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# INTRODUCTION

The ability to communicate effectively in English is a fundamental skill in today’s interconnected world. However, in Ecuador’s public education system, students encounter significant obstacles in developing oral proficiency. Among the most pressing challenges are overcrowded classrooms, limited instructional time, and traditional teaching methodologies that emphasize grammar and writing over spoken communication. Despite the national curriculum’s recognition of communicative competence as a key learning objective, many beginner-level students lack fluency, confidence, and motivation to speak English in real-world contexts (Montenegro, 2021). Recognizing these limitations, this study was designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the co-teaching method as a pedagogical strategy to enhance students' speaking skills in an EFL classroom setting.

# CHAPTER I

CONTEXTUALIZATION OF THE RESEARCH

## Research problem

### Problem Statement

In the context of the Ecuadorian public education system, beginner-level students in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms encounter significant obstacles in the development of oral proficiency. These challenges are predominantly rooted in systemic issues, including overcrowded classrooms, severely limited instructional time, and a persistent reliance on traditional teaching methodologies that prioritize grammar and writing over authentic spoken communication. As a direct consequence, many students demonstrate low levels of fluency, a notable lack of confidence, and minimal active participation in English-speaking activities.

This situation creates a critical disparity between the national curriculum's stated objective of fostering communicative competence and the functional abilities students actually acquire. The learning environment often fails to provide sufficient opportunities for verbal interaction, personalized feedback, or the real-world language practice necessary to build oral skills effectively. Students are consequently hindered in their ability to use English in meaningful contexts, which is the ultimate goal of language acquisition. This research, therefore, addresses the pressing need to explore and evaluate the co-teaching method as a potential solution to overcome these pedagogical barriers, aiming to foster an interactive and supportive classroom environment where beginner students can genuinely enhance their speaking skills.

### Problem formulation

To what extent does the implementation of the co-teaching method affect the development of speaking among beginner-level EFL students?

### Systematization of the problem

What are the theoretical foundations that support the “co-teaching classroom” as a holistic solution for addressing the complexities of speaking skill acquisition within the specific pedagogical context of the Ecuadorian educational system?

How does the implementation of foundational co-teaching strategies influence the engagement and participation of beginner-level EFL students in oral communication tasks?

What is the measurable progression of students' speaking skills following a co-teaching-based intervention, as determined by pre- and post-assessment instruments?

How do the final speaking skill outcomes of the student group that received the co-teaching intervention compare to those of the control group taught using traditional solo-teaching methods?

## OBJECTIVES

### General Objective:

To evaluate the effectiveness of the co-teaching method on improving speaking skills among beginner-level EFL students, focusing on fluency, accuracy, and communicative confidence.

### Specific Objectives:

To construct the theoretical rationale for proposing the “co-teaching classroom” as a holistic solution for EFL instruction by synthesizing research on foundational co-teaching models, the complexities of speaking skill acquisition, and the specific pedagogical challenges within the Ecuadorian educational system.

To measure the influence of foundational co-teaching strategies on beginner-level EFL students’ engagement and participation in oral communication tasks, through systematic observation and assessment during implementation

To determine the progression of student’ speaking skills through co-teaching-based interventions, using pre- and post-assessment tools such as audio recordings, rubric-guided observations, and student self-reflection reports

To compare the final speaking skill outcomes of the co-teaching intervention group against those of a control group taught via traditional solo-teaching methods.

## JUSTIFICATION

The justification for this research is founded on pressing pedagogical, practical, and theoretical needs within the Ecuadorian EFL context. The ability to communicate effectively in English is a fundamental skill in an interconnected world, yet the development of oral proficiency remains a significant and persistent challenge for students in Ecuador's public schools. There exists a critical gap between the national curriculum's mandate for communicative competence and the classroom reality, where overcrowded settings, limited instructional time, and traditional methods often leave speaking skills underdeveloped. This study is necessary because it directly confronts this long-standing issue by investigating a practical, student-centered methodology designed to foster the very skills that are currently neglected.

This research is particularly timely and relevant due to the emergence of co-teaching as a promising pedagogical model to address these specific barriers. Co-teaching provides a dynamic framework for increasing student opportunities for verbal interaction, receiving personalized feedback, and engaging in authentic language practice—key elements often missing in a traditional solo-teacher classroom. Furthermore, collaborative teaching models are already being implemented in some Ecuadorian schools, such as those supported by non-governmental organizations. Therefore, this study is not merely theoretical; it seeks to evaluate and provide empirical evidence for a strategy that has practical application within the national context, offering a pathway to optimize existing resources and collaborations.

The findings of this investigation are poised to offer significant contributions to multiple stakeholders. Primarily, beginner-level students stand to benefit from a more engaging and effective instructional approach that builds their communicative confidence, fluency, and willingness to participate. For educators and school administrators, this study will provide a research-validated framework for implementing co-teaching, offering insights into how to structure lessons that effectively enhance oral skills in resource-constrained environments. Finally, this research will add valuable empirical data to the existing body of literature on EFL pedagogy in Ecuador, potentially informing teacher training programs and future curricular development aimed at improving speaking proficiency nationwide.

# CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL BASIS OF THE RESEARCH

## 2.1. Conceptual Framework

## 2.2. Reference Framework

# CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

## 3.1. Location

We conducted this study at the Escuela de Educación Básica "Víctor Manuel Rendón," a public school located in the city of Valencia, province of Los Ríos, Ecuador. I deliberately selected this setting because it is representative of the typical conditions and challenges prevalent within the Ecuadorian public education system, such as overcrowded classrooms and limited opportunities for speaking practice.

This educational environment was characterized by factors that directly impact English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction. These conditions, including limited resources, often restrict the amount of instructional time dedicated to developing students' oral skills, creating a context where traditional teaching methods prevail and authentic speaking practice is scarce. Therefore, the school provided a realistic and relevant environment in which to implement and evaluate the co-teaching method as a potential solution to these systemic challenges, with the goal of generating findings applicable to similar EFL contexts across the country.

## 3.2. Types of Research

To achieve a comprehensive and holistic understanding of the phenomenon, this study utilized a mixed-method research paradigm. This approach intentionally combined qualitative and quantitative research types within a single study, as it provided a more complete picture of the research problem than either approach could offer alone. The integration of both data types allowed for a robust analysis, where quantitative results were explained and enriched by qualitative findings.

The qualitative dimension of this study was anchored in an action research model. We selected this approach to directly tackle the key challenge: improving speaking skills in a real classroom environment. This model was descriptive and exploratory, allowing for an in-depth examination of the co-teaching process as it naturally occurred. It operated through a reflective cycle of planning, acting, observing, and reflecting, which enabled continuous adjustments to the teaching strategies based on real-time classroom dynamics and student needs.

The quantitative component provided an objective framework for measuring the intervention's outcomes. This approach focused on collecting numerical data through pre- and post-test assessments to statistically measure the changes in students' speaking proficiency. Specifically, it sought to quantify improvements in fluency, accuracy, and confidence, allowing for a clear comparison between the experimental and control groups. By integrating these two research types, we were able to not only measure the effectiveness of the co-teaching method but also understand the contextual factors that influenced its success.

## 3.3. Research methods

In alignment with the mixed-method design, this study integrated both inductive and deductive research methods to guide the collection and analysis of data. The combination of these methods allowed for a dynamic approach where we could explore the complexities of the classroom environment while simultaneously testing a specific hypothesis. This dual approach ensured that the research findings were both contextually rich and empirically grounded.

We applied the inductive method for the qualitative aspects of the study. This method is exploratory in nature and involves building theories or generalizations from specific observations. We began by immersing ourselves in the classroom setting without preconceived notions, using observation checklists and reflective notes to capture the nuances of student participation, engagement, and confidence during the co-teaching sessions. By analyzing these specific instances and patterns of behavior, we developed a deeper understanding of *how* the co-teaching strategies influenced the learning environment and facilitated oral communication. This descriptive method was essential for interpreting the human elements of the learning process that numbers alone cannot capture.

For the quantitative portion of the research, we used the deductive method. This method begins with a specific hypothesis, which is then tested through the collection of empirical data. Our study was initiated with the hypothesis that implementing the co-teaching method would significantly enhance the speaking skills of beginner-level EFL students. To test this, we collected numerical data from pre- and post-test assessments, measuring specific variables such as fluency and vocabulary use. This structured approach allowed us to systematically evaluate the intervention's effectiveness and determine if the observed improvements were statistically significant, thereby confirming or refuting our initial hypothesis.

## 3.4. Data Collection Sources

To ensure a thorough and well-rounded analysis, we utilized a variety of data collection instruments designed to capture both quantitative and qualitative aspects of the students' progress and their experience with the co-teaching method. These instruments included pre- and post-test assessments, student surveys, classroom observations, and teacher reflections.

**Pre- and Post-Test Assessments**

To quantitatively measure the development of students' speaking skills, we administered individual oral production tests before and after the 8-week intervention. Each test consisted of a one-minute audio recording of the student. Given the students' beginner level, we did not provide a specific English prompt. Instead, to elicit their productive vocabulary, we prompted them in Spanish with broad, familiar topics such as "colors," "animals," "greetings," or "family." This allowed students to recall and produce any English words or simple phrases they knew. We then analyzed these recordings using the standardized rubric detailed in Appendix A to assess fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, and confidence. This method provided measurable data on the change in their oral proficiency following the co-teaching intervention.

**Student Surveys**

We used two distinct surveys to gather students' perceptions of the learning experience. First, we administered the Student Self-Assessment Survey (Appendix C) on three separate occasions: at the beginning, midpoint, and conclusion of the study. This survey was designed to track the evolution of students' self-reported confidence, motivation, and perceived fluency throughout the intervention period. Second, at the very end of the research, we administered the Survey on the Effectiveness of Co-Teaching in EFL Classrooms (Appendix D). This final survey gathered summative feedback on which co-teaching strategies students found most helpful and their overall assessment of the method's impact on their learning.

**Classroom Observations**

To collect qualitative data on in-class behavior and interaction, we conducted systematic classroom observations during each of the 18 sessions with the experimental group. We used the Observation Checklist (Appendix B) to record data consistently across sessions. This instrument allowed us to document key indicators of engagement, such as whether students participated actively, responded in full sentences, used new vocabulary, and demonstrated confidence through body language and tone. These observations provided rich, contextual data on how the co-teaching models influenced the classroom dynamics and students' oral participation in real-time.

**Teacher Reflections**

Teacher reflections served as an additional source of qualitative data, providing insight into the pedagogical process. These reflections were not recorded in a formal journal but were derived from two key activities. First, after each session with the experimental group, the collaborating teachers engaged in informal discussions to comment on the day's progress, challenges, and student responses. Second, we drew reflective data from the formal interview conducted with the lead teacher about the overall research experience. These combined reflections offered a professional perspective on the implementation of the co-teaching method and its perceived impact on both students and educators.

## 3.5. Research Design

We conducted this study using a mixed-method action research approach, which incorporated a quasi-experimental design. This framework was chosen as the most effective for achieving the study's dual objectives: first, to implement and evaluate a practical solution to a real-world problem within a specific classroom context (action research), and second, to measure the intervention's impact by comparing an experimental group with a control group (quasi-experimental design). The research took place at Escuela de Educación Básica "Victor Manuel Rendón," a public school in Valencia, Ecuador, which provided a realistic setting to test the co-teaching method.

The quasi-experimental structure involved the designation of two non-randomly assigned groups. The experimental group received instruction via the co-teaching method, while the control group was taught using traditional, solo-teaching techniques. This comparative structure was fundamental for assessing the specific effects of the co-teaching intervention on students' speaking skills. The study was implemented over an 8-week period and involved a cyclical process to ensure continuous improvement and adaptation.

## 3.6. Research Instruments

To collect comprehensive data for this mixed-method study, we employed a suite of research instruments specifically designed to gather both quantitative and qualitative data. The use of multiple instruments allowed for a thorough triangulation of findings, ensuring that the study's conclusions were supported by diverse forms of evidence. The primary instruments included a speaking assessment rubric, an observation checklist, student surveys, and teacher reflections.

**Rubric for Speaking Assessments**

We developed a standardized rubric to quantitatively assess student performance on the pre- and post-test speaking tasks. As detailed in Appendix A, this rubric evaluated four key criteria: Fluency, Pronunciation, Vocabulary & Grammar, and Confidence & Engagement. Each criterion was scored on a four-point scale ranging from "Needs Improvement" (1) to "Excellent" (4). This instrument provided a consistent and objective method for scoring the audio-recorded speaking samples, enabling a reliable comparison of student proficiency before and after the intervention.

**Observation Checklist**

For the qualitative data collection, we utilized an observation checklist to systematically record classroom dynamics during the co-teaching sessions. The checklist, presented in Appendix B, included specific, observable behaviors related to student participation (e.g., "Students participate actively in speaking tasks"), sentence construction, vocabulary use, and demonstrated confidence. We completed this checklist after each of the 18 instructional sessions with the experimental group to identify patterns in student engagement and monitor the immediate effects of the co-teaching strategies.

**Student Surveys**

We administered two distinct surveys to capture students' self-reported perceptions and attitudes. The

**Student Self-Assessment Survey** (Appendix C) was administered three times—at the beginning, middle, and end of the study. This tool used a Likert scale to track the evolution of students' confidence, motivation, and willingness to participate in speaking activities over time. At the conclusion of the research, we administered the

**Survey on the Effectiveness of Co-Teaching** (Appendix D). This final survey collected summative feedback, asking students to identify which co-teaching strategies they found most helpful and to reflect on the overall impact of having two teachers in the classroom.

**Teacher Reflections and Interview**

Teacher reflections provided a final, crucial layer of qualitative data. This information was captured through two primary activities. First, informal reflective discussions occurred between the collaborating teachers after each session to analyze classroom events, student progress, and pedagogical challenges. Second, we drew in-depth reflections from a formal interview conducted with the lead teacher about her experience with the co-teaching partnership and its effect on the classroom environment.

# CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings derived from the initial data collection instruments. The primary purpose of this section is to report the baseline state of student perceptions regarding oral communication skills prior to the implementation of the co-teaching methodology. The results detailed below are from an initial survey administered to 32 beginner-level EFL students, providing a foundational understanding of their motivations, attitudes, and the perceived classroom environment.

## 4.1. Initial Survey: A Baseline of Student Perceptions

The following analysis is organized thematically to provide a clear picture of the students' perspectives at the outset of the research project.

### 4.1.1. Foundational Motivation and Learning Goals

The data indicates a strong and consistent desire among students not only to improve their linguistic skills but also to increase their sense of security while doing so.

* **Desire to Improve Speaking Ability:** When asked, "Would you like to improve your ability to speak English?" (Pregunta 1), the student response was unanimously positive. A significant majority, 90.6% (29 students), expressed that they wanted to improve "a lot" (Sí, mucho), with the remaining 9.4% (3 students) indicating they wished to improve "a little" (Un poco). No student reported a lack of interest. This reveals a highly motivated cohort, intrinsically oriented toward the primary goal of this study.
* **Desire for Greater Confidence:** Complementing the desire for skill enhancement, students expressed a clear need to feel more secure. In response to the question, "Would you like to feel more secure when speaking English?" (Pregunta 7), 93.8% (30 students) answered "Yes, a lot" (Sí, mucho), and 6.2% (2 students) answered "A little" (Un poco). This near-unanimous sentiment highlights that the students' goals are not purely linguistic but are deeply intertwined with their emotional and psychological comfort in the learning process.

### 4.1.2. Perceptions of the Classroom Environment and Participation

This theme explores students' views on the practical opportunities and conditions for speaking within their current classroom setting.

* **Opportunities for Participation:** Students' perceptions of available speaking opportunities were divided. When asked, "Do you feel you have enough opportunities to participate by speaking English in class?" (Pregunta 2), 40.6% (13 students) felt they "sometimes" have opportunities, while an identical 40.6% (13 students) felt they "almost never" do. Only 18.8% (6 students) perceived "many opportunities." This suggests that over 80% of the students do not feel they are given ample chances to practice speaking.
* **Time for Participation:** The perception of time constraints was even more pronounced. A slight majority of 53.1% (17 students) felt there was "sometimes" enough time for everyone to speak (Pregunta 3), while 46.9% (15 students) believed there was "almost never" enough time. Critically, no student felt there was "always" enough time, indicating a shared sense that classroom oral practice is rushed or incomplete.
* **Motivation for In-Class Activities:** Despite the perceived limitations, students' internal motivation to participate remained high. Three-quarters of the students, 75% (24 students), reported that they "like and feel motivated" to engage in speaking activities (Pregunta 4). The remaining 25% (8 students) acknowledged that while they are "sometimes scared," they "still try." This result underscores a resilient and proactive attitude among the learners, even when faced with affective barriers.
* **Responsiveness of Teacher:** When asked if their questions are addressed quickly in class (Pregunta 10), the results were varied. While 53.1% (17 students) felt their questions were answered "sometimes," 34.4% (11 students) felt this "almost never" happened, and only 12.5% (4 students) felt it "always" did. This suggests that a notable portion of the class perceives a delay or lack of immediate feedback from the teacher.

### 4.1.3. The Affective Domain: Anxiety, Comfort, and Confidence

This section details the emotional factors influencing students' willingness and ability to speak English.

* **Fear of Speaking in Front of the Class:** Speaking anxiety is a tangible issue for this group. When asked directly, "Are you afraid to speak English in front of the class?" (Pregunta 5), more than half of the students, 56.3% (18 students), admitted to feeling fear either "a lot" or "sometimes." This indicates that for a majority of the learners, public speaking in English is an intimidating experience.
* **Comfort with Peers and Teacher:** The general comfort level in the classroom was moderate. In response to "How comfortable do you feel speaking English with your teacher and your classmates?" (Pregunta 8), 65.6% (21 students) described themselves as "more or less comfortable." A smaller group of 21.9% (7 students) felt "very comfortable," while 12.5% (4 students) felt "very uncomfortable." This suggests a classroom atmosphere that is not overtly intimidating for most, but that could be improved to foster greater ease and openness.
* **Self-Assessed Confidence Level:** Students' self-perception of their confidence (Pregunta 9) aligns with the data on fear. On a scale of 1 (very insecure) to 5 (very secure), the average rating was 2.97. The most frequent response was a "3 - more or less sure," selected by 34.4% (11 students). Critically, a combined 31.3% (10 students) rated their confidence at a "1" or "2," signifying a substantial portion of the class feels fundamentally insecure in their speaking ability.

### 4.1.4. Student Views on Instructional Support

The final theme covers what students feel they need in terms of pedagogical support.

* **Desire for Feedback:** There is an overwhelming demand for corrective feedback. Answering, "Would you like to receive more feedback on how to improve your pronunciation or fluency?" (Pregunta 6), 93.8% (30 students) responded "Yes, a lot." The remaining 6.2% (2 students) responded "a little," with no students being uninterested. This demonstrates a clear recognition from students that they need and want targeted guidance to improve.
* **Value of Individualized Attention:** Students believe that more personalized support would be beneficial. When presented with the hypothetical, "How would you feel if you could receive more individualized attention while speaking English in class?" (Pregunta 11), a commanding 90.6% (29 students) stated, "I would feel more secure." This result strongly suggests that students link personalized attention directly to an increase in their own confidence.
* **Openness to a Second Teacher:** Finally, the survey gauged students' receptiveness to the core concept of this study. In response to the question, "How would you feel about having a second teacher in the classroom to help you practice speaking?" (Pregunta 12), the response was overwhelmingly positive. 93.8% (30 students) indicated they would feel "very good" about this prospect, with the remaining students feeling it would be "good." No student viewed this idea negatively. This finding establishes an environment of high receptivity for the co-teaching model before its implementation.

# CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## 5.1. Conclusions

## 5.2. Recommendations
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ANNEXES

## Appendix A: Rubric for Speaking Assessments (Pre- and Post-Test)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Excellent (4)** | **Good (3)** | **Developing (2)** | **Needs Improvement (1)** |
| **Fluency** | Speaks smoothly with minimal hesitation and natural flow. | Mostly fluent with occasional pauses but maintains conversation. | Frequently hesitates, long pauses, disrupts communication. | Struggles to complete sentences, frequent breakdowns in speech. |
| **Pronunciation** | Clear and accurate pronunciation, few or no errors. | Mostly clear, with some mispronunciations but does not affect meaning. | Frequent pronunciation errors, sometimes affects understanding. | Many errors make speech difficult to understand. |
| **Vocabulary** | Uses a wide range of words, including some advanced expressions. | Uses an adequate vocabulary, with some variety in word choice. | Limited vocabulary, repeats simple words. | Very basic vocabulary, struggles to find words. |
| **Grammar & Sentence Structure** | Mostly correct grammar, varied sentence structures. | Some grammar mistakes but does not affect meaning. | Frequent grammatical errors, some misunderstandings. | Many errors prevent understanding, lacks sentence structure. |
| **Confidence & Engagement** | Speaks confidently, maintains eye contact, gestures, and natural intonation. | Speaks with some confidence, though some hesitation is noticeable. | Avoids speaking or requires prompting, speaks in monotone. | Very hesitant, avoids participation, little to no effort. |

**Scoring Guide:**

* 16-20 points → Excellent
* 11-15 points → Good
* 6-10 points → Developing
* 0-5 points → Needs Improvement

## Appendix B: Observation Checklist Template

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Yes** | **No** | **Comments** |
| Students participate actively in speaking tasks. |  |  |  |
| Students respond in full sentences instead of just words or short phrases. |  |  |  |
| Students use both learned vocabulary and new expressions. |  |  |  |
| Students show confidence when speaking (eye contact, gestures, appropriate volume). |  |  |  |
| Students hesitate less than in previous lessons (reduction of long pauses or "uhh"). |  |  |  |
| Students ask and answer questions voluntarily. |  |  |  |
| Students participate in pair or group speaking activities (conversations or collaborative tasks). |  |  |  |
| Teachers provide immediate and useful feedback during speaking tasks. |  |  |  |
| The co-teaching method increases student participation in speaking tasks. |  |  |  |
| Both teachers collaborate actively during lesson delivery (interactions, role switching). |  |  |  |
| Students show more motivation to participate in speaking activities due to the co-teaching approach. |  |  |  |
| Students gradually improve in accuracy and fluency in speaking throughout the lessons. |  |  |  |
| Students make use of different types of speaking tasks (debates, descriptions, presentations). |  |  |  |
| Students interact effectively with their peers during group activities. |  |  |  |

## Appendix C: Initial Student Self-Assessment Survey (change: pre-middle-post)

Instrucciones: Lee cada afirmación y marca (✔) la casilla que mejor describa cómo te sientes respecto a tus habilidades para hablar en inglés.

1. **¿Te gustaría mejorar tu habilidad para hablar inglés?**  
   ( ) Sí, mucho ( ) Un poco ( ) No me interesa
2. **¿Sientes que tienes suficientes oportunidades para participar hablando inglés en las clases?**  
   ( ) Sí, tengo muchas oportunidades  
   ( ) Algunas veces tengo oportunidades  
   ( ) No, casi nunca tengo oportunidades
3. **¿Sientes que en clase hay suficiente tiempo para que todos los estudiantes participen hablando en inglés?**  
   ( ) Sí, siempre ( ) A veces ( ) No, casi nunca
4. **¿Te sientes motivado(a) a participar en actividades de habla en clase (diálogos o role plays)?**  
   ( ) Me gusta y me siento motivado(a)  
   ( ) A veces me da miedo, pero lo intento  
   ( ) No me gusta para nada
5. **¿Te da miedo hablar inglés frente a la clase?**  
   ( ) Sí, mucho ( ) A veces ( ) No, para nada
6. **¿Te gustaría recibir más retroalimentación sobre cómo mejorar tu pronunciación o fluidez al hablar inglés?**  
   ( ) Sí, mucho ( ) Un poco ( ) No, no me interesa
7. **¿Te gustaría sentirte más seguro(a) al hablar inglés?**  
   ( ) Sí, mucho ( ) Un poco ( ) No, no me interesa
8. **¿Qué tan cómodo(a) te sientes al hablar inglés con tu profesor y tus compañeros?**  
   ( ) Muy cómodo(a) ( ) Más o menos cómodo(a) ( ) Muy incómodo(a)
9. **En una escala del 1 al 5, ¿cómo calificarías tu nivel de confianza al hablar inglés?**  
   ( ) 1 - Muy inseguro(a)  
   ( ) 2 - Inseguro  
   ( ) 3 - Más o menos seguro(a)  
   ( ) 4 - Seguro  
   ( ) 5 - Muy seguro(a)
10. **¿Crees que tus preguntas o dudas sobre el inglés son atendidas de manera rápida durante las clases?**  
    ( ) Sí, siempre ( ) A veces ( ) No, casi nunca
11. **¿Cómo te sentirías si pudieras recibir más atención individualizada mientras hablas inglés en clase?**( ) Me sentiría más seguro(a)  
    ( ) No cambiaría mucho para mí  
    ( ) Me sentiría incómodo(a)
12. **¿Te sentirías más cómodo(a) si hubiera un segundo profesor en el aula para ayudarte a participar más en las actividades de speaking?**  
    ( ) Sí, mucho ( ) A veces ( ) No, para nada

## Appendix D: Survey on the Effectiveness of Co-Teaching in EFL Classrooms

**Instrucciones:** Esta encuesta tiene como objetivo evaluar el impacto de la co-enseñanza en el aprendizaje del inglés. Responde las siguientes preguntas según tu experiencia.

**Parte 1: Selección Múltiple (Marca una respuesta por pregunta)**

1. **¿Tener dos profesores en el aula te ayudó a mejorar tus habilidades para hablar en inglés?**

**☐ Sí, mucho**

**☐ Sí, un poco**

**☐ No, no realmente**

**☐ No, no hizo ninguna diferencia**

1. **¿Qué estrategia de co-enseñanza te pareció más útil para practicar el habla?**

**☐ Enseñanza Paralela (Grupos pequeños con diferentes profesores)**

**☐ Enseñanza en Estaciones (Rotación entre actividades en grupos pequeños)**

**☐ Enseñanza en Equipo (Ambos profesores trabajan juntos)**

**☐ Enseñanza Alternativa (Apoyo extra para los estudiantes que lo necesitan)**

1. **¿Con qué frecuencia sentiste que te animaban a hablar en clase con dos profesores?**

**☐ Siempre**

**☐ A menudo**

**☐ A veces**

**☐ Nunca**

1. **¿La co-enseñanza hizo que las clases fueran más dinámicas e interactivas?**

**☐ Sí, mucho**

**☐ Sí, un poco**

**☐ No, no realmente**

**☐ No, para nada**

**Parte 2: Respuestas Abiertas**

1. **¿Qué fue lo mejor de tener dos profesores en el aula?**
2. **¿Qué se podría mejorar en la experiencia de co-enseñanza?**
3. **¿Recomendarías la co-enseñanza como método para otras clases de inglés? ¿Por qué o por qué no?**