The Effect of One Teach-One Assist Model of Co-teaching on Iranian EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension

Fatemeh Mohammad Hassani Soudmand [1], Touran Ahour [2*]

[1, 2] *Department of English, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran*
*Corresponding author: ahour@iaut.ac.ir
(Received: 2020/5/15; Accepted: 2020/9/6)

Abstract

Co-teaching is a method that two teachers work together and deliver the instruction in the same classroom to a heterogeneous group of learners. This study was an attempt to find out the effect of one teach-one assist model of co-teaching on Iranian EFL learners' reading comprehension. To this end, a quasi-experimental design with the pre-test, post-test, and control group was employed and 35 female students within the age range of 15-18 at the elementary level were selected as the participants of the study from Sanjesh-E-No institute in Tabriz, Iran. They were randomly assigned into the experimental and control groups after taking Key English Test (KET). The experimental group received instruction through two teachers while the control group was taught by a single teacher. Both groups took part in the pre-test and post-test of reading comprehension. The results of an independent-samples t-test revealed that the experimental group had significantly better reading performance compared to the control group. The results of the study can be useful for teachers, students, and any ELT program.

   Keywords: co-teaching, EFL learners, one teach-one assist, reading comprehension

Introduction

Reading is regarded as an important skill for ESL and EFL learners who want to succeed in their English learning as well as content areas that require reading English. Reading has an important role in learning process and students should try to develop it in order to succeed in their learning (Alderson, 1984; Anderson, 2003). Shaywitz (2003) claims that reading process as the royal road to knowledge is necessary for being successful in education and job performance.

Although this skill has a fundamental role in people's life, learning and teaching reading is difficult. Some challenges of reading are related to unfamiliar, technical, more complex material, or, as Asmawati (2015) indicates, to problems in comprehending text. They cannot focus on what they read during the reading activity and have difficulty to get the ideas of the text. Answering reading comprehension test will be time consuming if they use inappropriate strategies. He adds that students usually read the reading passage word by word, however, every detail of information in the passage is not needed to answer the reading questions. This mistake leads them to forget what they have read quickly. In this regard, Armbuster and Osborn (2003) point out that teaching reading is difficult and teachers should try to use various methods in teaching process and adapt them according to students' ability and performance in reading comprehension. Some factors that cause difficulty in teaching reading are related to over-crowded classrooms, and differences between students' needs and performance (Brooker, 2014; Cook & Friend, 2004, 2010; Moradian Fard & Agha Babaie, 2013; Reith & Polsgrove, 1998).

From the past, most of the classes are teacher-centered. In this case, the teacher has to do everything in the classroom. S/he should teach the students, monitor them, give feedback, ask questions and solve their problems. In over-crowded classes, all these need time and energy. Moradian Fard and Aghababaie (2013) indicate that the number of students in a class can affect teachers' performance and students' achievement. Having heterogeneous students with different linguistic, cultural background knowledge also makes problem in teaching process because

each learner has specific needs and goals. These differences need more attention, effort, and practice.

In order to tackle these problems, teachers should consider their students and try to choose appropriate methods according to their needs. When teachers choose different instructional methods, students have opportunity to see the combination of various methods that help them to understand instructor's expectations better, as well as improve their own learning outcomes (Anderson & Landy, 2006). Co-teaching is one of these methods that can be useful in heterogeneous classes. Kohler-Evans (2006) claims that co-teaching has become famous in educational field since it pays attention to the needs of all students. Tobin (2005) defines co-teaching as "a restructuring of teaching procedures in which two or more educators possessing distinct sets of skills work in a co-active and coordinated fashion to jointly teach academically and behaviorally heterogeneous groups of students in integrated educational setting" (p.785).

Researchers suggest different classifications for co-teaching (e.g., Maroney, 2009; Sharon, 1997; Watkins & Caffarella, 1999), but the most famous one is related to Cook and Friend (1995). They divide co-teaching into six subcategories including one teach-one observe (one teacher teaches and the other one observes specific characteristics of students for the purpose of gathering data for future instructional practices), one teach-one assist (one teacher teaches the lesson, the other circulates the class, monitors students and helps them), parallel teaching (both teachers cover the same information simultaneously to the students in two groups), station teaching (teachers divide content and students, then each station is taught by one of the co-teachers and the stations that are remained are completed independently by students themselves or with the supervision of other volunteer or a para educator), alternative teaching (one teacher teaches a large group of students and the other teaches to a small group that needs more attention, explanation, and practice), and team teaching (two teachers deliver instruction at the same time).

Co-teaching has an important role in students' linguistic and non-linguistic abilities (Bai, Mou, & Loredo, 2009, as cited in Zhihong, Xiaojuan, & Xiaoyin, 2013). It has a lot of positive points in comparison to single-teacher teaching (Dufour, 2003; Hadley, Simmerman, Long, & Luna,

2000; Jones, Jones, & Vermette, 2010; Muriel, 1989; Seymour & Seymour, 2006; Song Ge, 2010, as cited in Zhihong, Xiaojuan, & Xiaoyin, 2013). When the responsibilities in a co-taught class are shared, the improvement is observed in the educational programs, motivation, and achievement. In this way, it provides lots of benefits for students and teachers (Aliakbari & Bazyar, 2012).

Co-teaching also promotes team work and communication between teachers (Andrews & Wooten, 2005). When two teachers are in a class, students have opportunity to gain more personal, individualized instruction because of the shared responsibilities and more growth in a shorter amount of time. In theory, students should show a greater amount of growth when they are in a class with two teachers (Brooker, 2014). The purpose of co-teaching is pushing students to achieve higher levels of synthesis and integration of new material (Anderson & Landy, 2006). It also provides growth, personal development, increased teaching competence, and skill, especially for novice teachers (Chanmugam & Gerlach, 2013).

Co-teaching can be useful for different reasons. One is that it pays attention to the needs of all students in educational setting (Villa, Thousand, & Nevin, 2008). The other reason is related to teachers. In this method, instruction is received from teachers who are highly qualified. Co-teaching helps schools by providing situation for teachers to have advanced planning and delivering instruction in conjunction with special educators to guarantee the success of all students with necessary adaptation for the disable ones (Murawski & Dieker, 2004). The last reason is related to the collaboration. In co-teaching, teachers try to break up the monotony of one person doing all instruction and cooperate with each other during teaching process. They share their programs, talk about the materials that students should learn and why these topics or skills are important for them and how they can assess their learning outcomes.

Variety of researches have been conducted in the area of co-teaching and its different models. Murawski (2006) studied on disable students' achievement in resource (separate) classes, co-taught classes, and general classes without co-teaching. The results did not show a significant

difference. She commented that the reasons of failing co-teaching might be related to the lack of training and rough implementation.

Liu (2008) studied four models of co-teaching, among five models presented by Friend, Resing, and Cook (1993), in a context in which native and non-native English teachers participated in a team teaching classroom in China. The models that the researcher used were 'one teach-one assist', 'alternative teaching', 'station teaching', and 'team teaching. The results of the study showed that co-teaching had a significant improvement in the native English teachers' teaching. It also revealed that co-teaching models should be carried sequentially. In this regard, first "one teach-one assist" model of co-teaching should be used, followed by "alternative teaching"; then, "station teaching" and finally, "team teaching" should be conducted in the classroom.

Maultsby and Barbara (2009) studied Middle Tennessee students in grades fifth to eighth to find the effect of co-teaching on their language arts, reading, and achievement in math, which was measured by the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP). Six schools were chosen; three of them received instruction from two teachers while the others had one teacher. In this research, both special and general educators participated. The results showed that disable students had more math achievement in co-taught classes, but this method decreased the achievements of the normal students in reading and language arts.

Buerck (2010) evaluated the effect of co-teaching on regular education students. The researcher selected 38 co-taught and non-co-taught classes. The results of 441 students in a semester grade were considered in this study. She divided the students into three groups with different proficiency levels: low, medium, and high in order to find the effect of co-teaching on different levels in social sciences, mathematics, and language arts. The researcher also considered the teachers' perceptions about this method. The results showed that in co-taught classes, the students had higher performance in comparison to non-co-taught classes. These findings were related to all groups of students (e.g., low, medium, and high), even the performance of the low students improved in such classes. The teachers posited that "they check grades and missing assignments more often in co-teaching classes than in regular education classes and felt the constant

reminders were effective in keeping student grades higher" (Buerck, 2010, p. 87).

Likewise, Bacharach, Heck, and Dahlberg (2010) collected their data for four years from a sample of 9800 students and the results demonstrated significant gains in the reading scores of the students in the co-taught classes. They claimed that team teaching helped the students to receive effective teaching and have positive learning. In a similar vein, Aliakbari and Mansoori Nejad (2010) conducted a study about the effect of co-teaching on learning process in general grammatical proficiency in Iran. Fifty-eight first grade students in Ilam junior high school participated in this study. The results of the study did not lead to significant difference on the students' grammatical proficiency.

Aliakbari and Bazyar (2012) also examined the effect of parallel teaching on the general language proficiency of the EFL students as well as the participating teachers' and students' perceptions on this model in Iran. Thirty-two junior high school students participated in this study. Their age range was 13 to 14 and all of them were male. The results revealed that there was not any significant difference between the proficiency of the students in the parallel teaching and single taught class. The students in the co-taught class believed that although this method motivated them, having two teachers in one class deviated their focus from the lesson.

Similarly, Zhihong, Xiaojuan, and Xiaoyin (2013) studied on the effect of cooperative teaching on Chinese English learners' linguistic and non-linguistic abilities. Ninety-one non-English major in a college in South-eastern China participated in this study. The experimental group received co-teaching whereas the control group had one teacher. The co-teaching team consisted of two teachers, a native and a foreign teacher. The foreign teacher taught listening and speaking tasks related to the topics of textbook while the native one explained vocabularies, key points, and difficult sentences of the text. The results showed positive effect on the linguistic and non-linguistic abilities of the students in the experimental group. This research also showed that the students had positive view about co-teaching.

Aliakbari and Mansouri Chalanchi (2013) investigated the effect of alternative teaching on the improvement of EFL learner's reading

comprehension in Ilam, Iran. Their participants were level five female students at a private language institute. The control group received instruction from a teacher while in the experimental group two teachers co-taught. The results revealed a significant difference between the two groups indicating the outperformance of the experimental group in reading comprehension test.

Moradian Fard and AghaBabaie (2013) conducted a study on the effect of co-teaching on reading comprehension in Shahre-Kord, Iran. Their participants were 60 female students at the level five from two private language institutes. In their study, based on Cook and Friend's model (2004), they employed alternative model of co-teaching. The results indicated that the experimental group's reading comprehension was significantly improved.

In the study of Burks-Keeley and Brown (2014), teachers' perceptions were examined to find which of five co-teaching models (i.e., one teach-one assist, station teaching, parallel teaching, alternative teaching, and team teaching) was more effective regarding learning and teaching behaviors (e.g., teacher authority, classroom management, teaching model, differentiated instruction, engagement, motivation, confidence, behavior, learning, and work requirements). The results showed the effectiveness of the one teach-one assist model.

Khales Haghigh and Abdollahi (2014) also attempted to find out the effect of station teaching and team teaching on the improvement of the students' reading comprehension in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) situation in Ilam, Iran. Fifty-two sophomore marketing management students participated in the study. The researchers assigned the students to two experimental groups that received station teaching in one group and team- teaching in the other group, and a control group that received instruction from one teacher. The outcomes indicated the outperformance of the experimental groups in comparison to the control group, but there was not any meaningful difference between the performance of team-teaching and station teaching groups. In a similar vein, Soelen (2015) studied the effect of co-teaching on reading achievement of 103 students in the second through fourth grade of two elementary schools in north-west Iowa. Fifty-two students were taught by two teachers; a candidate (intern) and an

experienced cooperating teacher (mentor) while 51 students were taught by one teacher. The findings of the study did not show any significant difference in the reading achievement of co-taught students with non-co-taught ones.

Moreover, Mighdadi and Baniabdelrahman (2016) investigated the effect of team teaching on reading comprehension of Jordanian EFL students and their attitudes toward this strategy. Forty-eight eleventh grade students participated in this study who were assigned to the control (n= 23) and experimental (n= 25) groups. A reading comprehension test and a questionnaire were distributed among the students. The findings showed that the students had better performance in the team taught class in comparison to the single taught one. It was also revealed that the students had positive attitudes about this method.

Ghanaat Pisheh, Sadeghpour, Nejatyjahromy, and Mir Nasab (2017) investigated the effect of cooperative teaching on the reading skills of students with reading disorders. Three second education dyslexia female students from regular primary school of Tabriz participated in this study. For diagnosing reading disorders, the researchers employed the revised Wechsler Intelligence Scale and reading and dyslexia test. The students received five cooperative teaching sessions from two teachers. After the treatment, the results showed that this method was effective for developing reading skills among these students.

The related literature shows the value of co-teaching and its effect on learning process. Based on the aforementioned, this method can be useful for teaching reading in order to fulfill the needs of teachers and students in this process. Although some researchers have worked on co-teaching, to the knowledge of the researchers, there is not any research on one teach-one assist model in teaching reading in Iran. Therefore, the aim of the study was to find the effect of this model of co-teaching on the reading comprehension of Iranian EFL learners. In this regard, the following research question was posed:

RQ: Does one teach-one assist model of co-teaching affect Iranian EFL learners' reading comprehension?

Method

Participants

The participants in this study were selected out of 40 students in two classes (20 students in each class) from Sanjesh-E-No language institute in Tabriz, Iran. All of them were female and at the elementary level with the same first language background (Azeri Turkish). Their age range was between 15 and 18. They took the reading and writing parts of Key English Test (KET) and those whose scores fell one standard deviation below and above the mean were considered as the participants of this study, who 35 students, randomly assigned to the experimental and control groups. In this regard, the number of students were 19 and 16 in the experimental and control groups, respectively.

Instruments

In this study, the following instruments and materials were employed:

Key English Test (KET)

KET was used for homogenizing the students. This test evaluates students' ability in four English skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Each skill has its own parts. Due to the practicality issues, only the reading and writing parts were considered in this study. These sections consisted of nine parts (56 questions). Parts one to five were about reading and parts six to nine were related to writing. The students had to answer them within 70 minutes. All parts of reading and writing had one score except the last part of writing that had five scores. In this regard, the total score for the reading section was 35 and for the writing section was 25 and the overall score for both sections was 60.

Pre-test and Post-test

Since the participants were at the elementary level in English, the reading parts of two versions of KET were used as the pretest and posttest. The Reading parts consisted of 35 items and each item had one mark.

Textbook

The textbook entitled "Family and Friends 4" was used as the material of the study during the treatment. It is written by Naomi Simmons (2010) and published by Oxford University Press. It consists of 14 units and each unit has different parts including vocabulary, grammar, phonics, and four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). The reading parts of this book

have some pre-reading and post-reading questions. Students should answer the pre-reading questions carefully before the reading, and after the reading they should complete the sentences by using the words that are given or they should distinguish their correctness according to the text. They should also guess the meaning of vocabularies that are in the text.

 Procedure

   After ensuring the homogeneity of the students of the two selected classes from the Sanjesh-E-No language institute in Tabriz, Iran, in terms of language proficiency through the KET test, 19 students from one class and 16 students from the other class reached the criteria and overall 35 students out of 40 were considered as the sample of the study and their data were employed in the statistical analysis. For checking the homogeneity of the participants in both classes who had reached the criteria of one SD below and above the mean, an independent-samples t-test was carried out, which indicated no significant difference between their KET scores; therefore, both classes were considered homogenous regarding their proficiency level. It should be mentioned that due to the regulations of the institute, the researcher could not put aside those students who did not reach the criteria; thus, they were also sat in their regular classes but the researcher only considered the scores of the selected students in both classes in the data analysis. In this regard, these classes were randomly assigned to the experimental (n = 19) and control (n = 16) groups of the study. The classes of both groups were held on Saturdays and Mondays. Each session was one hour and 30 minutes. The researcher used the reading part of one version of KET as the pre-test and after the pretest, the treatment period started in 16 sessions.

   The control group, similar to traditional classes, was taught by one of the teachers in the institute. In this group, the teacher used "Family and Friends 4" as the teaching material in the classroom. For teaching reading, she prepared the students for the new lesson by initial discussion about the topic, or making explicit link between the topic of the text and the students' own lives and experiences. She wrote new vocabularies on the board. After that she asked the students to read the reading passage silently while she was writing some questions about the text on the board. During the reading

process, she monitored her students and answered their questions. After reading, they answered the questions and did the exercises. The teacher checked their answers and gave them feedback.

In the experimental group, two teachers co-operated with each other. Before the experiment, at a friendly meeting, the researcher briefed the teachers about the regularities of the one teach-one assist model of co-teaching that they were going to use in the class. Then they started their teaching using the same textbook "Family and Friends 4". One teacher taught reading like the control group and the other circulated the class during the process. She monitored the students, helped them with doing the exercises, answered their questions (e.g., *what is the pronunciation of "dinosaur"? or what is the meaning of invent?*) and solved their problems. In this class, the teachers consulted with each other from the beginning until the end of the class. They planned with each other about their responsibilities, and the programs about teaching. They divided their roles (e.g., who would teach reading, or circulate the class) and participated together in the class. They helped each other in teaching, monitoring, editing, and giving feedback to the students. For example, while, one teacher was writing some questions about the text on the board, the other one monitored the students' responses to the questions and gave necessary feedback to help them to find the right answer (e.g., *you should think more about your answer to the question two, what you have written is not the correct answer, go to the second paragraph and read it again*), or when the teacher asked the students to do the exercises, the other teacher monitored them and helped them if they had problem completing the exercise (e.g., *you should read the text carefully and write the name of each country in the blank, complete the sentences according to the text, or find correct equivalent for that word).*

They could also shift their roles when it was needed. At the end of each session, both teachers of the experimental group talked about the students' problems in learning (e.g., comprehension problems, pronunciation difficulties, using inappropriate strategies, focusing problems). After that, they tried to find solutions and solve them.

In the last session, the teachers gave the reading part of another sample of KET as the posttest to the control and experimental groups. Then, the

researchers entered the collected data into the SPSS 22 and ran an independent-samples t-test and checked its assumptions to test the null hypothesis.

Design

Non-equivalent pretest-posttest control group design, as one type of quasi-experimental research designs, was used. The study compared the two groups' reading comprehension performance after the implementation of the treatment. In this study, the dependent variable was the participants' reading comprehension and the independent variable was one teach-one assist model of co-teaching.

Results

Results of KET

In order to ensure the homogeneity of the participants, the researchers administered the reading and writing sections of KET to 40 elementary level students. Table1 shows the descriptive statistics.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for the KET Scores

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
KET reading	40	12	32	22.20	4.94	.18	.37
KET writing	40	8	25	16.40	4.89	.06	.37
KET total	40	24	57	38.60	8.70	.51	.37

As shown in Table 1, the students whose scores fell one standard deviation (*SD*= 8.70) below and above the mean (*M*= 38.60) were considered in the study. In this regard, 19 and 16 students were kept in the experimental and control groups, respectively; in this way, the number of the participants reduced to 35. Then, the researchers checked the normality of the participants' KET scores distribution as shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Test of Normality for KET Results

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
KET reading	.141	35	.074	.965	35	.311
KET writing	.079	35	.200[*]	.962	35	.267
KET total	.126	35	.171	.913	35	.065

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

As Table 2 indicates, the sig-values for reading and writing parts of KET are more than the set alpha level (.05), which reflects the normality of the distributions. As a result, parametric test of independent-samples t-test was conducted. The descriptive statistics for the experimental and control groups are shown in Table 3.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics for the KET Results of Both Groups

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
KET total	experimental	19	42.53	9.01	2.07
	control	16	37.81	5.19	1.30

Table 3 reveals that the experimental group's mean sore was higher than the control group's, but in order to determine whether their mean scores were significantly different, the results of independent-samples t-test should be checked (Table 4).

Table 4

Results of Independent-Samples T-Test for the KET Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
KET total	Equal variances assumed	7.112	.012	1.848	33	.074	4.71	2.55	-.48	9.90
	Equal variances not assumed			1.931	29.50	.063	4.71	2.44	-.27	9.70

Based on the results in Table 4, there was no significant difference between the experimental and control groups' mean scores, t (29.50) = 1.93, p= .063, when equality of their variances was not assumed (F= 7.11, p= .012). The mean difference in the statistics scores was 4.71 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from -.27 to 9.70. This indicates the homogeneity of the two groups at the beginning of the study.

Testing the Null Hypothesis

An Independent-Samples t-test was used to compare the experimental and control groups' mean scores in the pretest and posttest. Table 5 shows the results of descriptive statistics.

Table 5
Descriptive Statistics for the Pretest and Posttest Scores

Group		Pretest	Posttest
experimental	N	19	19
	Mean	25.47	32.21
	Std. Deviation	3.04	2.27
	Minimum	20	28
	Maximum	30	36
	Skewness	-.33	-.32
	Kurtosis	-1.38	-.55
control	N	16	16
	Mean	22.81	22.31
	Std. Deviation	4.53	4.66
	Minimum	15	17
	Maximum	30	32
	Skewness	.28	.64
	Kurtosis	-1.12	-.51
Total	N	35	35
	Mean	24.26	27.69
	Std. Deviation	3.97	6.11
	Minimum	15	17
	Maximum	30	36
	Skewness	-.27	-.53
	Kurtosis	-1.01	-1.12

As Table 5 demonstrates, the experimental group's mean was higher than the control group's. The skewness values for both groups indicate the normality of the data, which legitimize the use of parametric test of independent-samples t-test to check for the significance of the groups' mean difference. Table 6 shows the results of this test.

Table 6

Results of Independent-Samples T-Test for the Pretest and Posttest Scores of Both Groups

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Pretest	Equal variances assumed	4.464	.042	2.067	33	.047	2.66	1.29	.04	5.28
	Equal variances not assumed			1.999	25.48	.056	2.66	1.33	-.08	5.40
Posttest	Equal variances assumed	8.167	.007	8.191	33	.000	9.90	1.21	7.44	12.36
	Equal variances not assumed			7.757	20.93	.000	9.90	1.28	7.24	12.55

As indicated in Table 6, since the equality of variance was not assumed (*F*= 4.46, *p*= .04 < .05), the second row for the pretest had to be considered which shows no significant difference, *t* (25.48) = 1.999, *p* = .06 > .05, between the both groups' pretest mean scores, which indicates the groups' homogeneity regarding their reading comprehension ability before the treatment. In contrast, the posttest results indicate a significant difference, *t* (20.93) = 7.76, *p*= .000 < .05, between the both groups' mean scores, revealing the outperformance of the experimental group (*M* = 32.21, *SD* = 2.27) compared to the control group (*M*= 22.31, *SD*= 4.66). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Discussion

This study attempted to find the effect of one-teach, one-assist model of co-teaching on reading comprehension of Iranian EFL learners. The experimental group received instruction from two teachers while the control group had one teacher in the class like in traditional model. The results showed that the experimental group had better reading performance in comparison to the control group.

The findings of the study are in agreement with those of some studies in this area (Aliakbari & Mansouri Chalanchi, 2013; Bacharach, Heck, & Dahlberg, 2010; Ghanaat Pisheh et al., 2017; Khales haghighi & Abdollahi, 2014; Mighdadi & Baniabdelrahman, 2016; Moradian Fard & Agha Babaie, 2013; Murawski & Swason, 2001; Zhihong et al., 2013) that indicated the beneficial role of co-teaching on students' performance. They claimed that team teaching helped students to receive effective teaching and have positive attitudes toward learning. They also indicated the linguistic and non-linguistic improvement of co-taught students. Even this method helped students with reading disorders to improve their reading ability (Ghanaat Pisheh, et al., 2017).

In this regard, some scholars believe that the results of co-taught classes can be stronger than a single-taught class (Dufour, 2003). Seymour and Seymour (2013) have a similar view about this method and state that "there is concrete evidence to demonstrate that co-teaching is more effective than individual instruction" (p.42). There are still positive views about this model and some believe that students who receive co-teaching gain knowledge better than students who receive instruction through only one teacher (Hadley, Simmerman, Long, & Luna, 2000). In this way, it can increase students' knowledge, cultural background knowledge, and improve their comprehensive ability to some extent (Song Ge, 2010, as cited in Zhihong, Xiaojuan, & Xiaoyin, 2013). It can also cultivate their intercultural communicative competence through culture introduction (Muriel, 1989). It is reported that performance and attendance are higher for both general and special education students in a co-taught classroom (Jones, Jones & Vermette, 2010).

Although the present study like the studies mentioned above showed positive effect on the students' performance, some researchers did not find

significant differences between co-taught class and single taught one (e.g., Aliakbari & Mansoori Nejad, 2010; Burks-Keeley& Brown, 2014; Cook & Friend, 1995; Gonzalez, 2015; Soelen, 2015). These studies were conducted in different situations, for example, among the students in elementary schools (Soelen, 2015) and 10th grade students (Gonzalez, 2015), and on different aspects of language, for example, grammatical proficiency (Aliakbari & Mansoori Nejad, 2010). Considering students' and teachers' perceptions of different models of co-teaching (Burks-Keeley& Brown, 2014) revealed the ineffectiveness of some of these models in establishing the authority of teacher, class management, helping the students in their learning, and improving their confidence in learning. In this regard, although Cook and Friend (1995) introduced one teach-one assist model of co-teaching valuable, they claimed that this approach is not particularly useful to help focus student attention especially in large groups. They mentioned that the amount of teachers' authority in the classroom is also another problematic issue for students learning language through this model.

As it was discussed above, there were some studies that showed the positive effect of different models of co-teaching and there were some other studies that reflected ineffectiveness of some of these models. Therefore, with these contradictory results, there is still need to do research in this area in different ESL/EFL settings to come up with consistent results.

The results of this study showed the benefit of one teach-one assist model of co-teaching in educational system. The benefits of co-teaching are evident for both students, for example, access to two proficient teachers, monitor behaviors closely, smaller student-teacher ratio, etc. and for educators, for instance, professional satisfaction, immediate lesson feedback, prevention of student conflicts, improved instruction, and the like (Conderman, 2011; Dieker, 2001; Fenty & McDuffie-Landrum, 2011). Friend, Reising, and Cook (1993) also state that in co-taught classes, teachers bring their unique perspectives and strengths together to create instructional situation that cannot happen with the presence of one teacher. In increasing instructional options for all students, two teachers with different expertise work together to meet the needs of students better (Walsh, 1992).

The results can be useful for teachers, students, schools, or institutes. When two teachers cooperate with each other, they become familiar with their abilities, strengths, and weaknesses. Teachers can relieve each other during the instruction, or help to clarify their partner's instruction or perception; so, personality conflicts may decrease because two teachers are in the class and help students (Forbes & Billet, 2012). They can support each other while helping students master concepts and create a framework for better instruction through collaboration. In this situation, they understand the students' needs better, share their knowledge, skills, even experiences with each other in order to solve their problems. This model can be useful for novice teachers to monitor their colleague's actions in the class, and use his/her experiences in teaching, managing the classroom, etc. Co-teaching is beneficial for teachers' personal growth, support, and collaboration (Fenty & McDuffie-Landrum, 2011; Friend, 2007; Scruggs, Mastropieri, & McDuffie, 2007; Walther- Thomas, 1997; Weiss, & Brigham, 2000).

It is also beneficial for students. In this type of classes, students see different teaching methods, so they have an opportunity to choose appropriate one according to their needs and personalities. Brooker (2014) stated that when there are two teachers in a classroom, students have the opportunity to gain more personal, individualized instruction because of the shared responsibilities and more growth in a shorter amount of time. In theory, students should show a greater amount of growth when they are in a classroom with two teachers. When two teachers are in a class, students receive more direct instruction from two teachers with different teaching styles. By implementing co-teaching strategy, the varieties of students' needs are easier to meet and students are able to work with teachers every day (Brooker, 2014). Murawski (2008) contended that co-teaching "is considered a viable option for ensuring students have a 'highly qualified' content teacher in the room, while also ensuring that all students' individualized education needs are met by an instructor who is highly qualified in differentiation strategies" (p. 29). They can receive more attention, assistance, support, feedback from teachers, the elements that maybe missing in some of the cases in single taught classes for all of the students.

By considering these effects on teachers and students, the progression of schools and institutes are increased. When teachers collaborate with each other, they share noticeable points with each other, and try to solve the problematic areas in teaching; in that case, they may face fewer problems. Students also receive more attention from their teachers. They feel more freedom in asking their questions that can increase their motivation and result in their better learning, which, in turn, would lead to the betterment of schools and institutes.

This study examined the effect of one teach-one assist model of co-teaching on reading skill. Future research can be done on the effect of this model on the skills of writing and speaking as a comparative study with this study. In addition, similar research is needed to be conducted at school or university levels to determine the effectiveness of this model or other models of co-teaching on students' language achievement or learning. In this study, the gender of the teachers and students were not considered as a factor; further research can focus on this factor to gain more comprehensive results in the area of co-teaching in the EFL context of Iran.

Declaration of interest: none

References

Alderson, J.C. (1984). Reading in a foreign language: A reading problem or a language problem? In J.C. Alderson & A.H. Urquhart (Eds.). *Reading in a foreign language* (pp.1-24). London: Longman.

Aliakbari, M., & Mansouri Chalanchi, A. (2013). The effect of alternative teaching on improving EFL learner's reading comprehension. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW), 4*(4), 573-581.

Aliakbari, M., & Mansoori Nejad, A. (2010). Implementing a co-teaching model for improving EFL learners, grammatical proficiency. *Proceedings of the international conference ICT for language learning* 3rd edition. Florence, Italy.

Aliakbari, M., & Bazyar, A. (2012). Exploring the impact of parallel teaching on general language proficiency of EFL learners. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, *16*(1), 55-71. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/ full text/EJ979922.pdf

Anderson, L., & Landy, J. (2006). Team teaching: Benefits and challenges. *The Center for Teaching and Learning, 16* (1), 1-4.

Anderson, N. (2003). Reading. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Practical English language teaching* (pp.67-86). New York: Routledge.

Andrews, K., & Wooten, B. (2005). Closing the gap: helping students identify the skills employers want. *NACE Journal, 64* (4), 41–44.

Armbuster, B. B., & Osborn, J. (2003). *Put reading first: The research building blocks for teaching children to read*. Washington: National Institute for Literacy.

Asmawati, A. (2015). The effectiveness of skimming- scanning strategy in improving students' reading comprehension at the second grade of SMK Darussalam Makassar, English, *Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal,* 1 (01), 69-83.

Bacharach, N., Heck, T. W., & Dahlberg, K. (2010). Changing the face of student teaching through co-teaching. *Action in Teacher Education, 32*(10), 3-14.

Brooker, M. (2014). *Co-teaching vs. singular teaching and the difference it makes on student's reading growth* (Research paper), Northwest Missouri State University Retrieved from https://www.nwmissouri.edu/library/researchpapers/2015/Brooker,%20 Michelle.pdf

Buerck, L. E. (2010). Effects of enrollment in co-teaching classes on the academic performance of high school students without disabilities (Doctoral dissertation). *Available at ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.* (UMI No. 3408621).

Burks-Keeley, R. G., & Brown, M. R. (2014). Student and teacher perceptions of the five co-teaching models: A pilot study. *Journal of the American Academy of Special Education Professionals*, (Fall, 2014), 149-185. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1134796.pdf

Chanmugam, A., & Gerlach, B. (2013). A co-teaching model for developing future educators; teaching effectiveness. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 25* (1), 110-117. Retrieved from EBSCO.

Conderman, G. (2011). Middle school co-Teaching: Effective practices and student reflections. *Middle School Journal*, *42*(4), 24-31.

Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1995). Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 28*(3), 1-16.

Cook, L., & Friend, M. (2004). *Co-teaching: Principles, Practices and Pragmatics.* California: Northridge.

Cook, L., & Friend, M. (2010). The state of the art of collaboration on behalf of students with disabilities. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Consultation*, *20* (1), 1-8.

Dieker, L.A. (2001). What are the characteristics of "effective" middle and high school co-taught teams for students with disabilities? *Preventing School Failure, 46,* 14-23.

Dufour, R. (2003). Leading edge: 'Collaboration lite' puts student achievement on a starvation diet. *Journal of Staff Development, 24* (3). Retrieved from http:// www. nsdc.org/news/jsd/dufour244.cfm

Fenty, N., & McDuffie-Landrum, K. (2011). Collaboration through co-teaching. *Kentucky English Bulletin*, *60* (2), 21-26.

Forbes, L., & Billet, S. (2012). Successful Co-teaching in the Science Classroom. *Science Scope*, *36*(1), 61-64.

Friend, M. (2007). The co-teaching partnership. *Educational Leadership*, *64*(5), 48-52.

Friend, M., Reising, M., & Cook, L. (1993). Co-teaching: An overview of the past, a glimpse at the present, and consideration for the future. *Preventing School Failure, 37*, 6-1.

Ghanaat Pisheh, E. Z., Sadeghpour, N., Nejatyjahromy, Y., & Mir Nasab, M. (2017). The effect of cooperative teaching on the development of reading skills among students with reading disorders. *Support for Learning*, *32*(3), 245-266. Doi: 10.1111/1467-9604.12168.

Gonzalez, L. L. (2015). The effects of co-teaching on the English language arts achievement of general education tenth-grade students (Master's thesis). California State University, Stanislaus. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.csustan.edu/bitstream/handle/011235813/927/Gonza lezL%20Sp2015.pdf?sequence=1

Hadley, P. A., Simmerman, A., Long. M., & Luna, M. (2000). Facilitating language development for inner-city children: Experimental evaluation of a collaborative, classroom-based intervention. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 31,* 280-295.

Jones, J., Jones, K., & Vermette P. (2010). Co-teaching in the university setting: Promise and practice in teacher education. *National Teacher Education Journal, 3* (3), 49-57. Retrieved from EBSCO.

Khales Haghighi, J., & Abdollahi, Kh. (2014). The efficacy of team teaching and station teaching in the enhancement of students' reading comprehension in an EAP situation. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 98, 882-890.

Kohler-Evans, P. A. (2006). Co-teaching: How to make this marriage work in front of the kids. *Education, 127*, 260-264.

Liu, L. (2008). Co-teaching between native and non-native English teachers: An exploration of co-teaching models and strategies in the Chinese primary school context. *Reflections on English Language Teaching, 7(2),* 103-118.

Maroney, S. A. (2009). *Some notes on team teaching*. Retrieved from http://www. wiu.edu/ users/mfsam1/TeamTchg.htm.

Maultsby, S., & Barbara, M. (2009). A Descriptive analysis of the impact of co-teaching on the reading/language arts and math achievement of selected middle school students in a Middle Tennessee school district. ETD Collection for *Tennessee State University.* Retrieved from http:// digitalscholarship.tnstate.edu/dissertation /AAl 3408564.

Mighdadi, A. E. M., & Baniabdelrahman, A. (2016). The effect of using team teaching on Jordanian EFL eleventh grade students' reading comprehension and their attitudes toward this strategy. *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research, 3* (2)*, 38-50.

Moradian Fard, F., & AghaBabaie, (2013). The effect of co-teaching on improving EFL learner's reading comprehension. *International Journal of Advanced Studies in Humanities and Social Science*, *1*(2), 85-94.

Murawski, W. (2006). Student outcomes in co-taught secondary English classes: How can we improve? *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 22, 227-247.

Murawski, W. W. (2008). Five Keys to Co-teaching in Inclusive Classrooms. *School Administrator*, *65*(8), 27.

Murawski, W., & Dieker, L. (2004). Tips and strategies for co-teaching at the secondary level. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 36* (5), 52–58.

Murawski, W.W., & Swanson, H.L. (2001). A meta-analysis of co-teaching research: Where are the data? *Remedial and Special Education, 22* (5), 258-267.

Muriel, S. T. (1989). *The ethnography of communication*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Nevin, A. I., Thousand, J. S., & Villa, R. A. (2009). Collaborative teaching for teacher educators- what does the research say? *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, *25*(4), 569-574. doi: 10.1016 /j. tate. 2009. 02.009

Reith, H. J., & Polsgrove, L. (1998). Curriculum and instructional issues in teaching secondary Students with learning disabilities. In E. L. Meyen,

G. A. Vergason, & R. J. Whelan (Eds.), *Educating students with mild disabilities: Strategies and methods* (pp. 255-274). Denver, CO: Lov.

Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., & McDuffie, K. A. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A Metasynthesis of Qualitative Research. *Exceptional Children*, *73*(4), 392-416.

Seymour, M. W., & Seymour, D. (2013). Are two professors better than one?: Student and faculty perceptions of co-teaching. *International Journal of Learning*, *20,* 39-52. Retrieved from EBSCO.

Sharon, V., Jeanne, S., & Maria, A. (1997). The ABCDEs of Co-Teaching, *Teaching Exceptional Children, 30* (2), 4-1.

Soelen, J. (2015). Case for improved reading achievement using a co-teaching model. *Dordt College.Master of Education Program These,* 91(5), 2-22.

Tobin, R. (2005). Co-teaching in language arts: Supporting students with learning disabilities. *Canadian Journal of Education, 28* (4), 784-801.

Villa, R. A., Thousand, J. S., & Nevin, A. I. (2008). *A guide to co-teaching: Practical tips for facilitating student learning* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Walsh, J. M. (1992). Student, teacher, and parent preference for less restrictive special education models- Cooperative teaching. *Case in Point, 6* (2), 1-12.

Walther-Thomas, C. (1997). Co-teaching experiences: The benefits and problems that teachers and principals report over time. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 30(4),* 395-407.

Watkins, K., & Caffarella, R. (1999). *Team teaching: Face–to-face and On-line.* Presentation given at Commission of Professors of Adult Education meeting, San Antonio, Tex., Oct. 17.

Weiss, M. P., & Brigham, F. J. (2000). Co-teaching and the model of shared responsibility: What does the research support? In T. E. Scruggs & M. A. Mastropieri (Eds.), *Advances in learning and behavioral disabilities: Educational interventions* (pp.217-246). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Zhihong, Z., Xiaojuan,Y. , & Xiaoying, Z. (2013). The effects of cooperative teaching reform on Chinese English learners' linguistic abilities and non-linguistic abilities. *Higher Education of Social Science, 5*(2), 35-41.

Biodata

Touran Ahour is an assistant professor in TEFL and academic staff member at Islamic Azad University, Tabriz branch, Iran. She received her PhD in TESL from Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM) in Malaysia. She has authored several books and published many articles in scholarly journals and presented papers at national and international conferences. Her research interests include materials evaluation, reading-writing connection, assessment, teaching skills, and other ELT issues.

Fatemeh Mohammad Hassani Soudmand is an MA student at Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch, in Tabriz, Iran. She has been teaching for several years in different institutes in Tabriz. She has presented at national conferences. Her research interests include teaching skills and applied linguistics areas.