

University of Mary Washington

Eagle Scholar

Student Research Submissions

11-12-2008

An Investigation on Co-teaching English Language Learners

Rachel Gosdin

University of Mary Washington

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.umw.edu/student_research



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gosdin, Rachel, "An Investigation on Co-teaching English Language Learners" (2008). *Student Research Submissions*. 38.

https://scholar.umw.edu/student_research/38

This Education 590 Project is brought to you for free and open access by Eagle Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Research Submissions by an authorized administrator of Eagle Scholar. For more information, please contact archives@umw.edu.

An Investigation on Co-teaching English Language Learners

Rachael Gosdin

EDCI 590 INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH

November 12, 2008

FINAL DRAFT

Signature of Project Advisor

Dr. Jo Tyler
Associate Professor of Linguistics and Education

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	1
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	8
METHODOLOGY.....	22
ANAYLSIS OF RESULTS.....	25
DISCUSSION.....	34
CONCLUSION.....	44
REFERENCES.....	48
APPENDIX.....	53

Introduction

Changes are a normal part of teaching in today's challenging school environment. Today, however, English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) teachers are feeling a dramatic change in schools that is requiring teachers to rethink their roles with a whole new perspective. The politics around the best way in which to educate English language learners (ELLs) are shifting (Hawkins, 2005, p. 29). ELLs have been served through pull-out programs or dedicated classes with ESOL specialists; over the years, many schools have reconsidered the education of ELLs and moved to a more collaborative model.

Change has always been a big part of my career in education. As a certified foreign language teacher and ESOL specialist, I have taught elementary, middle and high school grades in the United States and Europe. I have had my own classroom, and I have had no classroom while serving three schools simultaneously. I have been handed a curriculum and a classroom chocked full of excellent materials, and I have had to create my own curriculum and materials. I have been in schools where content teachers seemed to prefer to keep a very distant relationship with me as the ESOL specialist (or none at all), and I have worked in schools where content teachers embraced working with ESOL specialists. While requiring adjustment and growth on my part, certainly none of these changes required a complete transformation in how I viewed my role as a teacher.

Practiced in schools across the United States, a collaborative model generally includes a mainstream teacher and ESOL specialist working together to accomplish both language development and integrated strategies to make content more accessible to all students with particular attention to ELLs (Holt, 2004, p. 82). Instead of exclusively pulling students out of mainstream classes for a specific time to work on language and/or content objectives, a

collaborative model of instruction means ESOL teachers work within the mainstream classroom in some degree, on a consultive basis or through co-teaching for example. This degree is largely determined by the educational philosophy of the school district or the individual school staff. Co-teaching produces the most dramatic changes in the role of the ESOL specialist and has powerful implications for its practical implementation.

I gained first hand experience navigating through the micro-level implications of a school-wide macro-level policy change. The principal of my school decided over the summer that ESOL instruction was to occur exclusively through co-teaching. When all teachers came back from the summer break, he assigned them to co-teaching; ESOL teachers were assigned two grade level teachers with which to co-teach language arts, social studies, science and math.

Perhaps the most intense level of collaboration is co-teaching. Already a familiar concept in the field of special education, school districts and individual schools across America have begun to model ELL instruction after special education inclusion models involving co-teaching. The collaborative method of two or more teachers teaching in the same classroom to support ELLs has gained international popularity, widely promoted in England, Australia, Canada, the United States and in international schools abroad (Davison, 2006, p. 455). St. Paul public schools made a district-wide change; pull-out teaching is now highly discouraged and typically one ESOL teacher is assigned to two mainstream teachers, with each teacher responsible for all students, ESOL and non-ESOL (Zehr, 2006, para. 1& 8). Over the course of seven years the method has been gradually phased in and ESOL programs revamped, starting as voluntary initiative and moving to a district-wide mandated program (para. 13). Not all teachers felt that they could support ELL learners using co-teaching and ended up leaving the district (Zehr, 2006, para. 13).

The co-teaching decision in my school was modeled similarly to the program in St. Paul and other schools in Northern Virginia. The principal's plan for co-teaching mandated that no pull-outs occur and that all language development occur within the mainstream classroom. Without professional development and training in co-teaching, all teachers wondered how they could become effective co-teachers and truly meet the needs of ELLs functioning in such a dramatically different classroom role. ESOL specialists and mainstream teachers alike struggled with the practical implications of the change to co-teaching assignments. In previous years, the ESOL office of the school provided adequate classroom space for the specialists for pull-out work with students, as well as a work space for planning time. This office was moved to a much smaller room barely big enough to hold a file cabinet and two bookshelves. For the first time, ESOL specialists negotiated for work space within their new co-teaching environment, the classroom that formerly "belonged" to the mainstream teacher.

The interrelationships that teachers form with each other impact pedagogic diversity of classroom life in ways that truly affect student learning (Creese, 2005b, p. 2). Policy changes also reflect important trends in second language instruction. Familiar to school administrators because of its widespread popularity in special education, the co-teaching model is being applied to the instruction of an entirely different population of students, English language learners who have very distinct needs. While there is some overlap in the fields and co-teaching certainly appears to offer exciting new avenues for students learning, transformations of ESOL programs across the nation must be based on solid research showing benefits to English language learners.

The ESOL specialists in my school previously had a budget for new materials to be used in pull-out; the principal cut this budget and directed ESOL specialists to discuss all needs within their new partners. These fundamental changes in assignments created much discussion

and during each meeting with the principal, two messages were repeated again and again: ESOL specialists are grade level co-teachers and ESOL specialists teach all students, not just ELLs. ESOL teachers struggled with their new identity and role in the classroom, and mainstream teachers tried to adapt to the loss of autonomy in the classroom. One of the veteran ESOL teachers at the school was unable to adjust to the wide-sweeping changes and with the suggestion of the principal, took early retirement in the middle of a school year. Despite the principals' assumption that all teachers could work together, bitter hostilities between some of the staff raged all year long, and several other teachers left at the end of the school year. Yet, informal interviews of departing staff revealed that not a single teacher was entirely against co-teaching as a means for language instruction.

The trials and tribulations I experienced foreground some issues that will be developed throughout this study. While the pace of the dramatic change in my school certainly had much to do with the upheaval, the drastic implications for student learning necessitate further investigation into the co-teaching movement itself. The purpose of my research is to examine how teachers who belong to different subject disciplines and often hold different views on education can collaborate successfully in multiple teacher classrooms. I examine multiple research studies to determine how collaborative teaching plays out in the classroom at the micro-level and which themes emerge from the studies as deserving particular attention for educators. Through a systematic qualitative synthesis of research, this investigation probes for specific strategies that ESOL specialists can use to successfully collaborate with general educators.

Qualitative Research

Qualitative research studies are becoming more numerous in the field of second language acquisition and learning (Tellez & Waxman, 2006, p. 245). In a 1995 special issue of the *TESOL Quarterly*, Lazaraton (1995) suggested that a review of major publications in applied linguistics from the previous last ten years revealed a growing interest in qualitative research and studies (p. 456). In subsequent years, qualitative studies have made gains in terms of visibility and credibility (Tellez & Waxman, 2006, p. 246).

An important role in research on applied linguistics is the evaluation of teaching practices (Tellez & Waxman, 2006, p.250). While such research has guided pedagogy, much of the research on effective language teaching practices has used quantitative methods which are less familiar to practitioners and sometimes abstract (Tellez & Waxman, 2006, p. 250; Lazaraton, 1995, p. 468). On the other hand, qualitative research is rich with context and descriptions reflecting classroom conditions that teachers recognize and appreciate from general experience (Tellez & Waxman, p.250; Lazaraton, 1995, p. 468). Indeed, if research is to have an impact on pedagogic policy, it is critical that that research be relevant and accessible to the “consumer” (Lazaraton, 1995, p. 467). The rich descriptions inherent in qualitative research provide insight into “attitudes, perceptions, interactions, classroom structure and behaviors” and are therefore particularly relevant to understanding co-teaching (Scruggs, Mastropieri, & McDuffie, 2007, p. 394).

Another benefit of qualitative research is that it allows the reader to gain an appreciation for the complexity of language learning that occurs in today’s classroom (Tellez & Waxman, 2006, p. 246; Lazaraton, 1995, p. 468). Educational ethnographies have particularly enabled researchers to explore the nuances of student learning and classroom environments using a descriptive approach, allowing readers to gain an appreciation for the complexity of second

language learning (Tellez & Waxman, 2006, p. 246). According to Harklau (2005), most researchers agree that the micro-level processes of interaction presented in an educational ethnography are “embedded in or mutually constitutive with macro-level institutional and societal economic, cultural, and political structures” (p.188). Essentially, they allow us an in-depth method of understanding how larger decisions play out in the classroom. Many of the studies examined in this synthesis are ethnographies and help us to appreciate the complexity of multiple teacher classrooms as well as the opportunities and complexities co-teaching relationships offer in terms of language learning possibilities.

Research Synthesis

Research synthesis is the systematic review of primary research studies and holds tremendous value in helping practitioners make sense of research on language learning and teaching (Norris & Ortega, 2006, p. 4; Tellez & Waxman, 2006, p. 249). Because the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) has placed new emphasis on scientifically based research and evidence-based educational decisions, we have seen a growing number of researchers and organizations working to synthesize the findings of primary studies in order to firm up the soft science of education (Tellez & Waxman, 2006, p. 249; Viadero, 2002, para.1). With the federal government’s \$18.5 million dollar initiative to make education an evidence-based field, we have seen a growing number of researchers and organizations working to synthesize the findings of primary studies with the hope of creating a national database that gives the public and practitioners “the lowdown” on what recent research says about current educational practices and policies (Viadero, 2002, para.2). Unfortunately, despite the fact that not all educational policies

like co-teaching are fully understood simply through quantitative study alone, the groups charged with synthesizing research for the clearinghouse databases have elected to disregard descriptive research in favor of experimental research (Viadero, 2002, para.13).

Qualitative research synthesis is vastly different from quantitative research synthesis, the main goal of which is to summarize or reduce findings into a common metric like mean effect size (Scruggs et al., 2007, p. 395; Norris & Ortega, 2006, p. 9). Instead, a qualitative research synthesis identifies themes which emerge from a purposeful sampling of primary studies on a complicated object of inquiry (Thomas, 2006, p.280; Scruggs et al., 2007, p. 395; Norris & Ortega, 2006, p. 13). Without sacrificing the individuality of the methods, nor the entirety of the constituent parts and going far beyond a literature review, a qualitative research synthesis integrates the emerging themes into a higher-order synthesis that promotes a broader understanding of the entire body of research, while respecting the epistemological integrity of the original works (Thomas, 2006, p.280; Scruggs et al., 2007, p. 395; Norris & Ortega, 2006, p. 13). Many qualitative research studies have taken place in isolated environments with limited ability to impact practitioners; qualitative research synthesis seeks to encourage connectedness across studies so that researchers have the opportunity to learn from each other and the actual “consumer” of educational research benefits (Scruggs et al., 2007, p. 395). While quantitative syntheses usually contain large numbers of studies, qualitative syntheses have so far contained smaller but purposeful numbers of primary studies (Tellez & Waxman, 2006, p. 250). Although my search for studies on co-teaching was quite extensive and will be discussed in the methodology section of this paper, the numbers of studies used for this project reflect this norm.

Literature Review

The purpose of this literature review is to present the theory of the co-teaching method and its relationship to the more general term of collaboration. Although the focus of this paper is on the theory and practice of co-teaching, collaboration is so essential to co-teaching that a clear understanding of its meaning is important as well. The terms are highly interrelated but not synonyms, as shown in Table 1. I will also discuss models of the co-teaching method, the method's origin in special education and current push in ESOL education. The study that follows this literature review will focus on the actual practice of co-teaching in schools.

Table 1. Definitions of Co-teaching and Collaboration

<i>Term</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Co-teaching	a service delivery option based on collaboration in which two educators equally share instructional responsibility in a single classroom (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 128)
Collaboration	a style for direct interaction between at least two co-equal parties voluntarily engaged in shared decision making as they work toward a common goal (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 7) Examples of collaborative activities include problem solving meetings between educators, consultation between educators and co-teaching (p. 129).

Collaboration and Co-Teaching: Definitions and Models

Co-teaching is defined as a service delivery option based on collaboration in which two educators equally share instructional responsibility in a single classroom (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 128). Co-teaching has traditionally been a service delivery option for special education students (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 113). Before the inclusion movement, special education

students received services in self-contained classrooms. When the practice of co-teaching was implemented, the special education teacher joined the content teacher in the general education classroom to service students there and to equally share in the class's instructional load (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 113). Educators have now extended co-teaching beyond special education, redefining the practice of co-teaching as collaboration and shared responsibility of all the students assigned to a classroom between any two professionals. This might include a remedial math teacher, a reading specialist, a gifted and talented specialist, and more recently, an ESOL specialist (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008, para. 3). Two teachers that are in a classroom at the same time are not necessarily co-teaching, although they may be collaborating. Co-teaching must include an equal partnership of the two teachers, not simply "an extra set of hands" (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 115).

Friend and Cook (2007) add that important within the concept of co-teaching is the idea that the two professionals engaged in co-teaching are peers and have equivalent credentials and employment status (p. 114). Paraprofessionals, though highly important in the classroom, are not co-teachers (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 114). It is interesting to note that internationally, ESOL specialists often have a higher employment status than regular content teachers and are awarded points on the pay scale due to their support and advisory position (Creese, 2002, p. 599; Arkoudis, 2006, p. 425, 428). In many countries, teachers must be practicing, certified content teachers before they can become endorsed as an ESOL specialist (Creese, 2002, p. 599). Though in the United States the certification standards vary between states and ESOL specialists do not normally enjoy a higher employment status within school settings, this paper uses the term *ESOL specialist* over *ESOL teacher* because the term emphasizes the necessary required expertise in the field of second language acquisition. This investigation also uses *employment status* and

effectual power status as two different concepts, the later conveying the reality of how ESOL specialists are actually viewed by staff in schools as discussed in the synthesis that follows this literature review. Because co-teaching is “like a professional marriage” and requires a high degree of collaboration, the practice requires two appropriately credentialed professionals (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 129).

Because the term *collaboration* is used to define co-teaching, its definition is important. Collaboration has become something of a buzzword in education (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 6; Johnson, 1998, p. 9). It is used to discuss how necessary change and reform can be accomplished in schools (Brooks & Hill, 2004, p. 59; Elliott, 2001, p. 1), and it has been applied in suggestions for handling nearly all situations in school communities (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 6). However, for all its popularity as a mechanism for educational improvement, a technical definition for the concept of collaboration is less obvious (Elliott, 2001, p. 1; Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 6). The word *collaboration* has become synonymous with related but distinctly different concepts such as cooperation, teaming, consultation, inclusion and partnership (Elliott, 2001, p. 2; Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 6-7). Confusion over its meaning in an educational setting has led to the superficial use of the term to describe the act of school professionals simply working together (Elliott, 2001, p. 1-2; Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 6-7).

Yet a true understanding of the term is important for practitioners. Friend and Cook (2007) define *collaboration* as “a style for direct interaction between at least two co-equal parties voluntarily engaged in shared decision making as they work toward a common goal” (p. 7). In their textbook on collaboration for educators, Friend and Cook are careful to point out that though education agencies can mandate practitioners to work in close proximity, it is truly the individuals involved who must choose to use a collaborative style in their interactions (p. 8).

Collaboration is an interactional style of working together, and there are many practices, activities or methods that are considered collaborative, as shown in Table 1. A special education and content teacher could engage in collaboration through a collaborative problem-solving meeting, for example. This paper focuses on the collaborative practice of co-teaching, one of the many collaborative practices that exist. Collaboration is more critical to co-teaching than to other collaborative practices or activities since co-teaching involves an “ongoing and intense relationship between two or more professionals” (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 129).

Before the coining of the term *co-teaching* by special educators Cook and Friend (1995), collaborative models of instruction were used in schools and often reflected different roles two teachers could play while working in the same classroom. Within the field of language teaching, Bourne and McPake (1991) first outlined three models of collaborative instruction, naming them support teaching, co-operative teaching and partnership teaching (p.12). However, recent literature on co-teaching practiced in schools reflects a preference for a descriptive taxonomy of the models borrowed from special educators Cook and Friend (1995). As described in detail by Friend and Cook (2007), the six models of co-teaching presented below have gone virtually unchanged through the years with a few authors putting a slight spin on the approaches to emphasize that both teachers teach all students and are actively involved with instruction. Important within the concept of co-teaching is an equal sharing of the instructional load, and Friend and Cook (2007) suggest that teachers should take turns as the leader (p. 120). As co-teachers collaborate during instructional planning meetings, they choose the co-teaching model that best meets the needs of the students, the instructional task, the ecology of the class, the demands of the curriculum and the teachers’ comfort level and skills (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 120).

One teaching, one observing is when one teacher has the primary responsibility for designing and carrying out classroom instruction while the other teacher's role is to collect data on a single student, group of students or classroom behavior (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 120). For example, an ESOL specialist could lead the entire class while the content teacher observes the participation of gifted boys, a specific population that she may be studying. When only one teacher is leading the class, far less planning is involved, and the model is also useful for gathering information on a specific question (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 121). However, one teaching, one observing has a serious drawback (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 121). One professional, usually the specialist, is relegated to the role of non-equal participant in classroom instruction (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 121).

One teaching, one assisting is when one teacher leads instruction and the other teacher supports the instructional process (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 127). This method requires far less planning than models where both teachers share in the presentation of instruction. However, a significant disadvantage of this model is that most often the content area teacher is the primary instructor (Friend & Cook, p. 128). As with the one teaching, one observing model, one teaching, one assisting denies the specialist an active role and undermines his or her credibility and influence in the classroom. Friend and Cook (2007) consider this co-teaching model "fraught with problems" and recommend that it is only used occasionally (p. 128).

Station teaching actively uses both co-teachers and involves the creation of several stations within the classroom (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 122). Each teacher leads instruction at a station and additional stations may be used for individual student work, peer tutoring, or instruction led by a paraeducator, volunteer or student teacher, with all students rotating to each station (p. 123). While classroom noise is definitely a problem with this approach, both teachers

teach all students and are equally sharing the instructional load. The specialist has an opportunity not just to support individual students but to have a fundamental impact on the class, thus ensuring in principle the appropriateness of the instructional setting for the diversity of children learning there.

Another model of co-teaching is *parallel teaching* in which the teachers jointly plan a lesson, divide the class into two groups and deliver their lesson with no rotation in groups (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 124). Although this method works well in lowering the student-teaching ratio, especially for discussions and jigsaw type whole-class activities, this approach cannot be used for core instruction of content material unless both practitioners are qualified to teach the material and address the needs of all students (p. 124).

Alternative teaching is a co-teaching model in which one teacher (often the specialist) works with a small group of students to provide highly intensive instruction while the other teacher is teaching the large group (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 125). This model can be used for pre-teaching or re-teaching concepts, enrichment groups and skills assessment (p. 125). However, because it essentially uses a pull-out group, Friend and Cook (2007) caution against constantly pulling out the same group as not to stigmatize students (p. 125). Therefore, a question that should be addressed with this model is whether the language needs of ELLs are met within the general class setting if homogenous pull-out groups are to be avoided.

Team teaching is the most fluid model of co-teaching and involves two teachers teaching together in an equal, synergetic partnership (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 126). Not for novice co-teachers, practitioners who enjoy this model of co-teaching have compatible teaching styles, flexibility, senses of humor and an ability to have natural instructional conversations with each other and students (p.126). In this method, teachers' roles are viewed as interchangeable yet

more distinct, and teacher conflicts are seen by both partners as inevitable and even healthy because they lead to a greater level of understanding (Davison, 2006, p. 468). However,

Among international educators who research ESOL co-teaching, the term *team teaching* is used to describe a different model which will be referred to as *support team teaching* in this paper. In countries like Australia, policymakers have determined that ESOL specialists and content teachers should work together to accommodate the language needs of ELLs (Arkoudis, 2003, p. 161). ESOL specialists have leadership positions within school buildings as professional development coordinators and are represented as agents of change in charge the successful mainstreaming of ELLs (Arkoudis, 2006, p. 425, 428). ESOL specialists and content teachers are required to plan as a team, and a large part of the ESOL specialist's job is to instruct the content teacher how to teach language in the content area rather than co-teaching language and content together. Many educators might not consider this supportive approach as a co-teaching model at all and would classify it as the collaborative activity of *consulting teaching*, where specialists consult with content teachers who then implement in their classrooms the ideas that were generated during a structured problem-solving process (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 88). However, while there is a certain aspect of consulting involved, the support team teaching model is not centered around problem-solving. Instead, ESOL teachers offer content teachers an understanding of the demands of studying a second language (Arkoudis, 2003, p. 166). During regular co-planning sessions, ESOL specialists analyze the language that the students need to learn for the topic in the content area; they then help content teachers organize lessons that integrate writing, vocabulary and other language functions important for ELLs (Arkoudis, 2003, p. 166). Friend and Cook (2007) also describe consulting teaching as voluntary and explain that both the consultant and consultee have the prerogative of entering or terminating the relationship

at any time (p. 91). In contrast, the support team teaching model is not voluntary because ESOL specialist and content teacher collaboration is mandated by state government policy. Because ESOL specialists in support team teaching are involved in instruction far beyond simple consultation and because this model involves two teachers of vastly different epistemological backgrounds coming together to create lessons together, support team teaching as used in this paper is classified as an additional co-teaching model.

A Push for Co-teaching

The inclusion movement started in various degrees in the 1960's (Holt, 2004, p. 90) and was part of a worldwide movement to empower and provide equal rights to those groups previously denied them (Creese, 2005b, p. 30). Since the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the United States in 1965, schools have been required to hire appropriate professionals for students designated for special services in special education, literacy and ESOL (Risko & Bromley, 2000, p. 10). Recent educational policy such as the reauthorization of America 2000 (1991) and Goals 2000 (1994), the passage of the Reading Excellence Act (1999), the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (2004) and changes in state regulations aim to diminish role differences between specialists and develop the sense of shared responsibilities among teachers and specialists in a belief that this improves the all around quality of education of students requiring special services (Holt, 2004, p. 91; Risko & Bromley, 2000, p. 10; Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 21). For example, changes in state regulation in New York resulted in reading specialists being able to take more active roles in designing curriculum and providing literacy instruction to students identified with learning disabilities that involve literacy problems (Risko & Bromley, 2000, p. 10). The lines

traditionally defining the specialist's role in schools have been blurred, and the collaboration of professionals is either mandated specifically or strongly implied in today's educational policies (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 21).

Although the concept of inclusion began in the 1960's, the special education field really began embracing collaborative practices in the 1980's. With NCLB and every reauthorization of IDEA, there has been a push to integrate students in special education into the general education classroom and to implement school-wide collaborative practices (Weiss, 2004, p. 219). With a 20- plus year trend toward special education students spending the majority of their day in the general education classroom, districts report an increase in more and more teachers involved in the practice of co-teaching (Weiss, 2004, p. 219).

The push for co-teaching has not been limited to special education. The increasing cultural and linguistic diversity in American schools is challenging long-established approaches to curriculum and instruction (Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001, p. 243). Greater student diversity and recent legislation requires that teachers have a greater knowledge of a larger spectrum of areas (Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001, p.243; Holt, 2004, p. 91), including language learning and content integration for ELLs, reading strategies for struggling readers, and strategies to successfully teach special education students in the mainstream classroom, to name few. Proponents of co-teaching question the "one teacher response for one group of students" paradigm (Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001, p.243). Additionally, research tells us that in many schools, over a long period of time, teachers have been colleagues in name only (Little, 1990, p. 165). As Little (1990) aptly phrased it, teachers all too often "work out of sight and hearing of one another, plan and prepare their lessons and materials alone, and struggle on their own to solve most of their instructional, curricular and management problems" (p. 165).

Proponents of co-teaching believe it offers several benefits. First, co-teaching allows a specialist to be directly involved in the instructional support of the general educator because it requires the planning of lessons together rather than the offering of suggestions or modifications common in consultive collaboration (Weiss, 2004, p. 219). Friend and Cook (2007) argue that this direct involvement with lessons leads to a “less fragmented” and “more contextualized” education for students (p. 118). Many would argue that for ELLs, the combination of ESOL specialists representing language learning and content teachers representing core curriculum would result in the most balanced instruction because the task of incorporating language objectives into content lessons is challenging (Short, 2002, p. 22). Short (2002) completed an observational study of four teachers in four different sheltered ESOL middle school classrooms in the United States including two ESOL specialists and two social studies teachers. Sheltered instruction usually features just one teacher (ESOL specialist or content teacher) instructing ELLs. Short (2002) observed many teachable moments for language teaching slip away with one fifth or less of ESOL specialists’ classroom teacher talk devoted to language and only 25 percent of social studies teachers’ classroom teacher talk devoted to language (p. 21). Short (2002) attributed these findings to the pressure that individual teachers feel as they prepare students for state and local testing (p. 21). Content teachers are immersed in the discourse of their discipline and do not easily recognize the language demands of the curriculum (Short, 2002, p. 21); ESOL specialists struggle to cover required content and can easily lose direction and control, forgetting their goal of language learning integration (Davison, 2006, p. 457; Lyster, 2007, p. 28).

Proponents of co-teaching in ESOL believe that an ESOL specialist working with a content teacher side-by-side would help insure balanced integration of language learning in content classrooms; basically, with so daunting a task, two is better than one.

While balanced instruction is the primary benefit of co-teaching, many educators believe it offers additional benefits. The lower student-teacher ratio of a co-taught class benefits all students in that it provides higher instructional intensity and active, focused learning (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 118; Weiss, 2004, p. 219; Holt, 2004, p. 92). Many proponents of co-teaching firmly believe through co-teaching students receive the content from general educators and special services through specialists, eliminating or reducing the need for pull-out instruction which many educators believe to be stigmatizing and isolating (Weiss, 2004, p. 219; Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 118). Eliminated as well is the demand for extra classroom space for pull-out instruction, a direct benefit to administrators in aging, cramped schools (Holt, 2004, p. 97). Finally, proponents believe co-teaching encourages increased understanding of students with special needs in both staff and students. Teachers learn from each other and improve the quality of education and professional growth; students appreciate diversity in the classroom and learn life skills as they watch adults engaged in problem solving and cooperation (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 119; Holt, 2004, p. 93).

Co-teaching in ESOL

NCLB has profoundly affected American schools as student assessment data has become the focus of institutional accountability (Hill, 2004, p. 15). Test results must be disaggregated by subgroups based on gender, race, poverty level, English language proficiency, and disability status (Kahl, 2003, para. 5). For the purposes of this study, it is important to distinguish between the terms *ELL* and *LEP* (limited English proficient) which are not used here to mean the same thing. Most educators agree that the term *ELL* is generally preferable to *LEP* in that it avoids the

negative connotation of the term limited and it also encompasses a wider range of students, from students who do not speak a word of English, to students proficient in conversational English, but who may continue to struggle with abstract language in content areas (Gersten & Baker, 2000, para. 7), even though they may no longer be a part of the LEP subgroup. The U.S. Department of Education (2004) defines the LEP subgroup not as a demographic group, but a classification that changes as a student gains language proficiency (para. 4). For accountability purposes, the U.S. Department of Education uses the term LEP to refer to only those students receiving English language services.

Legislation has put pressure on schools by pronouncing that by 2014, all LEP students will pass their state's accountability tests, regardless of how long they've been in the country (Wright, 2006, p. 22). Lack of progress for students in the LEP subgroup can mean that a school fails to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) and is deemed failing, leading to sanctions and possibly the threat of eventual takeover. Unfortunately, schools with large numbers of ELLs never seem to be able to show growth; unlike other subgroups used to calculate AYP, ELLs are constantly moving in and out of the LEP subgroup (Wright, 2006, p. 22). While African-American or Hispanic students, for example, always remain in the African-American or Hispanic subgroup for their entire educational career, ELLs who speak the most English and have gained sufficient language proficiency according to state testing are exited from the subgroup, their spot often replaced by a newly arrived student who speaks no English at all. Improvement in the LEP subgroup is difficult to show because the subgroup is essentially defined by its lack of English proficiency, resulting in low test scores (Rossell, 2005, p. 29).

Despite its push for educational decisions based on scientific research, NCLB itself ignores research on the time needed to gain proficiency in academic English for second language

learners. Commonly accepted in the field of applied linguistics is the work of Jim Cummins (1980, 1981, 1996), an expert on second language acquisition among school-age students. His research clearly distinguishes between two aspects of second language development: basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP). Developed in as little as two to three years and less demanding than CALP, BICS allow ELLs to carry on face-to-face conversation in social settings and is characterized as context-embedded since contextual cues are available to both speaker and listener involved in the conversation (Coelho, 2004, p. 153). Teachers and administrators often assume that BICS proficiency is all that's needed to succeed in school (Collier, 1989, p. 516), and as a result, ELLs stop receiving extra support after the first few years in American schools (Coelho, et al., 2004, p. 152). Proficiency in BICS does not indicate proficiency in the type of language needed for context-reduced, cognitively demanding language tasks measured on standardized tests (Collier, 1989, p. 516) and needed to understand classroom teacher discourse, read textbooks, etc. (Coelho, et al., 2004, p. 152). Experts in the field of applied linguistics agree that proficiency in CALP can take between five to ten years (Coelho, et al, 2004, p. 152; Collier, 1989, p. 525), and this view is supported by extensive longitudinal research (Thomas & Collier, 2000). Research has shown that ELLs who arrive in American schools and are behind in literacy skills in their own language may never reach full proficiency in English (Coelho, et al., 2004, p. 152).

Despite what research says about the time needed for ELLs to become proficient in English, NCLB's illogical 2014 deadline for 100% of ELLs to meet content area standards and illogical categorization of the LEP subgroup puts schools under enormous pressure to improve the test scores of ELLs. Administrators have begun to re-examine traditional pull-out programs, which have always had their critics. Thomas and Collier (1997, 2002) produced a study showing

that although they were better than no ESOL service whatsoever, pullout-programs were not enough to close the long-term achievement gap between ELLs and their native English speaking peers. Federally funded over more than 10 years, the study showed that bilingual education was far more efficient than pullout programs for ELLs (Thomas & Collier, 1997, p. 53). Yet bilingual education in America has declined nationwide, despite increasing numbers of ELLs in American schools (Crawford, 2007, p. 1) Between 1992 and 2002, the percentage of LEP students who received bilingual education decreased by more than half (Zehler et al., 2003, p. v). Likewise, a 2004 survey of the members of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) reflected decreased interest in bilingual education with less than half of the members interested in the issue of promoting multilingualism (TESOL, 2004, p. 3).

Criticized by Rossell (1998) for its undefined methodology and lack of a comparison group, the Thomas and Collier study (1997, 2002) has nevertheless been used to question the effectiveness of pull-out programs (Holt, 2004, p. 94). While not necessarily embracing bilingual education promoted in the Thomas and Collier study, many educators took notice of the study's strong emphasis on content instruction for ELLs (Holt, 2004, p. 94). Despite the fact that research tells us that proficiency in CALP can take up to 10 years, educators were quick to associate the ELLs' achievement gap demonstrated by Thomas and Collier with the pull-out program model. Around this same time, a widely published work on sheltered instruction by Echevarria, Vogt and Short (2000) highlighted the importance of academically rigorous content instruction for ELLs and gained prominence in ESOL pedagogy. Instead of investigating bilingual programs promoted by the Thomas and Collier study or the highly structured method for implementing sheltered instruction promoted by Echevarria, Vogt and Short, many administrators turned to the field of special education to look at the co-teaching method for

ESOL students (Holt, 2004, p. 96).

Methodology

The objective of this investigation is to gain understanding about the practice and processes of co-teaching in ESOL by first synthesizing available qualitative research studies and then comparing the results to similar studies on co-teaching in special education. After completing the literature review, I chose to examine the methodology of other qualitative research syntheses to determine the relationship of individual studies to the work as a whole. Modeled after Scruggs, Mastropieri and McDuffie's (2007) metasynthesis of qualitative research on co-teaching in inclusive classrooms with special education students, I determined to treat each individual research study as an "individual informant" and create a synthesis across all research studies focusing on ESOL co-teaching, permitting each study to present data and conclusions, information that was then integrated with the findings of other researchers (p. 395). Because co-teaching in special education has so fundamentally influenced the practice of co-teaching in ESOL (Holt, 2004, p. 96; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2008, para. 3; M. Friend, personal communication, September 12, 2008), my goal was to then return to research on special education co-teaching, including several metasyntheses, comparing my findings with theirs to create full picture on the practice and processes of co-teaching.

Because international researchers do not use the co-teaching method terminology described earlier in detail, each study was read several times to determine which method was being used by the researchers. Considering the complexity of synthesizing a group of research studies, I used graphic organizers to keep track of the researchers' data and conclusions. In

searching for emerging themes, studies were coded by author and publication date, setting and geographic region, research population, research design and co-teaching method. Studies were also examined for reported benefits of co-teaching, expressed needs of co-teaching and general themes found in authors' conclusions. Because studies were not necessarily always straightforward or explicit in announcing this information, studies were read and analyzed several times.

Sorting through the literature on co-teaching in general, one is impressed by the abundance of instructive "how-to implement co-teaching" manuals, textbooks and articles which contrast enormously with the paucity of actual research studies evaluating the effectiveness. In the area of ESOL co-teaching, there is far less implementation literature available and even less research completed on the method, notably in the United States. Though I did use implementation literature in the literature review section of this paper to review the theory of co-teaching, I only included research articles in the investigation of the practice of co-teaching that follows. The studies that were included for this synthesis employed qualitative methods as primary methodology. A requirement for including a study in this meta-analysis was that it contain a discussion on the co-teaching relationship, not just simply inclusion of special education or ELLs in a general education classroom with no mention of the dual teacher dynamic. For example, although very interesting, Martin-Jones and Saxena's (1996) study chronicling the relationship between content teachers and ESOL teaching assistants (TAs) was excluded. Friend and Cook (2007) point out that co-teachers must have "equivalent credentials and employment status" (p. 114). Because TAs assist content teachers and ESOL specialists and have a lesser employment status in schools, I did not include research on TAs because they aid teachers and do not truly co-teach with them. Because this project is interested in the relationship

between the two teachers engaged in co-teaching, studies with conclusions derived solely from considering the specialist's concerns or opinions were generally excluded. For example, Holt's (2004) action research study was excluded. The study focused exclusively on gathering data on the co-teaching experience of an ESOL specialist, with no data on the experience of the content teacher with whom the ESOL specialist co-taught. Although the study presented some interesting conclusions on how teacher-to-teacher communication occurs in a dual teacher classroom, the data of the study was deemed insufficient for contributing a complete perspective on the co-teaching method.

I used many different methods to find the articles used in this paper. Using educational search engines proved useful when searching for authors or specific journals but not as helpful for conducting general term searches using key words or topics. Descriptors employed in the searches included ESOL, English as a second language (ESL) or English as an additional language (EAL), co-teaching, inclusion, partnership teaching, collaborative teaching, collaboration and cooperative teaching. Databases used included ERIC, JSTOR, Science Direct (Elsevier), Google Scholar, Academic Search Complete, Wilson Web and EBSCO. The most effective means of identifying important studies was an ancestral search of each reference list of previously identified studies. This search produced results that could then be searched using the works these authors cited in their investigation. I conducted a hand search of relevant journals to identify articles that could have possibly been missed from previous procedures. I searched library catalogs from the University of Cincinnati, Virginia Commonwealth University and the University of Mary Washington as well as the Ohiolink catalog, a collection of all member libraries in the state of Ohio.

There were not any deliberate dated time limits set in the search. All the studies on co-teaching in ESOL occurred within the last nine years while the studies on co-teaching in special education began in the mid-1990's. Many of the researchers compiled data on a population through observations, interviews and recordings, and over the course of several years, published individual investigations examining different research questions. Because the conclusions of each work were unique, this project treated each publication as a separate study for accuracy in source quotation. As shown in Table 2, the eleven studies were conducted in Australia, England, Canada or Taiwan. Unfortunately, no American studies on co-teaching in ESOL met the criteria for this study discussed above.

Analysis

Modeled similarly to Scruggs, Mastropieri and McDuffie's (2007) metasynthesis of qualitative research on co-teaching in inclusive classrooms with special education students, this paper seeks to understand the day-to-day practice of ESOL co-teaching. Scruggs et al. (2007) analyzed multiple research reports for the predominant co-teaching models used in the actual day-to-day practice of co-teaching, the benefits of co-teaching and the expressed needs of co-teachers to improve the practice. I will analyze the eleven research studies on ESOL co-teaching for the same criteria with the goal of discovering if the practice of co-teaching reflects the theory reviewed in the literature review above.

Predominant Co-teaching Models Used in ESOL

Despite the multiple options of co-teaching models discussed earlier, research shows that ESOL specialists were associated predominantly with facilitative approaches like one teach, one assist, serving mostly as helpers to content teachers. Table 2 displays the predominant co-teaching models observed in the studies included in this project. ESOL specialists in the Arkoudis (2003, 2005, 2006) studies and Love and Arkoudis (2006) study engaged primarily in support team teaching. As discussed earlier, support team teaching involves an ESOL specialist working closely in joint planning with a content teacher, with a very limited partnership role in the classroom.

Creese's (2002, 2005a, 2005b, 2006) observational data reveals a reliance on only two of the multiple co-teaching models: one teach, one assist and alternative teaching with groups of ELLs. Creese (2005b) noted that secondary schools had a great deal of difficulty supporting true partnership team teaching and teachers had difficulties in organizing it (p. 202). While her data supports a very clear effort on the part of teachers to present their work as equal, Creese (2005b) observed that this was never completely successful (p. 202). Likewise, Davison's (2006) data reflects the rarity of truly successful co-teaching partnerships (p. 471), observing co-teachers who were "pseudocompliant" or working in "passive resistance" to co-teaching (p. 466).

Two researchers explicitly observed team teaching, or a true partnership of co-teachers. Discussing how rare a true equal partnership is, Gardner (2006) studied what teacher talk sounds like between two teachers she describes as equal partners. Data from her study suggests that within a 25-minute session, these teachers were not engaging in team teaching the entire period, instead showing a continuum of support to partnership talk, with the content teacher always in the leadership role (Gardner, 2006, p. 491). Likewise, Early's (2001) study featured teachers team teaching as well as using alternative teaching and pullout, depending on the personalities of

the partners co-teaching (p. 175). Early (2001) credits the extensive professional development used in the Vancouver School District with giving co-teachers commonality and shared focus (p.

Table 2. Coding of ESOL Research Studies on Co-teaching

<i>Author/Year</i>	<i>Participants</i>	<i>Setting/Geographic Region</i>	<i>Data Source Methodology</i>	<i>Predominant Co-teaching Model</i>
Arkoudis, 2003	2 teachers: ESOL specialist & science teacher	Australia High school science	Observation/discourse analysis	Support team teaching
Arkoudis, 2005	2 teachers: ESOL specialist & science teacher	Australia High school science	Observation/discourse analysis	support team teaching
Arkoudis, 2006	2 teachers: ESOL specialist & science teacher	Australia High school science	Observation/discourse analysis	support team teaching
Creese, 2002	3 different schools: 26 teachers total: 12 ESOL teachers & 14 content teachers	England secondary	Classroom recording & interview/ethnography	One teach, one assist; alternative teaching (ELL only)
Creese, 2005a	3 different schools: 26 teachers total: 12 ESOL teachers & 14 content teachers	England secondary Construction technology, geography, humanities,	Classroom recording/ethnography	One teach, one assist; alternative teaching (ELL only)
Creese, 2005b	3 different schools: 26 teachers total: 12 ESOL teachers & 14 content teachers	England secondary	Interviews & observation/discourse analysis	One teach, one assist
Creese, 2006	2 teachers: ESOL specialist & geography teacher	England Secondary	Ethnography(interview & observ) /discourse analysis	One teach, one assist
Davison, 2006	17 teachers: 5 ESOL, 12 content	International elementary school in Taiwan	Observation, Questionnaire& interview/discourse analysis	one teach, one assist though a few exceptions noted
Early, 2001	Phase 1 of study: 400 teachers (ESOL & content); phase 2: 75 teachers	Phase 1: 4 secondary & 8 Elementary schools in Vancouver, Canada ; phase 2:10 schools	Action research/discourse analysis	Support team teaching & team teaching
Gardner, 2006	2 teachers: 1 ESOL & content	Elementary school in England	Observation/discourse analysis	One teach, one assist, though team teaching did occur
Love & Arkoudis, 2006	ESOL teachers, 4 content teachers	Australia High school	Questionnaire, interview, observation/discourse	Support team teaching

			analysis	
--	--	--	----------	--

176). Overall, the ESOL co-teaching studies show a lack of teachers engaging in the more evolved co-teaching models like team teaching; this is a substantial deviation from what literature says about co-teaching.

Benefits of Co-teaching in ESOL

Research studies included in this report do not explicitly report many benefits of co-teaching in ESOL. (See Appendix). Most of the studies treat the concept of co-teaching as a policy that is not debatable in itself and instead concentrate their efforts in calling attention to problems in ESOL co-teaching and the need for improvement. Because the studies were often not straightforward in revealing any benefit to co-teaching at all, they were read several times to understand any overarching benefits that are assumed within the work, though not necessarily directly stated.

The studies implied that having an ESOL specialist in the content classroom had an influence on instruction, although sometimes in a nuanced way. For example, although Arkoudis (2003, 2005, 2006) focuses on the problematic nature and complexity of developing collaborative practices between co-teachers, her research does show that in some degree, the content teacher is influenced by the ESOL specialist's strategies for working with ELLs. The science teacher in Arkoudis's (2005) study rejects the ESOL pedagogy offered by the specialist for a genetics lesson essentially because the concepts rest in language curriculum rather than task-based language learning strategies (p. 182). Essentially, research shows that ESOL

specialists are not thought to have an explicit knowledge base, and content teachers often reject ESOL specialists' attempts to highlight language in learning (Arkoudis, 2005 p. 182; Creese, 2002, p. 611). However, the science teacher in Arkoudis's (2005) study does offer positive appreciation for the ESOL specialist's practical strategies for helping ELLs understand an upcoming science experiment, a task-based activity (Arkoudis, 2005, p. 182). While Arkoudis seeks to highlight the rejection of ESOL curriculum by content teachers and does so much more forcefully in the later Love and Arkoudis (2006) study, her earlier studies show a science teacher adopting at least some of the ESOL specialist's epistemological views, a benefit of co-teaching. Creese (2005) recorded an ESOL specialist lamenting that she didn't have more influence over the content teacher's instruction, but also backhandedly acknowledging some progress, "To some extent although I don't feel that we have influenced their practice, as much as I would like.... it has improved over the years..." (pp. 61-62). Another ESOL teacher acknowledged the following:

I mean when you see teachers taking on board suggestions that I have made or trying out things I think it does make a difference.... So when I sort of say to teachers that um, you know about presenting the key vocabulary before they look at the text, and they have done that. I feel that students have understood the text much more than they would have done if the teacher hadn't sort of thought about it. And it is nice when teachers sort of take things suggestions [*sic*] on board and you see them trying it out (Creese, 2005b, p. 62).

While data reflects a definite need for ESOL specialists to have more influence, at least to some degree, most of the studies included in this project noted the ESOL specialist's impact on content instruction.

To some degree, studies showed that the ESOL specialist's presence lead to greater class coherence and the ability to keep up with curriculum timetables. Creese's (2002, 2005a, 2005b, 2006) main focus was to emphasize the many problems surrounding the co-teaching relationship,

and one must truly search her studies for benefits, with some level of interpretation necessary. Creese (2006) mentioned very briefly that co-teaching creates learning opportunities for ELLs that would not exist without the presence of the ESOL specialist in the inclusive classroom (p. 450). Creese observed that the methods of serving ELLs through alternative teaching and one teach, one assist were important to the content teaching because students, not just ELLs, could be appropriately grouped based on needs (Creese, 2006, p. 450). The content teacher was able to keep the entire class on topic and did not have to keep stopping to help ELLs (Creese, 2006, p. 450). The presence of the ESOL specialist impacted the extent of ELL inclusion in content instruction and therefore impacted the content teacher's ability to keep up with the classroom syllabus (Creese, 2006, p. 450).

Only one study clearly showed that language teaching was occurring in the content classroom through the integration of language and content. Early (2001) concluded that with an intensive professional development in place, the collaborative effort between content teachers and ESOL specialists is highly beneficial and that language and content can be successfully integrated (p. 176). A clear assumption of this study, however, was that it was the specific program used, not the collaborative effort of the co-teachers alone, that created a successful program. Early (2001) concludes that the co-teachers "had resources to analyze the content and language of the social practice in which they which they were asking their students to engage" (p. 175). Because there was a common understanding and focus on language between two teachers with very different backgrounds, the teachers were able to discuss language explicitly and critically (Early, 2001, p. 175). However, Early (2001) mentions that critical to a successful experience with co-teaching is the flexibility to vary the approach based on individual teachers, which does not necessarily exclude "separate classroom contexts" (p. 175). Essentially, Early

does not rule out the use of pullout in schools for best serving the needs of ELLs in integrating language and content.

Expressed Needs of Co-teachers

Many researchers' studies expressed a need for policymakers, school districts and individual schools to consider linguistic diversity in ELL inclusion when implementing co-teaching in ESOL. Creese (2005b) showed that "a language policy founded on inclusivity will achieve little if it does not consider how micro contexts of classroom life interact with larger discussions, discourses, debates and conversations on education policy" (p. 202). When data across a number of studies shows that knowledge and pedagogies associated with language learning are being pushed to the periphery of schools' agendas (Creese, 2002, p. 611; Davison, 2006, p. 456; Arkoudis, 2006, p. 428), essentially ELL inclusion is not working as it was envisaged (Creese, 2005b, p. 202). Creese's (2005b) research showed that linguistic diversity was not considered in any way in the policy of ELL inclusion. Data across every study included in this project showed that teachers need a clear understanding of how language functions in teaching and learning for ELLs and the skills to be able to apply this knowledge through their pedagogies.

Multiple researchers concluded that joint planning time was a critical need in co-teaching. Davison (2006) found joint planning time and time in and out of class was critical in order for teachers to develop skills to successfully co-teach (p. 471). Presenting an emerging framework that draws on teacher talk and critical discourse analysis to describe and evaluate the stages of collaboration, Davison's (2006) data reveals that teachers in almost all stages report a

lack of joint planning time (p. 471). Davison quoted a teacher he classified as “compliant” with collaborative teaching, “Large blocks of time are needed if proper planning is to take place” (p. 471). Davison observed another similar co-teacher complaining of “insufficient planning time” (p. 471). Teachers who were working as true, equal partners also complained of the lack of time together, albeit in a much different manner: “There has been insufficient time to plan for the language implications of the content we are teaching; for example, the development of grammatical progressions” (p. 471).

ESOL specialists need to be schooled on collaborative negotiation techniques and how to communicate ESOL pedagogy to content teachers. As discussed earlier, research shows that ESOL specialists are not thought to have an explicit knowledge base, and content teachers often reject ESOL specialists’ attempts to highlight language in learning (Arkoudis, 2005 p. 182; Arkoudis, 2006, p. 417; Creese, 2002, p. 611; Creese, 2006, p. 450). If content teachers do not understand and respect ESOL pedagogy, ELL needs and the ESOL specialist’s role may be marginalized in the classroom. Essentially, an ESOL specialist not only needs to know how to teach ELLs but also how to articulate ESOL pedagogy in a clear yet non-threatening manner to content teachers during planning sessions. Numerous studies mentioned that because an ESOL specialist is coming onto the “turf” of the content teacher to teach instruction that has traditionally “belonged” to the content teacher, training in collaborative dialogue is important to successfully creating a solid co-teaching relationship (Arkoudis, 2006, p. 429; Davison, 2006, p. 459). Arkoudis’s (2006) analysis of dialogue during collaborative planning reveals a complex negotiation of pedagogic understanding, requiring skill and perseverance on the part of the ESOL specialist to influence mainstream instruction (Arkoudis, p. 429). Both Creese (2005) and Arkoudis (2006) showed that ESOL specialists engage the content teacher by asking many more

questions, while the collaborating content teacher is more willing to give out answers (Creese, p. 89; Arkoudis, p. 429). The researchers determined that ESOL specialists' question-asking was a collaborative dialogue technique that influenced content teachers in a non-hostile, indirect manner. ESOL specialists do not have the power status in schools to force content teachers to change their instructional planning to meet the needs of ELLs (Arkoudis, 2006, p. 429). Instead, Arkoudis (2006) observes that the ESOL specialist must rely on collaborative dialogue and negotiation skills to influence the content teacher (Arkoudis, 2006, p. 429). However, if both teachers shared the same perspective of language learning and content and language integration, such negotiation skills on the part of the ESOL specialist might not necessarily be so essential. In Early's (2001) study, all teachers and administrators were educated in an approach based on Mohan's (1986) Knowledge Framework. Early (2001) described the approach adapted by the entire school district as "a view of language as discourse in the context of social practice" (p.158). When teachers were not working from diametrically opposed epistemological viewpoints, Early's (2001) research showed a smoother collaborative process. When content teachers receive formal training in language learning and already accept ESOL pedagogy as a legitimate and important knowledge base, collaborative dialogue skills of ESOL specialists may be less critical.

All studies suggested the need for increased awareness, education, training or staff development to help co-teachers. Arkoudis (2006) reported that teachers in the UK very often find themselves ordered to co-teach through government policy directives that offer little conceptualization of how teachers should work collaboratively in planning curriculum (p. 417). While the integration of language and content teaching in schools has long been an active area of research in applied linguistics, the important partnership between ESOL specialists and

mainstream teachers has received less attention (Davison, 2006, p. 454). Arkoudis (2006) aptly concludes from her study that a concrete, conceptualized model of successful ESOL collaboration is lacking in research (p. 417); many of the studies on the co-teaching included in this project support her claim. However, staff development that educates teachers about the evolutionary stages that they will encounter and encourages them to reflect on their experience is crucial to effective collaborative teaching. Davison's (2006) study found that teachers go through distinct stages within the collaborative teaching experience from survival self-concerns and reluctance to change in the beginning, to the final stage of welcoming the partnership (p. 472). Though not all teachers reach the partnership stage and research confirms how rare it is (Creese, 2002, p. 612; Davison, 2006, p. 455; Gardner, 2006, p. 476), researchers state the need for an increased awareness of successful ESOL co-teaching practices (Arkoudis, 2006, p. 429; Love & Arkoudis, 2006, p. 274; Creese, 2005a, p. 202; Creese, 2005b, p. 204; Davison, 2006, p. 455; Gardner, 2006, p. 493). Although Early (2001) also calls for schools to "implement substantial, systemic changes in pedagogy, school organization, and professional development," her investigation is the only research study to propose an extensive staff development program to educate teachers (p. 174).

Discussion

I will begin this discussion by focusing on the major themes present in ESOL co-teaching research. I will then compare the predominant themes, the benefits, the expressed needs of co-teachers and the principal co-teaching models in ESOL co-teaching research to those found in special education co-teaching research.

Language and Status Roles in ESOL Co-teaching

The primary overarching theme found in all eleven research reports was the difficulty that co-teachers had in balancing language and content. International education policy notably in England and Australia assumes that the ESOL teacher has the authority to influence the mainstream teacher in curriculum planning; the ESOL specialist's slightly higher work status would also seem to support this concept (Arkoudis, 2006, p. 428). However, research reviewed for this paper shows a different reality— ESOL expertise is widely assumed to be limited to strategies or methodology rather than curriculum content (Davison, 2006, p. 456). All too often this reduces the ESOL specialist's contribution to suggesting strategies and techniques for inclusive classrooms, rather than explicit goals for ELL development in broader curriculum and assessment processes (Davison, 2006, p. 456; Arkoudis, 2005, p. 183). Arkoudis's (2005, 2006) research shows the disagreements of a science teacher and ESOL specialist when discussing curriculum. After the ESOL specialist presents information about ESOL curriculum in the science classroom, the content teacher laughingly rejects the specialist's concept of content, pronouncing it "vapid" (Arkoudis, 2006, p. 420). However, when the two teachers discuss how to organize classroom tasks, the content teacher deferred to the ESOL specialist's judgment because she offered relevant teaching tools and strategies that support the ELLs in the classroom (2005, p. 182). Although the content teacher accepts ESOL teaching tools and strategies, this example highlights the content teacher's rejection of ESOL curriculum and content and the difficulty of the ESOL specialist to insure that content and language are integrated. Arkoudis and Love's (2006) study also highlights the failure of an ESOL specialist to influence two content

teachers who strongly maintain their epistemological positions that exclude the possibility of a focus on language as they work with ELLs (p. 274). This study also illustrates the limitations in the conversational strategies of the ESOL specialist to affect the reconciliation of language and content demands in the classroom.

Creese (2006) found that content teachers often do not support ESOL specialist's work in focusing on language because the content teachers themselves are unclear about the relationship between form and function and how best to make it work in the content classroom (p. 202). In Creese's (2006) year long ethnography, she observed only one content teacher out of fourteen attempting to focus on form in the subject classroom. The content teacher incorrectly instructs the ELL on the past tense and awkwardly stumbles to correct himself (p. 195). Creese (2006) concluded that content teachers need grammatical and linguistic knowledge in order to feel confident in focusing on language in the classroom (p. 195). Content teachers' uncomfortable rejection of language in the subject classroom takes its toll on the effectiveness of the ESOL specialist's work with students in the classroom. In conclusion, a major theme in studies reviewed for this synthesis was the need to educate content teachers to accept that language and content are inextricably linked.

Research on collaboration reveals a delicate power struggle between ESOL specialists and general educators. Davison (2006) connects the lack of status in language teaching with the dominant but incorrect belief that ESOL does not have curriculum, just strategies to offer classroom teachers (p. 456). Creese (2006) suggests that this different knowledge status linked to language by teachers results in a rejection of language learning by students (p. 199). Creese's (2006) study chronicles an ESOL specialist's failing attempts to focus students on language who are consumed with returning to their subject area work to the point of being disrespectful. Many

researchers discussed how students are quick to pick up on classroom dynamics that clearly marginalized the ESOL specialist. Creese (2005b) captured a dialogue between a geography teacher and a student that sums up the view of a student (p. 1). Creese uses the abbreviation *EAL* for *English as an additional language* rather than the abbreviation used in this study, ESOL.

Student 1: Miss, what have you got that for (referring to the tape recorder)?

Teacher: Because she (referring to researcher) wants to record what I am saying and what Miss Smith (EAL teacher) is saying and then she can play it back and see if there is a difference between the two of us.

Student 1: There is.

Student 2: Yeah, I think there should be a difference.

Teacher: Why?

Student 1: Miss, you're the better teacher aren't you.

Student 2: Like if I don't understand and Miss Smith explains to me and I still don't understand and I call you over and you tell me a different thing.

Teacher: So we don't see it from two different ways you mean?

Student 1: But you're the proper teacher aren't you?

Teacher: Well no. We are both proper teachers.

Student 1: She's like a help.

Teacher: That's not true (Creese, 2005b, p. 1).

This dialogue represents an unfortunate prevailing attitude among students in dual teacher classrooms. Research from nine of the eleven studies included in this report reveals that administrators, teachers and students believe that ESOL teacher work is less important than subject teaching. Creese (2006) believes that because ESOL work is “described as facilitating, accessing, scaffolding and often working with a few,” staff come to conceive the position as “support, help and generic” (p. 450). Creese (2005b) captured a response by a content teacher when speaking about ESOL specialists that sums up this viewpoint:

The support teacher doesn't have half these things to do – half their time is free – they haven't got reports to write, they haven't got to talk to parents, they haven't got this to do, they haven't got that to do.... I mean standing up in front of 20 to 30 children, delivering and teaching is a very arduous job....I think their role is totally different. They can work with a few kids who have special needs and problems and they can sort those through, which is not the same as teaching 30 children en masse hour after hour after hour. They get the same wage structure and things like that which perhaps they shouldn't...(Creese, 2005b, p. 57)

This content teacher sees whole-class teaching of the subject as more important and difficult than providing for the individual needs of a few students (Creese, 2005b, p. 58).

Content teachers' treatment of ESOL classroom materials reflects their general disregard for the ESOL teacher's pedagogy. In another conversation captured in a co-teaching classroom, Creese (2005a) noted that classroom materials carefully prepared by ESOL specialists to differentiate a lesson for ELLs were treated as "ad hoc" or "irrelevant" by content teachers (p. 196). Here, Creese (2005a) uses the abbreviation *ST* for *subject teacher*:

EAL: Have we finished the population pyramids in that class? 8 Something 8 B?

ST: inaudible [the ST is half talking to herself about the need to find some work she is looking for]

EAL: Well what is it in the end, can you remember?

ST: Well yes, I know what I am teaching [*sic*]

EAL: Yeah but what is it?

ST: Interpretation of graphs.

EAL: Ah right. Thanks. So we are still on that, right. I've found some slightly easier work that John...

[ST is doing other things]

EAL: Right. I've found some easier work on population on pyramids that John prepared. Can I go through it with my group...

ST: Yes.

EAL: because if it is interpretation then they will find it hard yeah? (Creese, 2005a, p. 195-196)

Research reflects that while general educators' discourse shows they own their subject area, ESOL specialists do not discursively project a similar ownership in the classroom (Creese, 2002, p. 611). As evidenced in the above passage, Creese (2005a) often found that it was the ESOL specialist requesting permission to differentiate, contrary to what one would find if there were an equal relationship between the two educators (p. 196). Creese (2005a) notes that this interaction is typical of two teachers who have not been able to plan jointly and that it is almost always the ESOL specialist that requests information to catch herself up to classroom activities, instead of the content teacher working with the ESOL specialist to jointly plan together (p. 196). This

dialogue occurred right as class was beginning and the lack of communication and planning is apparent. Moreover, Creese (2005b) found that the lack of respect for ESOL specialist-created materials was often transmitted to the ELLs themselves (p. 57). Creese (2005b) observed a group of ELLs working very hard on materials that had been rewritten by the ESOL specialist to make content instruction more task-based. Using *ST* for *subject teacher* and *S* for *student*, Creese (2005b) observes the content teacher praising the group, but in a backhanded way, which the group of ELLs pick up on:

ST: You have really been rushing ahead haven't you!

S: Rushing ahead sir?

ST: I mean you have been working hard (Creese, 2005b, p. 57).

This excerpt shows that even when content teachers accept the use of linguistically appropriate materials created by the ESOL specialists, they do not necessarily endorse or understand their value and marginalize ESOL classroom instruction. While the lack of status and power struggle is a major theme in ESOL co-teaching studies, research does suggest that the more teachers talk in and out of class, the more teachers develop an understanding and appreciation of the materials and skills of the other (Gardner, 2006, p. 493).

Indeed, education of co-teachers clearly seems to mitigate power struggles in dual teacher classrooms. Early's (2001) study involved extensive district-wide professional development (p. 156). The Vancouver School District of Vancouver, British Columbia was one of the first in North America to recognize the value of a systemic, integrated approach to the teaching of language and content (Early, 2001, p. 158). The school district undertook an ambitious set of initiatives during a 10-year period and worked with researchers from the University of British Columbia to create a system-wide program and services for ELLs (Early, p. 158). Early's (2001) study was certainly the most positive of all the studies on ESOL co-teaching, with some teachers

even reporting that they enjoyed the experience (p. 175). While lack of professional development was a major theme in all other reports, the massive administrative support and instruction on methodology integrating language into content instruction present in Early's (2001) study helped mitigate power struggles between co-teachers and provide lesson planning focus. Davison's (2006) research showed that professional development must offer teachers the opportunity for discussion and critical reflection to encourage an understanding and appreciation of what the other has to offer (p. 472). Like Gardner (2006), Davison (2006) showed that the more teachers talk outside of the classroom, the more they take on each other's specialist language, a key component to reaching the partnership level of successful collaborative teaching (Davison, p. 471).

Comparing ESOL Co-teaching Research to Special Education Co-teaching Research

In comparison to the meager number of ESOL co-teaching studies that exist, research on co-teaching in special education is more extensive. However, research reveals surprising gaps in the knowledge base on co-teaching special education (Weiss, 2004, p. 219). Just as the ESOL research studies reviewed in this paper reflect very little monitoring of ELL achievement in co-taught classrooms, special education co-teaching studies called for more research to substantiate that co-teaching is an effective service delivery option for students (Murawski & Swanson, 2001, p. 258).

Research on special education co-teaching reveals many of the same problems found by researchers on ESOL co-teaching. First, special education teachers are not viewed as equals by content teachers. Weiss and Lloyd (2003) found that especially in high school, special education

teachers felt that content teachers did not accept their participation in instruction (p. 35). The special educators felt unable to influence instruction and adapt the classroom because the content teacher was responsible for the preservation of state-mandated curriculum (Weiss & Lloyd, 2003, p. 35; Scruggs et al., 2007, p. 407). Just as ESOL teachers' work with ELLs was marginalized and perceived as less difficult, Austin (2001) found that content teachers believe they have a greater work load than do special education co-teachers (p. 245).

Just as research on ESOL co-teaching reveals that co-teachers are not equal educational partners, special education research shows that the day-to-day practice of co-teaching falls short of what is envisaged in literature. Despite the many approaches available in co-teaching, from parallel teaching to team teaching, from one teach, one assist to alternative teaching, research reveals that special education teachers function more often than not as assistants in the co-taught classroom (Weiss & Lloyd, 2003, p. 38). In their meta-synthesis of 32 research studies on special education co-teaching, Scruggs, Mastropieri and McDuffie (2007) found that by a considerable margin, the most prominent model of co-teaching reported was some form of one teach, one assist, with the content teacher in the lead role (p. 405). Within this approach to co-teaching, Weiss and Lloyd (2003) observed the special educator uninvolved with whole-class instruction but instead, drifting from student to student, providing assistance and maintaining behavior (p. 32). One teacher in a study by Antia (1999) described herself, "I'm an aide sometimes, I'm an interpreter sometimes, and sometimes I'm a teacher" (p. 211). Just as research shows the major role of an ESOL specialist is providing services to the classroom teacher through making curricular adaptations and cooperative planning, Antia's (1999) study reveals a similar role for special education co-teachers. Set in an elementary school, Antia's study showed that the primary responsibility for special education co-teachers was assisting the content teacher, rather

than providing services to students (p. 213). Research shows that co-teaching in practice falls far short of what is described in literature.

Other themes found in ESOL co-teaching research were found in special education co-teaching research. First, co-teachers reported the need for more planning time, noted in nearly all the 32 investigations reviewed for Scruggs, Mastropieri and McDuffie's (2007) meta-synthesis, (p. 404). Second, a very common theme also found in ESOL studies was the need for teacher training on co-teaching. Teacher education programs include little formal education on co-teaching or collaboration (Weiss & Lloyd, 2003, p. 39), and teachers often feel unprepared (Scruggs et al., 2007, p. 404). Special education co-teachers expressed a desire for training in many of the same areas as ESOL co-teachers, including collaborative consultation skills, practical skill development and group interpersonal skills (Scruggs et al., 2007, p. 404).

Some of the themes present in special education co-teaching research were not seen in research on ESOL co-teaching. First, compatibility of co-teachers was an important theme in Scruggs, Mastropieri and McDuffie's (2007) meta-synthesis, noting that many investigations likened co-teaching to marriage (p. 405). Compatibility of co-teachers was not an important theme in the ESOL co-teaching research, perhaps because internationally, government policy dictates the practice and leaves little room for "divorce". In the United States, literature on co-teaching reflects Friend and Cook's (2007) idea that the assignment must be voluntary (p. 8). However, current practice shows a different reality. All the teachers in Weiss and Lloyd's (2003) study on special education co-teaching reported that they were required to participate in co-teaching based on the principal's assignments (p. 36). Austin (2001) similarly found that a majority of the special education co-teachers surveyed had not volunteered (p. 252).

Research revealed a power struggle in special education co-teaching classrooms over the two knowledge sets that special education teachers offer in inclusive classrooms, behavioral modifications and content adaptations. However, Buckley (2005) noted that co-teaching relationships were often successful to the degree that the special education co-teacher didn't interject behavioral modifications (p. 179). He observed a content teacher discussing the special education teacher's impact on classroom instruction:

Okay, well first I would be in charge. [Laughs] And I would let her first observe me. And then I would invite her to perhaps try a couple of lessons and see how she does. And then perhaps now we're establishing a better rapport with each other and now I am beginning to trust her, to trust her to teach in the way I am expecting the children to be taught, allow her to gradually take over some lessons (Buckley, 2005, p. 179).

This quotation from Buckley's (2005) study reveals that although the content teacher may claim to consider the special education to be her equal, she also wants to be sure that she could trust the specialist to teach the students in the way she believed was best (p. 179). Maintaining control of the classroom, the content teacher essentially allows the specialist to take part when she is satisfied that the specialist will not inject anything new into the classroom. In their meta-synthesis, Scruggs, Mastropieri and McDuffie (2007) similarly found turf battles quite common in dual teacher classrooms (p. 408). Although content teachers report to value their special education co-teacher, "all of them also said that they wanted things done their way and wanted to maintain control" (Scruggs et al., 2007, p. 179).

Although special education co-teachers did not have to concentrate on integrating language and content, the issue of content was also an important theme in special education co-teaching research. Co-teachers report that the content area of the class forces them to take certain roles and that the disparity in roles was necessary because the special education teacher lacked content knowledge (Scruggs et al., 2007, p. 407). Weiss and Lloyd (2003) concluded that special

education co-teachers were not able to meet the unique needs of students because they were not allowed to adapt instruction (p. 39). Summarizing what they found to be the sad reality in co-taught classroom, Scruggs, Mastropieri and McDuffie (2007) concluded the following:

In co-teaching, however, the general education teacher— because of her ownership of the classroom, the curriculum, the content, and most of the students— is very often in the dominant role, regardless of experience, expertise, or judgment. Therefore, the overall tilt of the classroom is typically in the direction of the general education teacher, where whole-class, teacher-led instruction is the rule, and the special education teacher applied assistance only within the context of the existing classroom structure. That this role is sometimes mediated by a high level of content knowledge on the part of the special education teacher suggests that the special education teacher may be more accepted only the extent to which she resembles the general education teacher (Scruggs et al., 2007, p. 412).

Following this conclusion further, if the most accepted special education co-teachers resemble their general educators partners, then where does the special educator's specialized training enter into the classroom? One cannot help but to wonder how special education teachers are able to meet student needs if making their role equivalent to the general education teacher's is the only way in which to gain acceptance and influence in the classroom. This idea is also reflected in ESOL co-teaching literature; teacher conflict centered around the ESOL specialist's drive to inject specialized knowledge (ESOL pedagogy) into the content classroom. If co-teaching relationships are only harmonious to the degree in which specialists don't perform their job in the classroom, the concept of the dual-teacher classroom needs to be rethought.

Conclusion

Research shows that the practice of co-teaching is very different from the ideal that is recommended in theory and is currently not working as envisaged in special education or ESOL. Friend and Cook (2007) clearly state that the use of one teach, one assist should be limited (p.

128). Co-teaching theory dictates that when there is no other model appropriate for instruction and one teach, one assist must be used, both teachers should take turns leading and assisting (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 128). Yet research on both ESOL and special education co-teaching discussed in this paper reveals that one teach, one assist is the primary model that co-teachers use in classrooms. Friend and Cook (2007) emphasize co-teachers must be willing to experiment and be creative in working with the co-teaching models (p. 120); the most essential requirement for the success of the co-teaching relationship is flexibility (p. 129). Yet research suggests a preference for whole-class, teacher-led instruction and a rigidity in sharing instruction. Co-teaching theory emphasizes that each professional has an important contribution to make (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 116); yet research reveals that many times one professional, usually the ESOL specialist or special education teacher, is marginalized. Marginalization of one professional and their specialized knowledge base has grave implications. In the case of ESOL, research clearly shows that ELLs are being sent a message by classroom dynamics that stifles language learning. This is the opposite of the message we want to send to ELLs, and other service delivery options that celebrate language, multilingualism and balanced content and language integration should be reexamined.

The actual practice of co-teaching itself does not mesh with theory. Friend and Cook (2007) identify co-teaching as “a specific service delivery option that is based on collaboration” (p. 129). They clarify that co-teaching is “an activity that teachers may choose to engage in while using a collaborative style of interaction” (p. 129). Research shows us that in actual practice, co-teachers often attempt co-teaching without collaboration. Collaboration requires equal participation in the critical decision-making involved with instruction (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 10). However, research reveals that co-teachers rarely work as equal partners. Time for planning

and collaborating outside of the classroom is minimal and in practice, co-teachers do not equally share the instructional load. In theory, the collaboration required for co-teaching requires that teachers share common goals (Friend & Cook, 2007, p. 9). Research on ESOL co-teaching as well as special education co-teaching reveals that content teachers often reject the specialized knowledge of their co-teacher partner. Teachers set goals for instruction based on specialized pedagogy and if, as revealed in this synthesis of literature on co-teaching, this pedagogy is discarded by their co-teacher partner, common goals are very difficult to set. For example, in practice, the ESOL specialist's goal of integrating content and language is often not supported by the content teacher. Furthermore, research in both special education and ESOL reflects that teachers most often do not volunteer to co-teach. Friend and Cook's (2007) definition of collaboration reflects that it must be voluntary and there is "no such thing as collaboration by coercion" (p. 8). Because co-teaching requires collaboration for true success, teachers are essentially being coerced to collaborate. Co-teaching without collaboration results in a practice that hardly resembles co-teaching as it was envisaged.

Teacher education programs must address the interconnected topics of co-teaching, collaboration and content and language integration so that theory may inform practice. When my school instituted co-teaching as described in the beginning of this paper, the principal simply decided over the summer that ESOL specialists would co-teach, with no more staff development or further instruction for teachers than an email assigning specialists to content teachers. If both content teachers and ESOL specialists are not schooled in methods that insure that language learning is a priority in the content classroom and are unprepared to collaborate, then ELLs loose out. Certainly preparing content teachers and ESOL specialists to approach joint planning with the objective of establishing explicit language learning objectives is essential. At my school,

teachers reported that the principal believed that conflicts surrounding the co-teaching relationship were essentially the fault of the ESOL specialist. Since research on co-teaching reveals that the source of co-teacher conflict most often revolves around the specialist's efforts to modify instruction, perhaps he was right. Certainly his constant reminder to ESOL specialists, "You are a grade level teacher, and you teach all kids, not just ELLs," marginalized the ESOL specialist's training in ESOL pedagogy. Therefore, general education teacher and administrator education programs need to help educators understand and appreciate the knowledge sets of ESOL teachers. Though evidence-based research may one day cast the co-teaching method as a passing trend, certainly teacher collaboration is here to stay, and educators need to be prepared to work successfully together.

Finally, the research synthesized here suggests that educators should be highly concerned about any further spread of the co-teaching method when it is coupled with complete elimination of other service delivery options like sheltered instruction, bilingual education and pullout programs. Further research should focus on the best programs for ELLs, and certainly quantitative studies that examine test scores of students in individual programs would be very useful. The ESOL profession needs to be very active in completing such research for the sake of ELLs.

References

- Antia, Shirin D. (1999). The roles of special educators and classroom teachers in an inclusive school. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 4, 203-214.
- Arkoudis, Sophie. (2003) Teaching English as a second language in science classes: Incommensurate epistemologies? *Language & Education: An International Journal*, 17(3), 161-173.
- Arkoudis, Sophie. (2005). Fusing pedagogic horizons: Language and content teaching in the mainstream. *Linguistics and Education*, 16(2), 173-187.
- Arkoudis, Sophie. (2006). Negotiating the rough ground between ESL and mainstream teachers. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(4), 415-433.
- Austin, Vance. (2001). Teachers' beliefs about co-teaching. *Remedial and Special Education*, 22 (4), 245-255.
- Bourne, Jill & McPake, Joanna. (1991). *Partnership teaching: Co-operative teaching strategies for English language support in multilingual classrooms*. London: HMSO.
- Brooks, Sarah & Hill, Paul (2004) Taking advantage of teaching turnover. In Paul Thomas Hill & James Harvey, (Eds.), *Making school reform work: New partnerships for real change* (pp. 8-16). Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institutions Press.
- Buckley, Cynthia. (2005). Establishing and maintaining collaborative relationships between regular and special education teachers in middle school social studies inclusive classrooms. In Thomas Scruggs & Margo Mastropieri (Eds.), *Cognition and learning in diverse settings: Vol. 18. Advances in learning and behavioral disabilities* (pp. 153-198). Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- Coelho, Elizabeth. (2004). *Adding English: A guide to teaching in multilingual classrooms*. Don Mills, Ontario, Canada: Pippin Publishing.
- Collier, Virginia. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. *TESOL Quarterly* 23(3), 509-531. Retrieved from JSTOR Database on September 24, 2008.

- Cook Linda & Friend, Marilyn (1995). Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices. *Focus on Exceptional Children* 28(3). Retrieved from Ebsco Host Database on September 24, 2008.
- Crawford, James. (2007). The decline of bilingual education: How to reverse a troubling trend? [Electronic version]. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 1(1), 1-6.
- Creese, Angela. (2002). The discursive construction of power in teacher partnerships: Language and subject specialists in mainstream schools. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 597-616.
- Creese, Angela. (2005a). Is this content-based language teaching? *Linguistics and Education* 16, 188-204.
- Creese, Angela. (2005b). *Teacher collaboration and talk in multilingual classrooms*. Clevedon, UK: Cromwell Press.
- Creese, Angela. (2006). Supporting talk? Partnership teachers in classroom interaction. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 9(4), 434-453.
- Cummins, Jim. (1980). Psychological assessment of immigrant children: Logic or intuition? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1(2), 97-111.
- Cummins, Jim. (1981). Age on arrival and immigrant second language learning in Canada: A reassessment. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 132-149.
- Cummins, Jim. (1996). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Ontario, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Davison, Chris. (2006). Collaboration between ESL and content teachers: How do we know when we are doing it right? *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(4), 454-475.
- Early, Margaret. (2001). Language and content in social practice: A case study. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58(1), 156-179.
- Echevarria, Jane, Vogt, MaryEllen & Short, Deborah. (2000). *Making content comprehensible for English language learners: The SIOP Model*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Elliot, Anne. (2001) Introduction. In Vera Woloshyn, (Ed.), *Collaboration uncovered: The forgotten, the assumed, & the unexamined* (pp.1-15). Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Friend, Marilyn & Cook, Linda. (2007). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

- Gardner, Sheena. (2006). Centre-stage in the instructional register: Partnership talk in the primary EAL. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(4), 476-494.
- Gersten, Russell & Baker, Scott. (2000). What we know about effective instructional practices for English-language learners. *Exceptional Children* 66(4), 454-470. Retrieved November 16, 2008 from Wilson Web Database.
- Harklau, Linda. (2005). Ethnography and ethnographic research on second language teaching and learning. In Eli Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 179-194). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hart, Ann Weaver. (1998). Marshaling forces: Collaboration across educator roles. In Diana Pounder, (Ed.), *Restructuring schools for collaboration: Promises and pitfalls* (pp. 89-120). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hawkins, Margaret. (2005). ESL in elementary education. In Eli Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 25-44). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hill, Paul Thomas. (2004) The need for new institutions. In Paul Thomas Hill & James Harvey. (Eds.), *Making school reform work: New partnerships for real change* (pp. 8-16). Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Holt, Nancy. (2004). Pull-out to collaboration: Becoming an effective ESL co-teacher. (Master's thesis, Hamline University, 2004). Retrieved November 17, 2008, from http://watson.hamline.edu/gse/academics/resources_advising/pdf/capstone_nmartinsenholt.pdf.
- Honigsfield, Andrea & Dove, Maria. (2008). Co-teaching in the ESL classroom. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 74(2). Retrieved September 15, 2007 from Wilson Web Database.
- Hourcade, Jack & Bauwens, Jeanne. (2001) Cooperative teaching: The renewal of teachers. *The Clearing House*, 74(4), 242-247.
- Johnson, Bob L. (1998) Organizing for collaboration: A reconsideration of some basic organizing principles. In Diana Pounder (Ed.), *Restructuring schools for collaboration: Promises and pitfalls* (pp. 9-26). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Kahl, Stuart. (2003). Implementing NCLB assessment and accountability requirements in an imperfect world. Retrieved October 13, 2008, from <http://www.measuredprogress.org/resources/education/nclb.html>
- Lazaraton, Anne. (1995). Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A progress report. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(3), 455-472. Retrieved September 17, 2008 from JSTOR Database.

- Little, Judith. (1990) Teachers as colleagues. In Ann Lieberman (Ed.), *Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now*. (pp. 165-193). London: Falmer. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED333064)
- Love, Kristina & Arkoudis, Sophie. (2006). Teachers' stances towards Chinese international students: An Australian case study. *Linguistics and Education*, (17)3, 258-282.
- Lyster, Roy. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Martin-Jones, Marilyn & Saxena, Mukul. (1996). Turn-taking, power asymmetries and the positioning of bilingual participants in classroom discourse. *Linguistics and Education*, 8, 105-123. Retrieved September 17, 2008 from Science Direct Database.
- Murawski, Wendy, & Swanson, H.L. (2001). A meta-analysis of co-teaching research: Where are the data? *Remedial and Special Education*, 22(5), 258-267.
- Norris, John M., & Oretaga, Lourdes. (2006) The value and practice of research synthesis for language learning and teaching. In John Norris (Ed.), *Synthesizing Research on Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 3-52). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Nunan, David. (2005). Classroom research. In Eli Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 225-240). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Risko, Vickie & Bromley, Karen. (2000). New visions of collaboration. In Risko Vickie & Bromley, Karen. (Eds.), *Collaboration for diverse learners: View points and practices* (pp. 9-19). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Rossell, Christine H. (1998). *Mystery on the bilingual express: A critique of the Thomas and Collier study* (Report No. FL-025-947). Washington, D.C.: READ Institute. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 433700)
- Rossell, Christine H. (2005). The flawed requirements for limited English proficient children of the No Child Left Behind Act. *Journal of Education*, 186(3), 29-40.
- Schlessman, Amy. (2004, August). *TESOL 2004 Critical Issues Survey*. Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages: Alexandria, VA.
- Scruggs, Thomas, Mastropieri, Margo. & McDuffie, Kimberly. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A metasynthesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional Children*, 73(4), 392-416.
- Short, Deborah. (2002). Language learning in sheltered social studies classes. *TESOL Journal*, 11, 18-24.

- Tellez, Kip & Waxman, Hersh. (2006). A meta-synthesis of qualitative research on effective teaching practices for English language learners. In John Michael Norris, (Ed.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching*. (pp. 245-277). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Thomas, Margaret. (2006). Research synthesis and historiography. In John Michael Norris, (Ed.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching*. (pp. 279-298). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Thomas, Wayne P. & Collier, Virginia. (1997). School effectiveness for language minority students (NCBE Resource Collection Series, No. 9) Washington, DC: Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs. Retrieved October 13, 2008 from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/resource/effectiveness/thomas-collier97.pdf>
- Thomas, Wayne P. & Collier, Virginia. (2002). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Retrieved September 27, 2008 from http://crede.berkeley.edu/research/llaa/1.1_es.html
- U.S. Department of Education. (2004). *Archived: Fact sheet: NCLB provisions ensure flexibility and accountability for limited English proficient students*. Retrieved October 13, 2008 from <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/accountability/schools/factsheet-english.htm>
- Viadero, Debra. (2002, September 4). Ed. dept. picks groups to develop database of effective practices. *Education Week* (22)1. Retrieved on September 21, 2008 from Academic Search Complete.
- Weiss, Margaret P. (2004). Co-teaching as science in the schoolhouse: More questions than answers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 37(3), 218-223. Retrieved on September 24, 2008 from Wilson Web Database.
- Weiss, Margaret P. & Lloyd, John Willis. (2003). Conditions for co-teaching: Lessons from a case study. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 26(1), 27-41.
- Wright, Wayne E. (2006). A catch-22 for language learners. *Educational Leadership*, 64(3), 22-27. Retrieved from Wilson Web Database on October 5, 2007.
- Zehler, Annette, Fleishman, Howard, Hopstock, Paul, Stephenson, Todd, Pendzik, Michelle, & Sapru, Saloni. (2003). *Descriptive study of services to LEP students and to LEP students with disabilities; Policy report: Summary of findings related to LEP and SpEd-LEP students*. Arlington, VA: Development Associates. Retrieved on October 13, 2008 from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/resabout/research/descriptivestudyfiles/policy_report.pdf
- Zehr, Mary Ann. (2006). Team-teaching helps close language gap. *Education Week*, 26(14), 26-29. Retrieved on November 17, 2008 from <http://www.edweek.org>

Appendix

Benefits, Needs and Themes of ESOL Co-teaching Research

<i>Author/Year</i>	<i>Title of Study</i>	<i>Expressed benefits of co-teaching</i>	<i>Expressed needs for success in co-teaching</i>	<i>Themes in teacher roles</i>
Arkoudis, 2003	Teaching English as a Second Language in Science Classes: Incommensurate Epistemologies?	-ESOL specialist influences content teacher's viewpoint to some degree	-ESOL specialists need to be schooled on negotiation techniques -Policy should not assume that all ESOL specialists are able to influence content instruction -ESOL specialists and content teachers need to engage in ongoing discussions about the needs of ELL they teach	Power struggle; dilemma and difficulty in bringing together two teachers of such different epistemological backgrounds
Arkoudis, 2005	Fusing pedagogic horizons: Language and content teaching in the mainstream	-Science teacher's lesson plans are influenced by ESOL pedagogy to some degree	-Further research into the role of the curriculum task and how it influences the extent to which language and content can be balanced -Greater focus on developing on good teaching practices for integrating language and content	Difficulty in balancing language and content; Pedagogic tension between co-teachers
Arkoudis, 2006	Negotiating the Rough Ground between ESL and Mainstream teachers	-Science teacher adopts some of ESOL teacher's epistemological views	-More teacher education on how to engage in cross-disciplinary planning, how to develop collaborative practices and how ESOL teachers can gain epistemological authority when working with content teachers	Power struggle; difficulty of ESOL teacher to articulate linguistics objectives, lack of respect for ESOL as a content area
Creese, 2002	Discursive construction of power in teacher partnerships	-none explicitly mentioned (however, has great potential for providing a variety of language learning opportunities)	-ESOL teachers need to equally "own" curriculum based learning -lack of respect for ESOL pedagogy and knowledge on language in learning -greater respect and understanding by content teacher for focus on language functions -Institutional support needed for full partnerships rather than language learning as support -Reexamination of speech	Power struggle; need for teacher education; Lack of ownership for ELL by content teacher; lack of respect for language teaching; problems sharing classroom instruction

			used by content and ESOL teachers (currently shows power relationship)	
Creese, 2005a	Is this content-based language teaching?	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -both ESOL and content teachers need to further understanding of focus on form and language focus in content classroom -both ESOL and content teachers need joint planning sessions -ESOL teachers need to equally “own” curriculum based learning and content teachers need to permit them to do so -ESOL and content teachers need to create clearly defined syllabus that investigates how language and content can interact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -co-teaching in inclusive classroom fails to achieve content-based language teaching standards - students reject ESOL pedagogy as less important -lack of joint planning -lack of content teacher supporting ESOL specialist’s presence in classroom and respect for specialist’s role
Creese, 2005b	Teacher Collaboration and Talk in Multilingual Classrooms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ESOL teacher’s target ELL groups and general presence adds to class coherence and inclusion of ELLs -potential for learning opportunities for ELLs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -policymakers need to consider linguistic diversity in inclusion -teachers need training on the role of language in the classroom -all teachers need a knowledge of how language functions in teaching and learning for ELLs and the skills to apply this knowledge through their pedagogies -content teachers need training in how to make their subject curriculum available for English language learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marginalization of ESOL specialists; language learning as problem in the mainstream classroom; bilingual ESOL specialists valued; equal partnerships between co-teachers highly rare; inclusion is failing
Creese, 2006	Supporting Talk? Partnership Teachings in Classroom Interaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ESOL teacher’s target ELL groups and general presence adds to class coherence and inclusion of ELLs -ESOL teacher provides opportunities for ELLs to negotiate meaning in their classroom interactions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Professional development for content teachers in order to achieve equal respect for content and ESOL pedagogy in the classroom -Professional development for content teachers to encourage opportunities for negotiated meaning in interactions with ELL -ESOL teacher’s lack of ownership of classroom tasks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different professional pressures of teachers; contradictions for content teachers as they strive to accomplish syllabus AND be sensitive to language needs of ELLs; ESOL seen as less important than content teaching
Davison, 2006	Collaboration Between ESL and Content Teachers: How Do We Know When We Are Doing It Right?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Although rare, some degree of adopting ESOL pedagogy by content teachers -In some degree, teachers may move 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More research into effectiveness - incorporation of explicit goals for ESL development into curriculum -clear conceptualization of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff development for co-teachers, relationship between co-teachers is neither easy nor unproblematic

		through the stages of partnership described in this paper towards a healthier co-teaching relationship	the task -systematic planned language development for ELLs, not just inclusion of students into mainstream classroom	
Early, 2001	Language and Content in Social Practice: A Case Study	-Collaborative practices viewed as beneficial by teachers in study -Co-teaching is effective when teachers have flexibility to practice method in way that best suits them	-Extensive professional development, administrative support and education on methodology of integrating language into content instruction is essential for ELL co-teachers -Schools needs to implement substantial, systemic changes in pedagogy, school organization to be successful	Extensive staff development critical for successful ESOL/content teacher relationship
Gardner, 2006	Centre-stage in the Instructional Register: Partnership Talk in Primary EAL	-In some degree, some teachers move through the continuum towards healthier co-teaching relationship through practice	-Co-teachers need to talk to each other in and out of class to take on classroom linguistic behavior of the other -increase staff development to educate teachers in co-teaching roles and appropriate classroom partnership talk	-equal partnerships are rare
Love & Arkoudis, 2006	Teachers' stances towards Chinese international students: An Australian Case Study	None	-Professional development & teacher education which helps teachers to understand that language and content are inextricably linked -Policy should not assume that all ESOL specialists are able to influence content instruction	Refusal of content teachers to adopt ESOL pedagogy and integration of language into content; incommensurate epistemologies of two groups of teachers; high-stakes testing and pressure on content teachers; inability of ESOL specialists to effect content instruction