BRITISH COUNCIL

TeachingEnglish

# Investigating NEST schemes around the world: supporting NEST/LET collaborative practices

Fiona Copland, Monika Davis, Sue Garton and Steve Mann


Aston University

UNIVERSITY of STIRLING

WARWICK
THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

# Investigating NEST schemes around the world: supporting NEST/LET collaborative practices

Fiona Copland, Monika Davis, Sue Garton and Steve Mann

ISBN 978-0-86355-768-2


10 Spring Gardens
London SW1A 2BN, UK

**www.britishcouncil.org**

# Acknowledgements

We have worked with a number of international partners on this project. Their work and support has been vital in producing the findings and outputs. It has been a pleasure to work collaboratively with our partners and we have gained a great deal from the process. In particular, we would like to thank:

All the teachers who spoke to us and who invited us into their classrooms. And the students too!

Chris Devison, Jeollanam-do Office of Education, South Korea

Jae Lee, TaLK Programme Co-ordinator, Jeollanam-do Office of Education

Jennifer Heo, Chungbuk National University, South Korea

Michael Free, South Korea

Michael Griffin, South Korea

George Skuse, Konkuk University, South Korea

Elaine Hau Hing Tang, English Language Teaching Unit, Chinese University of Hong Kong

The British Council, Tokyo

Tzu-Bin Lin, National Taiwan Normal University

Mihn Khanh Tran Thi, Nha Trang University, Vietnam

Harry Kuchah, University of Bath, UK

Greg Keaney, CfBT, Brunei

Eli Yonetsugi, Berlitz, Japan

William Vocke, Fulbright Taiwan (Foundation for Scholarly Exchange)

Sarah DeMola, Fulbright Taiwan (Foundation for Scholarly Exchange)

Emily Quade, Fulbright Taiwan (Foundation for Scholarly Exchange)

Kelly Chang, Fulbright Taiwan (Foundation for Scholarly Exchange)

# Contents

# Executive Summary

The project *Investigating NEST schemes around the world: supporting NEST/LET collaborative practices*, funded by the British Council ELT Research Partnership Awards Scheme, was undertaken during 2014. Its main aims were to:

- Discover which countries currently use NESTs (Native English Speaker Teachers) in state education.
- Investigate how NEST schemes operate in different countries and the training and support received by participants.
- Observe what happens in NEST classes and what are the typical roles played by LETs (Local English Teachers) and NESTs.
- Highlight what can be learnt from the experiences of LETs and NESTs to improve classroom teaching.
- Identify what support can be offered to LETs and NESTs to improve training and support.

The project was conducted using document analysis, interviews with NESTs and LETs and classroom observations. Document analysis was used to gather detailed information about NEST schemes and prepare a final audit document. Semi-structured interviews were carried out in six different countries (Brunei, Cameroon, Hong Kong, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan) with 15 NESTs and 8 LETs for a total of 23 interviews. Observational data were collected from a total of 15 classrooms in four countries (Japan, Korea, Hong Kong and Taiwan) involving ten NESTs and 15 LETs.

The study uncovered considerable diversity in the way schemes operate, the roles that teachers have in NEST schemes and the experiences of both NESTs and LETs. The main findings are:

1. The schemes can be broadly divided into two types:

   **Type 1** – those that require teachers to be qualified/experienced.

   **Type 2** – those for which qualifications and experience are not required.

Terms and conditions, as well as status, of NESTs vary according to the type of scheme, with Type 1 schemes generally offering better contractual terms and participants enjoying higher status and greater responsibility.

2. All schemes investigated for the project included an induction for NESTs, although some inductions were deemed more useful than others.
3. Key factors contributing to a successful co-teaching relationship identified by both NESTs and LETs were communication and planning.
4. NESTs and LETs generally took a pragmatic view of using English and the local language in the classroom, even where English-only is mandated.
5. Cross-cultural understanding and accommodation were deemed necessary by both NESTs and LETs for successful partnerships.

Based on the research findings, the following recommendations are made:

- Induction programmes should not be limited to NESTs but should be available for both NESTs and LETs.
- Induction should include time for NESTs and LETs to discuss their expectations of their roles. Ideally the discussion should be between partner teachers and be on-going.
- Teachers should be encouraged to maintain a healthy regard for the value of L1 and L2 in the classroom.
- Time should be made available for planning, especially where the NEST is peripatetic and moving from classroom to classroom or school to school.
- Planning should be a joint endeavour between the LET and the NEST and time should be created to allow this to happen.
- On Type 2 schemes in particular, status issues between LETs and NESTs should be carefully monitored. LETs and NESTs in these contexts should be given opportunities to discuss the impact of their roles.

The findings from the study have informed the design of materials to support NESTs and LETs with teaching collaboratively. The materials are freely available for download.

# 1

# Introduction

For well over a hundred years, teachers have been leaving English-speaking contexts, such as the UK and the USA, to teach English overseas. In a number of countries, the attraction of having 'native' English speaker teachers (from here, NESTs), either because of the perceived benefit of their linguistic skills or because of a lack of English teachers at home, has resulted in the establishment of formal programmes to recruit and sponsor NESTs (referred to in the study as NEST schemes). Previous research has examined individual schemes (for example, Shin, 2011) and compared particular schemes (for example, Carless, 2006). However, to date, there has been no overview of where the schemes are located, how they operate or of the experiences of both NESTs and Local English Teachers (from here LETs) taking part. What is more, there is a lack of widely available resources to support those considering or preparing for such schemes, or those who have recently joined. This project was instigated with a view to responding to these gaps and to answer the following questions:

1. Which countries currently use NESTs in state education?
2. How do these schemes operate and how much training and support do participants have?
3. What happens in NEST classes and what are the typical roles played by LETs and NESTs?
4. What can be learnt from the experiences of LETs and NESTs to improve classroom teaching?
5. What support can be offered to NESTs and LETs to improve collaboration?

To do so, the project brought together an international team of partners. Through classroom observations, interviews with NESTs and LETs, and document analysis, detailed information about the schemes was collected, from which three outputs have been produced. In order to respond to questions 1 and 2, an audit document (titled Global NEST Schemes – An Audit) was produced and is available for free download. It comprises a summary document giving basic facts about each scheme, and a full document providing extensive details of each of the schemes researched.

The Audit will be of particular value to teachers considering taking part in a NEST scheme and to policy makers considering establishing schemes in different contexts.

To respond to questions 3 and 4, NEST schemes were investigated through classroom observation, interviews with teachers and document analysis. The results from the investigation are presented in this report.

Finally, a set of materials for NESTs and LETs who are either preparing to work together or who have recently started working together, either as colleagues or as co-teachers, has been produced to respond to question 5. These materials (titled: Developing collaborative practice between LETs and NESTs) have been created by partners who are currently working in the field, and by the researchers, drawing directly on the research data. They are designed to be used either by groups of teachers or by individuals. The materials are freely available to download.

## 1.1 The Report

As stated above, this report responds to questions 2 and 3. Following a literature review of some of the existing research on NESTs and NEST schemes as it relates to the project, we then describe the research design and the data collected and how they were analysed. After presenting the findings, we provide recommendations for how NESTs and LETs can be supported to make the most out of their collaborations, with reference to the materials produced in response to question 5.

# 2

# Literature review

The focus of this project is NEST schemes, particularly how they operate and the experiences of the NESTs and LETs taking part. While the experiences of these teachers must be contextualised within current sociolinguistic debates, our main focus in this review is on recent research into these schemes.

We begin by examining the emergence of English as a global language and how this has affected the demand for teachers. Then we briefly visit the debates around native speakerism, with a particular focus on how the debate affects English language teachers. We then examine literature which has focused on NESTs and on LETs, before moving to reviewing literature on particular schemes. Finally, we highlight current themes in research in this area. But first we turn to the issue of terminology.

## 2.1 Terminology

We recognise that researchers have used different terms to describe the actors in NEST schemes. In this report, we use the acronym NEST for the 'native English speaker teachers'. Our decision to use the term is a pragmatic one: it is widely used and recognised. Nonetheless, we acknowledge it is also an inaccurate label (NESTs are not all native speakers, and not all are qualified teachers, for example). We are also keenly aware of the on-going debates around 'native-speakerism' and our use of the term is not meant as an endorsement of the native speaker myth (see below and Holliday, 2005; Park, 2008; Rampton and Blommaert, 2011; Creese, et al., 2014).

NESTs can take on a range of roles in different classrooms and are often called AETs (assistant English teachers) or ALTs (assistant language teachers). We use the acronym AET for both. We use the acronym NS for native speaker and NNs for non-native speaker.

We call the teachers who host the NESTs in overseas contexts LETs (local English teachers). Our decision to use LET draws attention to the problematic status of the 'non' (Medgyes, 1999) in 'non-native English speaker teacher' (NNEST), another popular acronym. We discuss some of the issues with these labels in more detail below.

## 2.2 English as a global language

The demand for teachers of English, whether they be L1[1] speakers of English or not, is closely linked to the global spread of the English language. This is a process that started in the nineteenth century (see Hackert, 2012) but accelerated in the twentieth century (Jenkins, 2006a) through colonisation, emigration and business, amongst other things (see Kachru, 1996 and Jenkins, 2009). English has become the language of engineering, science, trade, finance and diplomacy. The number of learners of English is still increasing (Medgyes, 1999; Graddol, 2006) and they are learning at a younger age (Copland et al, 2014). This all creates a demand for English teachers and for NESTs in particular (Liu, 2009).

[1] L1 is short-hand for 'first language'. We are aware that this term can be contentious but use it here so that we can distinguish between English and the usual language of instruction in the class.

## 2.3 Inner circle dominance

The sustained demand for NESTs is related to what is termed 'inner circle dominance' (Kachru, 1985), where the inner circle represents the traditional bases of English (e.g. the UK, USA, Australia, New Zealand). Preference for an NS model of English, specifically American English and British English, and in particular their grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation, is still prevalent, high status and norm-providing (Hall, 2011). Furthermore, testing and materials in English language teaching (ELT) remain oriented to the English of the NS (Jenkins, 2012) and there 'appears to be a firm and blind belief that norms and authentic models' should come from NESTs (No and Park, 2008: 71). Indeed, as Galloway (2013) notes, the NS continues to be used as a yardstick of competence and teachers are often paid for their accents (see also Galloway, 2014). All these conditions ensure that native speakers remain in demand globally.

Inner circle countries, in particular the UK and USA, have taken commercial advantage of the expanding ELT market and demand for western varieties by providing teachers, training, materials and testing. Shin and Kellogg (2007) provide a convincing account of the way Anglo-American spoken English has been packaged for export and mass-marketed, serving the business interests of the UK and US. Over the years, this marketisation has resulted in standard varieties of British and American English being 'accepted and promoted as the only internationally acceptable pedagogical models for English language teaching' (He and Zhang, 2010: 770).

A number of studies (e.g. Inoue and Stracke, 2013; Mynott, 2014) examine the attitudes of overseas postgraduate ELT/TESOL students studying in Australian and UK universities. On the one hand, these students value their qualification from an 'Inner Circle' institution; on the other hand, they are sceptical about the value of inner circle models of English and are aware of the importance of 'world Englishes'.

## 2.4 Beyond the inner circle

In contrast to the 'inner circle' countries, in which English is a main language of communication amongst citizens, and 'outer circle' countries (such as Nigeria, India and Malaysia for example), in which English has an official function, often because of their colonial histories, English in 'expanding circle' countries (such as Japan, Russia, and Korea for example) has no official status and there are no colonial links to Britain or the USA (Deterding, 2010). Yet the demand for English is strong. He and Zhang (2010) suggest that worldwide the majority of interactions in English in both outer circle and expanding circle countries are now between non-native speakers, using English as a common language, sometimes called English as a lingua franca (Jenkins, 2012). It is widely believed that the English required for these 'lingua franca' purposes is less complex than western native speaker models. Nevertheless, UK and USA varieties of English continue to dominate the ELT landscape (Galloway, 2013), and their testing systems (e.g. IELTS and TOEFL) continue to challenge English language learners with unobtainable NS models (Jenkins, 2012). Whether you subscribe to Phillipson's (1992) view that this is the result of a deliberate post-colonial plot or to the view that economic conditions are responsible (e.g. Brutt-Griffler, 2002), it is hard to ignore the continuing demand for native English speaker teachers.

## 2.5 Native speakerism

There has been a great deal of debate about 'native speakerism' and the related area, the 'myth of the native speaker'. Various aspects have been articulated by a range of researchers (Holliday, 2005; Kubota, 2009; Leung et al., 1997; Park, 2008; Pennycook, 1994; Phillipson, 1992; Seidlhofer, 1999; Widdowson, 1992; Creese et al., 2014). The debates touch on a number of issues, from ideological perspectives to the value of using terms such as 'native speaker', which do not accurately describe the realities of many teachers. Indeed, Kramsch (1997: 363) completely dismisses the term, calling it:

> *…an imaginary construct - a canonically literate monolingual middle-class member of a largely fictional national community whose citizens share a belief in a common history and a common destiny.*

As we state in the introduction to this section, we too find the term problematic. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this research project, the purchase this term gives on describing and imagining the field overrides qualms about its use.

In terms of this project, a particularly significant issue in the debate is status. It has often been argued that the elevated status of the native-speaker can have negative effects on LETs (Medgyes, 1992), causing lack of confidence, disempowerment, insecurity and inferiority regarding their English proficiency (Murai, 2004; Tsui and Bunton, 2000). Piller (2001: 14) calls the idealisation of the native speaker 'debilitating' for LETs, a view reiterated by Clark and Paran (2007: 409), who regard the NS model as an 'elusive concept' and so far removed from the NNSs' 'multi-competence' that the NS model is simply an unsuitable measure of achievement.

## 2.6 The local English teacher (LET)

There are both advantages and disadvantages to the label LET. As with most terms, advantages and disadvantages depend on the context and circumstances of use. *The TESOL Nonnative English Speakers in TESOL Interest Section* (NNEST-IS) serves as a reminder that organisations and networks of LETs may want to continue to use the term Non-NEST (see http://www.tesol.org/connect/interest-sections/nonnative-english-speakers-in-tesol). For many teachers, the term NEST is a badge of identity and a locus of communication. We use the term LET in this report mainly because it is the one most non-native English speaker teachers we observed and interviewed used to describe themselves.

Whatever term is chosen, it is now estimated that the percentage of English teachers classed as LETs has reached 80 per cent (Moussu and Llurda, 2008). Furthermore, in terms of using English for communication, NNSs far outnumber their NS counterparts.

Important work has been done in repositioning the LET as a legitimate model and teacher of English. Phillipson (1992) first put forward the concept of the 'native speaker fallacy', which strongly contends that the ideal teacher of English is a native speaking teacher. Being a non-native speaking teacher is also considered to be a distinct quality by Braine (1999: xiv), who supports Phillipson's argument when he says that 'the very fact that non-native speakers of a language have undergone the process of learning a language makes them better qualified to teach the language than those who are born to it'. Kamhi-Stein's (2004) work also positions LETs in a favourable light and shares their perspectives and experiences.

Authorities in some countries are beginning to recognise that LETs with a high level of English can be recruited into roles traditionally held by NESTs. In Japan for example, Japanese nationals who have spent time in English speaking countries and display high levels of proficiency are being recruited as assistant English teachers (AETs). However, Shibata (2010) found that while Japanese teachers of English in Junior High Schools appeared to approve of both types of AET (NESTs and LETs), their Senior High School counterparts tended to be reluctant to accept non-native speakers as AETs.

While LETs continue to be much in demand in their home countries, where local knowledge of educational and societal norms is recognised as important, there are barriers to their employment in inner circle countries (see Clark and Paran, 2007). However, in the UK at least, a gradual change may be underway: BAAL (the British Association for Applied Linguistics) recently banned employers from advertising for native speaker teachers on its site and LETs are employed in university departments, adult and further education centres and language schools.

## 2.7 The native English speaker teacher (NEST)

There are thousands of NESTs working in institutions in inner, outer and expanding circle countries, in every type of educational institution from nurseries to universities. Their status in these institutions depends on a range of factors from qualifications and experience to country of origin. The relative status of NESTs and LETs within the same educational institutions and schemes has long been an issue worldwide. Most studies tend to focus upon the position of LETs and their struggle against unfavourable comparisons with their native-speaker counterparts. However, Houghton and Rivers (2013) articulate NESTs' concerns in Japanese and Italian educational contexts. Their edited collection explores wide-ranging issues related to native-speakerism as it manifests itself in a range of workplaces. The collection shows how NEST teachers can be the targets of various forms of prejudice and discrimination. Other studies giving voice to the challenges and experiences of NESTs include Chen and Cheng (2010), who concentrate on the NEST perspective and challenges in Taiwan, and, outside South East Asia, Gingerich (2004), who focuses on the learning experiences of three NESTs (from the USA) in Lithuania.

In terms of recruitment, NEST schemes typically take NSs from inner circle countries (Jenkins, 2003), and EPIK (The English Program in Korea) even mandates that to qualify for a position you had to have been born in a (listed) English speaking country. However, there is evidence that this may also be changing. Whether this is because schemes are becoming more enlightened or because NSs cannot be secured is not clear. Notwithstanding, the JET scheme in Japan recruited teachers from four countries in 1987 and from forty countries in 2012, including from expanding circle countries (Deterding, 2010). CfBT, which recruits teachers mainly for Brunei, does not stipulate the birth country of the teachers it wishes to recruit, but instead requires that they have a degree from a university in Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, or South Africa.

There are also pernicious elements of race closely associated with native-speakerism. It was mentioned earlier that it is often believed preferable for native-speakers to have either a British or American accent (Galloway, 2013), but preference also extends to racial aspects of identity (see Chen and Cheng, 2010). Javier (2015) draws on Holliday (2005; 2011)

when she argues that ELT is dominated by the belief that native-speaker teachers represent a Western culture from which spring the ideals of both the English language and of English language teaching methodology. Associated with these ideals is the less explicit but prevalent view that native-speakers are western native English speakers, and white. Javier shows that the racial stereotype of the idealised NEST as 'white' creates problems for professionals who do not fit into others' linguistic and racial categorisations. She argues that visible ethnic minority NESTs (VEM-NESTs) may not be regarded as 'western' enough to be considered native speaking teachers because of their racial identities.

## 2.8 Learner and parent preferences

Whether NESTs are valued or not depends on whose perspective is foregrounded. Many studies show that learners believe that their speaking and listening will improve faster if they are taught by NESTs (e.g. Butler, 2007; Hadla, 2013), although there is no empirical evidence to support this belief. Lasagabaster and Sierra (2002) found that students in Spain also preferred NESTs or at least a combination of NESTs and LETs.

Parents have an important effect on the demand for native-speakers, as do LETs. Heo (2013) argues that Korean society has built a strong public faith in 'native speakers' (see also Park, 2008). One of Heo's featured teacher's talks about the significant impact that the NS has on the students' responses and attitude in class (compared to her solo teaching classes). She found that the students were more active and excited in the team teaching classes. In addition, teachers spoke of parents' expectations and preference for NESTs. As one of the teachers in Heo's study noted (ibid: 289) 'when we organised an English camp during a vacation, we had to put a native speaking teacher's name on the name list of tutors (.) otherwise, parents and students were less interested in or insecure about the camp programmes'.

## 2.9 NEST schemes

So far this section has discussed issues around NESTs and LETs, but this project focuses particularly on NEST schemes. For details on a range of schemes, including details of recruitment policies and terms and conditions, please see the NEST Audit. NEST schemes have been particularly robust in Brunei, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea and Taiwan, and most PhDs completed in the last few years on the subject of NEST schemes concern South East Asia. Shin (2011) and Heo (2013) both focus on schemes in Korea, while Bryant (2011) looks at various schemes in Hong Kong and Liu (2009) and Tsai (2007) both focus on the situation in Taiwan. Sutherland (2012) examines team-teaching in Japanese schools while Tran (2014) provides an account of 'relating' between Vietnamese and NEST teachers at the tertiary level in Vietnam. Outside South-East Asia, Hudson (2013) provides an insightful account of the Native Speaker's working experience in Higher Education in UAE.

Heo (2013: 40-52) provides a thorough overview of the various NEST schemes and features of individual teaching contexts and stated scheme objectives (building on previous work done by Liu, 2009). She particularly focuses on challenging issues of team teaching between teachers in these schemes. Carless (2006) also reviews aspects of team-teaching schemes in Japan, South Korea and Hong Kong. The next section of the literature review introduces the main NEST schemes with reference to key literature, before drawing out some common themes across the various schemes.

### 2.9.1 JET (Japan exchange and teaching) Programme in Japan

The JET programme is both the largest in scale and the longest continually running scheme (since 1987) and has expanded in scale by five times since it began (Miyazato, 2009). Two factors were particularly important in its establishment. The first was related to economic development and the second to a perceived cultural insularity (Miyazato, 2009). Being able to use the English language was seen as particularly important to developing communication between the Japanese and the rest of the world (Wada 1994; Wada and Cominos, 1994). Perhaps the most important feature of this scheme is that NESTs are recruited as AETs by CLAIR (the Council of Local Authorities for International Relations). The aims of the scheme are both to encourage Japanese students to engage with AETs in authentic communication but also to raise LETs' awareness of English as a communicative medium (Wada, 2002).

### 2.9.2 NET (Native-speaking English Teachers) Scheme in Hong Kong

The NET scheme began life as EELTPS (the Expatriate English Language Teacher Pilot Scheme). This started in 1987 and lasted until 1989. It was relaunched in 1998 and extended to primary schools in 2000. This scheme has layers of complexity (in terms of Hong Kong's colonial history, the shift from British to Mainland Chinese rule, language policy and various other cultural factors) that make it particularly difficult to pin down (Carless, 2006). In addition, English, both as an 'official' language and as a medium of instruction, has been contested for many years in Hong Kong, up to and beyond its reintegration into China (see Jeon and Lee, 2006).

The current scheme – called NET (or PNET if teachers work in primary schools) – recruits experienced and qualified teachers to work with LETs on designing and delivering interactive lessons on certain aspects of the curriculum.

There continues to be a widely held perception in Hong Kong that there are not enough trained and linguistically competent local English teachers (Lee, 2005), which may contribute to the belief that NESTs should be hired from overseas. The Hong Kong Education Bureau website, which provides details about the schemes, suggests that the purpose of hiring NESTs is to 'enhance the teaching of English Language and increase exposure of students to English'[2]. Not all NESTs working in Hong Kong belong to the NET/PNET scheme, of course. Many are locally hired with varying degrees of success. While some researchers believe NESTs bring benefits to Hong Kong classrooms (for example, Storey et al., 2001), Ng (2015) explores the challenges that a kindergarten NEST faces and questions the value of employing under qualified and inexperienced teachers to work in this context. (see too Luk and Lin, 2006)

### 2.9.3 EPIK (English Program in Korea) in Korea

EPIK recruits NESTs to teach in Korean primary and secondary schools, usually in team-teaching relationships. Park (2008) claims that EPIK draws significantly on the JET scheme. In general, most studies of EPIK are positive about its benefits (e.g. Kim and Lee, 2005; Park and Kim, 2000; Park, 2008) but there are other studies which point to a lack of collaboration, cultural conflicts (Ahn et al., 1998), and LETs' unwillingness to team teach with NESTs (Carless, 2002).

### 2.9.4 FETIT (Foreign English Teacher in Taiwan) in Taiwan

The FETIT scheme was introduced in 2003 and is on a smaller scale than schemes in Japan, Korea and Hong Kong. Liu (2009) argues that Taiwan's joining the WTO (World Trade Organization) in 2002 and its establishment of Challenge 2008 (a national development plan) were particularly influential in the expansion of the scheme. FETIT focuses particularly on teaching in remote areas where there are limited English learning resources (Chou, 2005). Wang (2012) shows that, although LETs show a great interest and willingness to team teach with NESTs, and believe that this collaborative model has pedagogic benefits, they are concerned about potential communication problems with and marginalisation by NESTs.

## 2.10 Important themes emerging from the literature

It is impossible to cover all the literature on the subject of NEST schemes. However, it is fair to say that accounts vary considerably. Some are focused on collaboration and cases of good practice between NETs and non-NETs, or effective team-teaching (e.g. Tajino and Tajino, 2000; Jang et al., 2010). Several studies (Choi, 2001; Choi, 2009; Kim, 2010) report positive comments from LETs about their teaching experiences and general satisfaction with the arrangements in their schools. Others are much more sceptical (e.g. Wang and Lin, 2013). This report attempts to include a range of perspectives, positions and stances.

### 2.10.1 Team-teaching

Sutherland (2012) argues that team teaching reinforces the dichotomy between native and non-native speakers to the detriment of both Japanese teachers and their students. However, Carless shows a range of good practice across several different schemes (2006). Other studies are also essentially positive about the team teaching aspects of such schemes (e.g. Kim and Lee, 2005; Park and Kim, 2000; Park, 2008). Heo (2013), in a detailed study of four team-teaching relationships in Korea, shows how the nature of the team-teaching relationship varied considerably in terms of team-teaching styles and interactional styles. These differences were dependent on levels of collaboration and levels of NESTs' experience in their contexts. A number of studies have considered intercultural aspects of team teaching (e.g. Carless, 2006; Luo, 2006, 2007; Tran, 2014), including detailed critical incidents relating to misunderstanding and cultural difference.

### 2.10.2 Language level

Across schemes there are frequent doubts expressed about LETs' English levels and hence their ability to work effectively with NESTs (e.g. in Taiwan, Chen, 2007; in Japan, Carless, 2002). In addition, some LETs develop a sense of inferiority about their English abilities that arises out of contact and comparison with NESTs (e.g. Murai, 2004). Johnson and Tang (1993) and Luk (2010) focus on communication difficulties that NESTs face in maintaining discipline due to lack of access to Cantonese, while Ng (2015) reports on how a LET struggled to support the NEST when the latter introduced unplanned vocabulary such as 'marshmallow'.

[2] See www.edb.gov.hk/en/curriculum-development/resource-support/net/index.html

### 2.10.3 NESTs experience and training

There is a common perception that NESTs often have little teaching experience and lack formal teacher training (Carless, 2002; Tajino and Tajino, 2000). The Hong Kong NET scheme is one exception to the general trend to employ inexperienced, untrained teachers, as is the CfBT scheme in Dubai and Koto-ku in Tokyo.

### 2.10.4 Collaboration

In Korea, Chung et al. (1999) report a lack of collaboration between LETs and NESTs. In Hong Kong NESTs often teach on their own (rather than in team-teaching relationships), particularly in secondary schools (Carless and Walker, 2006). However, in primary and kindergarten, team teaching is more normal. Furthermore, the PNET scheme requires LETs and NESTs to work together to prepare lessons. However, on private schemes, such as the one reported by Ng (2015), there is often little time for planning and preparation between LETs and NESTs.

### 2.10.5 Roles and relationships

Rutson-Griffiths (2012) argues that there are particular problems when teachers do not agree on their expected roles in the Japanese context. These can lead to conflict between LETs and NESTs. Similar views are articulated by Mahoney (2004). Because of the 'assistant' status and lack of formal training (Johannes, 2012), there is evidence that LETs in Japan can adopt, or be positioned to take on, passive translating and interpreting roles (Mahoney, 2004). Some accounts show evidence of NESTs being used as human tape recorders (e.g. Tajino and Tajino, 2000). Research across other schemes reveals that there is little consensus on what classroom roles teachers should take (Aline and Hosoda, 2006; Tajino and Walker, 1998; Marchesseau, 2006). Nevertheless, despite many studies highlighting the problems of establishing roles and relationships, positive collaborations are possible (e.g. Browne and Wada, 1998; Carless and Walker, 2006; Heo, 2013).

### 2.10.6 Preparation

Lack of planning and preparation can also cause tension between team-teachers. It can also mean that instead of the class being co-taught effectively, there is limited co-constructed instruction (Rutson-Griffiths, 2012). Park and Kim (2000) also provide accounts of several problems arising from insufficient preparation time for team teaching (Korea).

### 2.10.7 Effects on LETs

Tsui and Bunton's (2000) study showed that LETs in Hong Kong appeared to 'lack confidence in their own authority over the language as English teachers' (Tsui and Bunton, 2000: 301; see too Medgyes, 1992 and Murai, 2004). In Japan, Sakai and D'Angelo (2005: 324) report that in the 1980s and 1990s there was a huge increase in NESTs and consequently 'fewer and fewer local Japanese teachers of English'. Wang and Lin (2013) argue that NEST schemes have had the unintended consequences of jeopardising the professional identity of LETs in these countries. According to Elyas and Picard (2012: 68), '[LETs'] perception of the public's favour of NESTs can be seen as the root for their self-marginalisation and devaluing'. Indeed, Moussu and Llurda (2008) see the investigation of LETs' professional self-esteem as a particularly important topic that warrants further research.

This section has presented the research context in which the current study is situated, describing a range of issues associated with the terms NESTs and LETs and with NEST schemes more broadly. We have also highlighted the challenges and opportunities that NEST schemes offer. In the next section, we outline the research carried out for this project.

# 3

# Research design

This project followed a qualitative methodology. The basic aim of qualitative research is 'to understand better some aspect(s) of the lived world' (Richards, 2003: 10), aiming at detailed descriptions of people's perceptions, with the major goal of gaining an insider, or emic, perspective (Burns, 2010). Qualitative researchers therefore 'study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them' (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994:3). Drawing on qualitative approaches was thus deemed the most appropriate for answering the research questions and enabled a detailed and nuanced picture of the experiences and practices of NESTs and LETs to emerge, as well as complementary findings to be presented.

The research design adopted consisted of:

1. A survey of NEST schemes through document analysis and interviews to prepare an audit.
2. Semi-structured interviews with those working on a variety of schemes around the world.
3. Classroom observations of co-teaching classrooms.

Before undertaking any data collection, ethics approval was given by Aston University. The project was explained to all participants and their consent was obtained for their data to be used for the purposes of this report.

## 3.1 Procedures for preparing the audit

Research questions 1 and 2 asked:

1. Which countries currently use NESTs in state education?
2. How do these schemes operate and how much training and support do participants have?

In order to answer these questions, an audit of NEST schemes was undertaken and a document prepared that gives the key information about each scheme[3]. The starting point was well-known schemes such as JET (Japan), NET (Hong Kong) and EPIK (Korea). However, online searches and informal networking revealed a number of other schemes operating, mainly in Asia. In order to ensure that the audit document did not become too unwieldy, the decision was made to include only the larger schemes and those that operate in schools. Therefore the final audit covered 11 schemes, of which five were country-specific (JET – Japan, EPIK – Korea, NET – Hong Kong, CfBT – Brunei and FETIT– Taiwan) and six were international (VSO, Cuso International, British Council Language Assistants, Peace Corps, Fulbright and Australian Volunteers International). The schemes were divided into Type 1 – schemes for which experience/qualifications are required, and Type 2 – schemes for which experience and qualifications are not required.

The individual constituents of the audit were selected after detailed discussions between members of the research team, and were based on the information they considered interested parties (e.g. teachers) would find particularly useful. The starting point in gathering details about the constituents was, in most cases, the website dedicated to the scheme, which often contained much of the relevant information. Where a website did not exist and where more information regarding a specific field or category was needed, search engines were employed to locate relevant web pages and/or documents. Where possible, primary data were sought, i.e. data originating from official institutional web sources rather than from personal pages or secondary data. Documents accessed directly included (where available) sample contracts, participant handbooks, scheme summary reports, induction and training programmes, and advertising materials. In some cases, scheme representatives were contacted directly with requests to supply information either as part of the audit or as part of the wider project.

[3] NEST Audit document

## 3.2 Interviews and observations

Research questions 3 and 4 asked:

3. What happens in NEST classes and what are the typical roles played by LETs and NESTs?
4. What can be learnt from the experiences of LETs and NESTs to improve classroom teaching?

In order to answer these questions, semi-structured interviews and classroom observations were carried out. Opportunity sampling was used to identify research participants, drawing on researchers' contacts, snowballing and internet searches. For this reason, no claims of generalisability can be made; the data offer a snapshot of attitudes and practices in particular contexts.

In this research, a constructivist view of interviews was taken, in which interview data are not viewed as objective accounts of external reality but as a form of interaction jointly constructed by the interviewer and interviewee. The interviews are active and locally accomplished events (Mann, 2011: 8), in which perspectives on lived worlds are created in situ. The relationship between interviewer and interviewee is clearly fundamental in this type of interview. In all cases, interviewees were told that the interviews were for a project investigating NEST schemes around the world and that their answers would be anonymous and treated confidentially, with all identifying information removed. Moreover, interviewers created a friendly and collaborative tone, through responding to the interviewees' contributions and drawing on their own experience, as in the following extract:

***P:*** *But going back, I graduated in 2002 with a degree in French and Philosophy, and I then did a TEFL course, the CELTA at International House in London.*

***I:*** *Oh, I did mine there too.*

Two interview schedules were prepared, one for NESTs and one for LETs (see Appendix A and Appendix B). The interview schedules provided the key questions for each interview, but as the approach was semi-structured, each interviewer was also free to probe and follow up as appropriate in order to investigate in as much detail as possible the teachers' perceptions of the NEST scheme they were involved in. We did not always follow this sequence of questions, but tried to cover all areas by the end of the interview to enable case comparison.

Interviews were conducted by all three main researchers, as well as by research partners in Hong Kong and in Taiwan, and included a mixture of Skype, phone and face-to-face interviews. All interviews were recorded. The final interview database for this report consisted of 15 interviews with NESTs (one in Brunei, one in Cameroon, one in Hong Kong, four in Japan, six in Korea and two in Taiwan) and eight interviews with LETs (two in Hong Kong, two in Japan, three in Korea and one in Taiwan).

Interviews were analysed using a thematic analysis (Richards et al., 2012) to identify the benefits and challenges of the NEST schemes as perceived by the NESTs and LETs. An initial coding scheme was drawn up by one of the researchers based on the interview schedule and the findings from existing literature. The three researchers then used the scheme to code the same interview independently of each other. The three sets of coding were compared and deemed sufficiently similar to be able to proceed with further independent coding of the remaining interviews. At the same time, the coding categories were refined to give the final coding scheme (Appendix C).

Once all the interviews were coded by labelling relevant sections in a Word document, the data were sorted in two ways: first by country, so that all the data for each code from a particular country were copied and pasted into a single table; second by theme, so that all the data for each code were copied and pasted into a single table. Each table had two columns, one for data from NESTs and one for data from LETs. The two tables, with the alternative ways of sorting the data, allowed the researchers to identify key themes within a particular scheme as well as key themes across schemes.

Observational data were collected from 15 classroom observations. Table 1 shows the number of lessons and teachers observed in each country.

**Table 1**: Number of NESTs and LETs observed

| Country | Number of lessons | NESTs | LETs |
|---|---|---|---|
| Japan | 6 | 3 | 6 |
| Korea | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Hong Kong | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Taiwan | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| **Total** | **15** | **10** | **15** |

The choice of classrooms observed was dictated primarily by availability of classes during the researcher's visit and willingness of the teachers to be observed. In all observations, the role of the researcher was that of non-participant observer (Allwright and Bailey, 1991). The researcher took fieldnotes and collected classroom artefacts such as materials and students' work.

Although classroom observation is undoubtedly the best method for finding out what happens in classrooms, it must be remembered that the presence of a non-participant observer, or even only of a tape recorder, will inevitably lead, to some extent, to an alteration of normal behaviour, to what Labov (1972) calls 'the observer's paradox', and allowances must be made for this in the analysis and reporting of the data. In each case the NEST was also interviewed (see above) but was not only asked the questions in the interview schedule but also asked about the observed lesson and the pedagogies practised. Three LETs in Korea and one LET in Japan were also interviewed after the observed lessons.

Fieldnotes were analysed thematically to show and compare classroom pedagogies in order to highlight key episodes (Borg, 1998) that seem to impact on the effectiveness of classroom practice.

# 4

# Findings

In this section we introduce the main findings from the study. In doing so, we respond to two of the research questions:

- What happens in NEST classes and what are the typical roles played by LETs and NESTs?
- What can be learnt from the experiences of LETs and NESTs to improve classroom teaching?

The section is divided into: scheme organisation, roles and relationships, classroom language, cultural differences, communication, planning and status. These are the main themes that emerged from the analysis. Our aim is to elucidate features and issues shared by the schemes, although we recognise that some findings will be more relevant to some schemes than others. Throughout we draw on interview and fieldnote data.

## 4.1 Scheme organisation

Each scheme is run in different ways, although there are common features too. Most of the larger schemes reported in the audit require teachers to apply formally, and often from outside the country of work, through a central recruiting body. Smaller schemes may require local applications. The larger schemes are also more concerned with induction and support, perhaps because they are recruiting directly from English-speaking countries and recognise that teachers will find their new NEST environments different from what they are used to. However, a number of the NESTs we interviewed had not received formal induction, or had not received it until after they had been in the country for some time. One NEST reported:

> *There wasn't [induction] for me, because I came in suddenly, because a teacher left midway through the year suddenly … I didn't have anything, except for a brief one-to-one session with another teacher. So this year, lots of new teachers joined and they had a whole week-long induction, which was properly organised and was pretty good.*

Some schemes, such as VSO, Fulbright and CfBT in Brunei, seem to conduct a very detailed and supportive induction programme, which is reviewed after each delivery to ensure the activities are pertinent and helpful for new recruits. One NEST working in Brunei explained:

> *It's administrative, I think they do a fairly good job on housing, cars, customs, culture and tradition, and then they move swiftly into the more professional side of things. There are still quite old traditions that exist that have to be articulated, perhaps, in new ways.*

Likewise, NESTs were positive about the Fulbright programme in Taiwan:

> *I think Fulbright Taiwan does a very good job compared to some other programmes I've heard about. They make you arrive a month early for workshops and training and to work with your co-teachers and meet your co-teachers. And then, after a month of that training, you start at the school, but they have you kind of work as an observer first and then you get eased into the classroom.*

Other schemes may not be as successful, as this NEST teacher suggested:

> *[The induction] was terrible, it was really maybe because of the kind of people that were training us, in this local university and on the XXX course, there were people that weren't that much more qualified than me doing it, they'd been teaching for four years or something. I was taking the training course with a 40-year-old man who'd been a teacher back home, came over for a couple of years, being told how to teach by a 25-year-old.*

Another NEST teacher complained about the 'bootcamp-like' conditions of the induction:

> *Well, everyone goes through the same process, essentially we get off the plane and we have to do a ten-day orientation. During this orientation we get sent to this facility, which is the only way I can really put it. It's in the middle of nowhere and in this facility we ended up doing a lot of classes, we had a few field trips, a lot of seminars and lectures about culture and such. We also had to do a medical check, which was pretty extensive, they tested our blood, our weight and everything like that. Personally I did not like the experience, because I found it very constricting, I had to sleep in a room with two other people who were total strangers.*

Smaller schemes rarely have detailed induction programmes, often because teachers are recruited locally and already have experience of living and working in the local context:

> *It's really funny actually. Nothing at all! So if you are not experienced, it would be no idea, and you will be standing in front of the students doing nothing, I think. 'Cause I didn't even know what kind of textbook I would use.*

It is unusual for schemes to offer induction to LETs. One LET admitted that the night before the arrival of the NEST she 'couldn't sleep', while another explained:

> *I started teaching English in my previous school, there wasn't any NEST so I didn't know that I'm going to have a co-teacher from a different country so I started teaching by myself, and then by the end of that semester I was told that: 'Oh, there's going to be an English teacher and you should co-teach'.*

Once NESTs are in situ, support is provided through a range of mechanisms. The local teacher is often a first port of call, as one LET explained:

> *There's no systematic induction for new teachers so they are left on their own or have to ask the more experienced teachers, which take up their work time. Some guidelines, for example, a schedule that details what teachers can expect, would happen from the beginning to the end of a school year; earlier on would be helpful.*

On schemes such as JET and EPIK, support is also provided through a network of local co-ordinators.

Training takes place regularly on many of these schemes. Again, some experiences of training are positive, as this VSO explained about the in-service training he experienced:

> *Broadly positive is probably the best way to put it. People would come, people were engaged. We had a good relationship with a lady who was the Chief Inspector based in the ministry in Yaoundé who was fantastic and she would tell us and she would deliver a couple of training sessions.*

However, training may not be considered useful by all NESTs. As one explained:

> *We spend the day discussing the same problems that we've had all along. The training that we do is based on some sort of idealised fantasy of what is happening, especially for co-teaching. The training has for a long time really focused on co-teaching and we beat the same dead horse.*

On some schemes regular meetings and training sessions are held for NESTs, for LETs and for LETs and NESTs together, although joint training sessions are not always provided. Many of the materials developed from the findings of this project are designed to be used at these events to support effective collaborative working. The materials are freely available to download.

Finally, terms and conditions differ from scheme to scheme. Most NESTs seem to find these adequate for their needs, with some schemes offering very good terms and conditions indeed (see the Audit document for these. In some countries, however, the perception that NESTs attract better terms and conditions than LETs can lead to resentment. This is particularly true in Hong Kong, where one LET pointed out that the only difference between her and the NEST was their salaries!

## 4.2 Roles and relationships

By roles and relationships we mean how LETs and NESTs relate to each other, work together, particularly in the classroom, and the rapport that exists between them. Roles and relationships are particularly salient in schemes where team teaching or co-teaching between LETs and NESTs is the norm, which is the main focus of this section. A good deal of our interview data featured comments about roles and relationships.

Two features are particularly noteworthy. The first is that the management of roles depends a great deal on the way the relationship is configured. Another way of saying this is that each teaching relationship is unique. A teacher on the Korean EPIK scheme described the differences:

> *I have a different co-teacher for every grade, so I actually have four of them. It's very much dependent, I find, on the style of the teacher. The grade three teacher and I are basically in a pretty standard position. I'm on one side of the television, he's on the other side at the front. The grade four teacher, I lead some things and then she'll lead some things so then we'll switch, we pass the baton*

*between us. The grade five teacher has her own plan and doesn't always tell me what it is before she starts so I'm more like a resource.*

However, there are some contextual features that heavily influence how roles and relationships are enacted. Experience and expertise are particularly instrumental. The NET programme in Hong Kong, for example, requires its NEST teachers to have both teaching qualifications and experience. These factors, together with the way in which the scheme is organised, ensure that NEST teachers have a level of authority when they arrive at the local school. NEST teachers in this context often take the lead in terms of planning and conducting the lessons, as this LET explained:

*The NEST teacher takes the lead. She takes care of the NET scheme curriculum. There is co-planning every three weeks and the NEST explains to the teachers involved in the scheme how things are to be done.*

LETs may lack confidence in these situations, particularly if they are newly qualified, inexperienced or worried about their levels of English. A NEST in Hong Kong explained how she encourages LETs to take part:

*I've found it takes teachers time to get over the shyness. And they are shy about speaking English, even the English teachers, and if someone is not necessarily following the lesson plan, you don't just say, 'Oh, you're doing it wrong'. You have to be flexible. So I might say, 'Okay, do you want to do this part of the lesson, then I'll do this part then we'll swap?'. So you give them a bit of choice.*

Elliot, who teaches on a NEST scheme in Japan which also recruits experienced and qualified teachers, always takes the lead too, with varying degrees of involvement from LETs:

*If they're really enthusiastic and interested, then we'll have a long meeting every week and we sit down and discuss and we'll go through exactly what's going to happen, how it's going to work and we'll try to divide the work much more equally. If they're not interested, they'll just sit at the back and fold their arms and not even help hand out paper, so you just don't know.*

While it is also the case that inexperienced and under-qualified NESTs are also sometimes expected to lead the lesson, with the LET taking a back seat, it is more likely that, in these cases, the role of the NEST is to support the LET, modelling dialogues and key phrases, playing games and providing examples of 'Western culture'. LETs can sometimes be frustrated by the NESTs' lack of experience, as they often have to coach them in teaching strategies, as a Korean LET explained:

*The first few months I was struggling. It was harder to communicate and I could feel that he felt sorry for me but he was trying to do something but he doesn't have any experience, so he doesn't want to take control of everything, so he wants me to … tell him what to do you know how sometimes you get stressed, okay, if you're teaching alone you don't get stressed, all the plans in my head, I don't have to discuss it with anybody, it's there.*

Nevertheless, even inexperienced NESTs can feel under-employed or even undermined when they feel their skills are not being effectively utilised. One NEST complained:

*There have been times where I've been expected to just be an entertainer, a clown, a monkey.*

While another reported:

*I know that my counterparts in junior high school, they were completely the assistant. Some of my colleagues complained that they were a human tape recorder.*

For the most part, however, the teachers we interviewed were positive about their classroom roles. Furthermore, in all the schools we visited, a positive relationship seemed to exist between LETs and NESTs, perhaps unsurprisingly, as it is unlikely we would have been invited into classrooms where teachers did not feel comfortable with each other. This positive relationship was apparent in the respect teachers showed each other in and out of class and the friendly way they addressed each other. In some classrooms, this positive relationship manifested in a collaborative teaching partnership in which roles were equally distributed and teachers addressed each other in a relaxed way. For example, in a classroom in Korea, the NEST and LET discussed together different cooking techniques in front of the children. Fieldnotes state:

*The lesson was started by the LET but there was lots of to-ing and fro-ing between the teachers at the front throughout there was an equal distribution of turns between teachers and it really was not clear who was in charge.*

Likewise, in Hong Kong, fieldnotes describe a collaborative approach:

> *As the lesson progressed, the control shifted from LET to NEST there was some conflabbing between the two teachers during the lesson about what to do next and this seemed a fairly comfortable process.*

After this lesson the NEST confirmed that the relationship between her and the LET was particularly good, as they had been working together for many years.

In the majority of classrooms, however, roles were much more defined and collaborative interaction in class less apparent. The two approaches described below were quite typical. Fieldnotes from one school visit to Korea note:

> *The transitions between sections are quite abrupt. The LET announces, for example, 'the NEST will do the next part,' which the NEST duly does. The LET did all the grammar work and all games were played by the NEST. There is a clear differentiation of roles.*

While those from a school visit in Japan describe how:

> *… the NEST was left to do the teaching while the LET did a bit of 'disciplining' and a fair amount of turning a blind eye. There was very little turn-taking, as the LET did not really take part.*

In both these classrooms there was less fluidity, roles were clearly defined and contributions were less equally distributed. In the first, the LET takes charge of the 'serious' teaching – grammar in particular – leaving the NEST to do the 'fun stuff', as one NEST called it, practice activities, pronunciation and games. In the second, the NEST takes charge of the language learning aspects of the lesson, leaving the LET to ensure students know what they have to do, are on task and behave.

Of course, on schemes where team teaching is not prevalent and where NESTs teach independently, the importance of roles and relationships to successful learning and teaching encounters may seem less central. A NEST working with VSO explained how most collaboration happened outside class:

> *The moment we used to collaborate most was when it came to assessments, so, for example in the troisième class there were, let's say, 200 kids in troisième, and it was split into two classes and I took one and a colleague took the other. And we'd administer a common test that one of us would have written, so that each of us would mark our own class's work. So we really did very little, in terms of daily lesson planning nothing was collaborative. We ran an English club for those students who were interested to join. We had a session once a week for an hour on a Wednesday afternoon, I think, and we did that all together.*

On the CfBT scheme in Brunei, on the other hand, one teacher described the importance of being part of a team, working towards a common goal:

> *There seems to be an element of [collaboration] amongst the local schools and school teachers here, that we're all in it together and we all need together to get the job done.*

In teaching contexts where LETs and NESTs teach independently relationships remain important but are configured in different ways.

## 4.3 Communication

Both LETs and NESTs were asked what advice they would give to teachers who are either new to team teaching or to working in a different educational environment. Many focused on the importance of communication. One NEST suggested that communication should be semi-structured:

> *Personally, I think one of the most effective things that can be done is in the beginning, in the initial stages of the co-teaching relationship, is to sit down and clarify what are your expectations, what are my expectations, what do we want to do in the class, what do we see our roles and responsibilities as being? so I think directly confronting that at the beginning of the co-teaching relationship can save a lot of heartache and it can help you get into the teaching without having all of these back and forth smaller issues that negatively impact the teaching.*

Another NEST pointed to the importance of learning the local language in order to improve communication with both students and staff:

> *I would tell them if they don't already know Chinese they should try to learn Chinese, even if they're not allowed to use it in their classroom, I think it's important they understand what their students are saying. I think. And I think it's just important for working in the school.*

LETs also valued communication in order to ensure teaching efficacy:

> *And if you don't try to communicate with each other because you had small misunderstanding, then it will grow and grow over time and there is a big gap between you and your co-teacher and you*

*get to the point where you hate each other! And then you cannot deal with the situation any more, the classroom gets a nightmare. And then the students become the victims.*

This point was reiterated by a NEST from Taiwan who found talking to her local colleagues extremely helpful:

*So if I'm having trouble with a class I can talk to my co-teacher about that class … And I would also say just to chat and they're really great co-workers. The LET and I chat a lot.*

Coupled with communication, LETs and NESTs both highlighted the importance of flexibility from both sides, but particularly from NESTs. One NEST reflected:

*Maybe our style is completely focused on one way to do it, but that's not the only way to do it and it's not necessarily the best way to do it, but at the same time, if they think that they've got a good idea, then they shouldn't be afraid to stand their ground and persuade the teachers to give something a try.*

While another advised:

*Enter the experience with a very open mind and willingness to try out new things and … don't be too quick to dismiss what's happening in that context based on your own experiences, but try to integrate what you know, what you've learnt and what you've experienced with what's happening in the classroom context.*

LETs in our study were keen for local teachers to embrace difference and to encourage flexibility. One told us:

*The first thing is just from my personal experience, people can have a kind of stereotype, don't fix to those stereotypes because every person, individual persons are different, just open your mind, not only on speaking English but emotionally, and be ready to negotiate with native English speaker.*

While another suggested that:

*We shouldn't ask the NESTs to give in every time, as one of the biggest benefits they bring to the school is seeing things from another perspective.*

These comments demonstrate a willingness on the part of both LETs and NESTs to accommodate each other and to be open to different ways of doing things. Both underlined that communication, openness and flexibility are likely to lead to successful communication.

## 4.4 Classroom language

On some schemes language use in the classroom is mandated by the school, by the Ministry of Education or by the scheme itself. Teachers, be they LETs or NESTs, are told explicitly what languages are allowed in class. In many cases, L1 is actively discouraged. One LET explained how a NEST was scolded for using L1:

*[One NEST] spoke L1 quite well but she was told by the vice principal of the school: 'No you're not here to speak L1 to them, you are here to use English in the classroom. Don't speak L1 in class'.*

Teachers often have strong views on the subject but these views are not polarised according to whether the teacher is a LET or NEST. A NEST in Korea explained:

*I use no L1. I tell my students from the beginning, 'I do not speak Korean'… we have a sign. They can signal, 'I don't understand,' and then the LET will come and help individually.*

A position reiterated by a LET, also in Korea:

*I think it's really important to encourage them to use more English … I was thinking, 'should I use some L1?' No! If they know I use L1, they would too. So I'll say the first rule is use English. One of the rules: it's English class!*

Other teachers take a more pragmatic line. One LET explained the importance of ensuring students' understand meaning:

*[I use] mostly English but a little bit of L1 when I think they need some clarification, because I don't want them to get confused after class. I want them to leave the class with a clear idea.*

And two NESTs in Taiwan focused on how using different languages, in their case English and Chinese, can provide a strong model for students about languages and language learning:

*One thing I like about using both languages is that it shares with the students the idea that it's not either or. You don't have to only speak English, but that these two languages are valuable.*

*I think part of the reason I've wanted to use Chinese in the classroom is because I want to give them a role model of a language learner so that they see that it's okay to make mistakes because I always make mistakes in my Chinese.*

For many teachers, there is ambivalence around using L1 in the classroom. A NEST fluent in Japanese reflected:

> *I never use Japanese in the classroom except for comedy purposes, but I'll often respond in English to something they've said in Japanese … Personally, it seems so crazy to pretend I can't speak Japanese, because that's all I do every day of my life. It seems strange!*

And on a different scheme in Japan, Tomoko, a native Japanese speaker, employed as a NEST because of her bilingual skills, had to pretend not to know Japanese. Her co-teacher explained:

> *I tell her, please pretend not to understand Japanese.*

Tomoko explained how this injunction caused her to take on the role of a non-proficient Japanese speaker in another English class:

> *Most of the classes I'm prohibited to speak that. Some of them, like the male teacher I mentioned, who has no English whatsoever, and he actually asked me to use Japanese sometimes. Otherwise he doesn't understand and students go: 'Huh?' Then I started explaining in Japanese. But in a way, like broken Japanese.*

In all classrooms we observed, L1 was used, mostly but not exclusively by the LET. However, the amount of L1 varied considerably. In one classroom, it was used a great deal in order to clarify a complex grammar point. In others, it was used sparingly, to cajole and coax students into taking part or completing work, or to explain what to do or to elucidate meaning. Fieldnotes from a classroom observation in Japan note:

> *The LET translanguaged a fair bit, moving into Japanese generally to explain the activities.*

In Korea, fieldnotes state:

> *The LET did a lot of checking meaning and concept checking, mostly in English but also in L1 to ensure the children understood.*

Another focus of classroom language was the LET's use of English. Again, using English depended on a range of factors but confidence and proficiency were the most apparent in both the interviews and observations (where homeroom teachers have not traditionally been expected to know or teach English). Fieldnotes from a primary classroom in Japan indicate that one LET seemed to be modelling language-learning behaviour:

> *I was surprised by the amount of English the LET used. She was not afraid of making a mistake or asking the NEST for guidance where English was concerned … at one stage the LET asked: 'Do we put 'the' in the sentence?'*

This view was later reiterated by the co-teaching NEST:

> *She always tries to speak English as much as she can. Sometimes she code-switches into Japanese if she doesn't have that word, which is perfectly okay, perfectly great actually, great model for the students, and I can understand what she's saying so I just throw in English.*

As fieldnotes show another LET in Japan seemed to want to show students that speaking English was natural:

> *The LET used English without fuss or embarrassment despite his telling the NEST that he didn't like English. He certainly didn't convey this to the students.*

And in Hong Kong, a LET seemed particularly confident about using English as the medium of instruction:

> *When we walked into the class the LET was in full flow and kids were sitting in makeshift rows at the front. The LET was using English to teach the new vocabulary and all students seemed engaged.*

From this data it seems that, despite the general belief or imperative that teachers should use only English in class, L1 is deployed in a number of ways to meet different needs. Nevertheless, for the most part, and perhaps fairly predictably, it is the prerogative of the LET rather than the NEST to use the students' L1.

## 4.5 Cultural differences

Culture is a huge topic, not least as it is interpreted in so many different ways by so many different researchers. Teachers in our study focused on two areas of cultural difference: the classroom and broader educational context, and societal norms.

### 4.5.1 The classroom and educational context

A number of NESTs described the differences in school life compared to their own educational experiences. On NEST admitted:

> *I think the school life really just shocked me. I think coming from here and the US where school life is eight to four, you practise your sport and you're out of school by 6 at the latest, whereas Japanese school life … students leave at seven but then they have some practices on Saturdays or Sundays, and during the summer holidays they have some*

*practice round their holidays they have club practice and teachers are there all the time.*

This resonated with fieldnotes taken at a Korean school:

*The NEST told me that the school is like a second home for students. Apparently, some even come with their blankets in winter!*

Both LETs and NESTs felt that as the 'newcomer', it was incumbent on the NEST to learn about the school culture. For example, one LET explained how staff meetings in Hong Kong are designed to give out information and to inform staff of decisions already made; however, one NEST did not understand this concept:

*The only person that responded to the principal's announcements is the NEST. Later I told them about the local practice (not being so vocal at the meetings) and they are shocked but perhaps their principle is to voice out any disagreement. Usually we talk to people individually rather than sharing our views in a big meeting.*

In a different educational context, a NEST argued:

*I think what's more important is to have some sense of what the rules of the game are, of what the cultural rules are and the cultural expectations, because a lot of people, they come in and they think: 'This is how it works. If I have a problem I go straight to the top, I'm going immediately, directly to the principal.' This is the worst idea you can possibly have.*

For NESTs with experience of and qualifications in language teaching methodology, one of the biggest challenges is the difference between local teaching practices and those they have brought with them, as this NEST explained with reference to the material designed in the scheme support centre:

*So it slowly, step by step, introduces quite Western teaching methods, or non-traditional teaching methods I should say, not necessarily Western, but it slowly brings them out of their comfort zone. In P1 they make jelly and a birthday cake, and the first year when I did it they all freaked out! Then they gave it a try and then they love it and now the teachers don't blink an eye, they're up for it.*

Nevertheless, in all the classrooms observed, students engaged in interactive activities, some of which involved moving around the classroom, with incumbent noise levels. Fieldnotes from a classroom observation in Korea state:

*The children quickly get involved in the game, coming up with sporting items for different letters of the alphabet, and the noise levels rise. When the NEST wants their attention, she has a clapping cue, which the children respond to by clapping back.*

This is not to suggest that when teaching alone LETs did not introduce similar types of activity, but rather that they were a constant feature of co-teaching classrooms.

### 4.5.2 Societal norms

As might be expected, societal differences between LET and NEST cultures can cause misunderstandings and disappointments. Most of the comments about societal differences came, understandably, from NEST teachers, as it is they who are directly experiencing the contrast. For some NESTs it is hidden cultural practices that are most challenging. One NEST discussed how the differences in friendship groups, as she understood them, made it difficult to make friends in Japan:

*Because the Japanese have an 'uchi' and 'soto' group, and uchi is like the inner circle, people that are close to you, and soto is the outside, so socially, and this is also true in schools too. It's like there's the people have the uchi like their parents and their social group, parents, brother and sister, maybe one friend that they share their innermost feelings with, whereas like the soto group, it's more of a quick, 'Hey, how's it going?' and then see them once in a while and that's it. So it's really hard to make friends with Japanese people because it takes so much time and effort and you really have to push it.*

For others, the differences are more tangible. One NEST in Korea gave an example of differences in eating habits:

*So one of the things that many of my friends didn't know was how to eat a Korean meal, everyone shares everything. Well, some of the native speakers that I met, they're germophobes, they don't share food, that's not a thing where they're from – you get your meal and no one touches your food. So people, oh sharing and using the same spoon for the soup, they were horrified!*

For other NESTs it was being visibly different that was the greatest challenge:

*You're living alone and you could be the only blond-haired person in your town of 5,000 people, so they're always going to ask you questions, the same questions, where are you from, can you use chopsticks, all that they ask some ridiculous questions, you just have to brush that off. And be prepared to get stared at, I don't know if that makes sense, but like be prepared to be the other.*

One of the most positive comments about cultural

difference came from a NEST who had worked on scheme in a developing country. He embraced a more idealised view of difference:

> *… it was the idealised experience of this guy living in a rural village with no running water and blah, blah, blah and becomes part of the community. But really I had that kind of experience.*

## 4.6 Planning

Both LETs and NESTs noted the importance of planning lessons when co-teaching. Many LETs, however, struggled to find time to plan with co-teachers as they have so many commitments outside the classroom, such as running clubs and taking care of the pastoral needs of their students. One LET told us:

> *But here in Korea the Ministry duties and dealing with the students and dealing with the parents, dealing with so many things, more than teaching. So approximately, if I have to put as a percentage, that teaching part is only 30 per cent.*

Lack of time for planning was also highlighted by a LET in Hong Kong:

> *Yes. I think one of the problems is the time element to plan the lesson. Most of the teachers, I think, are very busy and don't have much time for planning, and that's the same in Hong Kong, same in China, same everywhere.*

Other LETs believe it is the role of the NEST to plan the lessons, as the primary focus of the lessons is to practise speaking; LETs, in contrast, generally have expertise in teaching linguistic systems such as grammar and vocabulary. One LET explained how the planning worked in her context:

> *So it depends on him or her but basically I let him or her do anything and then I'm just organising classes and I'm in charge of discipline problems, something like that.*

A NEST in Taiwan was grateful for the freedom she had to plan lessons independently for the students:

> *Our co-teachers gave us a lot of freedom to play games. Most of it has not been in the textbook. They have four classes, four class periods every week where they study grammar and then in our class period they would do more speaking and listening, and most of that is through games or through cultural introductions where we'd do hopefully a cultural exchange where we learn about Taiwan and they learn about America.*

However, not all NESTs have the skills to plan, particularly when they first arrive, as this Korean LET explained:

> *Taking the class, I should be more responsible for the whole process, like let's lesson plan together, or 'I will do this part, why don't you try planning this part?' so I was always the person who suggests something and also the main teacher in the classroom. I had to because they don't know about what to do at first.*

On some schemes, lessons are planned centrally, either by NESTs or by LETs and NESTs working together. In Hong Kong, for example, materials are produced by a central, government-funded team. This comprises Hong Kong Chinese English language teachers, who have qualifications in teaching in the local school system and experience in a range of schools, and NESTs, who are qualified in teaching children and in some cases teaching English to speakers of other languages. One NEST on this scheme explained how this approach provided legitimacy to the interactive materials and to the role of the NEST in delivering them:

> *But it's kind of like a structured way for NEST and LETs to work together because it's all structured and written out for them and the different roles and teaching ones … Because I think sometimes when there's just one individual, such as myself, in a school of 50-plus teachers, you're the outsider, your voice can get lost, but having a structured programme, endorsed by the government behind you, I think that helps.*

Joint planning was a particularly important issue for NESTs who were experienced and qualified. They regarded joint planning as an opportunity to share pedagogies of learning and to develop more communicative teaching approaches with LETs. A NEST in Japan explained the advantages joint planning could bring:

> *I think it would be much better if we both produced a lesson … in my experience, I don't think that Japanese teachers have any skill of creating a lesson from scratch, if nothing else, they don't have the training, or the experience – so I think that they would really understand the lesson more and they would be more involved … and they would gain the experience that they can use in their own classes as well, because I think the lessons we create are really good, but I'd like them to be a collaborative effort… if it's collaborative, then it's our lesson and they can do those activities in their classroom.*

However, learning from each other is not a one-way process. A number of NESTs reflected on having learnt a good deal about learning and teaching from their LET co-teachers. For most NESTs, however, more planning time would enhance the co-teaching experience immensely:

> *[I wish we had] more time! Regular meetings, if somebody who's scheduling or something can be aware of that or can realise how important it is to communicate for the team teaching, then that would make so much difference.*

## 4.7 Native speakerism

Much of the research that focuses on native speakerism suggests that NESTs can make LETs feel disempowered, insecure and inferior (e.g. Murai, 2004; Tsui and Bunton, 2000; Piller, 2001). Our findings suggest that the response of LETs to NESTs is contextual and contingent, and rarely results intrinsically from them being native speakers. In the Korean schools we visited, for example, the language skills of the LETs were extremely strong; all had spent some time overseas in inner circle countries and none mentioned that they lacked confidence in their use of English. Indeed, a number of them told us that they use English as a medium of instruction for all their classes, not only those where NESTs are present. Of course, we only observed and spoke to a limited number of LETs, who no doubt agreed to participate in part because of the strength of their language skills. Nonetheless, there are clearly LETs who are both expert and confident English language users who do not consider themselves inferior in this regard.

In the Korean, Taiwanese and Japanese schools, the NESTs are positioned as the AET (assistant English teacher). Some LETs are less than impressed with their NEST colleagues:

> *While that mostly that native English speaker, I cannot see them as a teacher because not enough education background and no degree. The reasons how they are hired is just extremely poor I feel sorry about it. They are not a teacher.*

A NEST explained how power relations can be enacted by LETs:

> *Sometimes the Korean teacher will talk down to us or give us an order that is less respectful than they would ever do to another Korean, to a Korean teacher, and that could lead to a lot of problems.*

Neither LETs nor NESTs were under any illusions about who was in charge, and this was communicated to the students, as illustrated here:

> *So they said, 'Pete senpai,' and that was interesting, they didn't see me as a sensei [teacher], but they didn't see me as just Pete, they see me as someone to look up to, but not quite as much as a proper teacher.*

In Hong Kong, on the other hand, the status of the NEST is very different. They are experienced and qualified and are employed as teachers, not assistants. They also work in central government educational offices, designing the syllabus and materials, and may deliver training sessions to LETs. These realities mean that they are locally regarded as at least equals if not superiors although this does not mean that their presence is welcome (see Luk and Lin, 2006). Their status and how they are positioned may influence how LETs respond to them, as this NEST explained about her LET co-teachers:

> *Always very polite and get on well, but they're very shy. And they're very shy about speaking English, even the English teachers, they're just nervous about it.*

Given that LETs in Hong Kong must have extremely strong language skills to be employed as teachers of English, it is likely that their feelings of inadequacy are linked to working with NESTs.

# 5

# Summary and implications

In this section we respond specifically to our final research question:

- What can be learnt about the experience of LETs and NESTs to improve training and support?

Although discussion on induction and training is rare in the literature on NEST schemes, they are central to the experience of many teachers and so worthy of investigation. According to our findings, schemes tend to offer support to NESTs rather than LETs, however. NESTs often receive induction and training and are provided with support mechanisms. LETs, on the other hand, are rarely invited to induction activities and training tends to be limited and often provided to LET cohorts rather than to mixed cohorts. While it could be argued that NESTs, who are often starting a new life in a very different cultural landscape, need support, our data suggest that LETs too would benefit from induction and training in order to feel more comfortable with the new teacher and, as is the norm on most schemes, to make the most of the team-teaching relationship. Joint induction would also provide a space for NESTs and LETs to share expectations and cultural perspectives, which could reduce tensions later in the partnership.

All NESTs and LETs we spoke to suggested that a positive relationship between co-teachers was an essential feature of successful co-teaching. For many, this positive relationship allowed for collaboration. However, 'collaboration' was open to interpretation. For some it is a partnership between co-teachers, in which planning and teaching are jointly achieved. For others it means sharing the same class but not necessarily at the same time. Teachers should be encouraged to discuss their own understandings of collaboration with each other to ensure that both parties at least understand each other's position. This could be achieved using the activity 'Experiential Learning Cycle', which can be found in the materials.

A key feature of collaboration is planning classes. The research literature suggests that joint planning is rare on NEST schemes (see, for example, Chung et al., 1999; Carless and Walker, 2006; Ng, 2015). Rutson-Griffiths (2012) sees insufficient preparation for planning and discussion between team teachers as causing less collaborative and therefore less effective performances in class. This study confirms that there is a lack of planning, with most teachers interviewed stating that planning time was not available. Planning is contingent on many factors, including time, experience, confidence, English language skills, motivation and cultural understanding. Time is a problem for LETs, in particular, who often have many demands on them outside the classroom and cannot make space for planning meetings. LETs may also lack motivation to team teach or lack confidence in doing so, manifested in not making time for planning or showing no interest in it. On the other hand, experience is often an issue for NESTs who may join a scheme with no teaching qualifications and having spent little if any time in the classroom. With limited knowledge or understanding of teaching in general and teaching English in particular, planning is difficult. It must be noted, however, that a number of NESTs we interviewed and observed had both teaching qualifications and experience, often in the host country; indeed, some schemes, such as CfBT and the Hong Kong NET scheme require both. Whatever the context, our data clearly show that planning is a key component of successful co-teaching. Not only does it help determine who does what in the classroom, but it also gives all teachers the opportunity to discuss the rationale for different activities and teaching approaches. The materials that accompany this report include a planning activity.

With no planning, problems arise. For example, LETs often expect a NEST to take on the interactive aspects of lessons, particularly teaching speaking. Many NESTs are happy to do this, but those with advanced qualifications and experience may feel they have more to offer and can also contribute in terms of teaching grammar, for example. NESTs for their part may expect support from the LETs but find this is not forthcoming.

Rutson-Griffiths (2012) argues that problems arise in the Japanese context when teachers do not agree on their expected roles; similar views are articulated by Mahoney (2004). In this study communication is highlighted by many teachers as a key aspect of successful planning and collaboration. Spending time at the beginning of a team-teaching relationship to discuss expectations, as suggested by one NEST, could be an effective response to this issue.

The findings from the study show that English predominates in NEST classrooms, whether these are taught by NESTs independently or in team-teaching dyads. However, the learners' L1 is also used by both LETs and NESTs, although it is generally the prerogative of LETs. Despite 'English-only' directives from ministries and institutions, teachers use L1 for a range of functions, from managing the classroom to being humorous and explaining grammar. Furthermore, they clearly articulate their beliefs with regard to using different languages. These range from creating an English language environment to modelling the ideal language learner for the class. The materials include an activity to promote discussion of L1/L2 use. This can be found in the materials.

The cultural aspects of NEST schemes must not be overlooked. Both NESTs and LETs can find the experience of working with someone from another culture daunting, although for others it is one of the main attractions. A number of the bigger NEST schemes address culture in some detail in their induction programmes, providing NESTs with insights into both educational and societal norms. However, it seems that much less support is provided to LETs who often have a NEST thrust upon them with no preparation. The materials include two activities with a specific cultural focus: Cross-cultural proverb exchange and The culture iceberg.

On a slightly different note, one set of materials asks participants to separate comments made in the interviews by LETs and by NESTs according to whether the comment was made by a LET or NEST. Given that much of the literature highlights differences between NESTs and LETs (e.g. Chou, 2005; Islam, 2011; Tran, 2014) we were surprised (and delighted) that the two groups agreed on a range of issues. Through focusing on similarities rather than differences, we believe the activity highlights the affinities between teachers, demonstrating that teachers have the best interests of students at heart.

Both LETs and NESTs in this study stated that flexibility and accommodation were important in reducing cultural clashes and this is the view expressed by Chen (2009). NESTs should be prepared to spend time settling into their new context before suggesting changes; LETs should be prepared to welcome alternative points of view on accepted norms. In the classroom, 'Western' communicative practices such as games and other interactive activities seem not only acceptable but expected, and issues such as noise levels are tolerated. This is not to suggest that LETs do not include these activity types in their general classroom practice but that the presence of the NEST validates their inclusion. There is also some evidence that when sharing classes LETs feel under pressure to catch up on core grammatical content.

In contrast to much of the research literature (for example, Tsui and Bunton, 2000; Elyas and Picard, 2012; Wang and Lin, 2013), we found little evidence of LETs actually being undermined. On most schemes LETs are in more powerful positions than NESTs. NESTs are mostly either clients or employed in a subservient role (the label often attached to the NEST is 'AET' – assistant English teacher). Of course, some LETs feel that the terms and conditions received by NESTs are unfair; however, for the most part the terms and conditions of LETs are superior to NESTs. The Hong Kong NET scheme and the Brunei CfBT scheme are exceptions to the general rule. On both schemes, NESTs are well qualified, experienced and receive excellent terms and conditions. The NESTs expect either to have their own classes or to lead on classes with LETs.

# 6

# Recommendations

Based on the research carried out for the project, a number of recommendations can be made:

- Induction should be available for both NESTs and LETs.
- Induction should include time for NESTs and LETs to discuss their expectations of their roles. Ideally the discussion should be between partner teachers or between a school representative and the NEST. Discussions of this nature should be ongoing.
- Teachers should be encouraged to maintain a healthy regard for the value of L1 and L2 in the classroom. The value of both languages may need to be explained to head teachers.
- Time should be made available for planning. This is particularly important when the NEST is peripatetic and moving from classroom to classroom or school to school. If necessary, fewer classes should be scheduled in order to make time for planning.
- Planning should be a joint endeavour between the LET and the NEST.
- On Type 2 schemes in particular, status issues between LETs and NESTs should be carefully monitored. LETs and NESTs in these contexts should be given opportunities to discuss how their roles might impact on other teachers.

# 7

# Conclusion

The research described in this report offers a snapshot of current attitudes towards NEST schemes and practices in NEST classrooms in a number of different contexts where such schemes operate.

Most of the research participants were involved in long-running and well-established schemes, run by either charities or governments. These schemes were more or less successful at evaluating and developing mechanisms for supporting teachers. However, in many countries, there are numerous smaller NEST schemes, many of which are run by private enterprise where the focus is on profit rather than on educational gains. It would be interesting to compare the experiences of teachers on these schemes with those reported here to see what differences, if any, exist.

Perhaps the key finding from our research is that NEST schemes are not inherently either positive or negative; what happens in NEST classes very much depends on the role of the NEST teacher, the relationship between the NEST and LET colleagues and, to some extent, the skills and experience of the teachers. Further research could usefully shed more light on the factors involved in each of these areas through more focused and in-depth studies of each one.

A key feature of this research project was to use the findings to produce materials that will support NESTs and LETs in having productive relationships, leading to successful teaching. Planning, culture (both educational and societal), communication, classroom language and classroom management all feature in these materials, which are designed to be carried out in training sessions or in self-study. The materials are freely available for download.

These materials are based on research data and produced with research partners directly involved in NEST schemes in different countries. It is hoped that they will provide a useful resource for all NESTs and LETs, not only those who are facing the challenges of such schemes, but also those who wish to build on and strengthen their already positive experiences.

# References


Ahn, H (2014) Teacher's attitudes towards Korean English in South Korea. *World Englishes* 33/2: 195-222.

Aline, D, Hosoda, Y (2006) Team teaching participation patterns of homeroom teachers in English activities classes in Japanese public elementary schools. *JALT Journal* 28/1: 5-22.

Allwright, D and Bailey, KM (1991) *Focus on the Language Classroom.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Alptekin, C (2002) Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal* 56/1: 57-64.

Árva, V and Medgyes, P (2000) Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System* 28/3: 355-372.

BERA (2011) *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research.* www.bera.ac.uk/researchers-resources/publications/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2011.

Berns, M (2008) World Englishes, English as a lingua franca, and intelligibility. *World Englishes* 27/3/4: 327-334.

Bolton, K and Graddol, D (2012) English in China today. *English Today* 28/3: 3-8.

Bolton, K, Graddol, D and Meierkord, C (2011) Towards developmental world Englishes. *World Englishes* 30/1: 459-480.

Borg, S (1998) Teachers' Pedagogical Systems and Grammar Teaching: A Qualitative Study. *TESOL Quarterly* 32/1: 9-38.

Braine, G (2010) Non-native Speaker English Teachers: *Research, Pedagogy, and Professional Growth.* Oxon: Routledge.

Browne, C and Wada, M (1998) Current issues in high school English teaching in Japan: An exploratory survey. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 11/1:97-112.

Brutt-Griffler, J (2002) *World English: A study of its development.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Press.

Bryant, DA (2011) *From origins to sustainability: native-speaking English teachers as an innovation.* Doctoral dissertation. The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.

Burns, A. (2010) *Doing Action Research in English Language Teaching: A Guide for Practitioners*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, YG (2007) How Are Non-native English-Speaking Teachers Perceived by Young Learners? *TESOL Quarterly* 41/4: 731-755.

Carless, D (2002) *Conflict or collaboration: Native and non-native speakers team teaching in schools in South Korea, Japan and Hong Kong.* Paper presented at the 7th English Southeast Asia (ESEA) Conference, Baptist University, Hong Kong.

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

Carless, D and Walker, E (2006) Effective Team teaching between Local and Native-speaking English Teachers. *Language and Education* 20/6: 463-477.

Chen, S-H (2009) *Intercultural team teaching: A study of local and foreign EFL teachers in Taiwan*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Durham University, UK.

Chen, W-Y (2007) *A Case Study on the Professional Development of Local and Foreign English Teachers in Team Teaching.* Unpublished PhD thesis. National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan.

Chen, WC and Cheng, Y (2010) A case study on foreign English teachers' challenges. *System* 38/1: 41-49.

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

Choi, H (2009) A study on team teaching between native teachers of English and Korean English teachers in elementary school. *Studies in English Education* 14/1: 161-189.

Chou, M-Y (2005) *A study of English Collaborative Teaching at Elementary schools in Hsinchu City.* Unpublished Masters thesis. National Taipei Teachers College, Taiwan.

Clark, E and Paran, A (2007) The employability of non-native-speaker teachers of EFL: A UK survey. *System* 35/4: 407-430.

Copland, F, Garton, S and Burns, A (2014) Challenges in teaching English to young learners: global perspectives and local realities. *TESOL Quarterly* 48/4: 738-762.

Costino, KA and Hyon, S (2007) "A class for students like me": Reconsidering relationships among identity labels, residency status, and students' preferences for mainstream or multilingual composition. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 16/2: 63-81.

Creese, A, Blackledge, A and Takhi, JK (2014). The ideal 'native speaker' teacher: negotiating authenticity and legitimacy in the language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* 98/4: 937-951.

Denzin, NK and Lincoln, YS (1994) 'Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research', in Denzin, NK and Lincoln, YS (...) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. pp. 1-18. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Deterding, D (2010) ELF-based Pronunciation Teaching in China. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics* 33/6: 3-15.

Dörnyei, Z (2007) *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methodologies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Elyas, T and Picard, MY (2012) Towards a globalised notion of English language teaching in Saudi Arabia: A case study. *Asian EFL Journal* 14/2: 99-124.

Faez, F (2011) Are you a native speaker of English? Moving beyond a simplistic dichotomy. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 8/4: 378-399.

Fang, X (2011) Globalising ELT: From Chinglish to China English. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 2/2: 377-381.

Ferguson, G and Donno, S (2003) One-month teacher training courses: time for a change? *ELT Journal* 57/1: 26-33.

Galloway, N (2013) Global Englishes and English Language Teaching (ELT) – Bridging the gap between theory and practice in a Japanese context. *System* 41/3: 786-803.

Galloway, N (2014) "I get paid for my American accent": the story of one Multilingual English Teacher (MET) in Japan. *Englishes in Practice*, 1/1: 1-30.

Galloway, N and Rose, H (2013) "They envision going to New York, not Jakarta": the differing attitudes toward ELF of students, teaching assistants, and instructors in an English-medium business programme in Japan. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 2/2: 229-253.

Gingerich, RR (2004) *Learning to Teach: A Study of Teacher Knowledge in English as a Foreign Language.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Iowa, USA.

Graddol, D (2006) *English Next*. London: British Council.

Hackert, S (2012) *The Emergence of the English Native Speaker: A Chapter in Nineteenth-Century Linguistic Thought*. Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Hadla, Z (2013) *Student and Teacher Perceptions of Native and Non-native English-speaking Teachers in a Lebanese Context.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Exeter University, Exeter.

Hall, G (2011) *Exploring English Language Teaching: Language in Action*. Oxon: Routledge.

Han, Z (2004) To be a native speaker means not to be a non-native speaker. *Second Language Research* 20/2: 166-187.

He, D and Zhang, Q (2010) Native Speaker Norms and China English: From the Perspective of Learners and Teachers in China. *TESOL Quarterly* 44/4: 769-789.

Henry, ES (2010) Interpretations of 'Chinglish': Native Speakers, Language Learners and the Enregisterment of a Stigmatised Code. *Language in Society* 39/5: 669-688.

Heo, JY (2013) *A case study of team teaching and team teachers in Korean primary schools*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Warwick, UK.

Holliday, A (2005) *The Struggle to Teach English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holliday, A (2006) Native-Speakerism. *ELT Journal* 60/4: 385-387.

Holliday, A (2011) *Intercultural Communication and Ideology*. London: Sage.

Houghton, SA and Rivers, DJ (eds) (2013) *Native-speakerism in Japan: Intergroup dynamics in foreign language education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Hudson, P (2013) *Tiptoeing through the minefield: teaching English in Higher Educational Institutes in the United Arab Emirates.* PhD thesis. Canterbury Christ Church University, UK.

Inoue, N and Stracke, E (2013) Non-native English-speaking postgraduate TESOL students in Australia: Why did they come here? *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL* 8: 29-56.

Islam, MN (2011) Collaboration between native and non-native English-speaking teachers. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 2/1: 33-41.

Jang, SH, Nguyen, BH and Yang Y (2010) Enhancing pedagogical roles of ESL/EFL native and non-native teachers through team teaching. *International Journal of Learning* 17/9: 249–257.

Javier, E (2015) *Narratively performed role identities of visible ethnic minority native English speaking teachers in TESOL*. Unpublished PhD thesis. The University of Manchester, UK.

Jenkins, J (2003) *World Englishes: A Resources Book for Students.* London: Routledge.

Jenkins, J (2006a) The spread of EIL: a testing time for testers. *ELT Journal* 60/1: 42-50.

Jenkins, J (2006b) Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly* 40/1: 157-181.

Jenkins, J (2006c) The times they are (very slowly) a-changin'. *ELT Journal* 60/1: 61-62.

Jenkins, J (2007) *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J (2009) English as a Lingua Franca: interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes* 28/2: 200-207.

Jenkins, J (2012) English as a Lingua Franca from the classroom to the classroom. *ELT Journal* 66/4: 486-494.

Jenkins, J, Cogo, A and Dewey, M (2011) Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Language Teaching* 44/3: 281-315.

Jeon, M (2009) Globalisation and native English speakers in English Programme in Korea (EPIK). *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 22/3: 231-243.

Jeon, M and Lee, J (2006) Hiring native-speaking English teachers in East Asian countries. *English Today* 22/4: 53-58.

Johannes, AA (2012) Team teaching in Japan from the perspectives of the ALTs, the JTEs, and the students. *TEFLIN Journal* 23/2: 165-182.

Johnson and Tang (1993) 'Engineering a shift to English in Hong Kong Schools', in Boswood, T, Hoffman, R and Tung, P (eds) *English for Professional Communication*. Hong Kong: City Polytechnic press. pp. 203-216.

Kabel, A (2009) Native-speakerism, stereotyping and the collusion of applied linguistics. *System* 37/1: 12-22.

Kachru, B (1985) 'Standards, Codification and Sociolinguistic Realism: The English Language in the Outer Circle', in Quirke, R and Widdowson, HG (eds) *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 11-30.

Kachru, B (1992) 'Models for Non-Native Englishes', in Kachru, B (ed) *The Other Tongue*. 2nd Edition. Chicago: University of Illinois Press. pp. 48-74.

Kachru, BB (1996) The paradigms of marginality. *World Englishes* 15/3: 241-255.

Kamhi-Stein, LD (ed) (2004) *Learning and Teaching from Experience. Perspectives on Non-native English-speaking Professionals*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Kim (2010) A narrative inquiry of a Korean English teacher's first journey through co-teaching. *English Teaching,* 65/4: 179-207.

Kim, K and Lee, C (2005) The effects of team teaching on elementary school students' affective domains and the directions for effective team teaching. *Primary English Education* 11/2: 133-171.

King, N and Horrockes, C (2010) *Interviews in Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Kirkpatrick, A, Deterding, D and Wong J (2008) The international intelligibility of Hong Kong English. *World Englishes* 27/4: 359-377.

Kramsch, C (1997) The privilege of the non-native speaker. *PMLA* 112/3: 359-369.

Kramsch, C and Sullivan, P (1996) Appropriate pedagogy. *ELT Journal* 50/3: 199-212.

Kubota, R (2009) The politics of cultural difference in second language education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 1/1: 21-39.

Kuo, IC (2006) Addressing the issue of teaching English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal* 60/3: 213-221.

Labov, W (1972) *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lasagabaster, D and Sierra, JM (2002) University students' perceptions of native and non-native speaker teachers of English. *Language Awareness* 11.2: 132-142.

Lee, I (2005) Empowering non-native speakers for English language teaching: The case of Hong Kong. *The Teacher Trainer*, 19(1), 9-12.

Leung, C, Harris, R and Rampton, B (1997) The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly* 31/3: 543- 560.

Li, M (2010) EFL teachers and English Language education in the PRC: Are they the policy makers? *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher* 19/3: 439-451.

Liu, J (1999) Non-native-English-speaking Professionals in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly* 33/1: 85-102.

Liu, T (2009) *Teachers' Narrative Understandings of the Taiwanese Foreign English Teachers Recruitment Project.* Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Manchester. UK.

Llurda, E (2009) 'Attitudes towards English as an International Language: The pervasiveness of native models among L2 users and teachers', in Sharifan,F (ed) *English as an International Language. Perspectives and Pedagogical Issues*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. pp. 119-134.

Llurda, E (ed) (2005) *Non-native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession*. Springer: New York.

Lovtsevich, GN (2005) Language teachers through the looking glass: Expanding Circle teachers' discourse. *World Englishes* 24/4: 461-469.

Luk, J (2010) Differentiating Speech Accents and Pronunciation Errors – Perceptions of TESOL Professionals in Hong Kong. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics* 12/2: 25-44.

Luk, J and Lin, A (2006) *Classroom Interactions as Cross-cultural Encounters: Native Speakers in EFL Lessons. London:* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Luo, W-H (2006) Collaboration between native and non-native English-speaking teachers: How does it work?. *The Journal of Asia TEFL* 3/3: 41–58.

Luo, W-H (2007) A study of native English-speaking teacher programmes in elementary schools in Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Education Review* 8/2: 311–320.

Mahoney, S (2004) Role controversy among team teachers in the JET Programme. *JALT Journal*, 26/2: 223-244.

Mann, CC (2012) "We wuz robbed inni'?": Towards Reconceptualising the 'Native Speaker'. *Journal of English as an International Language* 7/2: 1-24.

Mann, S (2011) A critical review of qualitative interviews in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics* 32/1: 6-24.

Marchesseau, G (2006) The State of the JET Programme, Team Teaching and English Education in Japan. *Research Bulletin of Naruto University of Education* 21: 168-174.

Margić, B and Širola, D (2009) (Teaching) English as an International Language and Native Speaker Norms: Attitudes of Croation Ma and Ba Students of English. *Journal of English as an International Language* 5: 129-136.

Medgyes, P (1999) *The non-native teacher.* Revised 2nd Edition. Ismaning: Heuber Verlag.

Medgyes, P (1992) Native or non-native: who's worth more? *ELT Journal* 46/4: 340-349.

Merriam, SB (2009) *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miyazato, K (2009) Power-sharing between NS and NNS teachers: Linguistically powerful AETs vs culturally powerful JTEs. *JALT Journal* 31/1: 35-62.

Modiano, M (2001) Linguistic imperialism, cultural integrity, and EIL. *ELT Journal* 55/4: 339-346.

Moussu, L and Llurda, E (2008) Non-native English-speaking language teachers: History and research. *Language Teaching* 41/2: 315-348.

Murai, G (2004) Using checklists: a way of reducing surprises in team-taught classes. *The Language Teacher* 28/11: 35-40.

Mynott. A (2014) *Inner Circle Dominance within ELT: An investigation into the perceptions of pre-service Chinese LETs*. Unpublished Masters Dissertation. University of Warwick, UK.

Ng, ML (2015) Difficulties with team teaching in Hong Kong kindergartens. *ELT Journal* doi:10.1093/elt/ccu057

No, K-S and Park, K-J (2008) Some Thoughts on the Native Speaker of English. *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics* 12/2: 71-92.

Ozturk, H, Cecen, S and Altinmaka, D (2009) How do non-native pre-service English language teachers perceive ELF? A qualitative study. *Journal of English as an International Language* 5: 137-146.

Park, J-K (2008) EPIK and NEST-NNEST collaboration in Korea revisited. *English Language and Literature Teaching* 14/4: 141-160.

Park, J and Kim, D (2000) Pedagogical effects of team teaching with native English speakers: An experiment to compare alternative teaching models. *Foreign Languages Education*. 7(1): 91-121.

Pennycook (1994) *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Longman.

Phillipson, R (1992) *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Piller, I (2001) Who, if anyone, is a native speaker? *Anglistik* 12/2: 109-121.

Qiang, N and Wolff, M (2003) The Chinglish syndrome: Do recent developments endanger the language policy of China? *English Today* 4: 30-35.

Qiong, HX (2004) Why China English should stand alongside British, American, and other 'world Englishes'. *English Today* 20/2: 26-33.

Rampton, B and Blommaert, J (2011) Language and Superdiversity. *Diversities* 13/2. UNESCO. ISSN 2079-6595. www.unesco.org/shs/diversities/vol13/issue2/art1

Rampton, MBH (1990) Displacing the 'native speaker': expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. *ELT Journal* 44/2: 97-189.

Reves, T and Medgyes, P (1994) The non-native English-speaking EFL/ESL teacher's self-image: An international survey. *System* 22/3: 353-367.

Richards, K (2003) *Qualitative Inquiry in TESOL*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ruecker, T (2011) Challenging the native and non-native speaker hierarchy in ELT: New directions from race theory. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 8/4: 400-422.

Rutson-Griffiths, A (2012) 'Human Tale Recorders: Curricular Integration and Team Teaching in Japan', in *The Asian Conference on Education 2012 Official Conference Proceedings*. The International Academic Forum. pp. 407-425.

Saito, A (2012) Is English Our Lingua Franca or the Native Speaker's Property? The Native Speaker Orientation among Middle School Students in Japan. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 3/6: 1071-1081.

Saito, A and Hatoss, A (2011) Does the ownership rest with us? Global English and the native speaker ideal among Japanese high school students. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning* 6/2: 108-125.

Sakai, S and D'Angelo, JF (2005) A Vision for World Englishes in the Expanding Circle. *World Englishes* 24/3: 323-327.

Seidlhofer, B (1999) Double standards: teacher education in the Expanding Circle. *World Englishes* 18/2: 233-245.

Seidman, IE (1991) *Interviewing as Qualitative Research*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Selvi, AF (2011) The non-native speaker teacher. *ELT Journal* 65/2: 187-189.

Sewell, A (2013) English as a lingua franca: ontology and ideology. *ELT Journal* 67/1: 3-10.

Shibata, M (2010) How Japanese teachers of English perceive non-native assistant English teachers. *System* 38/1: 124-133.

Shin, J and Kellogg, D (2007) The novice, the native, and the nature of language teacher expertise. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 17/2: 159-177.

Shin, U (2011) *A study on the effectiveness of co-operative team teaching in private English institutes*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Hoseo University, Korea.

Shirazizadeh, M and Momenian, M (2009) From EFL to ELF: Spotting the Blind Spots. *Journal of English as an International Language* 4: 44-65.

Storey, P, Luk, J, Gray, J, Wang-Kho, E, Lin, A and Berry, R (2001) *The Monitoring and Evaluation of the Native-speaking English Teacher Scheme (MENETS)*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Education.

Subtirelu, N (2011) *Juggling Identity and Authority: A Case Study of One Non-native Instructor of English*. TESL-EJ 15/3: 1-30.

Subtirelu, N (2013) What (do) learners want (?): a re-examination of the issue of learner preferences regarding the use of 'native' speaker norms in English language teaching. *Language Awareness* 22/3: 270-291.

Sutherland, S (2012) 'Real English' in Japan: team teachers' views on nativeness in language teaching. *Journal of English Studies* 10: 175-191.

Tajino, A and Tajino, Y (2000) Native and non-native: what can they offer? Lessons from team teaching in Japan. *ELT Journal* 54/1: 3–11.

Todd, RW and Pjanapunya, P (2009) Implicit attitudes towards native and non-native speaker techniques. *System* 37/1: 23-33.

Tokumoto, M and Shibata, M (2011) Asian varieties of English: Attitudes and pronunciation. *World Englishes* 30/3: 392-408.

Tracey, SJ (2013) *Qualitative Research Methods*. West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.

Tran, TMK (2014) *A Study of Relating between Vietnamese and Native English-speaking Teachers in Team-Teaching EFL Students at Tertiary Level in Vietnam*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Warwick, UK.

Tsai, J-M (2007) *Team teaching and teachers' professional learning: case studies of collaboration between foreign and Taiwanese English teachers in Taiwanese elementary schools*. Unpublished PhD thesis. The Ohio State University, USA.

Tseng, C (2013) The Myth of English Language Education in Asia: Language of Power and Promise? *The International Journal of Learning* 18/12: 77-84.

Tsui, ABM and Bunton, D (2000) The discourse and attitudes of English language teachers in Hong Kong. *World Englishes* 19/3: 287-303.

Wada, M (1994) 'Team teaching and the revised course of study', in Wada, M and Cominos, A (eds) (1994) *Studies in team teaching*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha. pp. 7-16.

Wada, M (2002) 'Teacher education for curricular innovation in Japan', in Savignon, SJ (ed) *Contexts and Concerns in Teacher Education.* New Haven: Yale University Press. pp. 31-40.

Wada, M and Cominos, A (eds) (1994) *Studies in team teaching*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

Wang, LY (2012) Preparing NESTs and LETs for team teaching at the pre-service level. *Studies in Literature and Language* 4/1: 32-37.

Wang, LY and Lin, TB (2013) The representation of professionalism in native English-speaking teachers recruitment policies: A comparative study of Hong Kong, Japan, Korea and Taiwan. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 12/3: 5-22.

Widdowson, HG (1992) ELT and EL Teachers: matters arising. *ELT Journal* 46/4: 333-339.

Xiaoxia, C (2006) An understanding of 'China English' and the learning and use of the English language in China. *English Today* 22/4: 40-43.

Zhu, L and Hamid, O (2013) Englishes in China: Researchers' and English teachers' perspectives and their pedagogical implications. *Journal of English as an International Language* 8/2: 67-87.

# Appendix A

## NESTs interview guide

| Possible interview question | Topic and comments |
|---|---|
| How long have you been a teacher? What teaching qualifications do you have? | Experience, background and qualifications. |
| Can you tell us about how you applied for x scheme/how you got the job? | Recruitment/application (try to find out details of recruitment criteria and qualifications). Explore why and how they applied for the scheme. |
| What induction or preparation did you have before you started?? | Preparation/Induction |
| Did you have any induction/preparation specifically for teaching in this context? | |
| What surprised you most when you first started working in this role? | |
| Can you describe your typical class (if not apparent check on whether the teacher has own classes or usually team teaches) | Working patterns (some may teach in more than one institution too) |
| Tell me about how you plan what is going to happen in the class? | Preparation/planning |
| In your teaching, what roles does each (team) teacher tend to play? | In-class interaction/roles (spend quite a bit of time probing this question in terms of who does what. Be sensitive and probe how the teacher feels about this division) Power?? |
| Tell me about the relationship between you and the NNESTs. | |
| Could you describe what languages are used in the classroom and who uses them? | If a NEST – do they have access to L1? How much code-switching/translation goes on between learners and the LETs? |
| What is the learners' response to you both in the roles you take? | Learner response/attitudes (find out about teacher-learner interaction patterns as well as issues like engagement and discipline). |

| | |
|---|---|
| What do you think works well in the way you run your respective classes/team teaching? | What does the teacher think has been successful? This should lead naturally into the next question and is the SWOT phase of the interview. |
| If you could change anything about the team-teaching relationship/relationship with the NNEST, what would you change? | How might things be improved? Any changes that would be 'ideal' but perhaps not achievable for some reason? Details of any conflict. |
| Outside of the ELT classes, what sort of activities or roles do you play in the school? | Look for detail about clubs, contact with other teachers, materials development, talk with other local teachers. |
| Do you socialise with your team teacher(s) outside the classes? | Look for information about both in-school chat/exchange and also more social relationships (cafes, restaurants, cinemas, home visits). |
| What are the challenges of working in your context?<br>What are the best things about working in your context?<br>Describe your teaching in three words. | |
| Why do you think the government wants a NEST scheme? | |
| Do you have much contact with other NESTs? | Information about support and contact with other team-teachers (both NESTs and non-NESTs). |
| Do you have much contact with other NNESTs? | |
| What advice would you give to teachers considering this scheme? | A chance to pick up some extra detail about what the teacher thinks is important about managing/getting the best out of such a relationship. |
| What do you wish you had known before you started the job? | |
| Overall, how do you feel about the scheme as a whole? | Overall evaluation – Pick up any issues to do with the running of the scheme, recruitment policy, support, value to participants. |

# Appendix B

## LETs interview schedule

| Possible interview question | Topic and comments |
|---|---|
| How long have you been a teacher? What teaching qualifications do you have? | Experience, background and qualifications. |
| Can you tell us about how long you've been in your present position? | General background |
| Have you had previous experience of teaching with native speakers? | Establish history of working with or team teaching with NESTs (if not other experiences of talking to NESTs). |
| In the present or previous teaching relationships with a NEST, were there any induction or preparation processes? | Preparation/Induction to work with NESTs. |
| Did you have any general impressions of the 'NEST' scheme before taking part? | This question is only relevant if there is an actual 'scheme'. |
| What surprised you most when you first started working with NESTs? | |
| Can you describe your typical class? | During this question, check on whether the teacher has own classes or usually team teaches. Establish working patterns |
| Do you team teach with the NEST or does the NEST teach alone? | Depending on the answer to this question, some of those below might not be relevant. |
| In your teaching, what roles does each (team) teacher tend to play? | In-class interaction/roles (spend quite a bit of time probing this question in terms of who does what. Be sensitive and probe how the teacher feels about this division). |
| Tell me about the relationship between you and the NEST(s). | |
| Could you describe what languages are used in the classroom and who uses them? | How much does the teacher use L1? How much code-switching/translation goes on in a typical class? |
| Do you think learners benefit from contact with NSs? | Learner response/attitudes (find out about teacher-learner interaction patterns as well as issues like engagement and discipline) |

| | |
|---|---|
| What do you think works well in the way you run your respective classes/team teaching? | What does the teacher think has been successful? This should lead naturally into the next question and is the SWOT phase of the interview. |
| If you could change anything about the team-teaching relationship/relationship with in NEST, what would you change? | How might things be improved? Any changes that would be 'ideal' but perhaps not achievable for some reason? Details of any conflict. |
| Outside of the ELT classes what sort of activities or other roles do you perform in the school? | Look for detail about clubs, contact with other teachers, materials development, talk with other local teachers. |
| Do you socialise with the NS outside the classes? | Look for information about both in-school chat/exchange and also more social relationships (cafes, restaurants, cinemas, home visits). |
| What are the challenges of working in your context?<br>What are the best things about working in your context?<br>Describe your teaching in three words. | |
| Why do you think the government wants a NEST scheme? | |
| Do you have much contact with other NESTs? | Is the teachers' relationship confined to one teacher or are there contacts with other NSs? |
| Do you share you experiences with other LETs? | Find out if they have a common view (be it concerns or shared positive experiences). |
| What advice would you give to teachers who were new to working with NESTs? | A chance to pick up some extra detail about what the teacher thinks is important about managing/getting the best out of such a relationship. |
| What do you wish you had known before you started working with NESTs? | |
| Overall, how do you feel about the scheme as a whole? | Overall evaluation – Pick up any issues to do with the running of the scheme, recruitment policy, support, value to participants. |

# Appendix C

## Analysis – code categories

Each code can be neutral or can be positive or negative (e.g. *TC- is negative comments about context)

| Code | Code abbrev. | Explanation |
|---|---|---|
| Experience/background of teachers | *TEX | ■ Experience, background and qualifications |
| Teaching context | *TC | ■ Contextual information (type of school etc) |
| Getting the job (applying, etc.) | *GET | ■ Recruitment<br>■ Application process• |
| Details regarding scheme | *SCH | ■ Contract<br>■ Nature of job<br>■ Induction or preparation |
| Scheme support | *SUP | ■ Comments about help, materials, online resources, ongoing training |
| Classroom methodology | *CM | ■ Details about typical classes (e.g. TBL – use of ICT, games, etc.) |
| Classroom interaction | *CI | ■ Aspects of classroom talk etc/In-class interaction |
| Roles and relationships | *RR | ■ Role each (team) teacher tends to play. Division of roles<br>■ Working alone/ team teaching in the classroom<br>■ Comments about changing relationship<br>■ This includes comments about contact with other NESTs/ NNESTs |
| Teaching relationships | *TR | ■ Comments about relationships, or about teaching alone<br>■ Sharing experience |
| Languages used in classroom and who uses them? | *LUC | ■ Comments about how much the teachers use L1 (How much code-switching/translation goes on in a typical class?) |
| Learners attitudes | *L | ■ Learner response/attitudes especially to teaching from NESTs or comparative comments (NNESTs vs NESTs)<br>■ (Find out about teacher-learner interaction patterns as well as issues like engagement and discipline) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Outside of the ELT classes | *OUT | ■ What sort of activities or other roles do the teachers perform in the school?<br>■ Details about clubs, contact with other teachers, materials development, talk with other local teachers |
| Do you socialise with the NS outside the classes? | *SOC | ■ Look for information about both in-school chat/exchange and also more social relationships (cafés, restaurants, cinemas, home visits) |
| Government policy related to NEST scheme? | *POL | ■ Government policy (include 'Ministry' or Education Authority`) |
| Sharing experiences/Contact with other NESTs or NNESTs | *SHA | ■ Is the teachers' relationship confined to one teacher or are there contacts with other NSs?<br>■ Common view (be it concerns or shared positive experiences) |
| Advice for teachers who were new to working with NESTs? | *ADV | ■ Comments about what the teacher thinks is important about managing/getting the best out of such a relationship<br>■ What do you wish you had known before you started working with NESTs? |
| Comments on culture | CUL | ■ Comments about lifestyle<br>■ Comments about differences in culture |
| Values related to either NESTs or NNESTs – intrinsic value of either | VAL | |
| Other comments that don't fit into a category | OTH | |

# Biographical information

**Fiona Copland** is Professor of TESOL at the University of Stirling, Scotland. She has worked as a NEST in Nigeria and Hong Kong and as a teacher trainer in Japan and the UK. She has also been Course Director of Master's programmes in TESOL at UK universities and supervises PhD students in a range of areas. Fiona has researched and published in the areas of teacher education, teaching English to young learners and linguistic ethnography.

fiona.copland@stir.ac.uk

**Monika Davis** is a language teacher and teacher trainer and educator, based at the Brasshouse Language Centre in Birmingham, UK. She is bilingual and has extensive experience in a wide range of teaching contexts in Poland and the UK, including CELTA and DELTA training. She has worked with the other authors on a number of projects over the years.

**Sue Garton** is Director of Postgraduate Programmes in English at Aston University, Birmingham UK where she teaches TESOL modules to both undergraduates and postgraduates as well as supervising PhDs. Her research interests include teaching English to young learners, language policy and planning, language teacher education and classroom discourse. She has published books and articles in the area of English language teaching, including From Experience to Knowledge in ELT with Julian Edge in the Oxford Handbooks for Teachers series and Professional Encounters in TESOL with Keith Richards. She is currently series editor, with Keith Richards, of a major new 15-volume series called International Perspectives on ELT published by Palgrave Macmillan.

s.garton@aston.ac.uk

**Steve Mann** is Associate Professor at the Centre for Applied Linguistics at University of Warwick. He previously lectured at both Aston University and University of Birmingham. He has experience in Hong Kong, Japan and Europe in both English language teaching and teacher development. Steve supervises a research group of PhD students who are investigating teacher's education and development. The group's work considers aspects of teacher development, teacher beliefs and the development of knowledge, the first year of teaching, mentoring, blended learning, and the use of technology in teacher development. He has published various books including Innovations in Pre-service Teacher Education published by the British Council.

steve.mann@warwick.ac.uk

**www.teachingenglish.org.uk/publications**

ISBN 978-0-86355-768-2