables (such as the teaching material, the duration of teaching, the teachers' qualifications, the teaching facilities and equipment) were controlled. The only differences were the method of teaching and the students' gender.

In order to identify in favor of which method the difference was the Tukey test of multiple comparisons was used. The results

are presented in table 6:1 and 6:2 below.

Mean	N	Group
64.98	40	Group 1 (non-native)
61.60	40	Group 2 (native)
60.43	40	Group 3 (mixed)

  

Group	Group 1	Group 2	Group3
Group 1 (non-native)			*
Group 2 (native)			*
Group 3 (Mixed Group)	*	*	

Table 6 shows that there is a statistically significant difference between the third method of teaching (team teaching of mixed teachers: native and non-native) on one hand; and the other two methods on the other hand (team teaching of two native teachers or team teaching of two non-native teachers) on their effect in improving the students proficiency in English in favor of the team teaching of mixed teachers (native and non-native). The results do not show significant difference between the team teaching method of two native teachers and the team teaching method of the non-native teachers.

The effect size equation was used to check the significance of the practical effect of the team teaching technique (mixed team teachers compared to non-native team teachers) along with the statistical significance through the level of improvement in standard deviation. The effect size was calculated and found to be 0.536, which is significant at  $\alpha < 0.05$ .

The effect size equation was also used to check the significance of the practical effect of the team teaching technique (mixed team teachers compared to native team teachers) along with the statistical significance through the level of improvement in standard deviation. The effect size was calculated

$$\Delta = \frac{\bar{X}_E - \bar{X}_C}{\left( \frac{\sigma_E + \sigma_C}{2} \right)}$$

and found to be 0.47, which is also significant at  $\alpha < 0.05$ .

### Discussion and Recommendation

In spite of all the difficulties of using the team teaching method, such as the challenge for teachers to find time for discussions, the needed support from many sides, including the teachers, school administrators and even the students' parents, and the special preparations and special training needed for teachers, which may not easily be achieved, team teaching has been proven to be a successful teaching method used in many schools around the world. At public universities in Saudi Arabia, team teaching is an especially pervasive instructional method in ESL classes. The government sponsors the Saudi Exchange and Teaching Program or SET Program and supports bringing thousands of English-speaking Assistant English Instructors (AEI) to Saudi Public Universities.

The results of the study showed that the team teaching method, which requires foreign and local English teachers to work together at the university level in the Preparatory Year was significantly better than the other two methods of team teaching in improving the students' English language proficiency. This result might be due to the fact that the use of team teaching of mixed background teachers allows teachers to experiment with a much wider variety of instructional models than could be attempted in a single teacher classroom or teachers of the same backgrounds. This model of team teaching seems to be an attractive instructional model (Tonks, 2005). Native speaking increases learner motivation, promotes cross-cultural understanding, enables more effective presentation of language content, especially dialogues, increases learner participation, produces effective educational materials (Benoit and Haugh, 2001) and provides on-the-job training for Saudi instructors of English. At the same time, teachers who share their culture and background with the students are more able to understand how their students think which enables them to under-

stand their students' difficulties, hopes and values.

As a follow up to the study, the researcher interviewed the participating teachers. He asked them: "Which is better from your point of view to teach a class with two native speaking teachers or one native and one non-native? Why?"

### Some of the answers were:

Salem (Non-native): "One native speaker and one non-native speaker so that they can complement each other. Non-native speakers are brilliant in teaching grammar. In some cases their English is perfect. Native speakers have a much wider vocab, an authentic accent and the knowledge of idiomatic English."

George (Native): "One native and one non-native. I think it is useful and productive in sense that you won't have two non-native teachers paired together. A native speaker can always be of assistance if need arises. However, from what I understand from the students is that many are frustrated due to many non-native speakers accent."

Pronunciation is the key to the English language, something that many non-natives struggle in."

David (Native): "One native and one non-native. The students can be exposed to two different teaching styles and approaches to learn English. They will also gain experience listening to two different accents. In addition, the non-native speaker might have better understanding of the difficulties faced by an Arabic-speaking learner of English."

Mark (Native): "I'd prefer to teach with a second native speaker due to cultural similarities; most likely to have better understanding of one another; similar background; and no contradictions in speaking/pronunciations."

Jennifer (Native): "One native and one non-native because this leads to better pedagogical outcome for the students, and better understanding between teachers/Integration."

All the interviewed teachers (native and non-native) believe that team teaching is of benefit to EFL students' language learning. The co-operation of the two teachers from two different backgrounds provides learners with a wider variety of instructional methods; it increases contact with native English teachers; and it reduces psychological stress. It brings authentic language input to English as Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, facilitates cross-cultural communication, enhances students' English language skills, and promotes local teachers' professional development. Team teaching in language education creates opportunities for teachers to exchange ideas and cultural values, encouraging them to interact with and learn from one another and this supports Abdallah's claims about team teaching (2009). Honigsfeld and Dove (2008) reported that co-teaching can (a) become an effective support for inclusive practices to accommodate the needs of diverse English Language learners. (b) it exposes English language learners to authentic language; and (c) it also exposes native speakers to students from other cultures.

Based on the results of the study, it could be concluded that in EFL contexts, a teaching team, consisting of language teachers with different linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds, is able to better respond to students' needs. This model provides students with more opportunities to use the target language, learn more about diverse intercultural values, and foster positive attitudes towards communicating with native speakers of the target language. Differences in cultural background and teaching strategy expose team teachers to being challenged and compared by students in class. The implementation of team teaching provides teachers with the opportunities to collaborate and assist one another in their teaching and widens their concept of teaching strategies and class management.

Cooperation between teachers in a team teaching arrangement can serve as an example of teamwork and communication. In an ESL setting, teaming teachers can effectively provide a communicative model in the target language. In addition, through parallel or differentiated instruction, learners can receive more personal instruction time from teachers. Finally, because learners are taught by more than one teacher, there is an increased chance that each learner encounters an instructional style that matches his or her learning style (Goetz, 2000).

Part of the limitations of the study was that the researcher was not able to get the students' results in each of the language skills (Listening, Reading, Speaking, and Writing) in

the PET Test. He only got their scores out of 100 of the four skills together. The researcher recommends conducting another study investigating the effect of team teaching on students' proficiency in each of the four language skills. He also recommends studying the effect of team teaching of native and non-native teachers on school level students in the different education stages.

## REFERENCES

- Abdallah, Jameelah. (2009). Benefits of Co-Teaching for ESL Classrooms. *Academic Leadership Online Journal*, 7(1). Retrieved on 15/8/2009 from [http://www.academicleadership.org/emprical\\_research/532.shtml](http://www.academicleadership.org/emprical_research/532.shtml) | Bailey, Kathleen. M., Curtis, Andy., & Nunan, David. (2001). Pursuing Professional Development: The self as Source. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle. | Bauwens, Jeanne; Hourcade, Jack J. (1995). Cooperative Teaching: Rebuilding the School House for all Students (Austin, TX, PROED). | Benoit, Rebecca. & Haugh, Bridget. (2001). "Team Teaching Tips for Foreign Language Teachers." *The Internet TESL Journal* 7(10). Retrieved on 9 August, 2005 <<http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Benoit-TeamTeaching.html>> | Becker, Helene. (2001). Teaching ESL K-12: Views from the Classroom. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle. | Bondy, Elizabeth; Ross, Dorene. (1998). Teaching teams: Creating the context for faculty action research. *Innovative Higher Education*, 22(3): 231 – 249. | Calderon, Margarita. (1995). Dual Language Program and Team-Teachers' Professional Development. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. | Calderón, Margarita. (1999). Teachers learning communities for cooperation in diverse settings. *Theory into Practice*, 38, 94-99. | Carless, David R. (2004). JET and EPIK: Comparative Perspectives. Paper presented at the KOTESOL, Busan, Korea. | Carless, D. (2006). Collaborative EFL teaching in primary schools. *ELT Journal*, 60, 328-335. | Bronwyn, Coltrane. (2002). Team teaching: Meeting the needs of English language learners through collaboration. *ERIC/CLL News Bulletin*, Spring 2002. Retrieved April 5, 2005, from <http://www.cal.org/resources/News/2002spring/team.html> | Cook, Lynne; Friend, Marilyn. (1996). Coteaching: guidelines for creating effective practices, in: E. L. Meyen, G. A. Vergason & R. J. Whelan (Eds) *Strategies for Teaching Exceptional Children in Inclusive Settings* (Denver, OH, Love), 155 – 182. | Crandall, JoAnn. (1998). Collaborate and cooperate: Teacher education for integrating language and content. *English Teaching Forum*, 36, 2-9. | Angela, Creese. (2005). Teacher Collaboration and Talk in Multilingual Classrooms. Frankfurt, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd. | Davison, Chris. (2006). Collaboration between ESL and content teachers: How do we know when we are doing it right? *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9, 454-475. | de Jong, Ester Johanna. (1996). Integrating: What Does it Mean for Language Minority Students? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Bilingual Education, Orlando, Florida. | Durkin, Christopher, and Sheirgill, Makhan. (2000). A team approach to practice teaching. *Social Work Education*, 19(2): 165-174. | George, Marshall A.; Davis-Wiley, Patricia. (2000). Team teaching a graduate course: case study: A clinical research course. *College Teaching*, 48(2): 75-80. | Goetz, Karin and EGallery. (2000). "Perspectives on Team Teaching." EGallery. University of Calgary. Retrieved on 9 August, 2009 <<http://www.ucalgary.ca/~egallery/goetz.html>> | Grabe, William., & Stoller, Fredricka L. (1997). Content-based Instruction: Research foundations. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.), *The Content-Based Classroom: Perspective on Integrating Language and Content* (pp. 5-21). White Plains, NY: Longman. | Honigsfeld, ANDREA, & Dove, MARIA. (2008). Co-teaching in the ESL classroom. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 2, 8-14. | Tsai, Jui-min. M. (2007). Team Teaching and teachers' professional learning: Case studies of Collaboration between foreign and Taiwanese English teachers in Taiwanese Elementary Schools. PhD Dissertation, Ohio State University. Retrieved on 20/11/2009 from [http://etd.ohiolink.edu/etd/send-pdf.cgi/Tsai%20Jumin.pdf?acc\\_num=osu1186669636](http://etd.ohiolink.edu/etd/send-pdf.cgi/Tsai%20Jumin.pdf?acc_num=osu1186669636) | Kasper, Loretta F. (2000). Content-based College ESL Instruction. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. | Knezevic, nne., & Scholl, Mary. (1996). Learning to teach together: Teaching to learn together. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching* (pp. 79-96). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved on 15/11/2009 from [http://etd.ohiolink.edu/etd/send-pdf.cgi/Tsai%20Jumin.pdf?acc\\_num=osu1186669636](http://etd.ohiolink.edu/etd/send-pdf.cgi/Tsai%20Jumin.pdf?acc_num=osu1186669636) | Little, Judith.W. (2003). Inside teacher community: Representations of classroom practice. *Teachers College Record*, 105, 913-145. | Luk, Ching M. (2001). Exploring the sociocultural implications of the native English-speaker teacher scheme in Hong Kong through the eyes of the students. *Asia Pacific Journal of Language in Education*, 4, 19-49. | Meerman, Arthur. D. (2003). The impact of foreign instructors on lesson content and student learning in Japanese junior and senior high schools. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 4, 97-107. | Nunan, David. (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, Judith. B. (2003). Collaborative instruction in elementary school: Push-in vs. pull-out. *The ELL Outlook*, 2. Retrieved April 5, 2005, from [http://www.coursecrafters.com/ELL-Outlook/2003/Outlook\\_0403.pdf](http://www.coursecrafters.com/ELL-Outlook/2003/Outlook_0403.pdf) | Roth, Wolff-Michael & Tobin, Kenneth. (2001). Learning to teach science as practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(6), 741 – 762. | Sandholtz, Judith H. (2000). Interdisciplinary team teaching as a form of professional development. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 27(3), 39 – 50. | Smylie, Mark. A. (1995). Teacher learning in the workplace: Implication for school reform. In T. R. Guskey & M. Huberman (Eds.), *Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms and Practices* (pp. 92-113). New York: Teachers College Press. | Tajino, Akira, & Tajino, Yasuko. (2000). Native and nonnative: what can they offer? Lessons from team-teaching in Japan. *ELT Journal*, 54, 3-11. | Tajino, Akira; Walker, Larry. (1998). Perspectives on team teaching by students and teachers: Exploring foundations for team learning. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, 11, 113-131. | Talbert, Joan E.; McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin. (1993). Understanding teaching in context. In D. K. Cohen, M. W. McLaughlin & J. E. Talbert (Eds.), *Teaching for Understanding: Challenges for Policy and Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. | The English Skills Program at the Preparatory Year/King Saud University. (2009). Retrieved from <http://www.py.ksu.edu.sa> | Todd, Richard Watson. (2003). EAP or TEAP? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2, 147-156. | Tonks, Basil. (2005). ESL team teaching in the Japanese context. *The International TEYL Journal*. Retrieved on 9 August, 2009 <<http://www.teyl.org/article12.html>>. | Yanamandram, Venkata. and Noble, Gary. (2006) "Student Experiences and Perceptions of Team-Teaching in a Large Undergraduate Class." *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*: Vol. 3: Iss. 1, Article 6. Retrieved on 15/11/2009 from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1043&context=jutlp> | Shibley, Ivan, A. (2006). Interdisciplinary team teaching: Negotiating pedagogical differences. *College Teaching*, 54(3): 122-126. | Walther-Thomas, Chriss., Bryant, Mimi. & Land, Sue. (1996). Planning for effective co-teaching: the key to successful inclusion, Remedial and Special Education, 17, 255 – 265. | Welch, Marshall. & Sheridan, Susan M. (1995). Educational Partnerships: Serving Students at Risk. Fort Worth, TX, Harcourt Brace. | Welch, Marshall; Brownell, Kerilee; Sheridan, Susan M. (1999) "What's the score and game plan on teaming in school": a review of the literature on team teaching and school-based problem-solving teams. *Remedial and Special Education*, 20: 36 – 49.