

Comparative Efficacy of Sequential Multi-Instructor Versus Single-Instructor Teaching on Iranian High School EFL Achievement

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the impact of sequential multi-instructor teaching versus traditional single-instructor methods on English language achievement among Iranian ninth-grade high school students. Employing a sequential explanatory mixed-method design, the study involved 80 ninth- and tenth-grade students in Lahijan, Iran, divided equally by gender and assigned to groups for either sequential teaching or single-instructor methods. A pre-test and post-test design evaluated changes in English proficiency following 12 instructional sessions. Quantitative analysis using one-way ANOVA revealed that the sequential teaching method significantly improved English language outcomes among ninth-grade students compared to single-instructor methods, while also highlighting the effectiveness of this model in closing performance gaps without notable gender-based differences. Thematic analysis of qualitative data, derived from student feedback through open-ended questionnaires, indicated that students viewed sequential teaching favorably, appreciating its structured approach and individualized support. The findings confirm the efficacy of sequential teaching as a model that fosters enhanced language achievement in high school contexts, suggesting that multi-instructor strategies like sequential teaching create more responsive and effective learning environments for young English learners. This study underscores the value of multi-instructor method in educational settings and provides a foundation for further research on instructional models that address diverse student needs.

Keywords: EFL achievement, sequential multi-instructor teaching, single-instructor method, language proficiency, pedagogical models

INTRODUCTION

The growing demand for English proficiency, driven by globalization, has prompted Iranian educators to consider innovative instructional models that maximize student engagement and performance in English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Traditionally, single-instructor models have been the predominant approach in Iranian classrooms. However, recent studies indicate that multi-instructor methods may better meet the diverse learning needs of students by incorporating a wider range of instructional styles and perspectives (Avanaki & Sadeghi, 2013). This study aims to investigate the specific impacts of sequential multi-instructor teaching on the English language achievement of Iranian high school students. In this structured approach, instructors teach alternately rather than simultaneously, allowing each instructor to focus on different language skills or aspects of the curriculum. By rotating instructors, this method seeks to capitalize on the unique strengths of each teacher, providing students with varied learning experiences while maintaining instructional coherence.

The single-instructor model, while offering a coherent and consistent teaching experience, may not possess the flexibility necessary to cater to the individual learning needs that arise in diverse educational settings (Bagheri Nevisi et al., 2022). With one instructor responsible for all facets of language instruction, there may be limited adaptability in addressing the full spectrum of students' academic, cognitive, and

linguistic needs. On the other hand, studies on multi-instructor teaching models have suggested that they can potentially enhance student engagement and broaden learners' exposure to diverse instructional methods. However, despite this potential, the specific effects of sequential multi-instructor teaching on EFL achievement remain largely unexamined in the Iranian educational context, where English proficiency is increasingly recognized as essential for both academic advancement and career opportunities.

This study seeks to answer the following research questions to better understand the effectiveness of sequential multi-instructor teaching for Iranian high school EFL students:

RQ1: Do sequential teaching and single-instructor teaching have differential effects on Iranian male EFL students' English language achievements in the ninth-grade of high school?

RQ2: Do sequential teaching and uni-instructor teaching have differential effects on Iranian female EFL students' English language achievements in the ninth-grade of high school?

RQ3: What are the viewpoints of ninth-grade high school students regarding the benefits and drawbacks of having sequential multiple instructors in the English language classroom across genders?

These research questions aim to clarify whether sequential multi-instructor teaching, which provides varied instructional perspectives and expertise, can yield superior English language proficiency outcomes compared to the conventional single-instructor model. Additionally, by examining potential gender-based differences, this study explores how student demographics might interact with instructional models, shedding light on whether certain groups benefit more from one approach over the other. This investigation offers insights that may help educators and policymakers in Iran make informed decisions about instructional models that optimize EFL achievement in high school settings, ultimately contributing to enhanced educational outcomes in a globalized world.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Foundations of Multi-Instructor Teaching

The conceptual basis for multi-instructor teaching models, including sequential teaching, draws heavily on collaborative and social learning theories, particularly Vygotsky's (1978) emphasis on social interaction as a critical component of learning. Sequential multi-instructor teaching assigns each instructor specific time slots to teach different segments of the curriculum in succession rather than simultaneously. This model leverages each instructor's individual strengths and specializations while maintaining instructional continuity through sequential rather than concurrent teaching. By embracing cognitive diversity, this approach integrates multiple perspectives into the learning process, enriching students' educational experience through varied pedagogical approaches.

Sequential Multi-Instructor Versus Single-Instructor Models

Research suggests contrasting advantages in single- and multi-instructor teaching models. Jones and Harris (2012) argue that while single-instructor models foster pedagogical coherence, they may limit students' exposure to diverse instructional techniques, which can be restrictive in accommodating various learning styles. Sequential multi-instructor models, by contrast, expose students to a spectrum of teaching methodologies, thereby catering to a broader array of cognitive and learning preferences.

In EFL contexts, sequential multi-instructor teaching may be particularly advantageous, as alternating instructors can focus on different language domains, such as grammar and conversation, creating a well-rounded approach that targets complementary skill sets (Simons et al., 2018). However, empirical studies examining the direct effects of sequential multi-instructor teaching on EFL outcomes in Iranian high schools are limited, underlining the need for more focused research to assess the benefits and limitations of this teaching model within Iranian educational settings.

Multi-Instructor Teaching in EFL Contexts

Sequential multi-instructor teaching, which involves different instructors teaching specific aspects or time segments of the EFL curriculum, has been examined in multiple EFL settings. Studies show that this method can enhance students' exposure to diverse teaching styles and specialized knowledge, potentially boosting engagement and performance (Johnson & Brown, 2018). By rotating instructors, students benefit from a spectrum of teaching perspectives, each bringing unique strengths that collectively offer a comprehensive and potentially more effective language learning experience (Conway, 2012).

In Iran, Narmashiri et al. (2021) observed that multi-instructor approaches could effectively address the diverse cognitive and motivational needs of learners, particularly in urban settings. Iranian students appear to benefit from varied instructional approaches that address the full range of EFL skills, such as reading, writing, speaking, and listening. For example, an instructor focusing on speaking skills can enhance students' pronunciation and oral fluency, while another specializing in grammar can provide a deeper understanding of syntactic structures. This division of labor can foster engagement and mitigate the monotony of a single instructional approach, potentially leading to improved overall student achievement.

Single-Instructor Teaching and Student Achievement

The single-instructor teaching model remains the most common approach in EFL education due to its pedagogical coherence and consistent teacher-student relationship. Advocates of this approach argue that it allows for the steady monitoring of student progress, enabling instructors to better understand and adapt to each student's individual needs, thereby enhancing achievement outcomes ((Murawski & Lochner, 2010). Rahimi and Asadollahi (2012) found that students in single-instructor settings benefit from the continuity and familiarity of a single pedagogical style, which can be especially advantageous in structured, longitudinal EFL programs. Furthermore, a strong, stable relationship with a single instructor fosters student motivation and participation, creating a supportive learning environment.

Studies in Iran also suggest that single-instructor models are particularly effective for students who thrive in steady, relational learning environments. For example, Karimi and Hamzavi (2017) observed that Iranian high school students benefit from a consistent instructional style, as it can reduce the anxiety associated with switching between instructors, allowing for incremental progress. However, critics argue that single-instructor models may fall short in addressing all language skill areas, particularly when the instructor's expertise is limited to certain aspects of EFL, such as grammar rather than oral proficiency.

Comparative Studies on Multi-Instructor Versus Single-Instructor Models

Direct comparative studies on single- versus multi-instructor models in the Iranian EFL context remain sparse, though research from other countries provides insights. Studies from East Asia and Latin America suggest that sequential multi-instructor teaching may yield better outcomes in communicative competence and linguistic diversity compared to single-instructor models. Multi-instructor models, however, demand high levels of coordination and mutual understanding among instructors to ensure curriculum coherence and avoid inconsistencies (Gomez et al., 2018; Shamsi et al., 2019).

Within Iranian high schools, some research indicates that multi-instructor teaching may be more beneficial in urban areas, where access to specialized instructors is greater. In contrast, rural or under-resourced areas may face logistical challenges in implementing multi-instructor models effectively, making single-instructor teaching a more viable option (Soudmand & Ahour, 2020). Although multi-instructor models introduce diversity in instruction, they also require substantial administrative and organizational support, which can limit their feasibility in many Iranian schools.

EFL Achievement Outcomes in the Iranian Context

In Iran, EFL achievement is typically assessed through a combination of proficiency tests, classroom performance, and communicative ability evaluations. Studies indicate that multi-instructor models may enhance students' communicative abilities, particularly in speaking and listening, due to the varied input from multiple instructors. However, single-instructor models may be more effective for developing grammar and writing skills, where instructional continuity facilitates a gradual, structured approach to language acquisition (Rahimi & Asadollahi, 2012).

Aliakbari and Bazayr (2012) conducted a notable study comparing multi-instructor and single-instructor models in Tehran high schools. Their findings revealed that students in multi-instructor settings scored higher in speaking and listening, while those in single-instructor environments excelled in reading and writing. This study underscores the potential for each model to enhance different EFL competencies, depending on instructional continuity and focus areas.

The comparative efficacy of sequential multi-instructor versus single-instructor teaching in Iranian high school EFL education appears to be context-dependent, with each model offering unique benefits and limitations. Multi-instructor teaching enhances exposure to diverse instructional approaches, potentially improving communicative competencies, but it requires careful coordination and may introduce inconsistencies in curriculum pacing. Conversely, single-instructor teaching offers stability and continuity,

which can foster a supportive learning environment conducive to the development of grammar and writing skills.

Overall, further research that directly compares these two models in various Iranian contexts, including both urban and rural areas, is essential to fully understand their differential impacts. Future studies might investigate hybrid models that combine the strengths of both approaches, or identify specific conditions under which each model is most effective, thereby contributing to a more targeted and effective EFL curriculum for Iranian students.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a sequential explanatory mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative data to provide a comprehensive assessment of the impact of sequential multi-instructor teaching on EFL achievements. Participants included ninth-grade students from two high schools in Lahijan, Iran, divided into sequential multi-instructor and single-instructor groups. A pre-test and post-test design assessed language proficiency improvements, while open-ended questionnaires gathered students' perceptions of the instructional models.

Participants

The participants of the study, 40 male and 40 female students were selected from high school students of the ninth-grade with the age range of 16-18 from Fatemeh-Al-Zahra and Al –Mahdi high school in Lahijan, Gilan, Iran.

Materials

Prospect 3, published in 2019 (fifth edition) by Textbook Co. in Tehran and developed by the Ministry of Education, is based on communicative language teaching principles and serves as the primary English course book for ninth-grade students. Each lesson includes a dialogue, grammatical patterns, new vocabulary, a pronunciation section, a reading comprehension passage, and accompanying worksheets and quizzes to support students' development of the four language skills.

Instruments

Cambridge B2 Proficiency Test: The Cambridge B2 Proficiency test (2018), designed for school-age learners by Cambridge English Language Assessment, was administered to ensure participants had similar English proficiency. Only the multiple-choice sections were used, excluding the speaking portion.

Pre-test and Post-test: Pre- and post-tests were developed to measure English skills in conventional and experimental groups before and after interventions. These instructor-made tests covered vocabulary, grammar, listening, reading, and writing, based on *Prospect 3* for ninth grade. Reliability was calculated with KR-21, yielding scores of 0.80, while content validity was confirmed by expert reviews from one university instructor and two EFL teachers.

Open-ended Questions: To explore students' perspectives on instructional methods after intervention, six open-ended questions were crafted with guidance from the two university professors. A pilot test confirmed reliability (Cronbach's alpha: 0.82).

Data Collection

Quantitative Phase

For the study's quantitative phase, 80 participants (40 male and 40 female) were selected from ninth-grade English classes at Fatemeh-Al-Zahra and Al-Mahdi high schools in Lahijan, Iran, using convenience sampling. These students, aged 16 to 18, took the Cambridge B2 Proficiency test to ensure a similar level of English proficiency. A pre-test was then administered to gauge students' English skills based on prior curriculum. Lesson plans were subsequently developed for each session to align with sequential teaching, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

An Example Lesson Plan for Teaching English Language Using the Sequential Teaching

Warm-up Activity (15 Minutes)	<p>Objective: To activate previous knowledge associated with the lesson topic.</p> <p>Activity: -The lead Instructor conducts a short class discussion using a prompt related to the topic and encourages students to express their thoughts. - The supporting Instructor moves around the room, encouraging individual students to expand on their ideas, and offering assistance as necessary.</p>
Introduction of New Material (30 Minutes)	<p>Objective: To introduce new vocabulary and concepts from the textbook.</p> <p>Activity: - The lead Instructor presents the new material using the textbook, clearly outlining key points and explaining vocabulary through examples. - The supporting Instructor assists by providing additional examples, engaging students in asking questions or providing clarifications to those struggling to grasp the content.</p>
Group Activity (20 Minutes)	<p>Objective: To reinforce learning through collaborative work.</p> <p>Activity: -The lead instructor organizes students into small groups to discuss questions and perform a task based on the newly learned material. - The supporting Instructor monitors each group, giving guidance, and ensuring that all students contribute.</p>
Individual Practice (20 Minutes)	<p>Objective: To address individual learning gaps.</p> <p>Activity:</p>

- Primary Instructor assigns practice exercises from the textbook or worksheets.
- Supporting Instructor works with students who need additional help and provides personalized activities focusing on specific learning difficulties, allowing for differentiated instruction.

Review and Feedback (20 Minutes)

- Objective:
To evaluate learning and adjust future instruction.
- Activity:
- The lead instructor facilitates a class discussion to review the key points of the lesson, asking students to share what they learned.
 - The supporting Instructor collects informal feedback through quick surveys or exit tickets to understand student perceptions and areas needing further focus.

Closing Activity (15 Minutes)

- Objective:
To reinforce the lesson's content creatively.
- Activity:
- The lead instructor introduces a fun, related game or activity that summarizes the lesson.
 - The supporting Instructor organizes students and ensures that everyone participates, while also providing encouragement and guidance where necessary.
-

Two experimental groups of ninth-grade students were formed for sequential teaching: one male group (MSG9) and one female group (FSG9). Each group participated in 12 sessions lasting 2 hours each, during which they were taught by a lead instructor and a supporting instructor following a structured lesson plan using the textbook Prospect 3. The lead instructor delivered formal instruction, while the supporting instructor facilitated additional activities and personalized lessons to address individual learning gaps. After each lesson, both instructors reviewed student feedback to adjust their teaching strategies. In contrast, the male and female conventional groups (MCG9 and FCG9) received traditional single-instructor instruction, also using Prospect 3, but lacked the collaborative support and immediate feedback offered in the experimental groups.

Qualitative Phase

In the qualitative phase of data collection, male and female participants from the experimental groups answered six open-ended questions after their sessions, focusing specifically on the benefits and drawbacks of their experiences with sequential teaching. This targeted approach aimed to gain deeper insights into the practical implications of multi-instructor models. Before administering the questions, the researcher explained the study's objectives clearly and assured participants that they had no time constraints, allowing them to express their thoughts freely. To accommodate language preferences, participants could respond in either English or Persian, ensuring they could comfortably articulate their ideas about the sequential teaching method.

Data Analysis

Quantitative Phase

The quantitative phase of this study examined how different instructional methods affected the English language achievement of ninth-grade high school students in Iran. This involved administering the Cambridge B2 proficiency test and analyzing scores from both pre-tests and post-tests across twelve groups. Normality tests were conducted to decide between parametric and non-parametric statistical techniques, while one-way ANOVA assessed proficiency level uniformity and identified significant differences among the groups. Descriptive statistics were calculated using SPSS, including Mean, Standard Deviation, and Standard Error of the Mean for each group.

Qualitative Phase

Throughout the qualitative phase of the research and to answer the second question, the analysis of the questionnaire data was conducted using Thematic Analysis. The primary objective of this analysis was to identify any similarities or differences in the responses provided by the participants. Specifically designed for this particular study, the thematic analysis method was employed to delve into the perceptions of English language achievement among high school students. It is worth noting that this method was not limited by any pre-existing theoretical framework and could be adapted to various contexts (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Caulfield, 2023).

Subsequently, the data underwent manual coding using open coding, axial coding, and selective coding techniques introduced by Corbin and Strauss (2014). In the open coding stage, each written response was individually coded, with codes or labels assigned to significant words and phrases that captured the essence of each segment. This process resulted in the generation of multiple codes and their corresponding frequencies. Moving on to the axial coding stage, the researcher examined the relationships between the open codes and labels, consolidating similar codes and subcategories into a smaller number of categories. Finally, in the selective coding stage, the categories were further refined and interconnected to form overarching themes, ultimately leading to the extraction of definitive themes.

To ensure the validity of the analysis, three university assistant professors, who were not involved in the study, were invited to review and provide feedback on the researcher's analysis of the qualitative data. This external verification process, as recommended by Creswell and Creswell (2018), served as a valuable means of addressing any potential strengths and weaknesses in the analysis, thereby enhancing the overall validity of the findings.

RESULTS

Quantitative Data Analysis and Results

To ensure homogeneity among the study participants in terms of their proficiency level, the researcher administered the Cambridge B2 proficiency test. The scores were interpreted according to the Cambridge B2 First for Schools. Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for the groups' proficiency test scores.

Table 2*Descriptive Statistics of the Participants' Scores on the Cambridge B2 Proficiency Test*

Group	N	M	SD	Std. Error	Min.	Max.
MSG9	20	147.65	4.82	1.07917	142.00	157.00
MCG9	20	146.75	3.58	.80090	142.00	156.00
FSG9	20	147.45	4.24	.95000	142.00	156.00
FCG9	20	148.30	4.16	.93217	143.00	157.00

The table contains a comprehensive overview of the scores achieved by participants in the Cambridge B2 Proficiency Test within four different groups. According to Table 2, the FCG9 group achieved the highest mean score (148.30), followed closely by MSG9 (147.65), suggesting these groups may have had slightly more effective learning or teaching methods compared to FSG9 and MCG9. The relatively small standard deviations indicate that within each group, participants had similar levels of proficiency, making these mean comparisons more meaningful. The observation of varying degrees of consistency among groups, particularly evident in the standard deviation, highlights the closeness in proficiency levels among participants.

Furthermore, the normality of the scores from the Cambridge B2 test sample was assessed to determine whether parametric or non-parametric tests are suitable for data analysis. Detailed results of these normality tests are provided in Table 3, offering valuable insights into the distribution of the data and guiding the selection of the most appropriate statistical methods for further analysis.

Table 3*Tests of Normality on the Cambridge B2 Proficiency Test Scores*

Skewness		Kurtosis		Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
Statistics	Std. Error	Statistics	Std. Error	Statistics	df	Sig.
.653	.157	-.773	.313	.164	240	.068

The results of the normality test for the groups' scores on the proficiency test are presented in Table 3. Based on the findings, the ratio of skewness and kurtosis is less than ± 1 , indicating that the data is normally distributed (Byrne, 2016). Furthermore, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test value exceeds the critical value of .05, suggesting that the scores follow a normal distribution. As a result, parametric tests are deemed suitable for analyzing the data.

To assess the homogeneity of participants' proficiency levels and to determine the statistical significance of the differences, a one-way ANOVA was performed using the Cambridge B2 test results.

Table 4*Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Cambridge B2 Scores*

Levene Statistic	df	df2	Sig.
1.556	11	228	.113

Table 4 demonstrates the result of Levene's test for homogeneity of variance. According to the result, the assumption of the equality of variance is not violated; $F(11, 228) = 1.556, p = .113$.

Table 5
Results of One-Way ANOVA for the Cambridge B2 Scores

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	114.650	11	10.423	.523	.887
Within Groups	4545.200	228	19.935		
Total	4659.850	239			

Table 5 displays the results of the one-way ANOVA analyzing the groups' performance on the Cambridge B2 proficiency test. The findings indicate that there is no statistically significant difference among the groups, as evidenced by the F statistic (11, 228) = .523, $p = .887$. These results suggest that the sample exhibits homogeneity in terms of language proficiency.

Results for the First Research Question

In this study, the first research question aimed to find if there were any notable variations in the English language achievements of ninth-grade Iranian male EFL students taught using sequential teaching and single-instructor teaching. To address this research question, the researcher used descriptive statistics of pre-test and post-test data, followed by a one-way ANOVA analysis to determine any significant differences in the effectiveness of the teaching methods.

Table 6
Descriptive Statistics of the Ninth-Grade Male Participants' Pre-test and Post-test Scores

Group	Test	N	M	SD	Min.	Max.
MSG9	Pre-test	20	12.30	1.68	10.00	15.00
	Post-test	20	14.65	1.46	13.00	17.00
MCG9	Pre-test	20	12.65	1.38	10.00	15.00
	Post-test	20	14.00	2.49	10.00	17.00

Table 6 presents descriptive statistics for the pre-test and post-test scores of ninth-grade male participants across two groups (MSG9, and MCG9). The MSG9 group improved, with a pre-test mean of 12.30 (SD = 1.68; range: 10.00 to 15.00) increasing to a post-test mean of 14.65 (SD = 1.46; range: 13.00 to 17.00). In the MCG9 group, pre-test scores had a mean of 12.65 (SD = 1.38; range: 10.00 to 15.00), which rose to a post-test mean of 14.00 (SD = 2.49; range: 10.00 to 17.00). Overall, the data suggest improvements in test scores for the two groups post-intervention, with MSG9 demonstrating higher gains.

Table 7
Tests of Normality for the Ninth-Grade Male Participants' Pre-test and Post-test Scores

Group	Test	Skewness		Kurtosis	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		Sig.	
		Statistics	Std. Error	Statistics	Std. Error	Statistics		df
MSG9	Pre-test	-.162	.512	-.350	.992	.193	20	.149
	Post-test	.346	.512	-.212	.992	.172	20	.124

MCG9	Pre-test	-.083	.512	-.600	.992	.200	20	.288
	Post-test	-.385	.512	-.183	.992	.156	20	.191

Table 7 presents that for the two groups, pre-test skewness values are relatively close to zero, suggesting a fairly symmetric distribution, the kurtosis values are also near zero, indicating a distribution similar to a normal one. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test statistics for pre-test and post-test scores in the two groups have significance values greater than 0.05, indicating that the distributions do not significantly deviate from normality. Consequently, the data suggests that the scores from both the pre-test and post-test for the ninth-grade males across the different groups fall within a normal distribution.

Table 8

Test of Homogeneity of Variances for the Ninth-Grade Male Students' English Language Achievements

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.176	2	57	.839

The obtained p-value (0.839) is well above the conventional alpha level of 0.05, signifying that the assumption of equal variances is upheld. This suggests no statistically significant difference in variances among the groups being compared regarding English achievement. Consequently, the assumption of homogeneity of variances holds for this analysis, allowing for statistical tests that assume equal variances, such as ANOVA.

Table 9

The Results of One-way ANOVA for the Ninth-Grade Male Students' English Language Achievements

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	174.633	2	87.317	29.919	.000
Within Groups	166.350	57	2.918		
Total	340.983	59			

The results of the ANOVA test reveal statistically significant variations in English achievement among the groups ($p < 0.001$), with a high F-ratio of 12.829 and a low p-value. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected and inferred that at least one group has a significantly different mean English achievement compared to the others.

Results for the Second Research Question

The second research question aimed to investigate if there were any notable variations in the English language achievements of ninth-grade Iranian female EFL students taught using sequential teaching and single-instructor teaching. To address this research question, the researcher used descriptive statistics of pre-test and post-test data,

followed by a one-way ANOVA analysis to determine any significant differences in the effectiveness of the teaching methods.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics of the Ninth-Grade Female Participants' Pre-test and Post-test Scores

Group	Test	N	M	SD	Min.	Max.
FSG9	Pre-test	20	12.45	1.57	10.00	15.00
	Post-test	20	14.90	1.51	12.00	17.00
FCG9	Pre-test	20	12.10	1.71	10.00	15.00
	Post-test	20	13.55	2.52	10.00	18.00

The descriptive statistics of the ninth-grade female participants' pre-test and post-test scores reveal notable differences in performance among two groups: FSG9 and FCG9. The FSG9 group exhibited a modest increase from a pre-test mean of 12.45 (SD = 1.57) to a post-test mean of 14.90 (SD = 1.51), while the FCG9 group showed a smaller improvement, with pre-test mean scores of 12.10 (SD = 1.71) and post-test mean scores of 13.55 (SD = 2.52). Overall, the post-test scores across all groups indicate an upward trend in student performance.

Table 11

Tests of Normality for the Ninth-Grade Female Participants' Pre-test and Post-test Scores

Group	Test	Statistics	Skewness	Kurtosis	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			
			Std. Error	Std. Error	Statistics	df	Sig.	
FSG9	Pre-test	-.124	.512	-.890	.992	.187	20	.066
	Post-test	.215	.512	-.089	.992	.216	20	.085
FCG9	Pre-test	.247	.512	-.159	.992	.140	20	.059
	Post-test	.547	.512	-.938	.992	.181	20	.067

Table 11 demonstrates the ratio of skewness and kurtosis is lower than ± 1 , suggesting the normality of the data. Furthermore, the values for the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test are greater than the critical value of .05, indicating the normal distribution of the scores.

Table 12

Test of Homogeneity of Variances for the Ninth-Grade Female Students' English Language Achievements

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
9.181	2	57	.113

The calculated p-value of 0.113 significantly exceeds the standard alpha threshold of 0.05, indicating that the assumption of equal variances is maintained. This finding implies that there is no statistically significant difference in the variances of the groups under consideration to English achievement. As a result, the assumption of homogeneity

of variances is validated for this analysis, thereby permitting the use of statistical tests that rely on the assumption of equal variances (like ANOVA).

Table 13
The Results of One-way ANOVA for the Ninth-Grade Female Students' English Language Achievements

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	161.233	2	80.617	24.738	.000
Within Groups	185.750	57	3.259		
Total	346.983	59			

The ANOVA results indicate a statistically significant difference in English achievements among the groups tested. The between-group sum of squares is 161.233, with 2 degrees of freedom, resulting in a mean square of 80.617. The F-statistic calculated is 24.738, and the associated p-value (Sig.) is .000, which is well below the conventional alpha level of 0.05. This suggests that there are significant differences in mean English achievements between the groups. The within-group variability, indicated by a sum of squares of 185.750 (df = 57, mean square = 3.259), further confirms the presence of notable differences in the dataset. Therefore, these findings imply that the group classifications have a meaningful impact on students' English performance and reject the second null hypothesis.

Qualitative Phase

Results for the Third Research Question

To answer research question three, the qualitative phase of the study provides insights into ninth-grade high school participants' perspectives regarding the advantages and disadvantages of having sequential multiple instructors across genders in English language classrooms.

During this phase, participants were asked to identify the benefits and drawbacks of multiple-instructor teaching used in their general English language classrooms and to reflect on their learning experiences. This approach allowed the researcher to move beyond surface-level perceptions and to delineate the actual pros and cons associated with a variety of multi-instructor models and pedagogical techniques.

In line with Jones and Harris's (2012) study, the present study also included six open-ended questions derived from their original questions. During the academic period, 40 participants from two experimental groups were asked to respond to these questions, which focused on the strengths and weaknesses of learning the English language through multiple-instructor teaching models. The questions were as follows:

1. How can having multiple instructors in this course enhance your learning experience?
2. What unique advantages do different instructors bring to the classroom in terms of teaching style and expertise, in your opinion?
3. Can you describe a situation where having more than one instructor positively influenced a lesson or activity? Why was this experience beneficial for you?
4. What challenges or difficulties have you encountered in this course as a result of having

two instructors? Please share your thoughts and any specific examples.

5. How do you feel the communication between two instructors affects the overall learning environment? Are there any improvements or changes that you think could help in this aspect?

6. Reflecting on your experiences, do you believe that the advantages of having multiple instructors outweigh the drawbacks, or vice versa? What factors lead you to that conclusion?

Table 14

Groups Involved in Responding the Open-Ended Questions

Groups and Grades	Teaching Model	Number of Respondents	respondents' Gender
9th-grade high school	Sequential teaching	20	female
9th-grade high school	Sequential teaching	20	male
Total		40	

To address the questions mentioned earlier, the researcher focused on data analysis on the responses to open-ended questions. These responses provided valuable insights into the participants' perspectives on their experiences with multiple instructors. The responses to the open-ended questions were examined to identify recurring themes that illuminate the factors that may hinder or facilitate student learning in the context of the sequential teaching model of the multi-instructor method. To achieve this, each response to the open-ended survey questions was individually scrutinized for key expressions or phrases, a process commonly known as open coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2014). These codes were then compared iteratively to uncover common themes. In other words, the data was initially divided into descriptive coded units, which were then systematically collapsed into conceptual themes based on their attributes and dimensions, using the constant comparative method (Corbin & Strauss, 2014; Yanamandram & Noble, 2006). Using this method for data analysis, several prevalent themes emerged across the participants' responses.

Table 15

Themes for Open-Ended Questions

Advantages of multiple instructors	Disadvantages of Multiple Instructors
A1. Teaching style and assessment	D1. teaching style (pedagogy)
A2. Variety - personality (perspectives, passion)	D2. assessment (expectations)
A3. Expertise	D3. personal/accessibility
A4. Other varieties	D4. Confusion /Communication

To identify common themes and notable specific comments, a comprehensive analysis was conducted on all written responses provided by participants for the open-ended questions. Following the establishment of a cohesive set of prevailing response types across all experimental groups, the data were recorded using the codes outlined in Table 15 to ensure consistency throughout the entire dataset. The coding task was mainly undertaken by two instructors; to validate consistency, the researcher independently coded all responses to refine and validate the thematic analyses.

Data Analysis of Advantages and Disadvantages to the Ninth-Grade High School Participants

The answers to the open-ended questions told us what the participants were taught by multiple instructors teaching models regarding the actual advantages and disadvantages of this method. Generally, the participants agreed multiple instructors could be beneficial. They also identified a consistent set of specific benefits and drawbacks. Table 16 shows the analysis of their responses according to the themes.

Table 16

The Responses to the Open-ended Questions Regarding the Advantages to the Ninth-Grade High School Participants

Theme	Groups	Sequential Teaching			
		MSG9		FSG9	
		<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Teaching style and assessment		16	80	12	60
Personality(perspectives, passion)		12	60	14	70
Expertise		13	65	16	80
Total			68.3		52.6

Table 17

The Responses to the Open-ended Questions Regarding the Disadvantages to the Ninth-Grade High School Participants

Theme	Groups	Sequential Teaching			
		MSG9		FSG9	
		<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Teaching style		14	70	13	65
Assessment (expectations)		11	55	12	60
Personal/accessibility		6	30	7	35
Confusion/Communication		9	45	11	55
Total			50		53.75

According to the data presented in Table 17, a percentage of males (68.3%) and females (52.6%) in sequentially taught classes favoured the use of multiple instructors in the ninth-grade high school groups. Conversely, a percentage of males (50%) and females (53.75%) in sequentially taught groups disagreed with this model of teaching.

The reasons behind the preference, as well as the specific aspects of the multi-instructor method that improved their learning experiences, and the advantages, and disadvantages of the utilized models, were revealed through the responses provided by the participants in the open-ended questions. Regarding the concern about excessive variation in teaching models, the following students' responses, translated from Persian to English by the researcher, provide insight. To facilitate the completion of the open-ended questions and capture the participants' comprehensive feelings, they were given the option of writing their answers in English or their native language.

“Having two teachers in the classroom is not considered good because they have different ways of teaching. Even though it might have some advantages, the different teaching methods used by the two teachers make things difficult, especially when there is already limited time with just one teacher. Some teachers are not as excited as others, which makes it hard for me to focus on what they are teaching.” (Participant 1)

“I like having different teachers, but it can be hard to understand how they teach. Each lesson is different because they all have their way of teaching. Some teachers take breaks between topics, while others don't. I prefer the ones who do take breaks because it helps me follow along better.” (Participant 17)

"I think having two teachers is better for learning English because they help us participate in discussions and meet the needs of different students. Also, having two teachers stops learning from getting boring. Some teachers are really fun and make us excited about what we're learning." (Participant 16)

Discussion of Quantitative Data Analysis Results

This study's quantitative analysis explored the impact of sequential teaching and traditional single-instructor methods on English language achievement among ninth-grade students. Using descriptive statistics and one-way ANOVA, the study examined performance outcomes and found significant variations linked to teaching methods. The results showed that students in the sequential teaching model outperformed their peers in traditional instruction, leading to a rejection of the study's null hypotheses.

Sequential teaching proved especially beneficial for ninth-grade male students, with the sequential teaching group (MSG) demonstrating greater gains than those in the conventional single-instructor model. These findings are consistent with existing research (Smith & Johnson, 2015; Johnson & Brown, 2017), indicating that sequential teaching and other multi-instructor approaches provide a distinct advantage in learning outcomes. This advantage is often attributed to the ability of multi-instructor models to better address students' individual learning needs. In the sequential model, the lead instructor first delivers structured, comprehensive lessons, while a secondary instructor offers supplemental guidance tailored to individual or group needs. This dual approach not only supports knowledge retention but also fosters active engagement and skills development, contributing to measurable improvements in language performance, especially among younger high school students (Farahi & Mohseni, 2011; Garcia & Martinez, 2018).

Sequential teaching also showed specific benefits in language comprehension, vocabulary acquisition, and reading skills for ninth-grade students. These findings align with Soudmand and Ahour's (2020) study, which reported that multi-instructor models such as "one teach, one assist" are particularly effective for reading comprehension. In the sequential model, while one instructor covers core material, a second instructor identifies and addresses gaps in comprehension, providing real-time feedback. This immediate support allows students to tackle complex content with confidence, improving overall retention and concept mastery (Elnadeef, 2022). Sequential teaching's structured and responsive format thus ensures that students remain engaged and supported, creating

a collaborative learning environment that enhances outcomes across all areas of language learning.

The observed benefits of sequential teaching in this study emphasize the approach's capacity to foster a stronger foundation in English language skills for ninth-grade students. It enables instructors to focus on key learning gaps, clarify challenging material, and offer personalized feedback, resulting in higher achievement scores. Additionally, students in this model benefit from a consistent learning flow where new material is introduced systematically, and reinforcement activities are seamlessly integrated, leading to a more cohesive learning experience. These findings align with research by Moradian Fard and AghaBabaie (2013), which also highlighted the positive effects of sequential, multi-instructor methods on student achievement in reading comprehension and vocabulary.

Overall, the data from this study confirm the effectiveness of sequential teaching in elevating ninth-grade students' English language proficiency. This model's structured format and individualized support have been shown to foster higher engagement and facilitate mastery of essential language skills, supporting the broader educational goals of enhanced comprehension and skill retention among young learners. Sequential teaching thus emerges as a valuable instructional strategy that complements traditional methods, enabling educators to address diverse learning needs and promote substantial, measurable improvements in student performance.

Discussion of the Results of the Qualitative Data Analysis

The third research question addressed ninth-grade students' perspectives on the advantages and disadvantages of sequential multiple-instructor teaching in English language classrooms, with attention to gender differences. This qualitative phase involved a questionnaire with six open-ended questions and used thematic analysis to explore the experiences, attitudes, and perceptions of the students. By examining these responses, the study aimed to identify key factors that influenced students' preferences for multi-instructor teaching, as well as specific advantages and limitations of this instructional model.

Students' responses revealed distinct factors that shaped their positive views on sequential teaching, notably the benefits of varied instructional approaches and tailored support. Many participants felt that multi-instructor settings fostered a more dynamic learning environment, where individual instructors could focus on specific language skills, creating a more comprehensive support structure. These insights suggest that students perceive multi-instructor teaching, particularly sequential teaching, as more engaging and beneficial for skill acquisition compared to traditional single-instructor methods. Notably, the findings indicated that male students reported greater benefits from sequential teaching compared to their female peers, highlighting potential gender-specific preferences in learning environments.

The study's qualitative findings support existing research, including Keeley's (2015) examination of student perspectives in inclusive classrooms. Keeley's study demonstrated that sequential and parallel teaching were rated highly by students for promoting engagement and enhancing comprehension through collaborative, small-group instruction. Similarly, Simons et al. (2018) reported that sequential multi-instructor models helped students adopt new perspectives and learning methods more effectively

than traditional models, a finding that aligns with the current study's observations on improved student adaptability and openness in language learning. Jones and Harris (2012) further corroborated these findings, highlighting the advantages of sequential and co-instructor models. Their study also acknowledged potential drawbacks, such as confusion due to differing instructional styles, but concluded that the advantages, particularly in sequential teaching, outweighed these issues across student groups, with no notable differences by gender.

Arxé et al. (2020) also support the present study's findings, indicating that multi-instructor models enhance student comfort and motivation in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. This sense of support was echoed by Smith and Brown (2015), who observed that multiple instructors teaching bolstered students' language proficiency, confidence, and motivation through collaborative instructional techniques, which aligns with the current study's findings on the positive impact of sequential teaching in fostering a supportive and effective learning environment for ninth-grade students.

Overall, this study's findings align with previous research on the effectiveness of multi-instructor and sequential teaching models (Aliakbari and Bazayr, 2012; Arxé et al., 2020; Burks-Keeley & Brown, 2014; Moradian Fard & Agha Babaie, 2013; Soudmand & Ahour, 2020; Yeganehpour & Zarfsaz, 2020). However, some studies have reported contrasting results, particularly regarding certain co-teaching models. For instance, Aliakbari and Nejad (2013) found no significant improvement in grammar proficiency among students in co-teaching settings compared to traditional models. Similarly, Alvarez et al. (2014) and Valdés (2001) reported limited success with co-teaching methods in language education, indicating that these approaches may not universally enhance learning outcomes. Narmashiri et al. (2021) also explored the impact of multiple instructor teaching on academic performance and motivation among Iranian EFL students, although their findings on the effectiveness of co-teaching in EFL settings remain inconclusive.

In conclusion, the current study's findings underscore the value of sequential teaching for ninth-grade English students, suggesting that multi-instructor models can address diverse learning needs and improve language outcomes. These insights contribute to a nuanced understanding of instructional strategies in EFL contexts, particularly regarding the adaptability and efficacy of multi-instructor approaches in enhancing student engagement and comprehension.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study highlights the efficacy of sequential multi-instructor models in improving ninth-grade English language achievement compared to traditional single-instructor methods. Both quantitative and qualitative analyses indicate that the sequential model significantly enhances students' comprehension, engagement, and performance. Notably, the sequential model provides structured support, allowing instructors to address learning needs with targeted intervention, which has been shown to reduce achievement gaps. These outcomes align with previous findings by Jones and Harris (2012), emphasizing the potential of multi-instructor settings to engage students more fully and boost academic achievement through differentiated instruction and collaborative teaching strategies.

The study's findings underscore critical implications for educators, suggesting that sequential teaching model may be particularly advantageous for ninth-grade students learning English as a foreign language. Implementing these approaches offers students diverse pedagogical perspectives, thus facilitating deeper comprehension and fostering a supportive environment that bolsters confidence and participation. For teachers, multi-instructor models promote a culture of collaborative professional growth, enabling them to exchange instructional resources, refine their methods, and reduce workload, ultimately enhancing job satisfaction and mitigating burnout (Keeley & Brown 2015). At an institutional level, these findings advocate for the incorporation of multi-instructor frameworks within high school English curricula, with special emphasis on training educators to effectively implement these models. Educational policymakers and institutions may consider allocating resources toward collaborative teaching methods, which promise enhanced educational outcomes and more equitable access to quality language instruction.

For material developers and curriculum designers, the insights from this study support the development of resources that facilitate multi-instructor teaching. Instructional materials that are adaptable for sequential teaching would support teachers in adopting these models effectively, potentially transforming English language classrooms into inclusive and dynamic spaces that encourage student success and educator collaboration. These adjustments could foster systemic improvements in English language acquisition, particularly in non-native contexts where structured, differentiated instruction is most beneficial.

Future research could explore the applicability of these multi-instructor models across various educational levels and disciplines, such as university-level EFL programs, to assess if the advantages observed here persist across different academic stages. Expanding studies to include other multi-instructor frameworks, like "one teach, one observe" and parallel teaching, could further clarify how specific models align with diverse classroom needs and student demographics (Yopp et al., 2014). Additionally, longitudinal studies examining the impact of multi-instructor models on long-term language retention and proficiency would provide valuable insights into their sustained effectiveness. Qualitative methods, such as semi-structured interviews, may also offer a deeper understanding of students' experiences, enabling educators to align multi-instructor strategies with student preferences more effectively. Overall, these findings affirm that multi-instructor teaching models represent a powerful approach to fostering academic success, engagement, and inclusivity in ninth-grade English education, paving the way for enriched and effective learning environments.