

Claims of Entitlements in Elementary EFL Co-teaching

Josephine Mijin Lee*

Lee, Josephine Mijin. (2021). Claims of entitlements in EFL co-teaching. *English Teaching*, 76(3), 63-84.

This study examined teachers' claims of entitlement in collaborative teaching sequences where the non-leading teacher enters into the domain of another teacher's ongoing instructional business. The data involves video recordings of second-grade elementary Korean and American teachers co-teaching math and science lessons. The analysis reveals that directives were prevalent in teacher-teacher communication, and unilaterally involved the Korean teacher making corrective remarks of American teacher's instructions or entering to take control of classroom management. The directives were also formulated as declarative interrogatives, proposals, and imperatives, which implied the Korean teacher's high entitlement. Also when the Korean teacher's directive was not met with immediate compliance, it escalated into a more demanding imperative. These findings reveal the differential institutional status and power balance between the two teachers and demonstrate the analytical gains of applying conversation analysis to co-teaching interactional data. Potential implications for teacher training are discussed in light of collegiality and complementary collaborative teaching.

Key words: entitlements, co-teaching, asymmetry, elementary, classroom interaction

*Author: Josephine Mijin Lee, Professor, Department of English Education, Ewha Womans University; A407 Kyoyukkwan, 52 Ewhayeodae-gil, Seodaemun-gu, Seoul 03760, Korea; Email: leejosephine@ewha.ac.kr

This article is based on the author's unpublished doctoral dissertation (Lee, 2015).

Received 30 June 2021; Reviewed 24 July 2021; Accepted 16 September 2021



© 2021 The Korea Association of Teachers of English (KATE)

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0, which permits anyone to copy, redistribute, remix, transmit and adapt the work, provided the original work and source is appropriately cited.

1. INTRODUCTION

Co-teaching is now a widespread practice in both English as a Second and Foreign Language (ES/FL) contexts, and the increasing popularity is often attributed to its intuitive appeal (i.e., two heads are better than one). It has been assumed that co-teaching brings benefits to language learning, such as richer linguistic input, more individualized feedback, and expanded contexts for authentic language use and social interaction (Huh & Lee, 2015). In fact, some early research on co-taught classrooms has reported improvements in the students' language proficiency, motivation levels, language attitudes, and academic achievement (Fu, Houser, & Huang, 2007; Rao & Yu, 2021; York-Barr, Ghere, & Sommerness, 2007). As a result, co-teaching is also quite common Korea in forms where native English-speaking teachers (*weneminkyosa*) are paired up with Korean English teachers (Moodie & Nam, 2016).

Other than the effects on student learning, another strand of co-teaching research shifts focus and underscores potential gains that *teachers* may experience by being in collaborative relationships. If done optimally, co-teaching affords teachers with opportunities for professional development, mutual learning, creativity, and diversification of teaching techniques (Dove & Honigsfeld, 2010; Scruggs, Mastropieri, & McDuffie, 2007). Tajino and Smith (2016) claim that co-teaching should be *co-learning* where teachers are forming a harmonious partnership of learning from each other. Allwright (2016) also extends the concept of collaboration to a more active term, *collegiality*, which captures teachers "working in good faith, not just for themselves but also for all the other people involved" (p. xvii).

Such collaboration, although most ideal, is not always easy nor is it always unproblematic. Despite the promising potential of collaborative teaching, teachers often report frustration due to interpersonal relationship and communication issues, as well as imbalances in roles and responsibilities. Common complaints by ESL teachers include feeling like an assistant to the mainstream teacher, not being able to provide much input into lesson planning, and not knowing how and when to communicate with the other co-teacher (Arkoudis, 2006; Creese, 2010; Dellicarpini, 2009). As the ESL teacher is relegated to a marginalized status, their loss of power and authority impedes their ability to fully support the students. Similar problems have also been reported being present in EFL contexts like China, Japan, Korea, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, where native English-speaking teachers are partnered up with a non-native local teacher (Carless, 2006; Rao & Chen, 2020).

Many co-teaching relationships fail because of arising tensions that preclude teachers from reaching constructive collegiality, and there is a dire need for studies that guide teachers to successfully negotiate their roles and responsibilities and accomplish their joint endeavor of serving the demands of the students, curriculum, and institution. Therefore, this study

seeks to address this need by zooming into the interactional details of co-taught EFL classrooms. Whereas previous studies have largely relied on self-reports of the teachers – that is, their recollective sharing of conflicts in collaborative partnerships (e.g., Balanyk, 2012; Jeon, 2010; Lee & Seong, 2011; Yim, 2012) – this study analyzes a co-taught lesson in a Korean elementary school to pinpoint actual power imbalances that emerge during inter-teacher communication in the classroom. The focal phenomena for analysis are episodes wherein the non-leading teacher enters the co-teacher’s ongoing lesson, and by examining the teachers’ claims of entitlement, this study intends to show the specificities of classroom interaction that implicate power relations between the two teachers. It is anticipated that the resultant findings will contribute to our understanding of co-teaching relationships in Korea, which in turn, provide suggestions for the improvement of training for such teachers.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Teacher Collaboration in EFL Contexts

Teacher collaboration refers to activities where teachers take collective responsibility across the stages of planning, instruction, and assessment with the goal of achieving enhanced student outcomes. Friend and Cook (1992) further this concept by defining the following elements to be included in effective teacher collaboration:

- It requires that participants share a goal.
- It includes parity or equal standing among the participants.
- It requires that participants share responsibility for decisions and outcomes.
- It requires participants to willingly share resources that include not only materials but time, expertise, commitment, support of colleagues, and other resources.
- It is emergent: As participants engage in successful collaborative contexts, their skills and positive beliefs are enhanced, therefore making their collaborative experiences more successful (as cited in DelliCarpini, 2014, p. 131).

Here, what deserves emphasis is that teacher collaboration involves *equal* and complementing roles through which co-teachers may possibly develop a compatible relationship of harnessing each other’s differences and learning from their strengths.

In EFL contexts, co-teaching is often based on the assumption that partnerships between native English-speaking teachers (NETs) and non-native local English teachers (LETs), as well as their respective strengths and weaknesses, will largely be complementary. For instance, the LETs generally report having low confidence in their English abilities, but

NETs' language proficiency may compensate this weakness. On the other hand, NETs lack local knowledge that can be shared with the students while LETs may be more familiar with the local culture, institutional policies, and examination systems (Medgyes, 1992).

When concerning the equality of teacher roles, however, the whole notion of employing "native speakers" in itself starts from an unequal ground of viewing language competencies that stigmatizes the "non-native" (Cook, 1999; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Rampton, 1990). Although NETs are recruited as native-speaking "assistants" of the target language, the most widely adopted co-teaching arrangements are *one teaching/one assisting* models where a NET leads the class while the LET is relegated to a passive role, acting merely as an interpreter for the students (Kim & Im, 2008; Tajino & Walker, 1998). When LETs take the lead, it is limited to classes on vocabulary or grammatical structures, and in those cases, NETs are simply exploited as "animators" or "human recorders" (McConnell, 2000). Both scenarios involve the teachers acting as two separate individuals rather than a unitary team, and the effectiveness of these arrangements has thus been questioned. Without clear guidelines about the respective roles, it is difficult to realize a fully-fledged collaborative form of instruction that maximizes the complementarity of both teachers.

Another source of conflict that impedes equal collegiality may involve the co-teachers' differentiated professional status and teaching background. Although LETs often take the role of "assisting" the NET's lesson, they are usually more experienced in teaching. NETs, on the other hand, are often young, inexperienced college graduates that lack formal training or credentials (Chung, Min, & Park, 1999; Tajino & Tajino, 2000). They are also only responsible of teaching and not involved in any administrative duties or evaluation of the students. As a result, some studies reported that LETs face difficulties because of NET's inability to control the class, and it is the LETs that are left with the rather "unpleasant" duties of teaching: routine classroom management, student discipline, and paper work (Choi, 2009; Heo & Mann, 2015; Kim, 2014). Meanwhile, a common complaint of NETs is that LETs are heavily occupied with administrative work and are unavailable for communication or planning for the class. Being in short-term appointments, NETs are often treated as "tourists" rather than legitimate teachers and are left out of major decision making that concerns the English curriculum. NETs thus are likely to feel politically powerless, isolated, and occupying a peripheral position in the school (Kim, 2010).

A recurrent problem in co-teaching, in fact, has been this lack of parity (Davison, 2016; Dieker & Murawski, 2003; Flores, 2012; Peercy, Ditter, & Destefano, 2017). In many cases, collaboration is difficult to achieve due to one teacher, generally the more experienced one taking control and dominating the less experienced teacher. These power inequities are mostly created because of the teachers' different capabilities: NETs possessing "language power" due to their nativeness and LETs holding "political power" in the institution (Miyazato, 2009; Rao & Chen, 2020). It has been posited that if one teacher dominates,

however, the collective intelligence diminishes. A successful, balanced collegial relationship heavily relies on mutual respect and social sensitivity that provides each party with psychological safety and belonging (Honigfeld & Dove, 2012; Thousand, Villa, & Nevin, 2006).

Therefore, examining how teachers shapes their power sharing is crucial to understanding the roles and responsibilities between NETs and LETs. Previous studies have contributed to this knowledge but have predominantly relied on data collected via survey and interviews. While these findings have successfully brought to attention the voices of teachers and their lived experiences, self-reports are limited to subjective perceptions (Lee, 2016; Park, 2014), falling short in demonstrating the observable details of (non-)collaborative action. To compensate this shortcoming, this study adopts a conversation analytic approach to examine co-teaching as it unfolds in classroom interaction. Should any issues of power imbalances arise, they will not be reports but *actions* that are demonstrably visible by the participants and are consequential in shaping the co-taught lesson. The findings emerging from such fine-grained, interactionally-based analyses should illuminate the relevancies and practices that pinpoint to asymmetries in the co-teachers' roles.

2.2. Entitlement and Institutional Roles

Conversation analysis and the concept of entitlement provide an analytic framework for examining power issues as a set of practices and normative orientations enacted in social interaction. That is, power is not an abstract fluffy concept but a particular stance that is oriented to, justified, complied with, or resisted by participants, and by observing stances of *entitlement*, one is given access to roles and norms of behavior that are institutionally ordained. Entitlement concerns one's rights and restrictions, and it is locally constructed by the participants employing certain turn designs and formulations.

Assertions or statements, for instance, reflects the speaker's high entitlement as it announces the next course of action without inquiring the recipient's acceptance. Proposals, on the other hand, ask for the recipient to accept the proposed content, which consequently, assumes lower entitlement coming from the speaker (Ong, Barnes, & Buus, 2020). The format of directives can also display different stances of entitlement. Imperatives are used to display strong entitlement because it "anticipates neither refusal nor acceptance, but simply that the request be complied with" (Rossi, 2012, p. 454). In other words, the speaker positions himself or herself as one that is fully entitled to direct the recipient's action while leaving out non-compliance as a response option. Conversely, these directives can be mitigated by prefacing it with *I was thinking* or *I wonder if*, which lessens the imposition on the recipient and hence, downgrades the speaker's entitlement to the requested activity.

Directives formulated as interrogatives (e.g., can you...?), at last, also display low entitlement as it leaves the requested action open for negotiation.

These claims of entitlements are important resources that provide the analyst with access to role relationships between a request-issuer and request-recipient, as well as the norms and expectations that are demanded of institutional roles like doctor/patient, parent/child, and care-giver/client. Craven and Potter (2010) found that in parent/child conversations, imperative forms of directives were prevalent which lies in stark contrast with the patients in Curl and Drew (2008) that used *I wonder*-prefaced directives when making after-hour medical calls to a doctor. For the clients in Lindström (2005), directives were implemented through imperatives and statements to display that the senior citizen is strongly entitled to assistance – one that has the legitimate right to request care under the institutional context of home help service – and that the help provider is legally bound to grant the requested task.

As demonstrated by these studies, claims of entitlement can reveal institutionally ordained, shared understandings about the respective rights of the participants, which may not necessarily involve equal relationships or “power” held by each party. By showing who can legitimately use a more entitled directive, asymmetries in entitlement can be maximized. Ervin-Tripp (1976) thereby posited that the speaker’s choice to use a certain directive format is implicative of “the relative power of speaker and addressee” (p. 29), and by analyzing the details of talk-in-interaction, the relationship between directives and power asymmetries can be observable. It should be emphasized here that any asymmetry or power issues, should it arise in entitlement claims, are made available as the *participants’* own concerns, not the analyst labeling the interaction as “power-related” *a priori* to the analysis.

Hence, aligning with this approach, this study takes interest in the co-teacher’s displays of entitlement to analyze their respective roles in an unfolding lesson. Adhering to the conversation analytic principles of “ethnomethodological indifference” (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970), the classroom interactions will be examined to describe how the teachers’ turn designs and formulations occasion their roles, respective rights, or institutional norms. The findings based on this analysis will then uncover whether any workings of asymmetries or power imbalances that have been reported by previous co-teaching literature are indeed made relevant by the teachers.

3. DATA AND METHOD

3.1. Participants and Setting

The data is contextualized in a larger data corpus that included classroom videorecordings of 97 lesson hours collected from six teacher pairs over two years (see Lee, 2015). The data

setting was a private elementary school (K-6) in Gyeonggi Province, South Korea. Being considered as one of the elite schools in the region, the school had been implementing Korea-English bilingual education, and bilingual co-teaching was one of the main highlights of their program. Each class had two head teachers – one Korean and one American teacher (hereafter referred to as KT and ET¹) – who shared joint responsibilities for their students and were required to co-teach subjects like science, math, and art in English. By co-teaching, the two teachers were expected to co-plan and co-lead these classes in English, with the exception of Korean classes which were taught by Korean teachers alone, and English classes which were also taught only by the American teacher. This dual-language teacher set-up was an institutional feature aimed at creating a “safe and supportive bilingual environment for the students”.²

The focal pairs for this study are two teacher pairs from the second grade which amounted to approximately 13 hours of videorecorded data. For both pairs, the KTs were experienced senior teachers that had worked at the school for a long period. ETs, on the other hand, were young, novice teachers that freshly graduated from college and entered the school as their first job. Both ETs had some Korean proficiency as they were Korean-Americans, but they disguised their Korean abilities as the school policy required them to use only English. Although the teachers in each pair differed in terms of their background and teaching experiences, their roles in the classroom were both head teachers, and they held equal responsibilities for lesson planning, teaching, and evaluating the students. Table 1 summarizes the background of these teacher pairs, and the subscripts indicate the different individuals.

TABLE 1
Description of Participant Backgrounds

		Gender	Nationality	Teaching Experience on Site
Pair 1	KT ₁	M	Korean	10 years
	ET ₁	F	Korean-American	2 years
Pair 2	KT ₂	F	Korean	19 years
	ET ₂	F	Korean-American	1.5 years

At the point of data collection, bilingual co-teaching had taken place for two years. The teachers, however, frequently reported being confused with this institutional arrangement. They were unsure how collaborative teaching should be done, how their roles should be distributed within a lesson, and whether this practice actually brought benefits for their students. Also, while the KTs complained that ETs were too inexperienced to be considered

¹ KT and ET are emic terms that were used at this institution.

² This is a direct quote from the institution’s teacher manual which was distributed in 2014.

an equal “co”-teacher, some ETs reported frustration that their KT’s were often domineering, and that they felt like an assistant to the KT, rather than a colleague. These were common concerns at the institution – hence, the motivation for conducting this study.

3.2. Method of Analysis

This study adopts conversation analysis (CA) as its methodological approach (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, 2007) for examining the interactional workings of entitlement claims in the second-grade co-taught lessons. In the initial stages of “unmotivated looking” (Psathas, 1995), directives occurring in teacher-teacher interaction appeared to be a robust phenomenon from the data set. The related episodes usually involved the non-leading teacher interrupting the teacher in lead to insert a request that suggested revising the instruction. Having defined a focus, a collection was created of these directives, and each sequence was analyzed with attention to the teachers’ entitlement implicated in their turn taking organization, sequential development, and turn design.

The final collection yielded 18 instances where the procedure of the lesson was revised by a non-leading teacher on the spot. One recurrent feature of these cases was that the remedial proposals were issued solely by KT when ET had done, or was doing, something that the KT considered as being problematic. Both teacher pairs were similar in that not a single instance involved ET entering in an incursive turn to the KT’s ongoing instructional activities. All of the excerpts were transcribed according to the CA conventions of Jefferson (2004), and the transcripts were organized in three-tiered lines. The first line presents the original Korean utterance transcribed in the Yale system of romanization, the morpheme-by-morpheme translation in the second line, and the vernacular English translation in the third line.

4. ANALYSIS

The following analysis shows how KT, through different directive formats, underlines his/her entitlement to insert corrective comments in the process of ET’s lesson. The analysis reveals that KT’s directives ranges from declarative interrogatives, declarative proposals, and imperatives. No instances of mitigated directive formats such as model-verb (e.g., can you) or *I wonder if*-prefaced requests were found. The turn design and directive formulations that KT employs illustrate the differential distribution of obligations that are involved in remedying instructions and by extension, claims of entitlement that implicate the asymmetry of co-teacher relationships.

4.1. Declarative Interrogative

The first extract is a second-grade lesson on the topic of neighborhoods. The objective was to devise a map that illustrates the major landmarks of the students' neighborhoods. As an assignment, the students were required to bring photos of different buildings in their neighborhood. In the following excerpt, ET is explaining that the students should glue those photos to a map and draw other things that they find in their neighborhood as well.

Excerpt 1 [2C-130914-3-07:39] *who did not bring pictures*

98 ET₁: I want you to draw something else.
 99 (0.6)
 100 [okay?
 101 Sup: [mm?
 102 ET₁: because this is so easy
 103 Miss Ko ma:de this for you (0.3)
 104 so you just go >ppwup ppwup ppwup ppwup< finished!
 105 Yuri: yes!=
 +((ET looks at KT))
 106 →KT₁: =excuse me! +(0.7) those who d-do not bring::
 107 ET₁: pictures?=
 108 →KT₁: =pictures? they can draw (.) with their (.) hands?
 109 ET₁: ↑ah:: ye↑ah::↓
 110 →KT₁: is it possible?=
 111 ET₁: =that sounds good:?
 112 KT₁: yeah.
 113 ET₁: so Sungmin Miyeon? (.) you draw.
 +((points to 4 corners of the worksheet))
 114 +(1.4) okay?
 +((points to 4 corners of the worksheet))
 115 +(1.8)
 116 yes.
 117 KT₁: anh kacye-on salam-tul-un
 not bring-come-ATTR person-PL-TP
 118 tangyenhi ttokkathi kuli-l-swu-nun epskey-ss-ci
 of course same draw-ATTR-able to-TP not-
 119 kunikka sangsang-hal swu iss-keyss-ci
 so imagine-do-able to
**“the people that didn’t bring photos,
 of course you won’t be able to draw exactly the same
 so instead, you could imagine what it might look like”**

In lines 106 and 108, KT addresses an issue that is relevant to the students who did not bring their pictures. He first designs the onset of his turn with an *excuse me* which not only solicits ET's attention but also indicates that his ensuing utterance may involve a shift in the current activity (line 106). After securing mutual gaze, KT continues with this turn to topicalize the category of students who are without photos (line 108) and offers a proposal that seeks for ET's acceptance. Here, we see the steps that KT takes to insert an issue that was unaddressed in ET's instructions, and in doing so, KT's actions are deployed in a fashion that resort to ET's approval. Notice that KT also delays his direct intervention until ET issues

his suggestion to the students. KT's minimal response *yeah* (line 112) frees up the space for ET to directly assign the students with the drawing activity. It is only after ET signals the end of her directive sequence with a *yes* (line 116) that KT starts to elaborate the instruction in Korean (line 117). All in all, KT's actions are carefully coordinated in a manner that orients to ET's leading role in the lesson.

It should be noted, however, that this does not equal to KT taking a subordinate position. Although KT's offers his proposal in a manner that leaves room for ET's refusal, the grammatical format of KT's suggestion is a declarative statement that ends with final rising intonation, and the way that it is produced is without any mitigations. That KT offers the suggestion as a declarative interrogative shows high epistemic strength and commitment to the content he is proposing (Heritage, 2013). KT's follow up question *is it possible* (line 110) also adds evidence to this analysis. While KT makes ET's acceptance or rejection of the proposal the next relevant action, the question strongly prefers a *yes* response, and a resulting affirmation would necessitate recipient action. ET, then by issuing an agreement, is faced with the expectation to reflect the suggestion in her subsequent actions. In this sense, the way KT's proposal is designed manages to show his entitlement to make adjustments to the lesson while still displaying his respect and sensitivity toward ET's leading role.

Meanwhile, as KT seeks for ET's confirmation, ET initially aligns with KT's proposition with an enthusiastic affiliative response $\uparrow ah::: ye\uparrow ah::\downarrow$ (line 109) and in a later turn, ratifies it with a positive acknowledgement *that sounds good:?* (line 111). Note that it is also ET who marks the completion of the proposal sequence by immediately issuing the new instruction to the target students (lines 113-116). By granting KT's proposal straightaway without any disagreements, ET shows alignment not only with what the proposal is about but also with the questions of entitlement regarding who issues the proposal and who grants it with complying action.

4.2. Declarative Proposal

In Excerpt 2, KT also makes a proposition that revises the course of ET's instruction, but this time, the proposal is delivered with an escalated strength of entitlement. Here, in this second-grade lesson of *sink or float*, ET has been explaining the procedure of the activity. KT, in the meantime, has been standing in the back of the classroom.

Excerpt 2 [2H-131023-3-15:26] *share their ideas*

26	ET ₂ :	each table will get a <small>+(holds up clay)</small> +clay? (0.4)
27		and you need to tr:y so that it can <small>+(right hand reaches to clay box)</small> +float.




28 →KT₂: but before they get,
 29 and then th- they (.) share (.)
 30 their ideas °like brainstorm°
 31 ET₂: uh-huh
 32 KT₂: (xx)=
 33 ET₂: =uh-huh=okay. I':m gonna give you one minute to ta:lk
 34 with your table ho::w >you can make this float<
 35 sh:: ready? set, go

ET reaches towards the clay box, displaying that she is ready to distribute the clay to the students. While ET attempts to directly proceed to the implementation of the activity, however, KT comes in with an alternative proposition. In line 28, KT designs the onset of her turn with a disjunctive marker *but* and follows it with a statement that suggests a group brainstorming session to precede the main activity. The proposal in this extract differs from Excerpt 1 in that it is designed to project a disagreement to ET's directions. KT's inserted comment interrupts the progressivity of the sequence, and it requires that ET takes a step back in her instructional procedure. Moreover, the declarative syntax notably comes across "as a telling, rather than asking" (Craven & Potter, 2010, p. 423). The absence of interrogative tags or rising intonation treats the proposal as one that is unproblematic, and thus shows a clear orientation that KT sees himself as being entitled to alter the route of ET's plan. In this way, the format of KT's proposition strongly makes an acceptance of the proposal the next preferred action. ET shows immediate alignment by immediately granting KT's proposal with an exclamatory token *aha* (lines 31, 33), issuing an *okay*, and directly changing the course of her plan to initiate the brainstorming activity (lines 33-35). Both teachers show no orientation to problematization of the talk or to problems in regards to the asymmetric distribution of entitlement. While KT shows a clear orientation herself being entitled to offer a correction, ET aligns with this by complying with the requested action.

4.3. Imperatives

The next extract involves a moment where rewards are offered in the form of hearts when a student group completes the prescribed work and behaves well according to the teacher's directions. The group with the most hearts at the end of the semester has been promised with a prize. Excerpt 3 starts with ET issuing a directive and an announcement that she will be distributing hearts to those student groups that exhibit the desired behavior. Here, ET performs the leading teacher role in the sense of independently regulating student activities (Buzzelli & Johnston, 2001).

Excerpt 3 [2H-131023-4-54:51] *I'm gonna give you a heart*

- ET**
- 
- #3.1
- 279 ET₂: put your books away: and come back.
I'm gonna give you a +heart
- 280 Ho: HEA:::RT!
- 281 S?: hea:::rt!
- 282 +((Ss moving around))
+(16.5)
- ET**
- 
- #3.2
- 283 +((KT walks to front of classroom))
+((ET sorts the hearts))
+(7.8)
- KT**
- 
- #3.3
- 284 +((Ss sit down & sits up straight))
+(14.3)
- 285 → KT₂: please put Tulip they did a good job Tulip
- 286 ET₄: ((looks at Tulip, puts heart))
- 287 KT₂: then (.) Hibiscus
+((points to Hibiscus group))
- 288 ET₂: yeah:: +this is Hibiscus right?
- 289 KT₂: yeah Carnation too: ((walks away))
- 290 ET₂: ((puts heart next to Hibiscus & Carnation))
- 291 okay. last one we're going to do
- 292 is the memory game:

While ET prepares to reward the student groups, we see that KT who was in the back moves toward the front of the classroom (line 283, IMG #3.2) and secures herself in a

position nearby ET and the heart chart. Her vision is faced toward the students, and her arms are clasped behind her back (line 284, IMG #3.3). Through this spatial and postural shift, KT communicates her co-involvement in the heart-giving activity, embodying the authority of an overseer that is monitoring the students for commendable conduct. ET aligns with this frame as she also directs her gaze at the students and holds up a heart to signal the beginning of the reward sequence.

Finally, as all of the students reach total silence and settle in their seats, KT issues an imperative requesting that ET place a heart next to the group *Tulip* that showed the best behavior (line 285). Although ET was originally the teacher that launched the heart-giving sequence, we see that KT self-establishes her entitlement to take lead in appointing the qualified groups and orients to it as a relevant action at this particular moment. ET, on the other hand, concedes to these demonstrated rights without challenging KT's directive and aligns by placing hearts next to the name of the designated groups (line 286). This pattern continues throughout the sequence, engendering an asymmetrical division of teacher roles. KT portrays the authoritative figure of nominating the student recipients while ET hear those nominations as directives to distribute the hearts to the corresponding groups. ET does not add her own selection of student groups nor does KT ask for ET's opinion on her choices. When ET does enter in a self-selected turn, it is to confirm the seating of one of the student groups which further confirms her acquiescence toward KT's leading role and demonstrates her sensitivity to accurately reward those groups designated by KT (line 288). KT's dominance of the activity is also evidenced by its closure. When KT leaves the floor and walks toward the left side of the classroom, ET does not extend the heart giving beyond that point. ET treats KT's withdrawal as the end of the sequence and moves on to announce the next agenda of the lesson.

The next extract is another example of KT using an imperative to issue a correction. This time, the directive requires ET to physically move across the classroom. As ET starts to distribute the class handouts, she calls on the student helpers to form a line in front of her. KT has been sitting towards the right side of the classroom, and this is when he notices that the students are standing in a tight space.

Excerpt 4 [2C-131205-FR-36:25] *it's too narrow*



273 ET₁: +uh::[:: (IMG #4.1)
 274 KT₁: [>please wait in your seat<
 275 ET₁: helpers come to me::?
 276 ((Ss run to ET))
 277 → KT₁: >MISS KO (xx)< THAT PLACE IS TOO NARROW! (.)



#4.2

+((ET looks at KT))

278 → KT₁: Miss Ko TOO NARROW +between



#4.3

279 → KT₁: ((KT points to ET & and to the front of the
 classroom, repeats this two times))
 280 +((KT withdraws gaze & sorts through stack of worksheets))
 +(0.5)



#4.4

+((points to front of classroom))

++((ET moves to front of the classroom))

281 → KT₁: you need to +go ++(0.3) yes.
 282 ET₁: ((looks at student reaching for handouts)) wait
 283 → KT₁: too narrow



#4.5

284 ET₁: +Dongju:n's table:: (.) >Dongjun's table<
 285 ((gives worksheet to Dongjun))

KT's turn announces his "noticing" of a problem (Schegloff, 1988) regarding the narrow space where the students are trying to form a line. The accelerated speed, high volume, and accentuation of *narrow* mark the urgency of the situation (line 277), but the lack of ET's recipient action causes KT to reinstate the problem in a subsequent turn (line 278). Finally, as ET exhibits her reciprocity by establishing mutual gaze (IMG #4.2), KT issues an "embodied directive" (Cekaite, 2010; Goodwin & Cekaite, 2013) that requests ET to adjust her spatial position to the center of the classroom (IMG #4.3).

Although ET reaches for the handouts to carry them as she moves, the absence of immediate compliance calls for KT to re-issue his directive. Craven and Potter (2010) document that directives, when they fail to get a response, get progressively more demanding in a way that strongly presumes the recipient's obedience. KT also follows a similar path as he upgrades the embodied directive into a verbal imperative. The verb *need* necessitates ET to move to the required space, which indicates KT's commitment in defining ET's optimal spatial position (line 281). Strongly entitled directives as such restrict the response options to compliance, constituting the requested action as the only acceptable behavior in that specific situation and thereby instigating an asymmetry between the participant roles³ (Antaki & Kent, 2012). ET orients to this expectation by forgoing the production of a verbal agreement but responding with a complying action. As soon as ET starts moving, KT shows receipt of the complying move with a *yes* (line 281, IMG #4.4) and ET, having arrived at the directed position, finally starts to distribute the handouts to the students (lines 284-285, IMG #4.5).

What stands out from Excerpt 3 and Excerpt 4 is that while ET is leading the lesson, KT occupies a withdrawn position in the classroom that embodies their non-leading role in the lesson. Using unmitigated imperatives, however, KT self-positions themselves with a "spectator" role that is strongly entitled to direct the next action or cast a correction to ET's

³ This comment, of course, does not preclude the possibility of rejection or resistance. In cases of such non-compliance, however, interactional complications may occur as in extensive accounts, repair sequences, and argumentative talk (see Craven & Potter, 2010).

instruction. This type of intervention is a threat to the leading teacher's face, especially given that it not only incursive to the current course of actions, but also characterizes ET's instructional decisions as an insufficient or inappropriate one to that moment. Despite such risks, the instructional urgency of the situation overrules the contingencies of ET's current business, and as KT's directive is met with ET's compliance, the superiority of KT's entitlement is ratified as a result.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study showed that when the non-leader entered the leading co-teacher's lesson, they were unilaterally done by KT and were issued in directive formats that assumed the KT's complete entitlement to do so. These directives were in a wide range of different unmitigated forms, such as declarative interrogatives (Excerpt 1) or proposals (Excerpt 2), as well as imperatives (Excerpt 3 and 4) that were built as "tellings" rather than "askings" (Curl & Drew, 2008) and did not account for KT's claimed entitlement. Whereas modal constructions of directives that are prefaced with *can*, *will*, or *could* treat acceptance of the requested action as contingent on the recipient's willingness to comply, the directive sequences in this study displayed markers of high entitlement by not leaving non-compliance as a formal option. These directives required the other teacher to either revise their instruction (Excerpt 1 and 2), to comply with rewarding a nominated student group (Excerpt 3), and to physically move to another location in the classroom (Excerpt 4). In a case where compliance was not immediate, the directive was escalated to a more demanding imperative. An asymmetry of participant roles was thus established as the ETs conceded to KT's proposal as a request that needed to be accepted, rarely demonstrating their independent judgment regarding the suitability of the suggestion.

What this analysis reveals is that observations of interaction can locate specific moments wherein different power relations are displayed by the participants themselves. Whereas surveys and interview reports can generate collections of claims – that is, the participants' *saying* that this is their reality –, interactional data *shows* where and how that reality transpires in their social encounters. The value of such analyses is that they can disclose even those details that may have gone unnoticed.

Along that line, the differential power relations between the co-teachers, with KT exercising high entitlement and ET at the conceding end, appeared to be one that was normative for the particular context of this school. This finding aligns with previous co-teaching research that reported inequalities between native speaking and non-native speaking teachers, and especially ones where native speaker teachers were marginalized into a limited position (Moussu & Llurda, 2008; Yim, 2012). One difference, however, is that unlike the hostile tone that dominated most interview-based reports, the interaction seen in

this study did not necessarily display overt conflicts between the two teachers. One explanation could be that the instructional urgency may have provided KT with the legitimate rights of formulating the directives in an entitled format that was less sensitive to ET's contingencies. Additionally, it is also possible that the KTs' seniority granted them with the right to direct the ETs to teaching techniques for better classroom management (Jeon, 2010).

Under the light of co-teaching principles, however, KT's interventions could be revised to be more compatible with the concepts of mutual respect and collegiality (Scruggs et al., 2007; Tajino & Smith, 2016). The corrective remarks could be more sensitized so as to minimize interference with the other teacher's ongoing instructional business instead of halting the progressivity of the sequence, publicly framing ET's turns as a repairable, and at times, requesting ET to reverse her previous actions. For instance, a non-leading co-teacher in Park's (2014) study draws largely on nonvocal resources, rather than explicit linguistic means, in order to refrain from interrupting the leading teacher's ongoing lesson. Also, even when an instructional comment was necessary, the non-leading teacher carefully solicited the other teacher and formulated her suggestion as a offer (e.g., *Do you want me to xx?, I can do xx for you.*) rather than a directive as in the KTs in this study. These practices serve to sustain asymmetry and mutual respect across teacher roles and authority (Flores, 2012; Jeon, 2009; Miyazato, 2009), which after all, are ones that students are exposed to in the classroom. For teacher collaboration to be successful, it has been pointed out that students should view both teachers as having equal authority (Thousand et al., 2006).

These findings shed light on the power issues of KTs and ETs, which although discussed in research, has been slow in being reflected to the realms of teacher training and education. To enhance the synergy that can be created through teacher collaboration, critical discussions can center on producing dialogues that are more constructive in supporting the less experienced teacher. Such discussions could also extend to efforts for developing in-service training programs and support systems in the schools that foster the growth and learning of the novice teacher and concomitantly, the more experienced co-teacher also benefitting from the collaborative experience (Davison, 2016; Heo & Mann, 2015). In fact, interactional data, as in the excerpts of this study, could be used in training sessions through which teachers can view examples of other teacher pairs and discuss the elements that need to be reflected in effective and respectful collaborative teaching practices.

Not much can be generalized by two teacher pairs, and more cases should be collected to promote empirical understandings that can bring positive change to co-teaching in EFL contexts. This study is also limited in that the site involves an elite-school type of setting, and thus, more examples from public school contexts would increase generalizability of the collective findings. Lastly, whereas this study took interest in only the teachers' practices, future research should consider bringing into equal focus the students' activities, as after all,

students are also important participants in the team of collaborative teaching and learning. What influence the interactionally unfolding asymmetries of teacher roles has on the students is one other empirical question that requires further investigation.

This study confirms that teacher collaboration cannot be taken for granted. It needs practice for teachers to form knowledge and trust in each other's strengths and reach a stage where the mutual sharing of ideas becomes possible (Liu, 2008; Martin-Beltran & Peercy, 2014; Tajino & Smith, 2016). The value of this study lies in the potential of interactionally-based analyses for documenting practices that define what collaborative teaching looks like in the classroom. It is hoped that these findings contribute to efforts in bringing harmonious and egalitarian co-teaching partnerships through which the full potential of complementary collaboration may be realized.

Applicable level: Elementary

REFERENCES

- Allwright, D. (2016). Foreword. In A. Tajino, T. Stewart, & D. Dalsky (Eds.), *Team teaching and team learning in the language classroom: Collaboration for innovation in ELT* (pp. xiv–xx). London: Routledge.
- Antaki, C., & Kent, A. (2012). Telling people what to do (and, sometimes, why): Contingency, entitlement and explanation in staff requests to adults with intellectual impairments. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(6–7), 876–889.
- Arkoudis, S. (2006). Negotiating the rough ground between ESL and mainstream teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(4), 415–433.
- Balanyk, J. (2012). Perceptions of co-teaching as shaped by differing educational discourses. *TESOL Review*, 4, 33–63.
- Buzzeli, C., & Johnston, B. (2001). Authority, power, and morality in classroom discourse. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(8), 873–884.
- Carless, D. R. (2006). Good practices in team teaching in Japan, South Korea and Hong Kong. *System*, 34(3), 341–351.
- Cekaite, A. (2010). Shepherding the child: Embodied directive sequences in parent-child interactions. *Text & Talk*, 30(1), 1–25

- Choi, H. (2009). A study on team teaching between native teachers of English and Korean English teachers in elementary schools. *Studies in English Education*, 14(1), 161–189.
- Chung, G., Min, C., & Park, M. (1999). A study of team teaching for the utility of the native English teachers in the elementary and the secondary school. *English Teaching*, 54(2), 201–227.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185–209.
- Craven, A., & Potter, J. (2010). Directives: Entitlement and contingency in action. *Discourse Studies*, 12(4), 419–442.
- Creese, A. (2010). Content-focused classrooms and learning English: How teachers collaborate. *Theory into Practice*, 49(2), 99–105.
- Curl, T. S., & Drew, P. (2008). Contingency and action: A comparison of two forms of requesting. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 41(2), 129–153.
- Davison, C. (2016). Collaboration between English language and content teachers: Breaking the boundaries. In A. Tajino, T. Stewart, & D. Dalsky (Eds.), *Team teaching and team learning in the language classroom* (pp. 71–86). London: Routledge.
- Dellicarpini, M. (2009). Dialogues across disciplines: Preparing English as a second language teachers for interdisciplinary collaboration. *Current Issues in Education*, 11(2). on Retrieved July 1, 2013, from <http://cie.ed.asu.edu/>.
- DelliCarpini, M. (2014). Modeling collaboration for ESL teacher candidates. *New Educator*, 10(2), 129–144.
- Dieker, L. A., & Murawski, W. W. (2003). Co-teaching at the secondary level: Unique issues, current trends, and suggestions for success. *The High School Journal*, 86(4), 1–13.
- Dove, M. G., & Honigsfeld, A. (2010). ESL coteaching and collaboration: Opportunities to develop teacher leadership and enhance student learning. *TESOL Journal*, 1(1), 3–22.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1976). “Is Sybil there?” The structure of some American English directives. *Language in Society*, 5, 25–66.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285–300.
- Flores, N. (2012). Power differentials: Pseudo-collaboration between ESL and mainstream teachers. In (Eds.),. In A. Honigsfeld & D. G. Dove (Eds.), *Co-teaching and other collaborative practices in the EFL/ESL classroom: Rationale, research, reflections, and recommendations* (pp. 185–193). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (1992). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

- Fu, D., Houser, R., & Huang, A. (2007). A collaboration between ESL and regular classroom teachers for ELL students' literacy development. *Changing English, 14*(3), 325–342.
- Garfinkel, H., & Sacks, H. (1970). On formal structures of practical actions. In J. C. McKinney & E. A. Tyriakan (Eds.), *Theoretical Sociology* (pp. 338–366). New York: Appleton Century Crofts.
- Goodwin, M. H., & Cekaite, A. (2013). Calibration in directive/response sequences in family interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics, 46*(1), 122–138.
- Heo, J., & Mann, S. (2015). Exploring team teaching and team teachers in Korean primary schools. *English Language Teacher Education and Development, 17*, 13–21.
- Heritage, J. (2013). Action formation and its epistemic (and other) backgrounds. *Discourse Studies, 15*(5), 551–578.
- Honigsfeld, A. & Dove, M. G. (2012). *Coteaching and other collaborative practices in the EFL/ESL classroom: Rationale, research, reflections, and recommendations*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Huh, S., & Lee, J. E. (2015). An instructional model of team-teaching in a university general English program. *Foreign Languages Education, 22*(2), 197–223.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Jeon, I. (2010). Exploring the co-teaching practice of native and non-native English teachers in Korea. *English Teaching, 65*(3), 43–67.
- Jeon, M. (2009). Globalization and native english speakers in english programme in korea (EPIK). *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 22*(3), 231–243.
- Kim, E. (2014). Team teaching in elementary and secondary cchools in Korea, Japan, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. *The Journal of Modern British and American Language and Literature, 32*(3), 67–86.
- Kim, J., & Im, B. (2008). A guide to improving team teaching in Korean middle schools. *Modern English Education, 9*(2), 71–94.
- Kim, M. (2010). How do native English-speaking teachers perceive co-teaching? *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics, 26*(4), 213–249.
- Lee, J. (2015). *The interactional organization of bilingual co-teaching in South Korea*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI.
- Lee, J. (2016). Teacher entries into second turn positions: IRFs in collaborative teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics, 95*, 1–15.
- Lee, M., & Seong, G. (2011). Yenge hyeplekswuepeyse hankwukin kyosawa wenemin kyosauy yekhal yangsang yengwu [A native English-spekaing teacher's and a

- Korean teacher's roles in the co-teaching classroom]. *Kyoywukmwunhwayenkwu*, 17(1), 225–260.
- Lindström, A. (2005). Language as social action. In A. Hakulinen & M. Selting (Eds.), *Syntax and lexis in conversation: Studies on the use of linguistic resources in talk-in-interaction* (pp. 209–230). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Liu, L. (2008). Co-teaching between native and non-native English teachers: An exploration of co-teaching models and strategies in the Chinese primary school context. *Reflections on English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 103–118.
- Martin-Beltran, M., & Peercy, M. M. (2014). Collaboration to teach English language learners: Opportunities for shared teacher learning. *Teachers and Teaching*, 20(6), 721–737.
- McConnell, D. (2000). *Importing diversity*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who's worth more? *ELT Journal*, 46(4), 340–349.
- Miyazato, K. (2009). Power-sharing between NS and NNS teachers: Linguistically powerful AETs vs. culturally powerful JTEs. *JALT Journal*, 31(1), 35–62.
- Moodie, I., & Nam, H. J. (2016). English language teaching research in South Korea: A review of recent studies (2009–2014). *Language Teaching*, 49(1), 63–98.
- Moussu, L., & Llurda, E. (2008). Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Language Teaching*, 41(3), 315–348.
- Ong, B., Barnes, S., & Buus, N. (2020). Downgrading deontic authority in open dialogue reflection proposals: A conversation analysis. *Family Process*. Advanced online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12586>
- Park, J. (2014). English co-teaching and teacher collaboration: A micro-interactional perspective. *System*, 44, 34–44.
- Peercy, M. M., Ditter, M., & Destefano, M. (2017). “We need more consistency”: Negotiating the division of labor in ESOL–mainstream teacher collaboration. *TESOL Journal*, 8(1), 215–239.
- Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk in interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rampton, M. B. H. (1990). Displacing the ‘native speaker’: Expertise, affiliation and inheritance. *ELT Journal*, 44(2), 338–343.
- 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.
- Rao, Z., & Yu, H. (2021). Enhancing students’ English proficiency by co-teaching between native and non-native teachers in an EFL context. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(5), 778–797.

- Rossi, G. (2012). Bilateral and Unilateral Requests: The Use of Imperatives and Mi X? Interrogatives in Italian. *Discourse Processes*, 49(5), 426–458.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50, 696–735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1988). Goffman and the analysis of conversation. In P. Drew & T. Wootton (Eds.), *Erving Goffman: Exploring the interaction order* (pp. 9–135). Polity Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis, Volume 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., & McDuffie, K. A. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A metasynthesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional Children*, 73(4), 392–416.
- Tajino, A., & Smith, C. (2016). Beyond team teaching: An introduction to team learning in language education. In A. Tajino, T. Stewart, & D. Dalsky (Eds.), *Team teaching and team learning in the language classroom: Collaboration for innovation in ELT* (pp. 11–27). London: Routledge.
- Tajino, A., & Tajino, Y. (2000). Native and non-native: What can they offer? *ELT Journal*, 54(1), 3–11.
- Tajino, A., & Walker, L. (1998). Perspectives on team teaching by students and teachers: Exploring foundations for team learning. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, 11(1), 113–131.
- Thousand, J. S., Villa, R. A., & Nevin, A. I. (2006). The many faces of collaborative planning and teaching. *Theory into Practice*, 45(3), 239–248.
- Yim, S. Y. (2012). Implementation of team teaching: Perspectives from native English speakers. *Foreign Languages Education*, 19(1), 109–131.
- York-Barr, J., Ghere, G., & Sommers, J. (2007). Collaborative teaching to increase ELL student learning: A three-year urban elementary study. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 12(3), 301–335.