

Volume 15, Number 1
May 2020

e-ISSN 2655-1977; p-ISSN 0216-1281

INDONESIAN JELT

Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching

Ton Nu Linh Thoai

Observing EFL teachers' use of formulaic language in class

Claire Goode

English language in Brunei: Use, policy, and status in education – A review

Arapa Efendi

Weighing on languages: Indonesian parents' perspectives on bilingualism

Grace B. Wivell

A culture of collaboration: Forms and factors affecting collaboration between NESTs and NNESTs in extracurricular English activities

Munmun Gupta

Indian parents' perspective of maintaining heritage language in the metropolitan Jakarta

ISSN 977-0216-1281-2-6



9 770216 12812 6

INDONESIAN JELT: INDONESIAN JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

Chief Editor

Christine Manara

International Editorial Board

Alan Maley (United Kingdom)

Anne Burns (Macquarie University, Australia)

Bedrettin Yazan (University of Alabama, USA)

David Wijaya (The University of Queensland)

Didi Sukyadi (Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia)

Herri Mulyono (University of Muhammadiyah Prof. DR. HAMKA)

Jack C. Richards (The University of Sidney, Australia)

Jayakaran Mukundan (Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia)

Joseph Ernest Mambu (Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana)

Nathanael Rudolph (Mukogawa Women's University, Nishinomiya, Japan)

Nugrahenny T. Zacharias (Miami University, Ohio, U.S.A.)

Ram Giri (Monash University, Australia)

Roby Marlina, (SEAMEO-RELC, Singapore)

Sisilia Halimi (University of Indonesia, Indonesia)

Subhan Zein (The University of Queensland, Australia)

Vishnu S. Rai (Tribhuvan University, Nepal)

Willy A. Renandya (National Institute of Education, Singapore)

Section Editors

Anna Marietta da Silva

Bambang Kaswanti Purwo

Lanny Hidajat

Setiono Sugiharto

Contact Details

Graduate School of Applied English Linguistics

Faculty of Education and Languages

Atma Jaya Catholic University

Van Lith Building, 2nd Floor, Jalan Jenderal Sudirman 51

Jakarta 12930, Indonesia

Phone/Fax number: (62-21) 5708821

ijelt@atmajaya.ac.id

website: <http://ojs.atmajaya.ac.id/index.php/ijelt>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Observing EFL teachers' use of formulaic language in class	1 – 19
<i>Ton Nu Linh Thoai</i>	
English language in Brunei: Use, policy, and status in education – A review	21 – 46
<i>Claire Goode</i>	
Weighing on languages: Indonesian parents' perspectives on bilingualism	47 – 63
<i>Arapa Efendi</i>	
A culture of collaboration: Forms and factors affecting Collaboration between NESTs and NNESTs in Extracurricular English activities	65 – 84
<i>Grace B. Wivell</i>	
Indian parents' perspective of maintaining heritage language in the metropolitan Jakarta	85 – 103
<i>Munmun Gupta</i>	

A culture of collaboration: Forms and factors affecting collaboration between NESTs and NNESTs in extracurricular English activities

Grace B. Wivell

Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, New York, USA

Abstract

Fulbright English Teaching Assistants (ETAs) assist local English teachers to further the English language development of students around the globe, while simultaneously acting as cultural ambassadors for the United States. ETAs in Indonesia are required to spend between twenty and twenty-five hours each week in the classroom with their teaching counterpart(s) but are also encouraged to engage with their school and community outside of class, and as such many ETAs also spend considerable time developing extracurricular English programming. While some of these extracurriculars are facilitated independently by the ETAs, many are collaborative projects with counterparts from the host institution. As part of a larger five-year research plan initiated by the American Indonesian Exchange Foundation (AMINEF) that seeks to explore the impact of ETAs, this research explores the collaboration within these extracurriculars. It seeks to identify the forms that this collaboration takes, as well as the factors that affect the collaboration. The findings suggest that collaboration within these extracurriculars usually takes the form of either one teach – one assist model, or team teaching, and that logistical and interpersonal factors are of the greatest concern within the collaboration.

Keywords: exchange program, English as a Foreign Language, NEST, and NNEST, cross-cultural communication

Introduction

Fulbright English Teaching Assistants (ETAs) assist local English teachers to further the English language development of students around the globe, while simultaneously acting as cultural ambassadors for the United States (Fulbright). ETAs have been placed in Indonesia since 2004, where the ETA Program, along with other Fulbright Programs, is administered by the American Indonesian Exchange Foundation (AMINEF 2016). The specific goals of the ETA Program in Indonesia are as follows:

- Promote mutual understanding and goodwill between Indonesians and Americans and to foster positive binational relations;
 - Assist local English teachers and engage students in communication and extracurricular activities in English;
 - Foster a classroom environment that encourages students to use conversational English to help improve their English-language skills;
 - Provide a native-speaking English model to enhance students' listening and speaking skills;
 - Give students (and teachers) the opportunity to actively practice their English skills;
 - Encourage grantee involvement in the local communities.
- (AMINEF 2016)

To meet these goals, ETAs in Indonesia are required to spend between twenty and twenty-five hours each week in the classroom with their teaching counterpart(s). However, as the above goals are not limited to the classroom, ETAs are also encouraged to engage with their school and community outside of class hours, and as such many ETAs also spend considerable time developing extracurricular English programming.

This study is part of a larger five-year research plan initiated by AMINEF, which seeks to explore the impact of ETAs in their schools and communities. Previous research that contributed to this five-year plan focused on the work of ETAs within the classroom. My own experience as an ETA led me to believe that the work ETAs do outside of the classroom is as integral to achieving the program goals as that which they perform within the classroom, which is why this work focuses on extracurriculars. My time as an ETA also showed that ETAs develop mentoring relationships with their Indonesian teaching counterparts that are often key to their success within their schools; as such, I focused on extracurriculars co-led by ETAs and their teaching counterparts.

This study explores collaborative English Extracurriculars, more specifically the form collaboration takes within extracurriculars and the factors which affect this collaboration. It offers insight into an element of collaboration between Native English-Speaking Teachers (NESTs) and Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers (NNESTs) that has not been previously explored within the Indonesia Fulbright Program or in other programs of this nature. A better understanding of collaboration in the extracurricular context may help to develop training and support to further the success of such initiatives. Therefore, this study was guided by two main research questions:

1. What form does the collaboration between ETAs and Counterparts/Co-Teachers take in extracurriculars?
2. What factors affect the collaboration between the ETAs and their Counterpart/Co-Teachers in extracurriculars?

By exploring these two questions, a picture of collaboration between ETAs and their counterparts as it currently exists might be painted, including an explanation as to why certain levels of collaboration existed at different levels.

Literature Review

The effect of extracurriculars has long been recognized in educational literature, especially as it relates to student confidence. Durlak and Weissberg (2007) report that 43% of American students considered in *The Impact of After-School Programs that Promote Personal and Social Skills* report, experienced an increase in overall self-esteem when they participated in after-school activities. More specific to English as a Foreign Language, Peng (2014) pointed out that “past experience and participation in extracurricular activities exerted a significant effect on their WTC [willingness to communicate] in the microsystem, the immediate English class” (p. 151). This is in keeping with research of foreign language learning generally. Dewaele (2007) found in a study of 106 adult language learners that “participants who had made regular extracurricular use of a foreign language during the learning of that language also reported lower levels of FLA [foreign language anxiety] than participants whose instruction had been purely classroom-based” (p. 395). Little recent research has been done on the specific effect of English Extracurriculars on EFL students, though it has been largely recognized that exposure to English outside of the classroom context does increase a student’s language proficiency in the language (Hwang, 2005).

As there is a distinct lack of research regarding English Language Extracurriculars in the EFL context, there is also no commentary on collaboration between NEST and NNESTs in the extracurricular context. There is, however, a plethora of commentary on collaboration between NESTs and NNESTs within the classroom, more specifically as it relates to co-teaching. While no research was found regarding these collaborations in the South-East Asia region, considerable research has been completed in the East Asia region, which has several cultural similarities to those present in Indonesia.

Friend, Reising, and Cook (1993) have identified five co-teaching models that are still used to discuss the many forms collaboration can take

within the classroom: one teach – one assist model, station teaching, parallel teaching, alternative teaching, and team teaching. Liu (2008) has suggested that in NEST and NNEST collaborations in the EFL classroom, parallel teaching is not an appropriate model, as NESTs and NNESTs have different skill sets and different roles to play. This idea is prevalent throughout the existing literature, as many believe that while the NESTs can be instrumental in the development of students' conversational English, NNESTs are at the advantage for more technical instruction (Carless, 2006). Beyond purely instructional roles, it is also recognized that while the NEST may be more knowledgeable of the cultural norms associated with the target language, the NNEST has far more expertise regarding the cultural norms with which the students are familiar (Kachi & Choon-hwa, 2001; Islam, 2011). Liu (2008) further suggested that NESTs and NNESTs should implement the other four co-teaching models in the following sequence, which Liu believes represents those most easily implemented to the most advanced: one teach – one assist, alternative teaching, station teaching, and finally team teaching. Liu's view stemmed not only from the general idea that collaboration can increase in its complexity as the participating educator develop a stronger relationship, and idea corroborated by Friend, Reising, and Cook (1993), but also because co-teaching is not common in many East Asian education systems. It is therefore unfamiliar to the NNEST. Moreover, the NESTs involved in these partnerships are often not teacher-trained, hence, often lack an understanding of many key educational concepts. These two key disadvantages to the incorporation of NESTs in the EFL classroom are echoed throughout the literature (Carless, 2006; Kachi & Choon-hwa, 2001; Tajino & Tajino, 2000).

Though the collaborations considered in this study were not within the classroom, they were within an educational context. Hence, it seemed reasonable to presume that the form the collaboration might take in the extracurriculars would echo those in the classroom, namely, one of the five models described by Friend, Reising, and Cook (1993). The specific form the collaboration took might reflect the level of collaboration the pair was able to achieve, as suggested by Liu (2008).

There are many factors that can affect the ability of NESTs and NNESTs to achieve successful collaboration in the classroom. Brown (2016) suggested that these factors can be divided into three broad sub-categories: pedagogic, logistical, and interpersonal. Again, though this research's focus was not on the classroom, as it was still in an educational context and focused on the collaboration between a NEST and a NNEST, it seemed reasonable that the same factors which affected in-classroom collaboration would also affect extracurricular collaboration.

Pedagogic factors included an understanding of more general pedagogy, such as classroom management, as well as pedagogical methods specific to collaborative teaching. In most programs considered in the current literature, NESTs do not receive formal training in pedagogy and receive only short pre-service training from their programs (Islam, 2011; Kachi & Choon-hwa, 2001). NESTs, therefore, play the role of facilitating conversational English and games in the classroom, rather than leading whole-class instruction on new grammar points; the latter is the responsibility of the NNESTs (Kachi & Choon-hwa, 2001). NNESTs, in contrast, are in all cases trained teachers, but they too are often not familiar with collaborative teaching (Islam, 2011; Tajino & Tajino, 2000). This lack of pedagogical understanding of collaborative teaching can lead to a confusion of roles and sometimes conflict between the NESTs and the NNESTs (Islam, 2011; Kachi & Choon-hwa, 2001). It has been suggested that the increase of positive pedagogical factors can sometimes be facilitated by pre-service training which includes a focus on collaborative teaching models and practices, for both NESTs and NNESTs (Islam, 2011; Luo, 2010).

Logistical factors included only one main factor: namely, time. Time to plan together is key for the success of a collaboratively taught lesson (Islam, 2011; Luo, 2010), and incorporating time for NESTs and NNESTs to reflect on their teaching together is also important for the success of the collaboration (Luo, 2010). A reported lack of sufficient time to plan and to reflect was apparent in most cases in which NESTs and NNESTs collaborated (Brown, 2016; Islam, 2011; Kachi & Choon-hwa, 2001; Luo, 2010). Islam (2011) suggested that in schools in which there is a NEST and NNEST collaboration, the administration should provide additional time for this planning.

Interpersonal factors are those most emphasized by Brown and by several other writers. Luo (2010), who focused on a program in Taiwan which only included NESTs with teaching certifications from their own country, defines the factors which can create a successful collaborative teaching partnership using the acronym R.E.F.L.E.C.T Knowledge. This acronym stands for Respect, Equality, Flexibility, Language, Empathy, Collaborative Culture, Time, and Knowledge. Six of these eight factors would be classified as interpersonal factors (knowledge, in this case, refers to pedagogical knowledge), and many of these same qualities are emphasized by Brown (2016). In some cases, NESTs and NNESTs each suggested that even if pedagogical and logistical factors are ideal, negative interpersonal factors can destroy the potential for successful collaboration (Luo, 2010). Brown (2016) suggests that some of these interpersonal factors

might be increased by incorporating Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) development into training for NESTs and NNESTs.

Though all of these factors affecting collaboration, be they Pedagogic, Logistical, or Interpersonal, have been explored only in the classroom context, they most likely affect collaboration between educators outside of the classroom as well. Though the environment is different, the goal of English curricular mirrors that of the classroom (i.e. to help students improve their English). Therefore, all of these factors will be considered as also having a potential effect on the collaborations researched in the present study, though other factors may prove to affect extracurricular collaboration as well. A thorough consideration of collaboration in an extracurricular context may provide insight into previously unexplored factors that may also play a role in in-classroom collaborations. In the current study, the English Teaching Assistants (ETAs) played the role of the NESTs, and their Indonesian counterparts that of the NNESTs. Throughout this study, these participants will be referred to as ETA(s) and Counterpart(s).

Research Methodology

Participants were selected from the 2016 – 2017 host institutions for ETAs. A survey was sent to ETAs in early November in order to see which ETAs were participating in English extracurriculars, and which of these extracurriculars involved collaboration with someone from the host institution (Appendix B). From the results of the responses to these surveys, seven schools were selected from which to collect data. Sites were selected to best represent the diversity of the ETA sites during the 2016-2017 grant period. ETAs in that year were placed in public senior high schools (SMAN), private senior high schools (SMA), public vocational senior high schools (SMKN), private vocational senior high schools (SMK), and Islamic high schools (MAN). The schools were located in nine provinces in four regions, namely Sumatra (Bangka-Belitung), Sulawesi, Nusa Tenggara Timor (N.T.T.), and Java. Sites were also selected to include both schools that had previously worked with an ETA, as well as first-year host schools. The characteristics of the seven participating schools can be found in Table 1.

The English Clubs at schools B, C, and F, S.E.C.C., and the Speech/Debate/Storytelling Club all met once a week and covered a wide range of mostly conversational topics, and were voluntary. *Lintas Minat* (Elective English) had a similar focus, and also met once a week. However, while the students did voluntarily choose English as the subject for their *Lintas Minat*, all students were required to be enrolled in a *Lintas Minat*, and attendance was mandatory.

Table 1.
Participants' demographic information

School	Type of School	Location (Province)	Number of ETAs ¹	Extracurricular
School A	Public Islamic School	Gorontalo	5	<i>Lintas Minat Bahasa Inggris</i> (Elective English)
School B	Public Vocational School	Bangka-Belitung	2	English Club
School C	Public Vocational School	N.T.T.	1	English Club
School D	Private Vocational School	N.T.T.	1	<i>Suara</i> (Voice of) School D
School E	Public School	East Java	2	S.E.C.C. (School English Conversation Club)
School F	Public School	Central Java	2	English Club
School G	Public Vocational School	Central Java	2	Speech/Debate/Storytelling Club

Suara (Voice of) School D was a somewhat different extracurricular. *Suara* School D was a bulletin board set up in the school courtyard, which displayed student's original writing in both Indonesian and English. The English Teachers and the ETA would regularly solicit work from students, and students were also free to submit any work which they thought could be displayed. Students who submitted work were expected to meet with the counterpart and the ETA to further develop their work before publication. The bulletin board was changed monthly.

As much of the literature regarding collaborative teaching between NESTs and NNESTs emphasizes the need for sufficient, quality training (Islam, 2011; Luo, 2010), and because I also assisted with the development of training for ETAs and Counterparts, I recommended that AMINEF consider extracurriculars when planning ETA training. ETAs placed in Indonesia participate in a Pre-Departure Orientation in Washington D.C. facilitated by the United States State Department, as well as an In-Country Orientation and Mid-Year Enrichment conference facilitated by AMINEF.

¹ This number represents the total number of ETAs that have been placed at that school, including the current ETA. Schools that are listed as having one ETA, therefore, were acting as host institutions for the ETA Program for the first time during the 2016-2017 grant year. Schools that have had several ETAs may not have had them in consecutive years.

Sessions regarding cross-cultural communication and collaborative teaching have long been incorporated into the AMINEF-developed trainings, and there has been an increased presence of Indonesian teaching counterparts at the trainings. Sessions involving teaching counterparts usually focus on classroom strategies, but at the 2016 orientation, I requested that these sessions also briefly discussed collaboration outside of the classroom. A past counterpart was invited to the orientation, and she discussed the various ways in which she was able to collaborate with the ETAs who had been placed at her school outside of the classroom. I believed, based on the recommendation by Brown (2016) for cross-cultural communication training, that this informal, discussion-based training might provide some of the needed support emphasized by the current literature, but in the extracurricular context. It must be noted that as only one teacher from the host school accompanies the ETA to the Orientation, while some of the teachers in this study attended this session, others were unable to do so.

Three main instruments were used to collect data for this study. ETAs and their cooperating Counterparts/Co-Teachers were asked to submit weekly reflective journals regarding the extracurricular selected to be researched from January to March 2017. As most ETAs do not have a teaching background, and reflective teaching is not yet prominent in Indonesia, research participants were provided with instructions and guiding questions (Appendix A); this document was provided in English to ETAs and in *Bahasa Indonesia* to Counterparts. I conducted observations of the selected extracurricular in late February or March. During these visits to sites, I also conducted interviews with the ETA and the Counterparts together, using a standard set of questions for every interview (Appendix C). During the interviews, though I spoke mostly in English, participants were given the option, in Indonesian, to respond in Indonesian if they preferred.

The data collected via these journals, observations, and interviews were coded using the structures from Liu (2008), Brown (2016), and Lou (2010). To determine what form collaboration took within the extracurriculars, this study considered both their own observations of the extracurricular as well as the journals completed by participants throughout the data collection period and compared these observations and descriptions the models of co-teaching which Liu (2008) described in their study. To determine which factors were of a concern to participants as they thought about their collaboration, this study used both Brown's (2016) categories as well as the conditions described by Lou (2008).

This study suffered several limitations. My intention was to use the initial journals to create the questions for the interviews, to ensure that the questions were specific to the individual contexts, and therefore more illuminating. However, only two ETAs submitted their journals weekly,

while the other five ETAs submitted their journals in one document at the end of the data collection period. No counterparts submitted journals throughout the data collection period, and two counterparts did not submit any journals at all. This resulted in the decision to use a standard set of questions for the interviews. During the observations at School A and School C, unanticipated schedule changes meant that the extracurricular was technically canceled on the day I visited the school. The teachers at the schools asked students to voluntarily attend the extracurricular at a different time and date so that I could still observe the extracurricular while they were in that particular city. However, it must be noted that these observations, while still valuable in their view of the collaboration, were not in the natural setting of the extracurricular.

Findings and discussions

1. Form of Collaboration

The collaboration which occurred in the seven extracurriculars considered would best be described by the one teach – one assist model, and the team teaching model. The collaborating pairs neither demonstrated during the observation nor expressed in their journals the use of the alternative teaching or station teaching models. There was also a blend of one teach – one assist, and team teaching models present in some of the pairs.

The pairs at schools G and E both demonstrated and recorded a one teach – one assist model of working together. When the pairs were able to plan activities for their English extracurriculars together, they planned specific roles for one another. In their descriptions of the execution of the extracurricular, as well as in my observations, there was little of the back-and-forth team teaching. In both cases, the ETA led much more teaching often than did the counterpart.

The pairs at schools B and D both demonstrated and recorded collaboration which most resembled team teaching. At School B, the activities for English Club were planned together without specifically prescribing which parts were to be the ETA's responsibility, and which were to be the counterpart's responsibility. During the execution of the extracurricular, whether the ETA or the counterpart led a particular section was determined rather fluidly. The pair did acknowledge that often certain roles fell to one or the other: the ETA most often modeled the activity first using natural spoken English, while the counterpart translated the English instructions if the students could not understand from context. Similarly, at School D, as the counterpart and the ETA worked together to help students prepare their writing for publication, the counterpart noted that he often

concentrated on the content of the writing, while the ETA focused on correct English usage. As the School D counterpart explained it in their interview: “I just check about the way of thinking, the logical aspect, but [the ETA] just focus on the grammatical aspect.” However, if the ETA or the counterpart were busy with other responsibilities, they noted that they would happily take on one another's roles. In addition, tasks related to the extracurricular which were not influenced by their different skill sets, such as eliciting written work from students or formatting the writing for publication, were completed equally by both the ETA and the counterpart.

At Schools A and F, the pairs appeared to blend one teach – one assist, and team teaching, switching back and forth between the two models. Though in their informal planning sessions both pairs did give specific roles to either the counterpart or the ETA, both ETAs also described in their journals a certain back-and-forth team work in the execution of their co-leading of the extracurricular, which is an element of team teaching. The ETA at School A explicitly noted in a journal entry that “...we usually teach in a true team teaching fashion (I'm very lucky to have that with her).” During the observation, the pair at School F also seemed to utilize one teach – one assist model about half the time while utilizing team teaching the other half of the time. During the observation at School A, the pair seemed to mostly utilize one teach – one assist model. However, it must be noted that this was one of the schools at which a special meeting of the extracurricular was created for the sake of observation, and so the unfamiliar setting and the mixed group of students may have contributed to this.

At School C, there was functionally no collaboration between the ETA and the counterpart during the data collection period. In her journals, the ETA noted that her counterpart had intermittently worked with her in a one teach – one assist fashion during the first semester. However, throughout the data collection period, her counterpart joined her in the extracurricular only once, and he was not present during the observation.

2. *Factors affecting collaboration*

Throughout the interviews and the journals, it appeared that several factors had an effect on the collaboration occurring (or not occurring) in these extracurriculars. These factors did generally match the three categories outlined by Brown (2016), though the participants in the current study did weight their concerns somewhat differently than the participants in Brown's study. Furthermore, all of the components Lou (2010) identified as necessary for collaboration in her study were also a concern for the participants in this study. However, I have also identified an additional component, Willingness to Learn, which was a frequent concern for participants, and which was not mentioned in Lou's study.

Pedagogical Factors

Though pedagogical factors seemed to be a significant concern in previous studies, in this study they did not seem to be as much of a concern for participants. ETAs did universally admire their counterparts for their pedagogical knowledge, especially as it related to classroom management. For example, the ETA from School B noted in her journals that, both in the classroom and in the extracurriculars, as she worked with her counterpart in both contexts, her counterpart, “has the power to get the students to take activities seriously and to convey to them that she expects more from them than they may even expect from themselves.” This was a skill she hoped she was learning from her counterpart.

While classroom management was mentioned, other pedagogical factors, such as the ability to convey a grammar point to students, were not mentioned by participants during any point in this study. This may be because the focus of the extracurriculars—with the exception of the *Suara* School D, which had a writing focus—was not so much to meet certain grammar or English proficiency markers but to allow students the opportunity to practice conversational English in an informal and fun way.

Most participants focus on conversational skills in their extracurriculars, which seems to stem from a belief that this is a skill the students will need in their futures, but not the one that is necessarily covered by the national English curriculum. The ETA at School A explained why she and her counterpart chose to focus on honing students listening and speaking skills as follows:

They will need all of those [skills], especially as a lot of the kids want to go to ITB [Bandung Institute of Technology] and want to go to UI [University of Indonesia], and when I talked to kids that went there from Gorontalo, who went to this school, all they're exposed to is in English: their lectures are partially in English... they have guest lecturers in English.

The ETA at School G focused especially on encouraging students to speak. She explained that one of the goals that she and her counterpart shared was students “getting more confidence to speak English, not being afraid of messing up in front of me.” In the case of *Suara* School D, the focus was on writing, rather than listening or speaking. This is also stemmed from a desire to focus on a skill that students would need in the future; as the counterpart noted during the interview: “We have a tourism program here, where the mastery of English is very important and needs to be communicated through media such as this [project].” Though the

extracurricular at School D did focus on a different skill set, all of the extracurriculars had a loose academic focus on a larger skill, rather than a specific grammar point, as they would be required to do by the national curriculum in a lesson.

The emphasis on keeping the extracurriculars fun, to maintain student motivation, and to ensure that they continued to practice these key skills, was a clear theme throughout the interviews. The ETA at School F said, “That’s been one of our goals for English club... just making it really different from class time, like, it’s just time to have fun with English, it’s not like, ‘we’re gonna focus on this grammar lesson today.’” The counterpart from School B explained that her goal as a teacher was to change the mindset of her students in regards to learning English:

I really want to change their mind about English [from] “English is hard,” and “English is difficult”; I try to change that statement into “English is fun,” and “You can have English everywhere you want; you can talk to everyone that you want without feeling shame.”

This counterpart felt that English Club, as it was not limited by the national curriculum, as the easiest place to accomplish her goal: “They do not realize that they are learning right now. We pack it into the games, we try to create their imagination, their brain, that English Club is fun.” In order to maintain student interest, the participants from schools A, B, C, and F all explained that they regularly ask students what they are interested in learning, and structure activities around those topics. The extracurricular at School D, similarly, allows students to write on whatever topic they choose.

In previous research focused on collaboration within the classroom, NESTs were often presented as being *limited* in that their lack of pedagogical training meant they must concentrate on facilitating conversations or creating games for English learning. However, in the context of these English Extracurriculars, in which conversation and fun were predominant objectives, this was seen far more as an advantage, rather than as a disadvantage.

Logistical Factors

Logistical factors did have a significant effect on collaboration, and similar to the effect Brown (2016) found it had on the collaboration within the classroom, it was almost universally a negative one. Like Lou’s (2010) list of components, it was time, or lack thereof, that was the greatest logistical factor at play.

Planning and reflecting, two key aspects of successful collaboration, were powerfully influenced by logistical factors. The pairs all discussed the struggle in finding time to plan within their busy teaching schedules. As most pairs also taught within the classroom together, when they were able to meet they often choose to prioritize planning lessons for class over planning activities for the extracurricular. In most cases, the planning of the extracurriculars either involved informal exchange of ideas over lunch or during breaks or via SMS. All pairs at School A, School E, and School F tried to meet in person each week, though they admitted that they were not always successful, and had to resort to other ways to communicate with one another. At Schools A, B, D, E, and F, the pairs all discussed a desire to reflect together on the extracurricular, but admitted that this reflection often occurred in informal settings or via SMS as well; none of the pairs attempted a set time to reflect on the success of the extracurricular.

Time limitations not only restricted planning and reflection, they also sometimes resulted in no collaborative leading taking place during part or all of the execution of the extracurricular. This was most often a result of other school responsibilities held by the counterpart. Pairs discussed being unable to lead the extracurricular due to the counterpart being required to invigilate exams, attend trainings at other schools, or accompany the headmaster to meetings with other schools in the district. In all of these cases in which the counterpart was unable to join the extracurricular, the ETA led the extracurricular alone. The ETA at School C cited an increasingly busy schedule as the reason why her counterpart was not able to join her for the extracurricular during the second semester. Familial responsibilities also contributed to the counterparts' ability to be fully present in the extracurricular. The counterparts at School A and School B were both mothers with young children, and, understandably, would sometimes need to leave the extracurricular for all or part of the time to care for their children. In the case of School A, there was one instance during the data collection period in which the ETA was not able to attend the extracurricular, due to a schedule change that resulted in an overlap with another class; in this case, the counterpart led the extracurricular alone.

Though time was the key factor in the limiting of planning, execution, and reflection, the willingness to engage in informal planning was noted as being key to avoiding particularly negative effects when the counterpart could not attend the extracurricular with the ETA. Whether the planning was formal or informal, the pairs seemed to recognize that having a plan and ensuring that the activities planned could be facilitated by one teacher if need be, the extracurricular could still be executed in a way that benefited the students. The ETA at school E noted in one of her journals, after leading SECC alone, "While [my counterpart] couldn't attend, I

appreciated having someone to bounce the idea off of and then to follow up with about how the activity went.”

Interpersonal Factors

Interpersonal factors, echoing the trend found in Brown’s (2016) study, were the factors of greatest concern to the participants in the present study and appeared with the most frequency in the data. In the present study, these interpersonal factors had a universally positive effect on the collaboration and helped the pairs to overcome more limiting factors. Within the interviews and in their journals, ETAs and counterparts discussed all of the components of successful collaboration discussed by Lou (2010), focusing most heavily on two of these factors: respect, and flexibility.

Each pair, even where collaboration was perhaps lower, expressed the greatest respect for one another, and emphasized how lucky they felt to work together. Words such as “motivated,” “enthusiastic,” and “dedicated” were frequently used by the pairs as they spoke about working together. ETAs constantly iterated that they felt their counterparts were admirable educators: “I truly respect [my counterpart] as a teacher,” said the ETA at School B, “she has been teaching for a long time and really knows what she is doing.” Counterparts, in turn, recurrently celebrated the creativity of the ETAs. “[The ETA] is very creative in the ideas she makes for class,” said the counterpart at School A.

Flexibility was repeatedly noted as being key to the success of their collaboration by ETAs and counterparts. This was apparent most often in relation to contending with logistical factors, such as difficulty in finding time to plan, or in having to change the schedule of the extracurricular itself. This flexibility was not treated by the participants as a particularly strong effort, but merely as something they needed to do: “Sometimes we have to use a different place, and sometimes the timing needs to be changed a little,” the ETA at School B said. “It is good [she] is so flexible, and does not stress,” responded her counterpart.

Alongside those previously identified by Lou (2010), there seemed to be an additional characteristic that participants identified as important for their collaboration. I am calling this characteristic Willingness to Learn. Every ETA identified a desire to learn as one of the reasons they chose to become ETAs at all: ETAs were generally most interested in learning more about education, as well as the cultures of Indonesia. Several counterparts also mentioned a desire to learn as one of the reasons they chose to become a teacher. The counterpart at school G, for example, when asked why he became an English teacher, said:

Why do I become a teacher? Yeah. Because I want to... It's not sharing the knowledge, but I want to meet new people, so I can talk to them, so I can learn a lot from being a teacher. Because I'm not transferring knowledge but I'm also learning something new from my students as well, from my colleagues, from anyone around schools. That's why I want to be a teacher.

Counterparts were often eager to work with an ETA in large part because it offered an opportunity to learn and work with another person within a co-teaching or co-leading setting, a rare opportunity in Indonesia, where co-teaching is not yet common. The counterpart at School F said in his interview:

Sometimes it is a very good idea to work together, why, because, when you work alone, you don't, you cannot share your idea to someone. ... I only have this idea, but I don't have someone to give suggestions.

As his school was not able to apply for an ETA the following year, and he himself would be taking a temporary leave from the school to earn his master's degree abroad, he was already seeking ways to create a co-leading environment for the teacher who would facilitate the extracurricular the next year: "maybe I can ask the principal to work with her." Sometimes, this willingness to learn was recognized by the other person in the pair, such as when the ETA at School D noted that: "[My counterpart] is incredibly committed to growing as a teacher."

Willingness to Learn seems to be related to Respect, in that members of the pairs believed that the other was someone from whom they could learn. However, as it seems to be more strongly tied to an individual's desire to better themselves, this seems to stand alone as a characteristic to be considered. Interestingly, while the concepts of Respect and Flexibility were put forth during the sessions on Co-Teaching and Extracurriculars that the ETAs and several of the Co-Teachers attended, Willingness to Learn was not discussed during this session. It was, however, discussed by a panel of ETA alumni who sought to advise new ETAs in how to approach engaging with their communities for a successful year. In the future, it may be beneficial to explicitly and intentionally include Willingness to Learn in the ETA training on co-teaching and collaboration, in an effort to increase its potential effects on collaborations both within the classroom and in extracurricular contexts.

Closing remarks

While this research was very much explorative, and in no way exhausted the wealth of what can be gleaned from studying NEST and NNEST collaboration within an extracurricular context, there were some conclusions that could be drawn. Regarding the form collaboration takes in the extracurricular context, this collaboration seems most likely to follow either One Teach—One Assist model or the Team Teaching model, while mixed models are also common. Several pedagogical, logistical, and interpersonal factors are of concern in regards to ETA and counterpart collaboration within English extracurriculars. However, these concerns vary somewhat in their significance from that which they hold in the classroom context. Pedagogical concerns are far less of a concern within extracurriculars than in previous studies which focused on the classroom, as the focus of the extracurriculars are less academic. Logistical concerns were of slightly higher significance when considered in regards to extracurriculars, perhaps because the extracurricular was a secondary priority, falling behind lessons for the classroom. Interpersonal concerns remained the most significant of the factors, with Respect, Flexibility, and Willingness to Learn the most prominent interpersonal factors which affect collaboration, as identified by the participants themselves.

Further research is needed to determine if the trends identified in this current study are replicable, including additional participants and a longer data collection period, the latter of which could also allow the tracking of changes in perceptions. It would also be useful if the research questions pursued in this study were considered in the classroom context. This would help to confirm that the differences noted in this study are due to it being in an extracurricular setting, rather than a classroom setting, and not due to the present study being located in Indonesia, rather than in the East Asia region, where much of the research in this area has been completed. While the decreased importance of pedagogical factors might be expected, as this is no longer a purely academic setting, it stands to reason that Willingness to Learn might also play a role in successful collaboration within the classroom. Reproduction of the current study in other regions could also help with this understanding, as many of the programs considered in other studies also require extracurricular involvement from their NEST participants. Finally, as the current study identifies models present in extracurriculars, but did not identify an ideal model of collaboration, assessing the quality of different models within extracurriculars is an area which also needs further research. Once the forms of and factors affecting

collaboration in English extracurriculars are better understood, this could help influence training and support in programs in which NESTs and NNESTs collaborate for student learning, not only in the classroom but in language-learning opportunities outside the classroom as well.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge all of the English Teachers and English Teaching Assistants who took time out of their busy schedules to complete journals, to be interviewed, and to coordinate observations. I would also like to acknowledge the American Indonesian Exchange Foundation (AMINEF), which provided financial and professional support during the data collection period of this research. Finally, I would like to acknowledge Professor Luciana at Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia, Jakarta, who provided invaluable advice and emotional support throughout this process.

The author

Grace B. Wivell was a Fulbright English Teaching Assistant in Indonesia from 2014 to 2016, first in Malang, East Java, and then in Gorontalo, Sulawesi. She received her bachelor's in English Literature and Education from Ithaca College in 2014, and her masters in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages from Stony Brook University in 2019. She is currently teaching in the Intensive English Center at Stony Brook University. When she is not teaching English as a Second Language, she loves hiking, cooking, reading, and writing poetry.

References

- AMINEF. (2016). *English Teaching Assistant*. Retrieved from: <https://www.aminef.or.id/grants-for-americans/programs-american/fulbright-us-student-program/english-teaching-assistant/>
- Brown, J.D. (2016). Team teaching in the English classroom in japan: a call for intercultural commutative competence development. *Accents Asia*, 8(2), 102-112.
- Carless, D. (2006). Collaborative EFL teaching in primary schools. *ELT Journal*, 60, 328-335. doi: 101093/elt/cclo23
- Dewaele, J. (2007). The effect of multilingualism, sociobiographical, and situational factors on communicative anxiety and foreign language anxiety of mature language learners. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 11 (4), 391-409. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069070110040301>

- Durlak, J.A. & Weissberg, R.P. (2007). The impact of after-school programs that promote personal and social skills. *Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL), William T. Grant Foundation*.
- Friend, M., Reising, M., & Cook, L. (1993). Co-teaching: an overview of the past, a glimpse at the present, and consideration for the future. *Preventing School Failure, 37, 6-10*.
- Fulbright. (n.d.). ETA Programs. Retrieved from: <http://us.fulbrightonline.org/about/types-of-awards/english-teaching-assistant-awards>
- Hwang, C.C. (2005). Effective EFL education through popular authentic materials. *Asian EFL Journal, 7(1), 1-12*.
- Islam, M.N. (2011). Collaboration between native and non-native English-speaking teachers. *Studies in Literature and Language, 2(1), 33-41*.
- Kachi, R., & Choon-hwa, L. (2001). A tandem of native and non-native teachers: voices from Japanese and American teachers in the EFL classroom in Japan. *Proceedings from Annual International Conference on Language Teacher Education. Minneapolis, MN*.
- Liu, L. (2008). Co-teaching between Native and Non-Native English Teachers: An exploration of co-teaching models and strategies in the Chinese primary school context. *Reflections on English Language Teaching, 7(2), 103-118*.
- Luo, W.H. (2010). Collaborative teaching of EFL by native and non-native English-speaking teachers in Taiwan. In A. Mahboob (Ed.). *The NNEST Lens: Non-Native English Speakers in TESOL* (263-284). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Peng, J. (2014). *Willingness to Communicate in the Chinese EFL University Classroom Students*. Multilingual Matters.
- Tajino, A. & Tajino, Y. (2000). Native and non-native: what can they offer?: lessons from teaching in Japan. *ELT Journal, 54, 3-11*.

Appendix A

Extracurricular Reflective Journaling Prompt

Throughout the data collection period (January-March 2016), please write one weekly journal entry about the extracurricular selected for this research.

Send journal entries weekly to Grace via email; if your reflections are handwritten, please send a clear photo of your reflections.

There is no minimum or maximum amount of writing that needs to be done, and the writing can take whatever form you choose (paragraphs, bullets, etc.). Please write in the language you are most comfortable using. What is important is that you reflect individually on the extracurricular activities and record these reflections weekly.

Below, you will find some guiding questions which may help as you write your weekly journal entries. Please note that these are only *guiding* questions, meant to help you to begin to think about your extracurriculars as you reflect. These guiding questions are not meant to be answered one by one, and you are not limited to writing about the ideas included in these questions.

Guiding Questions

1. Describe the planning and preparations for today's activities.
2. Describe the activity that took place during today's extracurricular.
3. Describe the students' responses to today's activities.
4. Describe the collaboration between you and your co-teacher/ETA during today's activities.
5. What did you learn from the results of today's activities, especially regarding the collaboration?
6. How do you hope to use what you have learned today to help improve future extracurricular activities, especially in regard to collaboration?

Appendix B

Extracurricular Survey for R/C Research 2016-17

1. Do you participate in extracurriculars at your school? (If “yes,” continue to question two; if “no,” submit the survey now.)
2. Please list all of your extracurriculars, and how often/when these extracurriculars meet.
Ex: Penguin Club, Every Monday After School at 3 PM
3. Is/are your counterpart(s)/co-teacher(s) involved in any way in the extracurriculars in which you participate? If “yes,” please briefly describe their involvement.
4. Part of the data collection for this research will require participants to write reflective journal entries following extracurriculars. Is this something to which you and the counterpart(s)/co-teacher(s) may be able to commit?

Appendix C

Interview Questions

1. Give a little bit of background to yourself as a teacher/as an ETA.
 - a. What led you to become a teacher?
 - b. Why did you choose to teach English instead of something else?
 - c. Why did you join the ETA Program?
 - d. Why did you choose Indonesia as your ETA country?
2. How was [extracurricular] developed?
 - a. Who first started this extracurricular?
 - b. And how did you come to be one of the leaders for this extracurricular?
3. How are the activities for [extracurricular] usually planned?
 - a. Has this process changed since the extracurricular began? If so, how?
 - b. Has this process changed since the two of you have begun working together? If so, how?
 - c. Are there changes you wish you could make to this process? If so, how? If not, why?
4. What are your hopes and goals for this extracurricular in the upcoming months? If there are any changes that you hope to make, what are the motivations for these changes?
5. What are your hopes and goals for this extracurricular after the ETA leaves? Are you preparing for the ETA leaving? If so, how? / If not, why?