*Corresponding author:
Asst. Prof. Hanan Dhia Alsalihi,
Department of English, College of Education for Women, University of Baghdad, Iraq
Email:
dr.hanan@coeduw.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Team Teaching Instruction Effectiveness on ESP Students' Achievement in New Headway Plus Book for Beginners

Abstract

ESP students frequently struggle to acquire English because of the complex vocabulary and grammar, which can be intimidating for newcomers. These issues could not be sufficiently addressed by traditional teaching approaches, nor may they offer enough involvement or support. Additionally, the majority of EFL teachers find it difficult to instruct their students effectively because of class congestion, differences in student needs, and discrepancies in student performance. This study investigates the effectiveness of team teaching instruction on the achievement of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) students using the New Headway Plus book for beginners. It aims to: evaluate the effectiveness of team teaching on ESP students' achievement in English, compare the performance of students taught through team teaching with those taught through traditional methods and explore students' engagement through team teaching classes.

A quasi-experimental design was used. The research was conducted with two groups of (60) first-level students from the College of Education for Women, Department of Social Work, who were studying English as part of their ESP curriculum. The experimental group was taught using a team teaching approach, while the control group received traditional instruction. Pre-test was administered on both groups before the experiment for equalization and to assess students' language proficiency, then the post-test and the engagement questionnaire were applied after the experiment on both groups and statistical analysis was used to compare the results. Findings revealed that team teaching significantly improved students' achievement and engagement compared to traditional methods.

فعالية التدريس الجماعي على تحسين تحصيل طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية لأغراض خاصة في كتاب للمبتدئين

أستاذ مساعد دكتور حنان ضياء الصالحي/قسم اللغة الإنكليزية، كلية التربية للبنات، جامعة بغداد

الخلاصة

غالبًا ما يواجه طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية لأغراض خاصة صعوبة في اكتساب اللغة الإنجليزية بسبب المفردات والقواعد المعقدة، والتي قد تكون مخيفة للقادمين الجدد. لا يمكن معالجة هذه المشكلات بشكل كافٍ من خلال مناهج التدريس التقليدية، وقد لا توفر مشاركة أو دعمًا كافيين. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، يجد غالبية مدرسي اللغة الإنجليزية لأغراض خاصة صعوبة في تدريس طلابهم بشكل فعال بسبب ازدحام الفصول الدراسية، والاختلافات في احتياجات الطلاب، والتناقضات في أدائهم. تبحث هذه الدراسة في فعالية تدريس التدريس الجماعي على إنجاز طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية لأغراض خاصة (ESP) باستخدام كتاب New Headway Plus للمبتدئين. ويهدف إلى: تقييم فعالية التدريس الجماعي على إنجاز طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية لأغراض خاصة في اللغة الإنجليزية، ومقارنة أداء الطلاب الذين تم تدريسهم من خلال التدريس الجماعي مع أولئك الذين تم تدريسهم من خلال الطرق التقليدية، واستكشاف مشاركة الطلاب من خلال فصول التدريس الجماعي.

تم استخدام تصميم شبه تجريبي. أجري البحث على مجموعتين من (60) طالبة من المستوى الأول بكلية التربية للبنات، قسم الخدمة الاجتماعية، يدرسن اللغة الإنجليزية كجزء من منهج تعليم اللغة الإنجليزية لأغراض خاصة. دُرّست المجموعة التجريبية باستخدام أسلوب التدريس الجماعي، بينما تلقت المجموعة الضابطة تعليمًا تقليديًا. أُجري اختبار قبلي على كلتا المجموعتين قبل التجربة للموازنة ولتقييم كفاءة الطلاب في اللغة، ثم طُبق الاختبار البعدي واستبيان المشاركة بعد التجربة على كلتا المجموعتين، واستُخدم التحليل الإحصائي لمقارنة النتائج. كشفت النتائج أن التدريس الجماعي قد حسّن بشكل ملحوظ من تحصيل الطلاب ومشاركتهم مقارنةً بالطرق التقليدية. واستخلصت الدراسة إلى توصيات لدمج التدريس الجماعي في برامج تعليم اللغة الإنجليزية لأغراض خاصة لتعزيز نتائج التعلم .

الكلمات المفتاحية: الفعالية، المشاركة، تعليم اللغة الإنجليزية لأغراض خاصة، كتاب New Headway Plus، تحصيل الطلاب، التدريس الجماعي.

Introduction

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) is a specialized branch of English language teaching that focuses on equipping learners with the language

skills necessary for their academic or professional fields (Basturkmen, 2006). However, teaching ESP to beginners poses unique challenges, particularly in terms of motivation, comprehension, and engagement due to the specialized nature of the content. Team teaching, which involves two or more instructors collaboratively planning, delivering, and evaluating instruction, has emerged as a promising methodology in language education. This study explores the impact of team teaching -a collaborative instructional approach- on the achievement of ESP students using the New Headway Plus book for beginners.

Problem of the Study and Its Significance

ESP students often struggle with learning English due to its specialized vocabulary and structures, which can be overwhelming for beginners. Traditional teaching methods may not adequately address these challenges or provide sufficient support or engagement to address these challenges (Kennedy, 1980). Also, Degan (2018) discovered that most EFL teachers struggle to successfully educate their students due to overcrowding in classes, variances in student needs, and disparities in student performance. These issues might be due to a lack of an acceptable, helpful, and successful approach. Furthermore, the researchers discovered that EFL students are not educated in accordance with their individual needs. Because of their unique differences, diverse demands, and lack of desire, students in colleges do not have the chance to learn English communicatively. Team teaching offers an innovative approach by combining multiple instructors' expertise to create a more dynamic and supportive learning environment. As a result, the researcher sought to determine whether there is a substantial change in EFL students' English language as a result of the teaching technique (Team teaching or Traditional teaching strategy).

The significance of this study lies in its potential to provide evidence-based insights into how team teaching can enhance ESP students' learning outcomes. By focusing on beginner-level learners in the Department of Social Work, this research aims to address a gap in the literature on collaborative instructional strategies in ESP contexts.

Value of the Study

This study contributes to the field of English language teaching by:

1- Providing empirical evidence on the effectiveness of team teaching in ESP classrooms.

2- Offering practical recommendations for implementing team teaching in beginner-level ESP programs.

3- Enhancing understanding of how collaborative instructional strategies can improve student engagement and achievement.

Objectives

1- To evaluate the effectiveness of team teaching on ESP students' achievement in English.

2- To compare the performance of students taught through team teaching with those taught through traditional methods.

3- To explore students' engagement through team teaching classes.

Hypotheses

1- Team teaching improves students' achievement more effectively than traditional instruction.

2- there are no statistically significant differences between the average scores of students in the experimental group studying English using the team teaching instruction and the average scores of students in the control group studying the same subject using the traditional method.

3- there are no statistically significant differences between the average scores on the engagement scale for students in the experimental group and the average scores of the control group.

Research Questions

1. Does team teaching improve ESP students' achievement and engagement more effectively than traditional instruction?

2. Is there a significant difference in post-test scores between students in the experimental group and those in the control group?

3. How does team teaching impact students' engagement through lessons?

Scope

The present study is limited to:

1- first-level students in the Department of Social Work at the University of Baghdad/College of Education for Women who are studying English as part of their ESP curriculum.

2- the New Headway Plus book for beginners by Soars & Soars (2014). Oxford University Press. Units 5, 6, 7, and 8.

3- Team teaching collaborative instruction.

4- Evaluate students' achievement in vocabulary, grammar, reading comprehension, and writing skills.

5- second semester for the academic year 2023-2024.

Theoretical Background

What is Team Teaching?

There is no one definition of team teaching or a single "best" methodology. Team teaching, according to Bess (2000), is a process in which all team members are equally involved and responsible for student instruction, evaluation, and creating and fulfilling learning objectives. Team teaching, according to some writers, is a methodology in which two or more instructors collaborate in the design and delivery of a course (Zhang &

Keim 1993). Davis (1995) proposes that, in actuality, team teaching entails a continuum of models and practices that are distinguished from one another largely by the extent of collaboration within the teaching team. McDaniel and Colarulli (1997) extend this idea of a continuum by proposing that models of team teaching may be articulated along four dimensions that represent the required features of cooperation and its potential for student learning, thus:

1- During the teaching and learning process, the degree of interaction between team teaching members and pupils. This dimension is concerned with the level of learning exchange between participants. Both team teaching members and students contribute to the learning exchange as learners with varying degrees of experience. Furthermore, when team teaching members engage in the classroom, their skills and viewpoints enrich the dialogue, and as a consequence, team teaching members are improved as learners and instructors (Gabelnick et. al. 1990).

2- The level of active learning and student participation in the educational process. This metric measures how successfully team teaching members and students collaborate on critical thinking about the content. Students and team teaching members should not be passive recipients of knowledge or passive communicators of knowledge. Students are empowered when their intellectual challenges are shared by their team teaching members, which leads to them being more interested in their studies (Association of American Colleges, 1994).

3- In the teaching and learning process, the degree of autonomy or dependency among team teaching members. This dimension focuses on how successfully team teaching members interact as a coherent group in terms of discussion, planning, delivery, student learning

assessment, and topic evaluation. True cooperation necessitates team teaching members to be accountable to one another, to be willing to compromise and share authority, even if it means sacrificing autonomy, and to be open to new ideas and teaching approaches.

4- The degree to which the content and perspectives of discipline-based knowledge are integrated to improve learning and teaching. Curriculum integration and integrative thinking are the emphasis of this component. Curricular coherence aids students' understanding of knowledge connections and integrated learning. Both team teaching members and students "are 'surprised by delight' when they find heretofore unknown connections and feel the exquisite rigor of intellectual effort," according to the study (Rinn & Weir 1984).

Since team teaching is viewed as a continuum of activities, some models of team teaching can be categorized as strong or weak based on how successfully team members integrate and collaborate as well as how involved they are in the teaching and learning process. In weak types of team teaching, there is little indication of collaboration and/or involvement from team members in the preparation, administration, and presentation of a subject.

An illustration of team teaching at this end of the spectrum would be when faculty members share the teaching of a subject, with one faculty member serving as the subject coordinator or lecturer-in-charge. Each faculty member may only provide one or two lectures. This kind of team teaching isn't team teaching at all, claim Jacob et al. (2002). Instead, it's more akin to guest lecturing, or at most a form of sequential teaching, when the subject is taught in discrete sections with little regard for teamwork or content integration. At the other extreme of the team teaching spectrum are models where team members participate equally and closely in every

aspect of the preparation, supervision, and presentation of a subject (George & Davis-Wiley 2000).

Types of team teaching

A. Two teachers share a classroom under the one teach/one observes technique.

While one instructor instructs the students, the other watches them. The observer records information on the pupils' behavior, academics, and social interactions. The observer might choose to focus on the entire group or a subset of students. The observer can use this strategy to manage students who are off track, identify students who are struggling or need a challenge, and assess how engaging the class is.

B. One teach/one assist is a teaching approach in which one instructor instructs the entire class. While the first instructor is delivering the lesson, the second teacher travels around the room offering customized assistance to the pupils in order to convey the need. The use of stations in the classroom is quite similar to the usage of centers in the classroom. The distinction is that the stations are guided by two licensed teachers. The class is divided into three sections. Teachers give teaching to two of those groups. The third group works on its own.

C. Parallel teaching entails dividing a class in two based on the academic demands of the students. Each of the two professors picks one of the groups and instructs them at the same time. It's a means for the students in the classroom to be differentiated.

D. Another style of instruction that distinguishes for students in a classroom is alternative teaching. With this technique, a single teacher instructs the majority of the students. The second teacher instructs a small group. This small group may be studying the same content as the rest of the class, or they may be doing pre-teaching, re-teaching, or enrichment (Friend et al., 2010).

The advantage of using Team teaching

Students benefit from team teaching because it combines the abilities of many faculty members (Mason 1992; Buckley 2000). Students can benefit from team teaching by receiving education from specialists in certain areas of a discipline's knowledge base and being exposed to different viewpoints on challenges (Buckley 2000). By integrating diverse views and linking the knowledge to a wider conceptual framework, students can acquire critical-thinking abilities (Davis 1995). In addition, team teaching allows students to observe how a collaborative team works. This is especially important for business students who are likely to be part of collaborative teams in the workplace (Mason 1992). The chance to observe how well faculty members collaborate in a group context may serve as a model for students' own teamwork. Additionally, a variety of teaching approaches and strategies are presented to the students, which improves the team's capacity to meet the various learning preferences of the students (Goetz 2000; Helms et al. 2005). Salim mentioned, "by using language in creative ways, learners can enhance their fluency and confidence" (2025:11).

Team-taught course setups also benefit students. Students who participated in team-taught classrooms had stronger teacher-student relationships (Wilson and Martin, 1998). According to Hinton and Downing (1998), a newly designed team-taught class received positive feedback from students, with 94% of them saying they preferred team teaching to more conventional methods. It should be noted, nevertheless, that some students can view these benefits of collaborative teaching as disadvantages. Some students may become irritated and perplexed when exposed to a variety of teaching philosophies and methods within a subject (Buckley 2000; Goetz 2000; Helms et al. 2005).

ESP Teaching Methodologies

ESP emphasizes relevance and practicality in language instruction. In ESP contexts, where students often struggle with specialized vocabulary and concepts, team teaching allows for the integration of subject matter expertise with language instruction. This dual approach not only aids comprehension but also fosters a more engaging and supportive learning environment (Kennedy, 1980).

The New Headway Plus Curriculum

The *New Headway Plus* series is designed for beginners, providing a structured approach to language acquisition. It emphasizes gradual progression through clearly defined grammatical structures and vocabulary tailored to everyday situations. The curriculum's focus on practical language use aligns well with the objectives of ESP, making it an appropriate choice for this study (Oxford University Press, 2002; Basturkmen, H. 2006).

Previous Studies

Several studies have explored the benefits of team teaching in language education:

1- Kochar (2000), the benefits of comprehensive team teaching for teachers, students, and schools outweigh the disadvantages. They spend three years studying inclusive team teaching and find that the benefits for special and general education kids are substantial. Students become more motivating, and their self-esteem improves as a result. Students can also identify their own abilities. According to the researchers, there are three major obstacles to be aware of when attempting to implement team teaching. Knowledge, organizational, and behavioral barriers are all present.

2- Austin (2001) presented research that included 139 educators and was followed up with 12 interviews to see how they felt about team

teaching. He says that educators believe that team teaching benefits all children because it fosters acceptance and tolerance. It also serves as a model for low-performing students. Educators feel that collaborative teaching benefits all students. The use of a team teaching technique increased all learners' test scores, grades, and performance in this study. Teachers from kindergarten through twelfth grade are included in this study. According to the findings, using a team teaching style is effective.

3- Wilson and Michaels (2006) evaluated the attitudes of special and general education students in a large suburban school system with two middle schools and three high schools about team teaching. For the past five years, team teaching has been implemented. Three hundred and forty-six students in team-taught English classrooms participated in and completed the survey. The researchers found that both general and special education students favored a team teaching technique in this study. According to the findings, team teaching benefits higher-level special education students more than general education students. Special education students are more likely than general education students to seek support from teachers outside of class. This research is based on the availability of aid, diverse views, and structural support that team teaching strategies provide.

4- Vogler and Long (2003) asked students to rate their opinions of team teaching in two parts of the same level class. They feel that team teaching improves them by presenting other viewpoints and increasing opportunities for personal assistance. Because the student and faculty perspectives on team – teaching cannot be proven, they propose that team – teaching be investigated further.

5- Lesely (2007) looked at students' feelings towards employing a team teaching technique in the classroom. The research includes 200

students from high schools in Ontario and Monterial, Canada, as well as 200 Saudi Arabian students. Students' views about the employment of team teaching strategies are measured using an attitude questionnaire developed by the researchers. She interviews the study's participants and finds that their sentiments regarding the use of team teaching in language acquisition are more favorable. In a scenario where native and non-native English teachers are engaging in a team teaching classroom.

6- Liu (2008) examined the effectiveness of four of the five team teaching models proposed by Friend et al. (1993). It is preferable to use "one teaching – one helping," "alternative teaching," "station teaching," or "team teaching" as models for team teaching. The study is being conducted in a classroom in China. The results of the study show that the effectiveness of the native English teachers in the classroom was significantly impacted by the various team teaching philosophies that were employed. Only the kind utilized in the classroom offer this improvement. According to the study, the kinds of team teaching should be employed sequentially for a significant impact; that is, "alternative teaching" should be used after "one teaching – one assisting." It is expected that "station teaching" and "team teaching" will be conducted in the classroom.

However, limited research has focused specifically on beginners in ESP contexts, highlighting the need for this study.

Methodology

Population and Sample

The population of the study involves all first-level students at the department of social work during the academic year 2023-2024. They were

125 students distributed on four sections. The researcher selects two sections randomly to represent the two experimental groups of the study. Section B which consists of (30) students as the experimental group who will be taught according to team teaching instruction and section D which consist of (30) students as the control group who will be taught according to the traditional teaching.

Instruments

The main instruments were used through this study as:

1- **Lesson planning:** in order to design and present a lesson by two instructors collaboratively, they follow certain stages such as: Pre-lesson planning stage, firstly they will make a collaborative meeting to discuss the lesson plan, objectives, and roles. They decide on the activities and materials needed. Secondly, they define roles as instructor A focuses on language structures and grammar and instructor B emphasizes vocabulary and pronunciation. In lesson structure stage, the lesson will start with warm-up phase for (5 minutes) instructor A introduce the topic with a brief discussion followed by activity. then instructor B present vocabulary part for (10 minutes) followed by activity. Instructor A present grammar part for (15 minutes) followed by activity. In practice phase, both instructors conduct role-playing activities where students practice asking and answering questions about the topic as well as students may work in small groups. In conclusion phase (10 minutes), instructor B reviews key vocabulary and phrases. Instructor A provides feedback on grammar usage followed by activity for students' reflection. Finally, assessment phase (5 minutes) both instructors use formative and summative assessment, see appendix A.

2- **Pre-test and post-test:** both tests were constructed by the researcher to measure language proficiency based on vocabulary, grammar, reading comprehension, and writing skills covered in New Headway Plus book, units 5, 6, 7, and 8. The test consist of four sections: section one for vocabulary (20) marks. The vocabulary section has two parts: part A (10 marks) involve matching words to their definitions. It has 5 items, 2 marks for each correct answer. Part B (10 marks) fill in the blanks. It has 5 items, 2 marks for each correct answer. Section two for grammar (20) marks. The grammar section has two parts: part A (10 marks) involve multiple choice. It has 5 items, 2 marks for each correct answer. Part B (10 marks) involve sentence correction. It has 5 items, 2 marks for each correct answer. Section three for reading comprehension (30 marks). The reading comprehension has three parts: part A (10 marks) involve true/false. It has 5 items, 2 marks for each correct answer. Part B (10 marks) involve short answer questions about the passage. It has 5 items, 2 marks for each correct answer. Part C (10 marks) involve find words from the passage. It has 5 items, 2 marks for each correct answer. Section four for writing (30 marks). The writing has two parts: part A (15 marks) involve sentence writing. It has 5 items, 3 marks for each correct answer. Part B (15 marks) involve paragraph writing (50-70 words), the scoring scheme will focus on: content (5 marks), organization and coherence (4 marks), and language use (6 marks) see appendix B.

3- **Questionnaire:** in order to assess student engagement in team teaching lessons, the researcher adapt a questionnaire based on the Students Engagement Instrument (SEI) developed by Appleton et al. (2006) and modified for team teaching contexts. The questionnaire consists of 15 Likert-scale items with four scales ranges from 1-4

(strongly disagree=1, disagree=2, agree=3, strongly agree=4). It is designed to assess four dimensions of student engagement in team teaching contexts. The first is cognitive engagement: items 1-4 measure students' mental investment in learning. The second is affective engagement: items 5-8 assess students' emotional responses to team teaching. The third is behavioral engagement: items 9-12 evaluate observable participation and effort. The fourth is social engagement: items 13-15 measure interpersonal aspects of engagement, see appendix C.

Experimental Design

A quasi-experimental design was used with two groups: Experimental group received instruction from two instructors collaboratively planning and delivering lessons. Control group received instruction from a single instructor using traditional methods. Both groups were taught over a 12-weeks period.

Equalization

To ensure comparability between groups, pre-test scores were analyzed to confirm no significant differences existed at the start of the study. The researcher applied the pre- test that she prepared to the two research groups. After the students answered the test and its data was transcribed, the average ranks and the total ranks for the two groups were extracted. The extent of the difference between the average ranks for the two research groups was identified by calculating the calculated Mann-Whitney value, which amounted to (90,000), which is greater than the tabular value, which amounted to (61) at a level of significance (0.05), so the results show that there is no statistically significant difference at a significance level of (0.05) between the average ranks of the two groups, and this indicates the equivalence of the two groups in the pre-test. Table No. (1) shows this.

Table (1) Mann-Whitney test to determine the equivalence of students in the two research groups on the pre- test

	groups	No.	Mean rank	Sum of Ranks	Mann-Whitney Calculated value	Tabular value	Level of significance (0.5)
Ranks							
Pre-test	control	30	15.07	211.00	90.000	61	Not-significant
	experimental	30	13.93	195.00			
	Total	60					

Procedures

1- **Planning:** instructors collaborated to design lesson plans aligned with NEW Headway Plus content.

2- **Equalization:** the researcher applied the pre-test before the experiment to ensure equalization between the two groups.

3- **Implementation:** the experimental group was taught by two instructors working collaboratively during each session.

4- **Assessment:** pre-test was administered at the beginning, followed by post-test and engagement questionnaire at the end of the intervention period.

5- **Data Collection:** Test scores and questionnaire responses were collected for analysis.

Experiment

At the beginning of the second semester, the researcher applied the pre-test at the 15th, Feb., 2024 on both groups to assess their initial language proficiency. This ensured that there were no significant differences in language skills between the two groups before the intervention. The intervention started at the 18th, Feb., 2024. Instructors collaborated to design and deliver lessons using team teaching for the experimental group. This involve both instructors working together during each session to provide comprehensive instruction that covered vocabulary, grammar, reading comprehension and writing. While the control group received traditional instruction from a single instructor. At the end of the semester,

both groups were administered a post-test at the 16th, May, 2024 to evaluate their language proficiency after the intervention as well as the engagement questionnaire was applied too to evaluate their engagement level.

Data Analysis

This part contains a presentation of the research results that were reached by the researcher after the completion of the statistical processing, which includes their interpretation and the conclusions that were drawn.

Presentation of the research results:

1- Measuring the effect size (effectiveness) of the team teaching instruction

In order to determine the effect size that demonstrates the strength of the influence of the independent variable (the team teaching instruction) on the dependent variable (achievement and engagement), the researcher used the corresponding statistical significance test that reflects the effect size of the current research instruction, through the value (r). The value of (r) was calculated, which is the effect size for the calculated value of (U) Mann-Whitney of the post-test for both the achievement test and engagement. By comparing the values with the specified standard, it appears that the effect size is large, and this shows the effectiveness of the team teaching instruction in a large and high way in achievement and increasing engagement, this result answers the first question of this study positively and accept the first hypothesis. Table (2) shows the values of (r) that reflect the effect size for the value of Mann-Whitney:

Table (2) R values to determine effect size

Independent variable	Dependent variable	U value	r value	Effect size
Team teaching instruction	Post achievement test	50.500	0.48	High
	Engagement scale	56.000	0.43	High

2- Presentation of the research achievement test results:

In order to test the second null hypothesis, which states that there are no statistically significant differences between the average scores of students in the experimental group studying English using the online team teaching instruction and the average scores of students in the control group studying the same subject using the traditional method.

In order to confirm the validity of this null hypothesis, the researcher applied the post-achievement test to the two research groups (experimental and control), and the average ranks and the total ranks were calculated for the students' grades for the experimental and control groups to know the effect of the team teaching instruction on the achievement of the English language subject for the ESP students of the experimental research group by comparing it with the control group, and the data were processed statistically using the Mann-Whitney test for two independent samples, and the results were as shown in Table (3).

Table (3) Mann-Whitney test to identify statistical differences between the experimental and control groups in the results of the dependent variable, the post-achievement test in English.

Ranks							
	groups	N	Mean rank	Sum of Ranks	Mann-Whitney U	Tabular value	Level of significance (0.5)
Post achievement test	control	30	11.11	155.50	50.500	61	Not-significant
	experimental	30	17.89	250.50			
	total	60					

It is clear from the table (3) that the calculated Mann-Whitney value of (50.500) is smaller than the tabular Mann-Whitney value of (61) and the level of significance (0.05), which indicates the existence of a difference between the average ranks of the control group's scores and the average ranks of the experimental group's scores in the post-achievement test of the English language subject, in favor of the experimental group with the higher average ranks. This indicates the effect of the team teaching

instruction, this result answers the second question of the study positively and reject the second hypothesis.

3- Presentation of the results of the engagement scale:

In order to test the third null hypothesis, which states that there are no statistically significant differences between the average scores on the engagement scale for students in the experimental group and the average scores of the control group.

In order to verify the validity of the null hypothesis, the researcher applied the post-engagement scale to the two research groups (experimental and control), and the average ranks and the sum of ranks were calculated for the students' grades and for the experimental and control groups to know the effect of team teaching instruction in engaging ESP college students for the experimental research group by comparing it with the control group. The data were processed statistically using the Mann-Whitney test for two independent samples, and the results were as shown in Table (4).

Table (4) Mann-Whitney test to identify statistical differences between the experimental and control groups in the results of the dependent variable of engagement.

Ranks							
	groups	N	Mean rank	Sum of Ranks	Mann-Whitney U	Tabular value	Level of significance (0.5)
Post engagement scale	control	30	11.50	161.00	56.000	61	Not-significant
	experimental	30	17.50	245.00			
	total	60					

It is clear from the table (4) that the calculated Mann-Whitney value of (56.000) is less than the tabular value of (61) at the level of significance (0.05), which indicates the existence of a difference between the average ranks of the control group's scores and the average ranks of the experimental group's scores in the post-engagement variable, in favor of the experimental group with the higher average ranks. This indicates the effect of the team teaching instruction in increasing students' engagement, which in turn led to an increase in their academic achievement, this result answers the third question of the study positively and reject the third hypothesis.

Discussion of Results

The findings confirm that team teaching is an effective methodology for improving ESP students' achievement at beginner levels. The collaborative approach allowed instructors to address individual student needs more effectively while fostering a supportive learning environment.

These results align with previous studies demonstrating the benefits of collaborative instructional methods in language in language education (Kochar (2000), Austin (2001), Wilson and Michaels (2006), Vogler and Long (2003), Lesely (2007), and Liu (2008). The positive students' perceptions further highlight the potential for team teaching to enhance engagement among learners.

Conclusion

Team teaching significantly improves ESP students' achievement when using New Headway Plus for beginner levels. This methodology fosters a more engaging and supportive learning environment, leading to better outcomes compared to traditional instruction.

Recommendations

1- Integrate team teaching into EFL programs.

2- Provide professional development opportunities for instructors on effective collaboration techniques.

3- Conduct further research on long-term impacts of team teaching across different levels and contexts.

References

- Appleton, J.J., S.L. Christenson, D. Kim, A.L. Reschly Measuring cognitive and psychological engagement: Validation of the student engagement instrument. Journal of School Psychology, 44 (5) (2006), pp. 427-445

- Association of American Colleges, 1994. *Strong foundations: Twelve principles for effective general education programs.* Washington, DC.

- *Austin, V. L. (2001). Teachers' beliefs about co-teaching. Remedial and Special Education, 22, 245-255.*

- Basturkmen, H. (2006). Ideas and Options in English for Specific Purposes.

- Bess, J 2000, 'Integrating autonomous professionals through team-teaching' in Bess, J. L. (eds.) *Teaching alone, teaching together: Transforming the structure of teams for teaching*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

- *Buckley, F. J. (2000). Team teaching: What, why and how? California: Sage, Thousand Oaks.*

- Davis, J 1995, *Interdisciplinary courses and team-teaching: New arrangements for learning,* ACE/Oryx: Phoenix.

- Degan, J. C. (2018). Stronger Together: A Case for Team Teaching in the Elementary School Setting.

- Friend, M., Cook, L., Hurley-Chamberlain, D., & Shamberger, C. (2010). Co-teaching: An illustration of the complexity of collaboration in special education. Journal of educational and psychological consultation, 20(1), 9-27.

- Gabelnick, F., MacGregor, J., Matthews, R. S., & Smith, B. L. (1990). Learning community models. New directions for teaching and learning, 41, 19-37.

- George, M. A., & Davis-Wiley, P. (2000). Team teaching a graduate course: Case study: A clinical research course. College teaching, 48(2), 75-80.

- Goetz, K. (2000). Perspectives on team teaching. *Egallery,* 1(4). [retrieved 1 Sep 2004, verified 29 Jan 2005] http://www.ucalgary.ca/~egallery/goetz.html

- Harmer, J. (2015). The Practice of English Language Teaching. Pearson Education.

- Hedge, T. (2000). Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom. Oxford University Press.

- Helms, M, Alvis, J, & Willis, M, (2005), Planning and implementing shared teaching: An MBA team-teaching case study. *Journal of Education for Business*. September/October, 29-34.

- Hinton, S & downing, J, (1998), *Team teaching a college core foundations course: Instructors' and students' assessments*. Richmond, KY: Eastern Kentucky University. ERIC document No. ED 429469.

- Jacob, H.S., Honey, R. & Jordan, C. (2002). Getting the most out of sequential teaching. *Focusing on the Student.* Proceedings of the 11th Annual Teaching Learning Forum, 5-6 February 2002. Perth: Edith Cowan University. http://www.ecu.edu.au/conferences/tlf/2002/pub/docs/Jacob.pdf

- Kennedy, C. (1980). Team teaching in ESP: A review of collaborative practices.

- Kochar, W.T., 2000. Successful inclusion: Practical strategies for a shared responsibility. Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Lesely, L., 2007. Secondary students' attitudes towards cooperation in language curriculum and future effects. Journal of Teaching, 4(6): 105-145.

- Liu, L., 2008. Cooperative teaching between native and non-native English teacher: An exploration of cooperative teaching models and strategies in Chinese primary schools' context. Reflection on English Language Teaching, 7(2): 103-118.

- Mason, J. C. (1992). Business schools: Striving to meet customer demand. *Management Review,* 81(9), 10-14.

- McDaniel, E & Colarulli, G (1997), 'Collaborative teaching in the face of productivity concerns:The dispersed team model', *Innovative Higher Education,* 22(1), 19-36.

- Oxford University Press (2002). *New Headway English Course Beginner*.

- Rinn, F, & Weir, S, 1984, Yea, team. *Improving college and university teaching*, 32(1), 5-10.

- Salim A. H. (2025). Art based pedagogy in Teaching Conversation at University Level. Lark 17 (1), 882-906. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31185/lark.3969.

- Soars J., & Soars L. (2014). *New Headway Plus Beginner*. Oxford University Press.

- Vogler, E. and E. Long, 2003. Team teaching two sections of the same undergraduate course: A case study. College Teaching, 4(3): 122-126.

- Wilson, G. L., & Michaels, C. A. (2006). General and special education students' perceptions of co-teaching: Implications for Secondary-level literacy instruction. Reading and Writing Quarterly, 22, 205-225.

- Wilson, V & Martin, K, (1998), *Practicing what we preach: Team teaching at the college level*. Muskingum, Ohio: Muskingum College. ERIC Document No. ED 417172.

- Zhang, J & Keim, M. (1993), 'Peer coaching, peer tutoring and team-teaching', *College Student Journal*, 27, 288-293.

Appendix A
Sample lesson plan: Team teaching for ESP students in Social Work Department
Lesson title: Unit 5 "The way I live"
Level: beginners
Time: one hour
Objectives:
- Students will be able to describe their daily routines using the present simple tense.
- Students will practice asking and answering questions about daily habits.
- Students will understand and use vocabulary related to daily activities.

Pre-lesson Planning
1- Collaborative Meeting:
- Instructors meet to discuss the lesson plan, objectives, and roles.
- Decide on the activities and materials needed.
2- Role Definition:
- Instructor A focuses on language structures and grammar.
- Instructor B emphasizes vocabulary and pronunciation.

Lesson Structure
Warm-Up (5 minutes)
- Instructor A: Introduces the topic with a brief discussion on daily routines.
- Activity: Students share one thing they do every day in pairs.
Vocabulary (10 minutes)
- Instructor B: Presents vocabulary related to daily activities (e.g., wake up, have breakfast, go to school).
- Activity: students match vocabulary words with their meanings in pairs.
Grammar (15 minutes)
- Instructor A: Explains the present simple tense for describing routines.
- Activity: Students complete exercises in pairs to practice forming sentences (e.g., "I wake up at 7:00 am")
Practice (15 minutes)
- Both instructors: Conduct role-playing activities where students practice asking and answering questions about daily habits.
- Activity: students work in small groups to interview each other.
Conclusion (10 minutes)
- Instructor B: Reviews key vocabulary and phrases.

- Instructor A: Provides feedback on grammar usage during the role-play.
- Activity: Students reflect on what they learned and share one thing they found challenging.
  Assessment (5 minutes)
- Formative assessment: Monitor student participation during activities.
- Summative assessment: Collect worksheets from vocabulary and grammar exercises for evaluation.
  Materials Needed
- New Headway Plus textbook for beginners (Unit 5)
- Handouts with vocabulary and grammar exercises.
- Whiteboard and markers.
  Tips for Team Teaching
  1- Clear communication: it ensures smooth transitions between instructors.
  2- Flexibility: it is flexible to adjust activities based on student feedback or engagement.
  3- Feedback: it provides constructive feedback to students during and after the lesson.

  By following this plan, instructors can effectively collaborate to deliver comprehensive lesson that engages students and enhances their ESP skills using Unit 5 of New Headway Plus.

Appendix B
Achievement Test for Units 5, 6, 7, and 8 of New Headway Plus for Beginners.
Purpose:
This test intends to measure the students' true proficiency with vocabulary, grammar, reading and writing skills that are taught in Units 5 through 8 of New Headway Plus Beginner by John and Liz Soars. The test is aligned with the textbook's objectives and focuses on evaluating students' ability to use English for communication in real-life contexts.
Target Group:
First-level students at the College of Education for Women, Social Work Department (ESP learners).
Duration: 90 minutes
Test Design
The test consists of four sections: Vocabulary (20 marks), Grammar (20 marks), Reading (30 marks), and Writing (30 marks). The total score is 100 marks.

Section 1: Vocabulary (20 Marks)
Part A: Matching (10 Marks)
Match the words from the box to their definitions. Write the correct letter in the blank.
Words:
1. doctor
2. supermarket
3. expensive
4. holiday
5. ticket
Definitions:
a) A person who helps sick people.
b) A place where you buy food and other items.
c) Something you need to travel by bus or train.
d) Something that costs a lot of money.
e) A time when you don't work or study.
Part B: Fill in the Blanks (10 Marks)
Complete the sentences with the correct word from the box.
Words: hotel, cheap, airport, weekend, restaurant

1. We stayed in a nice _____ during our trip.
2. This bag is very _; it didn't cost much money.
3. I'll meet you at the _ before your flight leaves.
4. Let's go to a _ for dinner tonight.
5. I always relax on the _ after a busy week.

Section 2: Grammar (20 Marks)

Part A: Multiple Choice (10 Marks)

Choose the correct answer.

1. She ---------- to work every day by bus.

a) go

b) goes

c) going

2. How much --------- these apples cost?

a) do

b) does

c) is

3. I ---------- TV last night because I was tired.

a) don't watch

b) didn't watch

c) wasn't watching

4. There ---------- a lot of people at the party yesterday.

a) was

b) were

c) are

5. They ---------- to the park every weekend.

a) goes

b) went

c) go

Part B: Sentence Correction (10 Marks)

Correct the mistakes in these sentences.

1. She don't like coffee. → _____.
2. We goes to school every day. → _____.
3. There is two chairs in the room. → _____.
4. He buyed a new car last week. → _____.
5. I am not understand this question. → _____.

Section 3: Reading Comprehension (30 Marks)

Read the following passage and answer the questions below:

Passage:

Sarah lives in London with her family. She works as a nurse at a big hospital in the city center. Every morning, she wakes up at 6:00 am and takes a bus to work. She loves her job because she enjoys helping people and working with her colleagues.

On weekends, Sarah likes to spend time with her friends and family. Sometimes they go to the park together or eat at a restaurant. By the way, Sarah loves to throw herself into reading books and watching movies as much as possible when she's not busy with other stuff.

Part A: True or False (10 Marks)

Write "True" or "False" next to each statement.

1. Sarah lives in London with her friends. _____
2. She works as a teacher at a big hospital in London city center. _____
3. Sarah takes a bus to work every morning at 6:00 am. _____
4. On weekends, Sarah always goes to work instead of spending time with her family and friends. _____
5. Sarah enjoys reading books in her free time. _____

Part B: Answering Questions (10 Marks)

Answer the following questions based on the passage.

1. Where does Sarah live? _____.

2. What does Sarah do for work? _____.
3. How does Sarah get to work? _____.
4. What does Sarah like doing on weekends? _____.
5. Name one activity Sarah enjoys in her free time? _____.

Part C: Vocabulary from Context (10 Marks)

Find words from the passage that mean:

1. A person who helps sick people → _____.
2. The opposite of "evening" → _____.
3. To like something very much → _____.
4. A place where you can eat food → _____.
5. Not working → _____.

Section 4: Writing (30 Marks)

Part A: Sentence Writing (15 Marks)

Write five sentences about what you do on weekends using these words:

• usually
• sometimes
• never
• always
• often

Part B: Paragraph Writing (15 Marks)

Write a short paragraph (50–70 words) about your daily routine using these prompts:

• What time do you wake up?
• How do you get to school/work?
• What do you do in your free time?

Scoring Rubric

• Vocabulary: Correct use of words from units covered.
• Grammar: Accuracy in sentence structure and tenses.
• Reading Comprehension: Understanding key details from texts.
• Writing: Content, organization and coherence, and language use.

References

Soars, J., Soars, L., New Headway Plus Beginner (2014). Oxford University Press.

Writing Rubric for Paragraph Writing

This rubric is adapted from (Harmer, 2015 and Hedge, 2000).

Scales / Items			Excellent (13-15 marks) Consistently strong performance in all criteria.	Good (9-12 marks) good performance with minor errors.	Fair (5-8 marks) Fair performance with noticeable errors.	Poor (0-4 marks) poor performance with significant errors.
Content (5 marks)						
1	**Relevance**	The paragraph addresses all three prompts (waking up time, mode of transport to				

		school/work, and free time activities.				
2	**Completeness**	All necessary information is included.				
3	**Accuracy**	Information is accurate and consistent.				
Organization and Coherence (4 marks)						
4	**Clear Introduction**	The paragraph begins clearly.				
5	**Logical Flow**	Ideas are logically connected.				
6	**Effective conclusion**	The paragraph ends appropriately.				
Language Use (6 marks)						
7	**Grammar**	Accurate use of grammar structures (e.g., verb tenses).				
8	**Vocabulary**	Appropriate choice of vocabulary.				
9	**Fluency**	The writing flows smoothly without awkward phrasing.				

Appendix C

Student Engagement in Team Teaching Questionnaire

Instructions: Please rate your agreement with each statement on a scale of 1 to 4, where:

1 = Strongly Disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Agree

4 = Strongly Agree

No.	Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
	Cognitive Engagement				
1	The team teaching approach helps me understand difficult concepts better.				
2	I find it easier to stay focused during team-taught lessons.				
3	Having multiple instructors makes the learning process more interesting.				

4	I feel more motivated to learn in team-taught classes.				
	Affective Engagement				
5	I feel more comfortable asking questions in team-taught lessons.				
6	The team teaching approach creates a positive learning environment.				
7	I enjoy the variety of teaching styles in team-taught classes.				
8	I feel more supported in my learning when there are multiple instructors.				
	Behavioral Engagement				
9	I participate more actively in discussions during team-taught lessons.				
10	I complete assignments more thoroughly for team-taught classes.				
11	I attend team-taught classes more regularly than traditional classes.				
12	I pay more attention during team-taught lessons.				
	Social Engagement				
13	Team teaching encourages more collaboration with my classmates.				
14	I interact more with instructors in team-taught classes.				
15	The team teaching approach improves my communication skills.				

This questionnaire is adapted from the Student Engagement Instrument (SEI) developed by Appleton et al. (2006) and modified to specifically address team teaching contexts. The SEI was originally designed to measure cognitive and psychological engagement in school settings.

Reference:

Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., Kim, D., & Reschly, A. L. (2006). Measuring cognitive and psychological engagement: Validation of the Student Engagement Instrument. Journal of School Psychology, 44(5), 427-445.

Documentation:

The questionnaire consists of 15 Likert-scale items. It is designed to assess four dimensions of student engagement in team teaching contexts:

1. Cognitive Engagement: Items 1-4 measure students' mental investment in learning.

2. Affective Engagement: Items 5-8 assess students' emotional responses to team teaching.

3. Behavioral Engagement: Items 9-12 evaluate observable participation and effort.

4. Social Engagement: Items 13-15 measure interpersonal aspects of engagement.