



Experiences of EFL Lecturers Using Collaborative Teaching in Speaking Classes at the Higher Education Level

Raja Mahendra Tanjung^{*1}, Mukhlash Abrar², Noprival³

Universitas Jambi, Kota Jambi, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: rajatanjung123@gmail.com

Info Article Received: 02 Mei 2026 Revised: 01 Juni 2026 Accepted: 03 Juli 2026 Publication: 31 Juli 2026	Abstract: <i>This study investigates the factors contributing to EFL students' reluctance to speak English during classroom discussions and explores the strategies they use to overcome this issue. A qualitative case study was conducted with eight students from the English Education Study Program at a public university in Jambi Province, selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews and analyzed using Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis. The findings reveal three major factors underlying students' reluctance: linguistic factors (limited vocabulary, pronunciation difficulties, and grammatical constraints), psychological factors (fear of making mistakes, criticism, nervousness, low self-confidence, and low self-esteem), and learning-related factors (unsupportive learning environments, difficult course materials, and limited speaking practice). To address these challenges, students employed strategies such as rehearsing before speaking, writing ideas beforehand, seeking peer assistance, and actively listening during discussions, which helped reduce anxiety and improve confidence.</i> Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan menginvestigasi faktor-faktor yang menyebabkan mahasiswa EFL enggan berbicara bahasa Inggris dalam diskusi kelas serta strategi yang mereka gunakan untuk mengatasinya. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dengan desain studi kasus. Partisipan terdiri atas delapan mahasiswa Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris di salah satu perguruan tinggi negeri di Provinsi Jambi yang dipilih melalui purposive sampling. Data dikumpulkan melalui wawancara semi-terstruktur dan dianalisis menggunakan analisis tematik Braun dan Clarke (2006). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa keengganan mahasiswa dipengaruhi oleh tiga faktor utama, yaitu faktor linguistik (keterbatasan kosakata, kesulitan pelafalan, dan kendala tata bahasa), faktor psikologis (takut melakukan kesalahan, takut dikritik, gugup, kurang percaya diri, dan rendahnya harga diri), serta faktor pembelajaran (lingkungan belajar yang kurang mendukung, materi yang sulit, dan minimnya praktik berbicara). Untuk mengatasinya, mahasiswa menerapkan strategi seperti berlatih sebelum berbicara, menuliskan ide, meminta bantuan teman, dan mendengarkan diskusi secara aktif.
Keywords: Collaborative Teaching, EFL Lecturers, Speaking Classes, Higher Education, Qualitative Study Kata Kunci: Pengajaran Kolaboratif, Dosen EFL, Kelas Berbicara, Pendidikan Tinggi, Studi Kualitatif.	
Licensed Under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License 	

INTRODUCTION

As it is necessary for effective communication, learning English as a foreign language (EFL) is important. When the sender and receiver understand the information being communicated, effective communication is possible (Mulyanti et al., 2021). Students need to develop language skills to achieve this. The four main language skills are speaking, writing, listening, and reading. Communication is one of the most important, as it shows the ability of a person to express himself and communicate with others in a foreign language. Speaking a foreign language, however, is often considered the most difficult talent to acquire. As higher education institutions seek to prepare students for global communication and cross-cultural collaboration, educational models become more inclusive and inclusive (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

Learning is a form of learning that has become popular in recent years, especially in higher education (Friend & Cook, 2013). Also sometimes called learning or group learning. This activity is described as cooperative learning, when two or more professors work together in planning, implementing and delivering instruction (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Friend and Cook (2013) argue that teachers can combine various experiences, teaching styles and teaching styles to enhance classroom learning. In an EFL setting, teaching can enhance students' exposure to various language input methods and associated methods (Richards, 2006). Moreover, mentoring offers opportunities for professional development for learners via shared learning experiences, reflective practice and peer collaboration (Bailey et al., 2001).

Based on a number of crucial factors, the researcher decided to investigate EFL lecturers' experiences in implementing collaborative teaching in speaking classes at higher education. First, in response to the increasing complexity of language classrooms and the growing demand for more active and student-centered learning environments, collaborative teaching has emerged as an important pedagogical trend in EFL education (Harmer, 2007; Kumaravadivelu, 2006). Research has shown that collaborative teaching, including co-teaching by native and non-native teachers, can help to develop a supportive cultural learning environment, enhance students' English language proficiency and foster positive attitudes towards speaking classes (Carless & Walker, 2006; Muchnik-Rozanov & Tsybulsky, 2019). Furthermore, Richards (2006) suggests that collaborative teaching provides learners with a rich linguistic environment through exposure to a variety of language input, and Friend and Cook (2013) argue that

it encourages complementary teaching roles and behaviours, resulting in more effective classroom instruction.

Speaking is arguably one of the most difficult skills to develop, largely because of factors such as anxiety, fear of making mistakes, low self-confidence and a lack of opportunities to engage in authentic interaction within the classroom context (Brown, 2007; Horwitz & Cope, 1986). According to Young (1991), many EFL learners tend to avoid speaking activities because of the fear of being negatively evaluated by their peers and lecturers, which often hinders their oral language development. To address these problems, collaborative teaching and learning strategies have been increasingly adopted in EFL classrooms, as they are thought to promote more dynamic, supportive and engaging learning environments (Harmer, 2007; Friend & Cook, 2013). Research has shown that collaborative teaching enhances more interaction, offers instant and diverse feedback, and exposes students to different linguistic inputs, all of which contribute to improving students' speaking proficiency (Carless & Walker, 2006; Richards, 2006). Also, the good classroom atmosphere, necessary in the development of communicative competence in speaking classes, can be achieved with the collaborative teaching, which can also contribute to increasing students' engagement and reducing fear (Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Bailey et al., 2001). Collaborative teaching can also increase active student engagement and minimize learners' fear by and lack of confidence, there is a lack of research on the actual experiences of EFL instructors in teaching speaking, especially in higher education and in places where collaborative teaching is underdeveloped or faces specific challenges (Friend & Cook, 2013; Muchnik-Rozanov & Tsybulsky, 2019). Prior research has concentrated largely on student results and instructional efficiency, with little attention to the lived experiences of lecturers (Carless & Walker, 2006; Richards, 2006). Therefore, this research will investigate the practical realities, benefits and challenges of collaborative teaching from the lecturers' perspectives to help develop more effective and sustainable teaching practices in EFL speaking contexts (Kumaravadivelu, 2006). favorable classroom climate, which is crucial for the development of communicative ability in speaking classes

Numerous researchs in EFL and higher education settings have reported that collaborative teaching tends to boost teaching quality, student engagement and professional growth (Friend & Cook, 2013; Villa et al., 2008; Richards, 2006). Studies have indicated that team teaching can provide more dynamic learning conditions and

deliver more language input, especially in speaking classes (Carless & Walker, 2006; Harmer, 2007). However, other studies also highlight challenges such as time restrictions, unequal workloads, different philosophies of teaching and institutional support (Bacharach et al., 2014; York-Barr et al., 2007). More recently, some study has been done on the viewpoints of EFL teachers and lecturers in respect to collaboration. However, while teacher collaboration provides chances for professional development, it is often challenged by environmental and institutional issues (Li & Zhu, 2020). According to Nguyen and Baldauf (2021) EFL lecturers considered collaborative teaching as valuable but difficult to applied, particularly at the tertiary level. In Indonesia, Rahman et al. (2022) found that collaborative is very effective for EFL education, but its implementation is inconsistent owing to institutional and cultural limitations. There are such findings; nevertheless, there is a dearth of research on the lived experience of EFL lecturers in implementing collaborative teaching in speaking classes at the higher education level, especially in Indonesian universities. Thus, more study is required to explore lecturers' experiences, problems, and coping methods in this situation.

This is even the more essential given the drawback of research on the lived experience of EFL professors themselves, particularly at university level. While students' perspectives and achievement have been widely examined, fewer studies explore how lecturers perceive collaborative teaching, how they manage its challenges, and how it affects their professional growth.

The effectiveness of this collaborative teaching model, however, the effectiveness of collaborative teaching suffered from the experiences and views of lecturers who implement it. Lecturers' experiences may not only expose the advantages of collaborative but also, its difficulties, like teaching philosophy differences, time constraints and institutional support (Villa et al., 2008). Based on the current study, the researcher aims to investigate EFL lecturers' experiences with collaborative teaching in higher education settings. This study aims to provide a more thorough knowledge of how collaborative teaching is organized, carried out, and assessed in speaking courses by closely evaluating lecturers' points of view, reflections, and approaches to instruction. This study also aims to identify the perceived advantages, difficulties, and coping mechanisms experienced by lecturers to demonstrate the practical reality of collaborative teaching. This study is aims to offer significant insights into the design of

more effective, thoughtfully planned and long-term collaborative teaching approaches in EFL higher education.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative case study design to explore EFL lecturers' experiences in implementing collaborative teaching in oral English classes at the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Jambi. A qualitative approach was selected because it enables an in-depth understanding of participants' perceptions, experiences, and meaning-making within their natural teaching context (Creswell & Poth, 2017; Merriam, 1998). The researcher acted as the primary research instrument by collecting, interpreting, and analyzing the data directly. Participants were selected using purposive sampling based on three criteria: (1) lecturers who had experience implementing collaborative teaching in EFL speaking classes, (2) lecturers who had participated in collaborative teaching for at least one academic semester, and (3) lecturers who voluntarily agreed to participate by providing informed consent.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews and document analysis. Semi-structured interviews served as the primary source of data, allowing participants to describe their planning, implementation, challenges, and strategies in collaborative teaching. Each interview lasted approximately 30–45 minutes, was audio-recorded with participants' permission, and transcribed verbatim. To strengthen the findings, relevant documents, including Semester Learning Plans (*Rencana Pembelajaran Semester* [RPS]) and course syllabi, were analyzed to provide contextual evidence regarding the planning and implementation of collaborative teaching. These documents also supported data triangulation.

The collected data were analyzed using Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis, consisting of six stages: familiarization with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the final report. Interview transcripts and supporting documents were read repeatedly to identify meaningful patterns, which were systematically coded and grouped into broader themes representing lecturers' experiences. The final themes were interpreted and supported by direct quotations from participants to ensure that the findings accurately reflected their perspectives.

To ensure the trustworthiness of the study, Lincoln and Guba's (1985) criteria were applied, including credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Credibility was established through triangulation of interviews and documentation. Transferability was enhanced by providing rich descriptions of the research context and participants. Dependability was ensured through clear documentation of the research procedures, while confirmability was achieved by maintaining an audit trail, reflective notes, and grounding interpretations in participants' statements. Ethical principles were also maintained throughout the study by obtaining informed consent, protecting participants' confidentiality through pseudonyms, and ensuring that participation was voluntary and that all collected data were used solely for research purposes.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

Collaborative Coordination Strategies

The findings revealed that lecturers employed three main collaborative coordination strategies to overcome challenges in implementing collaborative teaching: shared planning and course alignment, establishing early and ongoing communication, and flexible role and schedule adjustment. These strategies were intended to maintain instructional continuity, strengthen coordination between teaching partners, and ensure that speaking courses remained coherent despite divided teaching responsibilities. The first strategy, shared planning and course alignment, involved using a common *Rencana Pembelajaran Semester* (RPS) as the primary guideline for organizing learning outcomes, teaching materials, assignments, examinations, and assessment procedures. All participants emphasized that collaborative teaching required lecturers to negotiate instructional decisions rather than work independently. Participant 1 explained that the shared RPS served as the main reference for lecturers teaching the same course, while Participant 2 noted that, in the absence of detailed role agreements, the RPS provided the direction for determining topics and learning activities. Participant 3 further emphasized that learning materials, teaching methods, assignments, structured tasks, midterm examinations, final examinations, and assessment criteria all required discussion between both lecturers. Likewise, Participants 4 and 5 highlighted that large speaking projects, such as drama performances, required collaborative planning regarding project design, learning materials, implementation, and assessment. These findings indicate that shared

planning functioned not only as administrative preparation but also as a means of maintaining consistency, reducing instructional differences, and ensuring that major speaking activities could be implemented effectively.

The second strategy was establishing early and ongoing communication between teaching partners. Since limited communication emerged as one of the main internal challenges, participants regarded regular communication as essential for discussing lesson plans, sharing course information, coordinating schedules, clarifying responsibilities, and preventing misunderstandings throughout the semester. Participant 1 emphasized the importance of discussing classroom activities, co-planning, co-assessment, and role distribution before instruction began. Similarly, Participant 3 viewed communication as a professional responsibility because lecturers could not always choose their teaching partners and therefore needed to actively build cooperative relationships for the benefit of students. Participants 4 and 5 explained that communication was maintained through face-to-face discussions as well as digital platforms such as WhatsApp, telephone calls, and Zoom meetings. These communication channels enabled lecturers to coordinate teaching implementation, solve emerging problems, and arrange class substitutions despite limited meeting time and different schedules. The findings therefore suggest that continuous communication played a central role in maintaining collaboration throughout the semester.

The third strategy was flexible role and schedule adjustment. Rather than maintaining rigid teaching responsibilities, lecturers adapted their roles according to agreements, availability, expertise, and course demands. Participant 1 explained that lecturers could divide responsibilities based on different instructional strengths, such as focusing separately on pronunciation, fluency, grammar, or vocabulary. Participant 2 described how lecturers substituted for one another whenever unavoidable commitments occurred, while Participants 3 and 5 explained that teaching responsibilities were commonly divided between the first and second halves of the semester according to mutual agreement. Participant 5 further emphasized that flexibility became particularly important during large performance-based projects, where several lecturers were needed to supervise preparation, rehearsals, implementation, and assessment. Consequently, flexible role adjustment enabled lecturers to respond to heavy workloads and scheduling conflicts without interrupting the continuity of the learning process.

Pedagogical Adaptation Strategies

Besides strengthening coordination between teaching partners, the lecturers also implemented pedagogical adaptation strategies to address challenges related to student engagement, participation, and speaking performance. Two major strategies emerged from the interview data: student-centered performance-based activities and preparatory input and guidance before speaking tasks. These strategies enabled lecturers to maintain students' motivation while supporting the development of their speaking ability. The primary pedagogical strategy was the use of student-centered performance-based activities. Rather than relying mainly on lecturer explanation, participants designed learning activities that required students to participate actively, express their ideas, and perform orally in English. Participants explained that speaking classes should provide varied opportunities for authentic communication because repetitive classroom activities often reduced students' concentration and willingness to participate.

Participant 2 described using dialogues and presentations to encourage active participation while varying classroom activities to prevent boredom. Participant 3 similarly emphasized the use of performance-based tasks, including video projects, role plays, one- or two-minute dialogues, solo performances, and presentations. These activities allowed students to practice speaking through different forms of interaction, including individual, pair, and group work, while accommodating different levels of confidence and speaking ability. Participants 4 and 5 further explained that classroom speaking tasks, video assignments uploaded to the learning management system, group discussions, and presentations encouraged students to communicate more naturally. Participant 5 stressed that speaking activities should not merely require students to read prepared texts but should encourage them to express their own ideas and communicate authentically. Collectively, these findings indicate that performance-based activities were designed not only to increase speaking opportunities but also to improve the quality and authenticity of students' oral communication.

The second pedagogical strategy involved providing preparatory input and guidance before students performed speaking tasks. Participants explained that students often needed support before they were ready to speak confidently in English. Consequently, lecturers provided topic discussions, grammar review, listening activities, video examples, vocabulary support, additional explanations, and speaking guidance before assigning oral performances. This preparation enabled students to organize their ideas, understand language use, and gain greater confidence before

participating in communicative activities. Participants also emphasized that guidance should encourage students to speak naturally rather than memorizing or reading written scripts. By combining preparatory activities with performance-based tasks, lecturers attempted to reduce students' anxiety while improving the quality of classroom interaction. The findings suggest that effective speaking instruction involves not only providing opportunities to perform but also equipping students with sufficient linguistic and conceptual support beforehand.

Overall, the pedagogical adaptation strategies demonstrate that lecturers continuously adjusted their instructional practices to respond to students' learning needs. Through varied student-centered performance-based activities and appropriate preparatory guidance, lecturers sought to maintain students' engagement, encourage authentic communication, and strengthen speaking performance despite the practical challenges of collaborative teaching. Together with collaborative coordination strategies, these pedagogical adaptations contributed to maintaining the continuity and effectiveness of speaking courses implemented through collaborative teaching. This study examined the implementation of collaborative teaching in speaking classes, the challenges experienced by lecturers, and the strategies used to overcome those challenges. Overall, the findings indicate that collaborative teaching is influenced not only by pedagogical principles but also by institutional conditions such as workload, scheduling, and lecturer coordination. Although participants viewed collaborative teaching as beneficial, its implementation varied according to contextual realities. Therefore, collaborative teaching should be understood as a flexible instructional practice rather than a single teaching model.

Implementation of Collaborative Teaching in Speaking Classes

The findings revealed two forms of collaborative teaching: full collaborative teaching and divided collaborative teaching. Full collaborative teaching involved two lecturers jointly planning, teaching, and assessing students within the same classroom, whereas divided collaborative teaching referred to lecturers sharing responsibility by teaching different parts of the semester. Although participants regarded full collaboration as the ideal model, divided collaboration was more frequently implemented because it better accommodated institutional demands. This finding supports Friend and Cook (2013), who describe collaboration as shared responsibility in planning, instruction, and assessment, and Villa et al. (2008), who emphasize the

value of combining educators' expertise. In speaking classes, the presence of two lecturers provides greater opportunities for immediate feedback and individualized support, particularly during communicative activities. This also reflects Vygotsky's (1978) concept of scaffolding, where learners benefit from continuous guidance during the learning process. However, this study does not suggest that full collaborative teaching automatically improves students' speaking achievement because the findings are based on lecturers' perceptions rather than direct evidence of student performance. Instead, the results demonstrate that the effectiveness of collaborative teaching depends on how consistently lecturers coordinate their instructional decisions. Even when teaching responsibilities are divided, collaboration can remain effective if lecturers maintain common learning objectives, assessment standards, and instructional continuity throughout the semester.

Challenges in Collaborative Teaching

The findings indicate that collaborative teaching involves both internal and external challenges. Internal challenges included limited communication, differences in teaching styles, and the complexity of joint planning and assessment. External challenges involved lecturers' workload, institutional arrangements, and students' adjustment to lecturer transitions. These findings demonstrate that collaboration requires more than assigning two lecturers to one course; it also requires continuous communication and shared commitment. Limited communication reduced lecturers' ability to monitor student progress and maintain instructional continuity, supporting Friend and Cook's (2013) argument that communication is fundamental to successful collaboration. Similarly, Li and Zhu (2020) found that teacher collaboration is frequently constrained by time and contextual conditions. Differences in teaching styles were also perceived as both opportunities and challenges. While different instructional approaches may enrich classroom experiences, inconsistent expectations may require students to repeatedly adjust to new classroom environments, particularly in speaking classes where confidence and interaction are essential.

Heavy workload emerged as the primary external challenge because lecturers were responsible for multiple classes and demanding speaking projects, making simultaneous co-teaching difficult to maintain. Consequently, divided collaborative teaching became a practical alternative. Institutional arrangements also influenced collaboration by determining teaching assignments, although meaningful collaboration

still depended on lecturers' willingness to communicate and work together. Furthermore, lecturer transitions required students to adapt to different teaching styles and classroom expectations. Although such transitions could introduce instructional variety, they also risked disrupting students' confidence if coordination between lecturers was insufficient. Overall, these findings suggest that the success of collaborative teaching depends on balancing institutional constraints with effective lecturer coordination. Communication, shared planning, and institutional support are therefore equally important in sustaining collaborative teaching practices.

Strategies Used by Lecturers to Overcome Challenges

To address these challenges, lecturers adopted both coordination and pedagogical strategies. Coordination strategies included regular communication through meetings and digital platforms such as WhatsApp, telephone calls, and Zoom, as well as shared lesson planning and flexible role distribution. These practices enabled lecturers to exchange information, maintain instructional continuity, and accommodate scheduling constraints while remaining aligned with the course objectives. This finding reinforces Friend and Cook's (2013) view that continuous communication is central to effective collaboration.

Another important strategy was aligning teaching through the Semester Learning Plan (RPS). Although lecturers taught separately, the RPS functioned as a common reference for learning outcomes, teaching materials, assignments, and assessment criteria. This alignment reduced inconsistencies between lecturers and helped ensure that divided collaborative teaching remained coherent throughout the semester. In addition to coordination, lecturers adopted pedagogical strategies that emphasized student-centered learning. Speaking activities such as discussions, role plays, presentations, video projects, and group performances were used to increase students' participation and communicative competence. Before these activities, lecturers provided scaffolding through explanations, grammar review, listening activities, and examples to help students perform more confidently. These practices are consistent with Richards (2008), Harmer (2007), and Vygotsky (1978), who emphasize meaningful interaction and guided learning in language instruction.

Overall, the findings indicate that successful collaborative teaching requires both effective lecturer coordination and appropriate classroom practices. While the reported strategies helped lecturers manage many implementation challenges, further research

involving classroom observation and students' perspectives would provide a more comprehensive understanding of how collaborative teaching influences speaking performance.

Collaborative Coordination and Pedagogical Adaptation Strategies

The findings show that lecturers employed two broad strategies to address the challenges of collaborative teaching: collaborative coordination strategies and pedagogical adaptation strategies. The first coordination strategy was shared planning and course alignment. All participants emphasized the importance of using a common *Rencana Pembelajaran Semester* (RPS) as the main reference for teaching. Through shared planning, lecturers discussed learning materials, teaching methods, assignments, structured tasks, examinations, and assessment procedures to ensure consistency throughout the course. As Participant 3 explained, decisions regarding learning materials, teaching methods, assignments, and examinations could not be made individually but required discussion between both lecturers. Similarly, Participants 4 and 5 highlighted that large speaking projects, such as drama performances, required joint planning regarding project implementation, learning materials, and assessment criteria. These findings indicate that shared planning functioned as an important strategy to maintain course coherence and minimize inconsistencies between teaching partners.

The second coordination strategy was flexible role and schedule adjustment. This strategy enabled lecturers to respond to heavy workloads, scheduling conflicts, and institutional teaching arrangements. Participants explained that teaching responsibilities could be adjusted according to agreements, expertise, and availability. One lecturer might focus on fluency while another emphasized grammar or vocabulary, allowing them to complement each other's strengths. Flexibility also enabled lecturers to substitute for absent colleagues and maintain course continuity. For performance-based speaking projects, several lecturers could share supervision during preparation, rehearsal, implementation, and assessment. Overall, flexible role adjustment helped ensure that collaborative teaching remained feasible despite practical constraints.

The lecturers also implemented pedagogical adaptation strategies to maintain students' engagement and speaking development. The primary strategy was the use of student-centered performance-based activities. Rather than relying on teacher-centered instruction, lecturers designed activities that required active student participation,

including dialogues, role plays, presentations, video assignments, solo performances, group discussions, and project-based learning. Participants explained that varied speaking activities prevented boredom, encouraged authentic communication, and accommodated different levels of confidence and speaking ability. Students were encouraged to express their own ideas instead of simply reading prepared texts, making classroom interaction more meaningful and communicative.

Another important coordination strategy was establishing early and ongoing communication among teaching partners. Since limited communication had emerged as a major challenge, lecturers emphasized the need to discuss teaching plans, classroom activities, assessment procedures, schedule changes, and role distribution before and throughout the semester. Participants viewed communication as a professional responsibility that ensured continuity, particularly in divided collaborative teaching where lecturers did not always teach together. Besides face-to-face discussions, lecturers also relied on digital communication platforms such as WhatsApp, telephone calls, and Zoom meetings to coordinate teaching activities, exchange information, solve problems, and arrange class substitutions when necessary.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that lecturers addressed collaborative teaching challenges through both coordination and pedagogical strategies. Communication, shared planning, and flexible role adjustment strengthened collaboration between teaching partners, while student-centered performance-based activities enhanced students' participation and speaking practice. These strategies illustrate how lecturers continuously adapted both their professional collaboration and instructional practices to maintain the effectiveness of speaking courses.

Discussion

This study explored the implementation of collaborative teaching in speaking classes, the challenges encountered by lecturers, and the strategies used to address those challenges. Overall, the findings indicate that collaborative teaching is shaped not only by pedagogical principles but also by institutional conditions such as workload, scheduling, and lecturer coordination. Although lecturers viewed collaborative teaching positively, its implementation varied according to contextual demands. Thus, collaborative teaching should be understood as a flexible practice rather than a single instructional model.

Implementation of Collaborative Teaching in Speaking Classes

The findings show that lecturers perceived collaborative teaching in two forms: full collaborative teaching, where two lecturers jointly planned, taught, and assessed learning, and divided collaborative teaching, where lecturers shared responsibility by teaching different parts of the semester. While full collaboration was considered the ideal model, divided collaboration was more commonly practiced because it was more practical within existing institutional conditions.

This finding is consistent with Friend and Cook (2013) and Villa et al. (2008), who emphasize collaboration through shared planning, instruction, and assessment. In speaking classes, the presence of two lecturers may provide more immediate feedback and individualized support, which aligns with Vygotsky's (1978) concept of scaffolding through guided interaction. However, this study only reflects lecturers' perceptions and does not demonstrate that full collaborative teaching directly improves students' speaking achievement.

The findings further suggest that collaborative teaching exists on a continuum rather than in a single form. Divided collaborative teaching can still support learning when lecturers maintain consistent learning objectives, assessment criteria, and communication throughout the course. Therefore, the effectiveness of collaboration depends less on the physical presence of two lecturers and more on the quality of coordination between them.

Challenges in Collaborative Teaching

The findings reveal that collaborative teaching involves both internal and external challenges. Internal challenges included limited communication, differences in teaching styles, and the complexity of joint planning, while external challenges involved heavy workload, institutional arrangements, and students' adjustment to lecturer transitions. These findings support Friend and Cook (2013), who argue that successful collaboration requires continuous communication and shared responsibility. Similarly, Li and Zhu (2020) and Nguyen and Baldauf (2021) found that collaboration is often constrained by time, workload, and contextual factors. In the present study, these challenges were interconnected. Limited coordination reduced instructional consistency, while workload restricted opportunities for lecturers to collaborate more closely. Consequently, effective collaborative teaching depends not only on individual

commitment but also on institutional support that facilitates communication and shared planning.

Strategies Used to Overcome Challenges

To address these challenges, lecturers adopted both coordination and pedagogical strategies. Coordination strategies included regular communication through meetings and digital platforms, shared lesson planning, and flexible role distribution. These practices helped maintain continuity despite divided teaching responsibilities and reflected the collaborative principles proposed by Friend and Cook (2013). Pedagogically, lecturers used student-centered speaking activities, including role plays, presentations, discussions, and group projects, supported by scaffolding through explanations, language input, and guided practice. These strategies are consistent with Richards (2008), Harmer (2007), and Vygotsky (1978), who emphasize meaningful interaction and guided learning as essential components of speaking instruction. Overall, the findings suggest that collaborative teaching is most effective when lecturer coordination is combined with engaging classroom practices. Although the reported strategies helped lecturers manage existing challenges, further research involving classroom observation and students' perspectives is needed to evaluate their impact on speaking performance.

CONCLUSION

The findings indicate that EFL lecturers generally perceived collaborative teaching as a beneficial approach to speaking instruction because it promotes shared responsibility, the exchange of teaching ideas, and more varied learning experiences for students. However, collaborative teaching was not implemented through a single model. While full collaborative teaching—characterized by joint planning, simultaneous teaching, shared feedback, and assessment—was viewed as the ideal practice, the dominant model was divided collaborative teaching, in which lecturers taught different parts of the semester. This arrangement was mainly adopted to accommodate workload and scheduling demands. The study also found that collaborative teaching involved both internal and external challenges. Internal challenges included limited communication, differences in teaching styles, and the complexity of joint planning and assessment, whereas external challenges involved heavy workload, institutional arrangements, and students' adjustment to lecturer

transitions. Although lecturer transitions could disrupt learning continuity, they also provided opportunities for varied teaching approaches, suggesting that the effectiveness of divided collaborative teaching largely depends on coordination between teaching partners. To address these challenges, lecturers employed collaborative coordination strategies, including continuous communication, shared planning through the RPS, and flexible role adjustment, as well as pedagogical strategies such as student-centered performance-based activities and preparatory guidance before speaking tasks. Overall, the study concludes that collaborative teaching has strong potential to enhance EFL speaking instruction when supported by effective communication, shared instructional planning, flexible collaboration, and institutional support.

REFERENCES

- Abrar, M. (2024). *Teknik pengumpulan data penelitian kualitatif: Suatu pengantar*. Universitas Jambi Publisher.
- Bailey, K. M. (2006). *Language teacher supervision: A case-based approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, J., & Westrup, H. (2003). *Essential speaking skills*. Continuum.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Burns, A. (2010). *Doing action research in English language teaching*. Routledge.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Freeman, D., & Richards, J. C. (1996). *Teacher learning in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2013). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.

- Gatbonton, E., & Segalowitz, N. (2005). Rethinking communicative language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 325–348.
- Gower, R., Phillips, D., & Walters, S. (2005). *Teaching practice handbook*. Macmillan.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English*. Pearson Longman.
- Harmer, J. (2015). *The practice of English language teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (1998). Cooperative learning returns to college: What evidence is there that it works? *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 30(4), 26–35.
- Johnson, K. E. (2013). *Approaches to second language teacher education*. Routledge.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon.
- Li, M., & Zhu, W. (2020). Teacher collaboration in EFL contexts: Practices, challenges, and professional development. *System*, 89.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- Littlewood, W. (2004). The task-based approach: Some questions and suggestions. *ELT Journal*, 58(4), 319–326.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition*. Academic Press.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2016). *Second language research: Methodology and design* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Nguyen, H. T. M., & Baldauf, R. B. (2021). EFL lecturers' perspectives on collaborative teaching in higher education. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 49.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

- Rahman, A., Yusra, K., & Fitriani, S. S. (2022). Collaborative teaching practices in Indonesian EFL classrooms: Opportunities and challenges. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 123–135.
- Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2017). Teaching English through English: Proficiency, pedagogy and performance. *RELC Journal*.
- Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. Routledge.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning*. Kluwer Academic.
- Villa, R. A., Thousand, J. S., & Nevin, A. I. (2008). *A guide to co-teaching: Practical tips for facilitating student learning*. Corwin Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.