

---

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

## Implementing Rotating Teachers Process and Co-teaching in English Class: An approach to Sustaining Saudi Students Proficiency

**Dr. Elsadig Ali Elsadig Elnadeef**

*Assistant Professor, English Department, College of sciences & Arts- Dhahran Aljanoub, King Khalid University, Saudi Arabia*

**Corresponding Author:** Dr. Elsadig Ali Elsadig Elnadeef, **E-mail:** [eelnadeef@kku.edu.sa](mailto:eelnadeef@kku.edu.sa)

---

**ABSTRACT**

This study investigated the implementation of rotating teachers and co-teaching model at universities. It aims at accentuating the benefits of implementing rotating teachers and co-teaching model in promoting the quality of education. To achieve the aim of the study, the researcher employed the analytic descriptive method. The subject of the study consisted of 944 male students studying at King Khalid University and 182 male instructors teaching eight courses at KKU. Two questionnaires were used for data collection. By using the statistical program SPSS, the study revealed that the implementation of rotating teachers and co-teaching model have various advantages, such as inculcating positive collaborative experience and disadvantages, such as controversy teaching strategies among instructors. It also revealed that Instructors consistently identify collaboration and mentoring as a potential advantage. The study concluded that using rotating teachers and co-teaching in single courses require improving instructors' pedagogical skills and knowledge, and success in using rotating teachers, co-teaching in single courses depend on using a well-organized and collaborative approach in all aspects of the course, and rotating teachers and co-teaching is recommended to be implemented in English class due to their positive productivity.

**KEYWORDS**

Rotating teachers, co-teaching, parallel teaching method, station teaching model, teaming model, alternative teaching model

**ARTICLE DOI:** [10.32996/ijllt.2022.5.2.22](https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2022.5.2.22)

---

### 1. Introduction

Education in the 21<sup>st</sup>-century era involves various requirements entailing rationality, humanistic core, employability and 4C's – collaboration, communication, critical thinking and creativity. However, the teaching process, which requires sharing and modulation of knowledge, and learning, which entails the processing of information and function of knowledge, create a sense of boredom and frustration in classes. Recent generation students are affected by technology and the speed pace of life. As a result, they feel worried and emotionally sensitive in terms of mood. Hence, pedagogical methods and approaches require adaptability and accommodation to cope with the students' attitudes and emotions to attract them to proper education. Educators exert great efforts to promote education quality. Thus, updated teaching approaches, methods, techniques and strategies are fostered to facilitate and accelerate learning and maximize motivation. Rotating teachers and co-teaching are an educational model that assists promote educational quality. This study investigates the effectiveness of implementing the rotating teacher's process and co-teaching in English class as an approach to sustaining students proficiency.

#### 1.1 Rotating Teachers

Rotating teachers have the perfect balance among students' attitudes, feelings and motivation. Moreover, it entails changing the teachers who teach a course periodically, so students get new teachers successively and reunite with the former teachers (Lester, N., & K. R. Evans(2009). Rotating teachers have various advantages such as: students avoid getting bored with the same teacher; even though all the students follow the same syllabus, the new teacher brings a new style, a different accent and a different sense of humor; teacher variety helps students become more adaptable because students taught a course by one teacher grow dependent on that teacher's accent, teaching style, vocabulary; the student/teacher relationship can be harmonious but also sometimes fractious, so a new teacher can come in and resolve these issues by giving every student a fresh start; teachers enjoy

**Copyright:** © 2022 the Author(s). This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Published by Al-Kindi Centre for Research and Development, London, United Kingdom.

seeing students they have not taught for a while and remarking on the progress they have made; students also look forward to re-seeing a former teacher( Neumann, Browning, J. Clarke, D. Harrison, K. Ing, C. Kutas, J. Pitre, R. Serbanescu, M. Wall, & R. Wilson 2006).

Elton (2001) states that if the teachers are all well trained, experienced and follow the educational institution's philosophy, the change should be seamless. In fact, <sup>1</sup>the students and parents look forward to the rotation as much as we do. In the rotating teacher's process, students move through a variety of different learning modalities, which free students from having to move through every modality at every stage in their coursework. Furthermore, instead, it lets them work in modalities that better meet their needs at any given point (Carpenter, L. Crawford, & R. Walden, (2007). ). Rotating teachers involves a group of instructors working purposefully, regularly, and cooperatively to help a group of students of any age learn. Teachers together set goals for a course, design a syllabus, prepare individual lesson plans, teach students, and evaluate the results. They share insights, argue with one another, and perhaps even challenge students to decide which approach is better. Rotating teachers can be single-discipline or interdisciplinary that meet with a common set of students over an extended period of time.

Rotating teachers refer to two or more teachers teaching a single course. The most common mode of rotating teachers is for two or more instructors to teach one course relying on skills or modules division. (Carpenter, Crawford, and Walden 2007). Rotating teachers entails many problems involving issues of communication, organization, and figuring out teachers' expectations. (Dugan and Letterman 2008). Teaching periods can be scheduled consecutively, and teachers work together to set objectives, develop tests or examinations and division of content. Teachers can enrich teachers' education and culture because they come from various backgrounds, and they vary in their competencies and teaching strategies.

### **1.1.1 Advantages and Disadvantages of Rotating Teachers**

Lester and Evans (2009) list various advantages and disadvantages of using rotating teachers:

#### **1.1.2 The Advantages**

-Rotating teachers improve the quality of teaching, and poor teaching can be observed and critiqued by students and administration. Thus, evaluation of teachers can be more insightful and balanced than self-evaluation of a teacher.

-Rotating teachers spreads responsibility, encourages creativity, deepens friendships and builds community among teachers. Teachers complement one another, and they share insights. Rotating teachers reduces student-teacher personality problems

#### **1.1.3 The Disadvantages**

-Rotating teachers is not always positive because some teachers have rigid personality types and are wedded to a single method. Thus, some students dislike such kinds of teachers.

-Rotating teachers require mutual arrangement and agreeable times for planning and evaluation.

-Students may confuse due to the conflicting opinions and different methods of teaching.

### **1.2 Co-teaching**

Co-teaching is an adaptable instructional model that involves an instructional arrangement to deliver core instruction to a diverse group of students in a single partnership. It entails joint instructional decisions, sharing responsibility, establishing of a school-based culture of collaboration, combining ownership of the instructional environment and accountability for the learning of all students. (Thai 2007 and Kaspar, 2000). Students benefit from co-teaching as well constructed and supported teaching model from various aspects such as enrichment support, exposure to positive academia, social role model, opportunities for interactions among teachers and a supportive system for education that addresses students' needs. It makes teachers share responsibilities and experience; in addition, it increases collaboration in the lesson plan and lesson development. It involves the distribution of responsibility among people for planning, instruction, and evaluation for a classroom of students. <sup>1</sup>Co-teaching is a fun way for students to learn from two or more people who may have different ways of thinking or teaching. Partners must establish trust, develop and work on communication, share the chores, celebrate, work together creatively to overcome the inevitable challenges and problems, and anticipate conflict and handle it in a constructive way (Sandholtz, Judith H.2000)<sup>1</sup>. Team teaching itself is

---

<sup>1</sup> *Times have changed, and it is important to make shifts in the role of the teacher in order to prepare today's students for a different workforce. To succeed, students will need a different set of skills such as creativity, communication, critical thinking, and collaboration. They will also need to be able to adapt to change, be resilient, and to work effectively in a variety of environments – which is why we need to change the traditional role of teacher-as-expert standing and delivering content from the front of the room to a facilitator who designs customized approaches for students.*

definable as allocation of teaching responsibilities; planning as a team, but with individual instruction; cooperative planning, instruction and evaluation of learning experiences.<sup>2</sup>

### **1.2.1 Models of Co-teaching**

Cook, Lynne; Friend, Marilyn (1996) list various models of co-teaching:

#### **1.2.1.1 Parallel Teaching Model**

Teachers are both teaching the same information, but they divide the class into equal groups and teach simultaneously. This allows for more support, more supervision and greater participation from students. The implementation of the parallel teaching method requires dividing the students into equal size groups, and each teacher teaches the same content in the same amount of time. The instructional method may differ, but the group does not rotate. The teacher must have adequate knowledge of content, pedagogical skills and noise level tolerance.

*In the last decade, English language classrooms responding to the impact of English as a global language (Nunan, 2003) require team teaching, that is, foreign and local English teachers working together. Team teaching, as a form of teacher collaboration, is in education at all levels. Co-teaching (Cook & Friend, 1996; Walther-Thomas et al., 1996; Roth & Tobin, 2001), cooperative teaching (Bauwen & Hourcade, 1995) and team teaching (Welch & Sheridan, 1995; Sandholtz, 2000) are synonyms.*

#### **1.2.1.2 Station Teaching Model**

The teacher divides the content and students, and each teacher teaches a portion of the content to one group. The teacher subsequently repeats the instruction for the other group. The implementation of <sup>1</sup>station teaching model requires dividing the students into equal size group, and each teacher teaches a portion of the content in the same amount of time. The teacher prepares two or more stations in advance, and the group rotates from one station to another.

#### **1.2.1.3 Teaming Model**

Both teachers are delivering the same content at the same time in the same instructional process. Metaphorically it is called one brain into two bodies and tag team state.

The implementation of teaming model requires both teachers are fully engaged in delivering of core instructional, and both teachers are responsible for classroom management.

#### **1.2.1.4 Alternative Teaching Model**

One teacher takes responsibility for the large groups while the other works with the small group. The small group is not a permanent subset of the class and can be pulled aside for teaching enrichment to foster a special activity to present the reminder of the class. The implementation of an alternative teaching model needs to determine instructional intervention needs of the class. The teacher who works much with the small group follows the same lesson plan being implemented by same group instruction.

#### **1.2.1.5 One Teach, One Observe**

One teacher manages instructions of the entire class, with another teacher systematically gathering data that the teachers have determined to be important. The implementation of the one teach one observe model requires reviewing the instruction, mastering of concepts and recording students behavior for decision making by the teacher.

#### **1.2.1.6 One Teach, One Observe**

##### **One Teach, One Assess**

One person takes primary responsibilities for teaching the content of a lesson while the other provides unobtrusive assistance and scaffolding to the students according to their needs. The implementation of this model involves collecting data and observing students to ensure their understanding and the amount of assistance students need.

---

<sup>2</sup> Bailey et al. (2001) identify five forms based on degrees of collaboration; direct content, team content, subsidiary content, supplementary content, and adjunct models (p. 182-183). Team content, subsidiary content, and supplementary content models typically involve the co-working of what might be termed 'language and content' teachers in the same classroom. Team teaching's 'natural format' increases students' motivation to learn a language through variations in language input (Crandall, 1998 and Grabe & Stoller, 1997)

### **1.2.2 The Elements of Co-Teaching<sup>3</sup>**

The Elements of Co-Teaching are broken into the following sections( Benoit & Haugh, 2001):

- <sup>1</sup>Collaborative Planning
- Co-Instructing Students
- Co-Assessment and Reflection
- Common, Publicly Agreed-on Goal

Many co-teachers begin with an agreement to achieve one instructional event, such as a school play, as a team. Their successes then lead them to agree to co-teach instructional thematic units for a six-week period of time, perhaps culminating in a school-wide celebration.

#### **-Shared Belief System<sup>4</sup>**

Co-teachers agree that not only do they teach more effectively, but their students also learn more effectively. The presence of two or more people with different knowledge, skills, and resources allows the co-teachers to learn from each other.

#### **-Parity**

Parity occurs when co-teachers perceive that their unique contributions and their presence on the team are valued. Treating each member of the co-teaching team with respect is a key to achieving parity. Co-teaching members develop the ability to exchange their ideas and concerns freely, regardless of differences in knowledge, skills, attitudes, or position. Soliciting opinions and being sensitive to the suggestions offered by each co-teacher is especially important when there is a perception of unequal status because of position, training, or experience. (Sandholtz, 2000).

### **1.3 An Intensive English Course in King Khalid University Context**

Because of the importance of the English language, an intensive English course, which main concern is teaching English, is taught at <sup>1</sup> KKU. Students are subjected to intensive language training for an average of twelve hours a week.

The program aims to develop the students' competence in English and provide them with the language skills they need in their academic and professional lives. The program objectives are that students` advance in English language skills and linguistic competence; effectively communicate in English (written and spoken); acquire basic academic skills and ways of learning for academic success; prepare for international standard linguistic competence examinations (IELTS/TOFEL and PET) in order to (at least) meet the minimum requirements. The necessity for teacher professionalization is justified by the fact that learning by students is not so much dependent on teachers' individual creativity but on rational guiding principles evolved and tested by the community of professionals and whose implementation can be systematically evaluated. Conceived from this angle, real teaching should result in learning unless strong adverse circumstances prevail. Consequently, implementing rotating teachers and co-teaching can provide Saudi students with various modes of experience and positive behavior patterns. In addition, it can provide them with a sense of critical thinking, particularly in the evaluation of teachers' teaching styles and personality frameworks. In regards to the ideological core of the English Language Center in following up with teachers, rotating teachers and co-teaching can be a fruitful source of students' reflection and impression of teachers. Co-teaching and rotating teachers are regarded as a mutual exchange of experience among teachers and a source of professionalism development. According to the brain-based theory, learning is highly influenced by emotions and school, and life experiences that affect physiological function are said to impact the capacity to learn. Accordingly, co-teaching can affect Saudi students and teachers positively, and it creates a new

---

<sup>3</sup> *Team teaching improves the quality of teaching and learning in schools (Knezevic & Scholl, 1996; Smylie, 1995; Talbert & McLaughlin, 1993). Teaming, compared to teachers' open discussion in regular meetings, is a collaborative practice requiring closer involvement with teammates' work; such as peer coaching and interdisciplinary teaming. Teachers help each other and improve teaching practice by observing each other in the classroom, designing curricula, and/or teaching together. This makes intellectual, social, and emotional demands supportive of their motivation (Little, 2003)*

<sup>4</sup> *Saudi Arabia has a short history (2007-) in team teaching. Since 2007, the Ministry of Higher Education's preparatory year programs focused on the English language. A minimum of eighty percent of teachers must be native speakers and all work in pairs. According to Bondy and Ross (1998) and George and Davis-Wiley (2000), team teaching's essential elements are clearly defined and respectful relationships; agreement on methods of instruction, discipline, supervision of classroom aides and curriculum; planning, teaching, and assessing students together (Abdallah, 2009). King Khalid University aims at promoting the teaching process and learning process. Overall, KKU focuses on educational quality output. Therefore, KKU continuous tracing the updated and recent approaches and theories to promote the teaching process. English Language Center at KKU aims at following updated teaching techniques, strategies, methods and approaches under the supervision of Cambridge Pres. As a result, rotating teachers is implemented automatically in an intensive English course.*

language setting that amazes the students. Transitioning to rotating teachers and co-teaching can be challenging, but ultimately co-teaching partners give students so much more than either teacher could do on his/her own.

## 2. Methods of the Study

In this study, the researcher asked both students and instructors to identify specific advantages and disadvantages of the rotating teachers and co-teaching model used in their particular course.

Students in nine courses (table 1) responded at the end of their term to three questions, worded so that students would focus on the advantages and disadvantages of rotating teachers and the co-teaching model.

The three questions posed to students were:

Q1: This course has more than one instructor. What do you think are the advantages of having multiple instructors in this course?

Q2: This course has more than one instructor. What do you think are the disadvantages of having multiple instructors in this course?

Q3: All things considered, how do you think having multiple instructors affected this course and teaching simultaneously a class?

Some students completed the survey on paper during class, while most completed the survey online outside of class time. In most courses, students earned a small amount of extra credit for completing this and other surveys. A total of 944 students from eight of these courses responded to open-ended questions Q1 and Q2, and 873 students responded to Q3.

**Table 1: Courses Involved, Teaching Models, and Numbers of Student Respondents**

Course Topic and Level	Students		Q 1 & Q2
Q3			
2nd year Business Administration	40	36	28
3rd year Computer Science		188	131
129			
2nd year Arabic Language	26	17	17
Business Administration	515	344	340
Business Administration	182	107	105
2nd year Islamic Study	103	54	54
2nd year Computer Science	470	203	200
3rd year Majors English	41	32	0
Totals			944
873			

Note. <sup>a</sup>Teaching model (number of instructors): Rotating Teachers and Co-teaching : all instructors present for all classes and sharing the lead role.

All written responses to Q1 and Q2 from students were analyzed to identify common themes and to identify specific comments. Once a consistent set of dominant response types was identified for all courses, data were recoded using codes given in table 2 to ensure consistency across the entire data set. The coding was done primarily by the two authors, and consistency was tested by having both researchers independently code all responses from the third-year Oceanography course. The two sets of codes were consistent to within 3% for responses to Q1 and 7% for responses to Q2. Comments from many students were interpreted using more than one code. For example, the following response to Q1 was coded as both A1 (Variety – teaching style and assessment) and A4 (Expertise): “More variety in teaching styles to suit the student, and instructors are experts in the specific field they teach.” Instructors were asked the same two open-ended questions as students, but they were told to comment separately on advantages and disadvantages to students, to instructors, and to the department. Seventeen instructors responded, including 11 who taught in one or more of the nine courses and six who taught in other courses. Eight instructors who taught portions of courses in this study did not provide feedback.

**Questions to instructors are:**

Q1: Your course, “Course Name” has more than one instructor. What do you think are the *advantages* of having multiple instructors in this course? Please comment on advantages (a) for students, (b) for you and (c) for your department.

Q2: What do you think are the *disadvantages* of having multiple instructors in this course? Please comment on disadvantages (a) for students, (b) for you and (c) for your department.

182 coded comments from all instructor feedback were recovered. The same codes identified from student data were used, with some additional codes to accommodate unique perspectives about impacts on instructors and the department.

**2.1 Results**

Student answers to question Q3, summarized in table 3, reveal that multiple instructors may be perceived as advantageous by as many as 100% of students or as few as 14% in any particular course. Table 3 is sorted to establish whether there is any pattern to this wide range of responses. Boundaries between high, moderate, and low rankings of “advantage” in table 3 were tested for significance using two-tailed Chi-squared tests by comparing distributions of student responses among values in the “Advantage,” “Neutral,” and “Disadvantage” columns. Across the high/moderate boundary, the distribution was significantly different between Business Administration and third-Computer Sciences (p 0.0003). At the moderate/low boundary, the distribution was significantly different in Arabic compared to second-year Computer Science (p = 0.0001). Within the moderate category, differences were not significant between Arabic Language and Computer Science, nor between Islamic Studies and English Language (p 0.09 and p 0.53, respectively). Evidently, multiple instructors are seen as more advantageous by students in courses taught using rotating teachers and co-teaching models and less advantageous in courses taught using a sequential model.

Open-ended responses to questions Q1 and Q2 tell us what students and instructors think are the actual advantages and disadvantages to students of being taught by multiple instructors. Generally, both students and instructors agree that multiple instructors in the form of teachers rotating and co-teaching can be beneficial, and they identify a consistent set of specific benefits and drawbacks. Also, teaching and assessment issues are generally identified more often as disadvantages than as advantages, while personality-related matters are more often identified as advantages than as disadvantages.

Specific differences between perceptions of students and instructors are shown using figure 1. Instructors were significantly more likely than students to identify expertise (p 0.0003) or personal perspective and passion (p 0.03) as advantages of multiple instructor models. Regarding disadvantages, figure 2 shows that although students and instructors are generally in agreement, instructors are significantly more likely than students to identify confusion and communication (p 3.1E-5). This suggests that instructors are more keenly aware of this problem than students. Next the researcher compares responses from students in the five sequential model courses to those in the three-team or hybrid courses. Figures 3 and 4 indicate that students learning in team-taught settings consider perspective and expertise as advantages more often than students taught by one instructor at a time. This preference pattern is similar to data from instructors shown in figure 1, so students in team-taught courses appear to be more in agreement with instructors.

**TABLE 2: Emergent Codes for Questions Q1 and Q2.**

Advantages of Multiple Instructors (Q1)	Disadvantages of Multiple Instructors (Q2)
A1. Variety - teaching style and assessment	D1. Adjustment - teaching style (pedagogy)
A2. Variety - personality (perspectives, passion)	D2. Adjustment - assessment (expectations)
A3. Variety - non specific	D3. Adjustment - personal/accessibility
A4. Expertise	D4. Adjustment - non-specific
A5. Conditional (works if.. .)	D5. Confusion - Caused some confusion
A6. None – no advantages between instructors	D6. Communication - Lack of effective communication
A7. Makes no difference	D7. Conditional (Works if.. .)

A8. Other	D8. Makes no difference
A9. No comment	D9. None - no disadvantages
	D10. Other
	D11 No comment

**TABLE 3: Student Responses to Question Q3, Sorted on the "Advantage" Column**

Ranking of Advantage	Course	Model <sup>a</sup>	Advantage <sup>b</sup>	Neutral <sup>c</sup>	Disadv <sup>d</sup>
High	2nd year Business Administration	HY (2)	100%	0%	0%
	2nd year. Computer Science	TT (2)	81%	19%	0%
Moderate	2 <sup>nd</sup> English Language	SM (6)	76%	16%	8%
	3rd year Arabic Language	HY (3)	58%	22%	19%
	Islamic Studies	SM (2)	44%	31%	25%
Low	2nd year. Majors Math	SM (2)	35%	39%	26%
	2nd year Engineering	SM (2)	14%	33%	54%

*Note.* <sup>a</sup>Teaching models are described in Table 1. <sup>b</sup>Advantage column: percentage of students selecting either large advantage or small advantage. <sup>c</sup>Neutral column: percentage selecting neutral. <sup>d</sup>Disadv (disadvantage) column: percentage selecting small disadvantage or large disadvantage.

The results presented above summarize collective trends, but particular comments from individual students also provided useful insight. For example, individual comments from Business Administration include "The teacher cannot build on examples that students have generated when the other instructor was teaching." Such remarks highlight the need for instructors to know what their colleagues are doing. Problems resolving topics or class discussions are also identified by students with comments such as, "I was not sure who was right", or "how were we to take everyone's perspective into account?" The importance of resolving team-taught segment is also noted by Wenger and Hornyak (1999) and is a fundamental component of working with teams in any setting (Stanfield 2000). A further example of good advice to instructors comes from a student in third-year Arabic who noted "Instructors can help out each other."

Finally, students who experienced true rotating teachers and co-teaching clearly appreciated the benefits. For example, comments from second-year English include "... they worked together instead of alternating classes like some of my other courses," "it helped create a great atmosphere in the classroom that this class is about discussion and participation and not just one person lecturing at you," and "it made the class more fun." These and many other examples from all nine courses demonstrate how individual students can provide insightful information, which helps identify what is working and ways of addressing aspects that need improvement. Although effects on student learning are paramount, these teaching models also have advantages and disadvantages for instructors themselves, and for their departments. These are elucidated by responses from the 17 instructors who provided feedback (tables 4 and 5). One of the main concerns for instructors is time (row one of both tables 4 and 5). They note that multiple instructor models may increase flexibility (e.g. to attend meetings or do field work), but the total time commitment also increases because of the need for planning and coordination. Instructors consistently identify collaboration and mentoring as a potential advantage. To quote one instructor, "I learn an enormous amount by interacting with another colleague in course creation, modification, and maintenance." However, corresponding difficulties include incompatibility within the team, poor communication, or reduced freedom to teach as one pleases (rows two and three of table 4).

**TABLE 5: Advantages and Disadvantages to the Department**

Row	Advantages to the Department	Disadvantages to the Department
1	Flexibility with time (5)	Extra time and fairness (5)
2	Expertise and breadth of coverage (6)	Complexity of management and frustration (4)
3	Economic benefits (3)	Increased costs (2)
4	Enhanced reputation for the Department (3)	Reduced reputation (2)
5	Enhanced collegiality and mentoring (3)	'none' or 'not sure' (3)

*Note.* Data are from instructor responses only. Numbers in brackets are the numbers of instructors, of 17 total, who made the comment.

These results are consistent with Carpenter, Crawford, and Walden (2007), who also identify collaboration and mentoring as benefits of multiple instructors, especially when teaming an experienced instructor with one who is new to the particular course. Collaboration may be particularly beneficial for faculty who are not otherwise likely to collaborate intellectually. Instructors like being allowed to teach more within their own area of expertise. For example, one instructor stated, "I don't have to give lectures on topics too remote from my re-search area." They also suggested that having experts in first-year classes might benefit the department by attracting students into corresponding degree programs. However, maintaining teaching quality and enthusiasm, lack of commitment or freedom, and poorer connection with students (especially when teaching only small portions of a course) were all recognized as challenges (table 4 row 3 and table 5 row 2). Also, teaching somewhat outside one's own specialization can be considered an opportunity rather than a problem (Huston, 2009), especially at the first- or second-year level.

Table 5, rows 3 and 4 suggest that multiple instructors could result in either increases or reductions in cost or reputation. This apparent contradiction can be reconciled if a department's teaching reputation is related to the course or instructor evaluations and student word-of-mouth. In other words, improving courses with multiple instructors can result in improved reputation, but that requires an increase in costs represented by devoting additional total faculty time and care to the course. Evidently these pros and cons identified by instructors demonstrate that they recognize how actions that promote benefits or reduce problems will probably have associated costs. Finally, from informal interviews with administrative staff, one impact on departments not identified in table 5 is the increased complexity and cost of managing course scheduling within institutional and personal constraints

### 3. Recommendations

The following recommendations are about how to use rotating teachers and co-teaching in single courses:

- using rotating teachers and co-teaching in single courses require improving instructors' pedagogical skills and knowledge.
- Instructors working in teaching teams should concentrate on consistent, collaborative teaching techniques and strategies.
- Success in using rotating teachers and co-teaching in single courses depends on using a well-organized and collaborative approach in all aspects of the course.
- In using rotating teachers and co-teaching in single courses, teaching strategies should entail explaining to students the intentions and reasons for using rotating teachers and co-teaching.
- Co-instructors should agree on teaching strategies and class procedures, especially with younger students.
- All instructors should try as much as possible to use similar pedagogies and assessment formats throughout.
- Occasional simple surveys to obtain feedback about what is or is not working should be conducted periodically.
- An effective teaching team should be built and participate in decisions from a professional perspective to the course.
- Rotating teachers and co-teaching is recommended to be implemented in English class due to their positive productivity.

### 4. Conclusions

Rotating teachers and co-teaching are an adaptable instructional model that require an instructional arrangement to deliver core instruction to diverse group of students in a single partnership.. Implementing Rotating teachers and co-teaching have lots of advantages, such as it can provide students with various modes of productive experiences and positive behavior patterns for both instructors and students. Using rotating teachers and co-teaching in single courses ensure that multiple instructors work as a team, and have predictable learning experiences driven by well-defined and consistent learning goals, expectations and challenges.



**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Conflicts of Interest:** Declare conflicts of interest or state

**Acknowledgement:** The author extends his appreciation to the Deanship of Scientific Research at King Khalid University for funding this work through General Research Project under grant number (project number: 69 /year: 2022).

## References

- [1] Bailey, K. M., Curtis, A, & Nunan, D. (2001) Pursuing Professional Development: The Self As Source, Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- [2] Benoit, R & Haugh, B (2001) `Team Teaching Tips for Foreign Language Teachers` *The Internet TESL Journal* 7(10). Retrieved on 9 August, 2005 <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Benoit-TeamTeaching.html> .
- [3] Becker, H (2001) Teaching ESL K-12: Views from the Classroom, Boston: MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- [4] Bondy, E and Ross, D (1998) Teaching teams: *Creating the context for faculty action research Innovative Higher Education*, 22(3). 231 – 249.
- [5] Bronwyn, Co (2002) `Team teaching: Meeting the Needs of English Language Learners Through Collaboration`, ERIC/CLL News Bulletin, Spring 2002. Retrieved April 5, 2005, from <http://www.cal.org/resources/News/2002spring/team.html>
- [6] Carpenter, D. M., L. Crawford, & R. Walden, (2007). Testing the efficacy of team teaching. *Learning Environments Research*, 10(1): 53–65.
- [7] Cook, L, and Friend, M (1996) `Coteaching: Guidelines for Creating Effective Practices` in: E. L. Meyen, G. A. Vergason & R. J. Whelan (Eds.) *Strategies for Teaching Exceptional Children in Inclusive Settings* (Denver, OH, Love), pp. 155 -182.
- [8] Crandall, J A (1998) `Collaborate and Cooperate: Teacher Education for Integrating Language and Content`, *English Teaching Forum*, 36. 2-9.
- [9] Durkin, C, and Sheirgill, M (2000) `A Team Approach To Practice Teaching`, *Social Work Education*, 19( 2). 165-174
- [10] Dugan, K., & M. Letterman. (2008). Student appraisals of collaborative teaching. *College Teaching*, 56(1): 11–15.
- [11] Elton, L. (2001) Research and teaching: Conditions for a positive link. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6(1): 43–56.
- [12] George, M A. and Davis-Wiley, P (2000) `Team Teaching A Graduate Course: Case Study: A Clinical Research Course`, *College Teaching*, 48(2). 75-80.
- [13] Goetz, K and Gallery E (2000) `Perspectives on Team Teaching`, EGallery. University of Calgary. Retrieved on 9 August, 2009, <http://www.ucalgary.ca/~egallery/goetz.html>
- [14] Grabe, W & Stoller, F. L (1997) `Content-Based Instruction: Research Foundations` in M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.) *The Content-Based Classroom: Perspective on Integrating Language and Content*, White Plains, NY: Longman. 5-21.
- [15] Honigsfeld, A & Dove, M (2008) `Co-teaching in the ESL Classroom`, *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 2. 8-14.
- [16] Tsai, and Jui-min, M. (2007) Team Teaching and Teachers' Professional Learning: Case Studies of Collaboration Between Foreign and Taiwanese English Teachers in Taiwanese Elementary Schools. Ph.D Dissertation, Ohio State University. Retrieved on 20/11/2009 from [http://etd.ohiolink.edu/etd/send-pdf.cgi/Tsai%20Jumin.pdf?acc\\_num=osu1186669636](http://etd.ohiolink.edu/etd/send-pdf.cgi/Tsai%20Jumin.pdf?acc_num=osu1186669636) .
- [17] Knezevic, A & Scholl, M (1996) `Learning To Teach Together: Teaching to Learn Together` in D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.) *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 79-96. Retrieved on 15/11/2009 from [http://etd.ohiolink.edu/etd/send-pdf.cgi/Tsai%20Jumin.pdf?acc\\_num=osu1186669636](http://etd.ohiolink.edu/etd/send-pdf.cgi/Tsai%20Jumin.pdf?acc_num=osu1186669636) .
- [18] Lester, J. N., & K. R. Evans (2009) Instructors' experiences of collaboratively teaching: Building something bigger. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(3): 373–382.
- [19] Little, J. W. (2003) `Inside Teacher Community: Representations of Classroom Practice`, *Teachers College Record*, 105. 913-145.
- [20] Neumann, M., S. Browning, J. Clarke, D. Harrison, K. Ing, C. Kutas,
- [21] J. Pitre, R. Serbanescu, M. Wall, & R. Wilson (2006) *Team teaching: A survey of 50 courses in the Faculty of Arts and Science at the University of Toronto with more than one instructor*. University of Toronto Faculty Learning Community, July. <http://faraday.physics.utoronto.ca/PVB/FLC/TeamTeachingReport.pdf>
- [22] O'Loughlin, and Judith B. (2003) `Collaborative Instruction in Elementary School: Push-In vs Pull-Out`, *The ELL Outlook*, 2. Retrieved April 5, 2005, from [http://www.coursecrafters.com/ELL-Outlook/2003/Outlook\\_0403.pdf](http://www.coursecrafters.com/ELL-Outlook/2003/Outlook_0403.pdf)
- [23] Sandholtz, J. H. (2000) `Interdisciplinary Team Teaching as a Form of Professional Development`. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 27(3). 39 – 50.