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ABSTRACT

The purpose of study is to investigate the perception of students and teacher advisors on the efficacy of native and non-native English teachers on the language teaching and learning in Abu Dhabi schools. The data was collected by surveying 400 students and 59 teacher advisors and interviewing 40 students and 10 advisors. The findings of this study indicate significant differences between the efficacy of both native and non-native English teachers in four aspects; (a) teaching competencies, (b) pedagogy, (c) students’ learning and (d) awareness of students’ cultural and social background. The students and teacher advisors perceive English native teachers as possessing the strengths of having a good command of the language, a superior ability to teach conversation and speaking, being a good model for teaching pronunciation and communication skills, having a good knowledge of vocabulary, as well as superior skill at teaching language, literature and culture. On the other hand, non-native English teachers possess strengths in teaching grammar, anticipating learners’ difficulties, class management, understanding students’ needs, engaging students in all activities, using varied teaching methods, and being an effective model of language learning. It is recommended that more consideration should be paid to qualifications, expertise and experience while recruiting any English teacher. Native and non-native English teachers need varied professional development programs due to their diverse needs and capabilities. The two types of teachers need to develop their performance through reciprocal communication and co-operation. Creating an ideal environment in which native and non-native English teachers meet their full potential will be beneficial to improve teaching and learning.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Learning English has become a necessity all over the world due to its dominant impact on all fields of modern life. Thus, the need for English teachers and instructors whether native or non-native has increased. The issue of which is more effective - native or non-native speaking - is a controversial issue nowadays in different parts of the world and opposing views have developed. It has been shown clearly that both native and non-native English teachers have different strengths and weaknesses. Some learners and administrators think that an English native speaker is by nature the best person to teach the language while others claim that non-native teachers can do the job equally well.

As far as researchers are concerned, some advocate the native English teacher as the best teacher. For example Solovova (2006) believed that a native English teacher is one of the main factors of successful learning of English due to their fluency, obtaining better outcomes in oral skills. In contrast, others argue that non-native English teachers can do the job better. For instance, Kawano (2000) claimed that non-native speaker teachers perform better in classroom management, since they have the knowledge of institutional culture, goals and classroom pedagogy. Also Kirkpatrick (2006) concluded that non-native teachers bring some unique skills to the classroom as they set realistic models for students in a way that native speakers cannot do. The third perspective is represented by Al-Omerani (2008) who believes that an ideal English language learning environment requires the co-operation of both native English teachers and non-native English teachers as learners can thus get benefits from both of their advantages. In addition Mahboob
(2003) felt that the native and non-native English teachers complemented each other and they preferred to study with both of them.

The main factor is the efficacy of native and non-native English teachers on teaching competencies and to what extent they impact students' learning. This difference of opinion is based on how much value is placed on the different expertise the two kinds of teacher offer — the perfect linguistic competence of the native speaker versus the fact that a non-native teacher has experienced a similar learning process to the students s/he will be teaching. It could be argued that native English teachers are better qualified to teach English, as they bring some unique skills to the classroom. This is because English is their mother tongue and they are simply more competent in English. Although this may be true while learning their first language, the situation is different in passing on this knowledge as they teach English as a second or foreign language. In addition, these teachers are not necessarily more effective teachers in the UAE context due to cultural and social issues that may interfere with the learning process. Also, many factors can interfere and hinder the native speakers to do his job effectively such as understanding the students' needs and interests and methods of motivating them.

In fact, many would claim that non-native speakers are better qualified language teachers than native speakers as they have struggled themselves to learn English and they know exactly where learners have difficulties. Furthermore, non-native teachers have the ability to communicate in the native language when needed. This is especially useful in classroom management and during the explanation of some difficult learning issues like abstract concepts, some vocabulary, and grammatical rules. Sharing a mother tongue with students will also help in punctuality and discipline. Besides, non-native English teachers
Ts) are more capable of understanding the students’ cultural and social background. Hence, they can anticipate the challenges and difficulties that learners encounter due to their experience of both languages and their interference; they also understand learners’ interests, needs and learning styles more profoundly.

AI-Ain public secondary schools that form the focus of this research are under the supervision of Abu Dhabi Education Council (ADEC). Firstly, some of the schools have been affiliated with the Public Partnership Project (PPP) of global educational providers. Alongside the PPP project, a group of native English teachers, Licensed Teachers, (LTs) have been recruited, and they are responsible now for teaching English to a large number of students in secondary schools in the Emirate of Abu Dhabi, especially for grade 12. The native English teachers and also all non-native English teachers are supervised by a native English advisor. Therefore, most schools now have native speaking teachers or input from native speaker mentors as part of educational reforms in English teaching in public secondary schools in the Emirate of Abu Dhabi (Al-Khaili, 2009).

In a period of economic development, Abu Dhabi has initiated a comprehensive plan for economic diversification. The education system is involved in this as it is one of the key pillars that will enable the Emirate to reach the standards of excellence it strives for in all fields (Al-Khaili, 2009). Abu Dhabi Education Council (ADEC) has embarked on a complete transformation of the education system through a 10 year strategic plan from 2009-2018 (ADEC, 2009). The aim is to create quality education from early childhood to adulthood, based on world-class standards and expertise (Al-Khaili, 2009).

This requires more focus on English not only as a subject in itself, but also as a medium of instruction for many subject areas such as Mathematics, Science and Computer
Technology. In addition, English is a key factor in improving education and enhancing the capabilities of students in terms of research and the increasingly critical use of modern technology which invariably requires English. According to ADEC’s vision of education as detailed on their official website, the Emirate’s goal is to be recognized as a world class education system that supports all learners in reaching their full potential to compete in the global market (ADEC, 2010). This statement makes it very clear why English has become a must for the UAE education system.

In addition, ADEC’s mission, according to the official website, is to develop world-class learners who embody a strong sense of culture and heritage and are prepared to meet global challenges (ADEC, 2009). ADEC’s vision and mission obviously reflect that English has become the medium of instruction and it now occupies a very important position in the learning and teaching process. However, English language teaching in the UAE has become a problematic issue, and it has faced many difficulties and challenges.

ADEC has been striving to raise the standards of the local teachers who are teaching English, but it has been found that some non-native English teachers are reluctant to change or their performance is not good enough to meet the new trends toward creating a bilingual context. These educational reforms have been trying to change secondary education towards a bilingual context. This is another reason for the recruitment of English native speaking teachers in public schools in the Emirate of Abu Dhabi (ADEC, 2009). Besides, hiring English native speaking teachers as one aspect of educational reforms, the curriculum has been changed to match the reforms, and a conceptually-based native speaker curriculum has been chosen. It is not a TESOL or ESL curriculum, even though the students are learning English as a foreign language. This is one of the major
challenges, as students' standards do not match the requirements of this kind of curriculum which lacks the English support they need in their context and with their learning needs (Subaey, 2008).

After analyzing the standards and indicators of English language for grade twelve, the researcher found the standards expected to be above the students' level and capabilities. For example, the following are two indicators for reading.

- Analyze cultural values and assumptions in texts, and identify and explain how different cultural contexts may influence response.
- Analyze and discuss texts from different perspectives to explore and justify different readings (Subaey, 2008).

The researcher who has been teaching English in the UAE for a long time thinks these indicators are clearly inappropriate for the UAE Arab students as they have been designed to challenge even English native speaking learners. This situation has increased the difficulties and challenges of English teachers. This is the context of the schools where the researcher has conducted his study. The different abilities of native and non-native speakers need to be measured for their effectiveness against this kind of background. In addition, it is clearly evident to all the English teachers and other stakeholders that the English language in the UAE is considered as foreign language rather than a second one. ADEC is working to push it towards being a second language in the future.

In fact, there are various factors that affect the students' English level as mentioned, such as curriculum, teachers, education system, learners and motivation. These factors are intermingled and in reality impossible to separate. In this study the main focus is paid to the efficacy of teachers of English either native or non-native on language
teaching competencies and their impact on students' learning as well as understanding of cultural and social context. Also, the study concentrates on the strengths and weaknesses of native and non-native English teachers as seen by the secondary school students, and advisors including principals, heads of departments, supervisors and consultants. Furthermore, this study is an attempt to find out which type of teachers is more beneficial and in what linguistic and pedagogical competencies.

**Purpose of Research**

The purpose of this research study is to investigate the students' and advisors' perceptions about the efficacy of native and non-native English teachers on their teaching competencies and their impact on students' learning and their cultural and social background in Al-Ain public secondary schools in the UAE. In addition, the study aims to find out the strengths and weaknesses of NETs and NNETs in those areas. It also looks into students' preferences for both native and non-native English teachers and the reasons behind them. Besides, it tries to find out what the advisors think about whether NETs or NNETs are more beneficial and why they have this perception.

**Problem Statement**

It has been noticed that there is a problem regarding public secondary school students' performance in English. Their level doesn't qualify them to enter the undergraduate studies where English is the language of instruction, or to achieve the strategic plan of Abu Dhabi Education Council, which aims to create a bilingual context in the Emirate, requiring mastery of both Arabic and English.

It has been assumed that the general weakness of the students' outcomes was due to the overall competencies of non-native English teachers and their effect on students'
learning. As a result of this situation, many English native teachers have been hired to work in secondary schools as a means of improving access to university and promoting a bilingual society.

The problem is complicated, as native speaking teachers have also brought observed drawbacks despite their personal familiarity with English language. Also some of their teaching competencies are less efficacious than expected and their impact on students' learning has not yet fulfilled expectations. Some of these drawbacks include poor classroom management, a mismatch between their own culture and students' culture and misunderstanding of students' cultural and social background, all of which has made the problem worse. It has also been acknowledged that some NETs are not qualified or experienced in teaching English as a foreign or second language, or are not even English teachers at all. In addition, this recruitment solution does not take into consideration other important qualities such as teachers' pedagogical knowledge, expertise and experience. The disappointing level of students' English language learning in the Abu Dhabi schools was originally attributed to the unsatisfactory performance of non-native English teachers, but recently it has been suggested that native English speakers are not the solution either.

The unsatisfactory level of the students has been attributed to the teachers' performance, whether native or non-native.

Research Questions

The aim of this study is to explore the perceptions of students and teacher advisors about the efficacy of native and non-native English teachers on teaching and learning. In addition, it also aims to examine the strengths and weaknesses of native and non-native
English teachers in terms of teaching competencies and their effect on students' learning

This study tried to tackle six questions:

(a) From students' perspective, is there a significant difference between the efficacy of NETs' and NNETs' teaching competencies and their effect on learning?

(b) Do students prefer to be taught by NETs or NNETs?

(c) What are the strengths and weaknesses of NETs and NNETs from the students' perspective?

(d) From teacher advisors' perspective, is there a significant difference between the efficacy of NETs' and NNETs' teaching competencies and their effect on students' learning?

(e) What are the strengths and weaknesses of NET and NNET from the teacher advisors' perspective?

(f) What type of teacher (NET or NNET) do teacher advisors think is more effective?

Significance of the Study

It has been noticed so far that little research related has been carried out locally on the students' or other stakeholders' perceptions native and non-native English teachers. At the same time, as Mahboob (2003) points out, even internationally, little research has been carried out internationally related to students' perceptions about non-native English teachers. Therefore a clear comparison of the pedagogical effectiveness of both types of teacher is long overdue if the native English teacher is to be chosen as the future of English teaching in the Emirate. It is hoped that a study such as this might reveal some facts associated with the English language programs implemented in UAE public secondary schools. All stakeholders including administrators, parents, students and
English teachers could receive benefit from the findings and recommendations of this study regarding various issues. For instance, they might develop new criteria of recruitment of both types of teachers. Also, the findings could assist in designing professional development programs to meet the varied needs of teachers.

In addition, school principals might get clearer ideas about the strengths and weaknesses of both types of teachers and ask each type of teachers to teach the areas or skills in which they are superior at. Hopefully, the findings would also generalise to other Arab countries where the two types of teachers are employed in trying to raise English language standards. Also this study is very beneficial to the teachers themselves as it provides them insights about their strengths and weaknesses. Hence, they can promote their advantages and strengths and overcome their weaknesses.

**Limitations of the Study**

The limitations of this study can be summarized as follows; this study was implemented on a sample of participants in Al-Ain public secondary schools. In addition, it was carried out in the school year 2010-2011. Thus, the study is limited only to some public schools in Al-Ain city in the UAE and in one academic year. Another limitation may be that the groups of stakeholders questioned about their attitudes to the two types of teachers did not include the teachers themselves. After all a self-reflective teacher would have insights from a unique perspective.

**Definition of Key Terms**

**Native English Teacher**

Cook (2003) defines a native speaker is the person who acquired the language in his childhood naturally and effortlessly, through ongoing exposure, innate talent for language learning, and the need for communicating. Also, a native speaker is viewed as
person who uses the language correctly, and has insight into what is acceptable or not. Kirkpatrick (2007) argues against the belief that native speakers are inevitably better at speaking English than non-native speakers, and that native speakers are inevitably better at teaching English than non-native English teachers. Both Cook (2003) and Kirkpatrick (2007) give an example that challenge a distinction between these two native speakers and non native speakers; a native speaker, just by virtue of the fact that s/he is a native speaker, does not have a scientifically-based understanding of either the language he learnt, or the best pedagogical practices he implemented, or the culture with which it is associated (Reis, 2010).

A native English teacher (NET) can be defined in this study as a teacher whose mother tongue or first language is English and he is teaching English for non-native English students.

**Non-native English teachers**

It is difficult to find a precise and accurate definition of non-native speakers or, specifically, NNET. However, Medgyes (2001) mentioned some distinctive features to clarify the concept of a NNET, who can be one of the following;

- NNET is the teacher who speaks the same mother tongue as his or her students like Arab teachers who teach English for Arab and Emirati students in the UAE. NNET is a person whose English is regarded as a Foreign or second language. S/he can be also bilingual, a second language user or a foreign language user. Regarding the non-native speaker, Cook (2005) defines a notion of multi-competence that means knowledge of more than one language in one mind. Cook tries to treat the bilingual or second user of the
language as a whole not as two components, one for the first language and the other for the second language. Hence, Cook defines the characteristics of the L2 user:

a) The knowledge of the second language user is not the same as that of native speakers’;
b) Language uses are varied in the cases of native and non-native speakers;
c) Native and non-native speakers have different skills, and unique and diverse uses of the language (Reis, 2010). Native speakers (NS) have already acquired the language but non-native speakers (NNS) are still acquiring the language.

Non-native English teacher (NNET) can be defined in this study as a teacher whose mother tongue or first language is not English (It is Arabic in this case) and he is teaching English for non-native English students.

**Efficacy**

Cambridge Advanced learners’ Dictionary (2008) defines the efficacy as the power to produce a desired result or effect.

In this study, efficacy means the ability to achieve intended educational goals related to English language such as classroom instruction, reflective language teaching, and classroom management, motivating and engaging students in the educational process. It also includes understanding students’ socio-cultural context.

**Teaching**

This is the process of providing opportunities and situations that enable students to develop the skills and knowledge to achieve the learning outcomes. The teacher will provide strategies, techniques, and activities that allow this development to occur. There are two approaches for English language teaching: the first one is TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language). This relates to teaching to learners in places where
English is not the native language. This is the situation in most of Arab countries including the UAE. The other important approach is TESL (Teaching English as a Second language). It refers to teaching English for non native English students; it also similar to teaching English for the students whose first language is not English in the UK or the USA. It is also similar to teaching English in some counties like India where English is the second official language. English here in the UAE can be considered as TEFL at the moment, although initiatives from Abu Dhabi Educational Council are moving towards creating a bilingual community by improving English language, necessitating a move from TEFL to TESL (Norland & Pruett-Said, 2006).

In the case of this study, teaching means that native and non-native English teachers help Arab students improve their ability in English language and use the four skills involved in successful communication: listening, speaking, reading and writing. It will also include knowledge of culture and grammar. Other aspects of teaching will include classroom management, and using appropriate aids and clear instruction as well as other educational aspects that help them learn English.

**Learning**

Cambridge Advanced learners’ Dictionary (2008) defines learning as a process of transforming information and experience into knowledge, skills, behaviors, and attitudes. Within the field of English language learning, two important concepts need to be identified: one important distinction is between EFL and ESL. EFL is used to describe English that occurs in places like the UAE where English is not used as a native language. However, ESL is used to describe English teaching of non-native English learners in
places like the UK and USA where English is the first language of the majority (Norland & Pruett-Said, 2006).

In this study, learning is understood as the process in which a student learns the English language by employing the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing), as well as grammar, vocabulary and culture; the students are also engaged in all activities that can facilitate the learning.

**Teacher Advisors**

The educators including heads of the department, principals, supervisors and consultants who monitor, coach and observe native and non-native English teachers and evaluate their performance.

**Teaching Competencies**

Kantane (2006) defines the competencies as a set of knowledge, skills, and experience needed for performing well in a job. Regarding language teachers' competencies, they consist of at least three main areas: the competence of knowledge of the language they are teaching, pedagogical competencies, and sufficient understanding of the students' culture that enable them to interact with their learners in ways that do not disrupt the learning process or cultural competencies (Bulajeva, 2003).

Teaching competencies in this study is defined as knowledge of English language, literature and four language skills as well as language learning.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

The main purpose of this chapter is to review studies that tackled educational issues related to the efficacy of native and non-native English teachers on teaching and learning. A study of the literature related to stakeholders’ perceptions of NETs and NNETs has been very beneficial to this research study and provides some useful insights which helped to illuminate the issues discussed in this study. This chapter is divided into two sections. The first one reviews the theoretical background in relation to NETs’ and NNETs’ issues while the second deals with the recent studies, master theses and doctoral dissertations which have looked at the issues more deeply. The related studies’ section is divided into main themes that tackle both NETs’ and NNET’s advantages and disadvantages in terms of language teaching competences, students’ learning and cultural and social backgrounds.

Theoretical Framework

Some educators argue that it is better to hire native speakers of the English language to teach it as a foreign or second language; whereas, others strongly believe that native speakers have their own deficiencies and non-native speakers will do the job better. This research deeply investigates the debatable issue identifying the reasons behind each point of view. When choosing a native speaker of English or non-native one, we arrive at two contradictory positions that tackle this issue from two different perspectives. Firstly, the writer deals with the advantages and disadvantages of the native speaker teacher, and secondly goes on to consider the same aspects of the non-native speaker teacher.

Native English Teachers’ Advantages
Native English teachers are by definition competent and knowledgeable in their language use. They are also naturally capable of communicating effectively with the language; therefore, a native English teacher is a good model to help students acquire the language. Contrastingly, he is not necessarily a good teacher as the roles of the teacher go beyond simple competence in the language. A teacher has a variety of other responsibilities towards his students, for example, a successful teacher needs to understand, amongst other things, the cultural background of his students, their interests, needs, learning styles and individual differences. The teacher should also have the capacity to motivate and engage the students to participate effectively within the classroom. The native English teacher might well be at a disadvantage here, as he may not be able to effectively handle the needs of his students because he lacks the cultural and social knowledge sensitivities of the students.

In fact the literature emphasizes this advantage mentioned above; stating that native speakers have a knowledge base and competency in the language that is hard to beat. For example, Millrood (1999) stated that a native teacher is better than an equally qualified non-native one, simply because he/she has the language knowledge advantage. In addition, there are other advantages about having a native teacher that cannot be ignored, such as the input that the person provides and in terms of pronunciation and language use. In the vital area of pronunciation native teachers have an edge over the non-native teachers. In addition, Omord (2008) emphasized the role of the native speaking teacher in the primary school because this is very important for children to master correct pronunciation and complex grammatical constructions.
These advantages are also found in the communicative area. Native English teachers have more advantages regarding their communicative skills; they are more competent, able to communicate within diverse social settings and produce fluent and spontaneous discourse of the language. The writer thinks it all depends on our overall objectives of teaching the language. If we intend to enable our students to master the language fluently, it is better to hire native speakers to teach them as they are more capable of communicating the language more effectively and efficiently. Medgyes (2001) argued that a native speaker has the language competence advantage that is a set of rules internalized in his mind as well as treasure of vocabulary such as slang, idioms, and so on.

Medgyes (2001) also claimed that when it comes to speaking in particular, it goes without saying that native English teachers are better models and resource for students to learn from. Any native English teachers can naturally highlight problems with grammar and pronunciation. One advantage a native English teacher can have is the intuitive knowledge of the language and the almost instinctive recognition of errors, having such a wide exposure to not only the grammar, but also idiomatic and fixed phrasal expressions.

Moreover, Medgyes (2001) added that some native English teachers’ lack of knowledge of the student's mother tongue forces students to communicate with the second language while talking with the native teacher; this increases the students’ use of the second language and enables students to maximize their exposure to the language. In contrast, however, the use of students’ mother tongue can be of value in favour of non-native speaker teachers not only for the effective explanation of abstract notions but also for classroom management.
Another advantage for the native speaker is that almost 'automatically' native teachers have a natural capability of teaching cultural issues related to English cultures like habits, heritage, customs and traditions more than non-native teachers, due to their abilities to appreciate and conceptualize the figurative meaning and its symbolism. What qualities does a native speaker have? S/he has a good knowledge of the language, the roots, history and be aware of the current cultural context in their own country. Some of these teachers are from places which can be used to illustrate their lectures with information about where they lived. This is very important because a language is a living thing; it concerns the people that use it, where they live and what they do (Millrood, 1999).

One important writer on the superiority the native English teacher can have is Solovova (2006) - he advocates the idea by indicating that to be a native speaker is one of the main factors of successful teachers of English. He also states the following reasons for English teachers' success; a native English teacher himself is different and foreign, so students will be more interested to deal with. Then, s/he is viewed as an ideal model set for the learners to acquire and learn the language s/he uses the culture s/he comes from. Next, s/he provides an authentic language learning context as well as an opportunity to deal with a native speaker that might create a feeling of success and enjoyment. Moreover, a native speaking teacher usually speaks about his/her culture, his/her lifestyles and customs and tradition. This attracts the students' attention and motivates them to get more involved in their learning at a faster rate.

A Hungarian study factored in the important issue of learners' level of English. Mardid and Candado (2004) conducted a mixed approach research study to investigate
both teachers' and students' preferences of NETs and NNETs and their influence on English language classrooms in Hungary. The findings revealed that there were significant differences from teachers' and students' perspectives in terms of pedagogical behaviour of NET and NNET. Also, students' preferences for NETs increased with their achievement level. NETs are preferred due to their fluency, obtaining better outcomes in oral communication, better in pronunciation, knowledge of vocabulary and spelling rules, the students receive more time of exposure to language with NETs. However, NNET were preferred in grammar, better understood learning process, more acquainted with the learners.

Braine (1999) investigated the question of the qualifications needed by a successful native speaking teacher claiming that native teachers of English—even without teaching qualifications—are more likely to be hired than qualified and experienced non-native teachers, especially outside the United States of America. From the students' point of view, it is certainly beneficial to have a native teacher. Native teachers can provide all the slang, colloquial vocabulary items, and help students with special usages and pronunciation problems.

Native English Teachers' Disadvantages

The native speaker is not without disadvantages, of course. For example, some educators claim that native teachers might reflect their own cultural concepts, values and beliefs on his students. This may cause cultural conflict and shock when these values and beliefs contradict the values and beliefs of students (Widdowson, 1992). In contrast, other educators argue that native teachers can carry out the curriculum set by the ministry without cultural influence. He can respect and regard the cultural background of learners.
Even the non-native teachers while teaching the western cultural issues, have to carry out authentic situations for learners as language is considered a tool of culture. NETs need to adopt an open attitude towards students' culture, share with the similarities and differences between the two cultures (Cook, 1999). On the other hand, is it disrespectful to the learner to expose them to another culture that possibly conflicts with their culture? The writer believes that students will be exposed to many cultures due to the exponential growth in information technology and trends.

A Taiwanese study showed some of the major issues with NETs. Ke and Wu (2009) carried out a research study to investigate Taiwanese students' perception towards their native-speaking English teachers (NETs). This collected data through a mixed method approach by giving 107 students a questionnaire and interviewing three native English teachers and 19 students who filled out a questionnaire.

The results of the study showed mixed perceptions of native English teachers. Firstly, students expected more encouragement and interaction. One third of students expected NETs with a standard accent, whereas a quarter does not care about accent at all. On the other hand, the NETs showed negative responses towards the students' passiveness and lack of responsiveness. Although the students expect the teachers to be to be interactive, they themselves showed an unwillingness to participate. In addition, the researchers recommended teachers should transform their teaching strategies and techniques to create attractive learning environments, and they should become informed about the cultural backgrounds of the students. Also intercultural and global trends should be catered for in teaching and learning a foreign language (Ke & Wu 2009).
On the other hand, some educators argue that native speakers as language teachers have certain demerits regarding teaching and that non-native teachers are better in teaching the target language. The main issue is that a native speaking teacher cannot be a really effective learner model because he or she did not have to learn English as a second language. It is suggested that non-native speakers can teach better English than the native speakers. The reason being they have struggled themselves to learn that language. They know exactly where learners struggle and where mistakes are made. They are also aware of many more techniques of learning to speak which is not the case with the native speakers. In addition, they can anticipate the difficulties that may encounter the students and the best methods to deal with these issue (Coskun, 2008).

Other writers also concur as they see an advantage in the fact that a non-native speaking teacher has learnt English himself/herself. Phillipson (1992) claimed that the native speaker is a burden and the non-native English teachers are the ideal English teachers. He elaborated that they are even more effective than the native speaking teachers in teaching English as a foreign or second language teaching. NNETS have gone through the process of learning as second or as an additional language that is undoubtedly different from fist language acquisition. They have first-hand experience in learning English as a second language, and their personal experience has made them more sensitive to the linguistic and cultural needs, difficulties and challenges of their students. A lot of non-native English teachers (NNETs), especially those who share the first language with their students, have developed profound awareness of the differences and similarities between English and their students' mother tongue. This sensitivity grants them the chance and capability to anticipate their students' linguistic obstacles. NNETS who share the students'
mother tongue and culture are advantaged as they are more sensitive to their students’ needs, interests and learning styles. Thus, they are more likely to be effective and capable not only in teaching but also in developing curriculum and pedagogy.

**Non-native English Teachers’ Advantages**

Cook (1999) also believes non-native teachers have an advantage over natives in the sense that they are more aware of the interconnection of the Students' mother tongue language and the English language providing that they are they're native speakers of the same language. They will be more capable of deciding which areas are more or less problematic. Thus, these teachers can put more emphasis on certain constructs. Secondly, the cultural differences are also crucial; it could be argued that native speakers are less aware of the UAE students’ behaviour.

Non-native speakers may also have a cultural advantage. Kawano (2000) claims that English native teachers do not understand their non-native students’ culture. This lack of knowledge will increase teachers’ frustration and can lead to failure in building up better relationships between teachers and students. Consequently, students can be discouraged and classroom activities will not be conducted smoothly. He added that each culture has its own preferred learning styles and that learners will succeed best in a classroom culture that recognizes and builds on the community culture.

Another area where non-native speaker teachers perform better is classroom management, since they have the knowledge of institutional culture, goals and classroom pedagogy. They know what to expect from students and how to manage them. This awareness of norms not only enables them to analyse students’ needs better but also helps them to cope with a whole spectrum of issues, ranging from very different management
practices to attitudes in classroom behaviour such as cheating in examination, which may hinder the native speaker teacher’s effectiveness. However, the native teacher can implement appropriate classroom procedures to create an enjoyable learning environment and overcome behavioural obstacles that hinder learning and reduce learning outcomes. On the other hand, the native teacher can maintain appropriate classroom management if he employs adequate procedures and varies the techniques and activities to match the students’ needs, interests and learning styles to guarantee their effective engagement in the learning process (Üstünlüoglu, 2007).

**Non-native English Teachers’ Disadvantages**

Non-native speakers also have disadvantages, however, according to researchers. Some native language teachers do not speak the Standard English and carry a strong foreign accent in their speech. Hence, their English is neither accurate nor intelligible, sounding unnatural to the students. How can such a teacher teach efficiently if he himself cannot handle Standard English appropriately and sufficiently? (Janopoulos, 2003). Henry Widdowson, the great TESOL scholar, once remarked that, in teaching English, the native speaker possessed “authenticity of language”, but the non-native speaker (when teaching in his own cultural context) had authenticity of teaching practice. In other words, the native speaker undoubtedly knows his or her language very well and entirely from the inside. He has learnt the language at his mother’s knee. His growth as a person cannot be separated from his development in the language of his infancy. The trick is to what extent he can teach the language well and this depends on the training, natural ability for teaching and understanding the preferred learning styles and values of his students. In
addition, a native speaker teacher should know everything about the students’ language and the difficulties they may face.

Good language teachers should have both the authenticity of language and the authenticity of pedagogy as well. It is not possible or at least difficult to find that all English native speaking teachers meet all the above conditions and have the two authenticities at the same time. Employers, therefore, recruit the best candidates they can get and hopefully, they would find at least some of the teachers meet the selection criteria. Some native speaking teachers, however, clearly don’t meet the criteria at all of being good teachers. It is said that authenticity of language is regarded as being much more important than authenticity of pedagogy. Employers hope that the teacher has enough teaching ability, even though they may be untrained, inexperienced or unsuitable for other reasons to be a teacher. They seem to believe that the simple fact of hearing an authentic native speaker accent and authentic native oral grammar is more important than knowing how language is learned and how best to teach it. However, the most realistic choice and solution is to recruit competent and proficient bilingual teachers (Janopoulo, 2003).

There are many excellent non-native English teachers. These teachers not only have a good command of the language, but they can also understand the students’ needs and interests well. These teachers are more capable of supporting students to learn and predict what kinds of difficulties and challenges students are likely to encounter with English. They also understand the values and expectations of students’ culture and they can accept and fit in with the social and managerial culture of a local school. So why don’t we employ these teachers who can do the job of teaching well instead of relying on native speaking teachers? It is simply as it is difficult to find the required number of them to
employ. In fact, there appears to be not many local teachers at all who have the ability, confidence and desire to teach English. It is especially difficult to find local teachers who are able to teach subject content through English, as is required in a bilingual program.

Historically, there has been a preference for native speakers as teachers of a language. For instance, two of the most influential books in TESOL assume that native speakers provide the target model for language learning, and Phillipson (1992) argues persuasively that the view of the ideal teacher being a native speaker has been widely accepted and has had a wide-ranging impact on language education policies. Within recent academic literature, however, this native speaker model which assumes that non-native English teachers are inferior to native English teachers (NETs) has come under fire (Nemtchinova, 2005).

The academic literature and educational principle suggest that native and non-native English teachers should be treated equally, yet in many countries there is a broad social and commercial preference for native speaker teachers which may also involve racial issues. Attitudes towards native and non-native English teachers have typically been investigated through questionnaires, but since such attitudes may involve prejudices, other research methods designed to elicit implicit attitudes may be preferable. In one interesting study, the Implicit Association Test was used to investigate the implicit attitudes of Thai students towards native and non-native English teachers, and results were compared with explicit attitudes elicited through a questionnaire. The results indicate that attitudes towards native and non-native teachers are complex with an explicit preference for native speaker teachers, but no implicit preference and warmer explicit feelings towards non-native speaker teachers (Todd 2009).
Kirkpatrick (2006) discussed the issue of English native speaking teachers thoroughly. He concluded that non-native speaking teachers bring some unique skills to classroom as they set realistic models for students in a way that native speakers cannot do. For example, a student can look at a teacher of English and think, "I could be like that! He learned English really well, and so can I!" The same student might regard the English native speaking teacher as an unreachable model, "It's all very well and good for him, but he doesn't realize how difficult his language is to us. I'll never be able to speak English as well as he can." In this way, the local teacher can provide a level of motivation to many students. In addition, the non-native teacher who has successfully mastered the English pronunciation system is probably better equipped to teach learners than the native speaker, who might be restricted to being a model for students to copy (Kirkpatrick 2006).

The priority of selecting native or non-native speaking teachers is determined by the objective and purpose behind the choice. For instance, some people think that English is best learned from native speakers because they want to speak English like a native speaker. But Kirkpatrick said there is no need for learners to speak English like native speakers Instead, educators should encourage learners to take pride in their status as bilinguals (Kirkpatrick, 2006).

Maum (2002) stated that the term non-native-English-speaking teachers (NNETs) have become debatable among ESL professionals. Some hold that it is required that NETs and NNETs be distinguished because the distinctions between them are actually their merits and therefore worth noticing whilst others disagree with the dichotomy and feel that drawing a distinction among teachers according to their status as native speakers or not leads to the superiority of the NETs and discrimination in hiring practices (Maum, 2002).
Medgyes (2001) states that NETs and NNETs differ in their teaching practices as a result of their divergent linguistic background but a teacher’s effectiveness does not depend on his or her being a native speaker of English or not. Both the NETs and NNETs serve equally useful goals (Medgyes, 2001). In this thesis, the terms native-/non-native-English-speaking teachers are adopted as the writer considers the differences between these two types of teachers do exist and can be of benefit to learners in various aspects.

The writer suggests that the aim of learning English is to be revealed for learning English more effectively and having the ability to communicate not to speak like natives. In addition, non-native speaking teachers are more qualified to teach grammar and structure because they know the difference between Arabic and English language well. But of course, sometimes native speaking teachers are needed. Learning with NETs, there is an advantage, because it helps students have the curiosity and interest of English by experiencing conversations with native speakers and their pronunciation, but we must avoid thinking that NETs are the best English teacher. The best English teacher is a bilingual teacher who is good at both languages. However, the writer believes that a language teacher should be judged by what he knows not who he is (native or non-native).

**Related Studies**

This section reviews the literature tackled with current master thesis and doctoral dissertations which have studied about the efficacy of native and non-native speakers on teaching and learning. The studies employed a variety of methodologies and are all recent publications. The studies chosen are up to date and varied in terms of the methodology they used and the manner in which they tackled the issues. In addition the results are different in some aspects and similar in others as they were carried out in different
countries and contexts. The related studies are arranged and organized in accordance with the advantages and disadvantages of both Native and Non-Native English teachers.

Al-Omrani (2008) carried out a mixed method study to investigate the perception and attitudes of three groups of Saudi students towards native and non native English teachers. The study focuses on the pedagogical advantages and disadvantages of each type of teacher. It also concentrates on the areas in which a native English teacher is superior and inferior to non-native ones. Al-Omrani also tried to explore the impact on the students of being taught by non native English teachers. This research study was carried out in two stages; a questionnaire was distributed to 100 students in the first stage and 16 out of the one hundred students were then subjected to an interview and follow up emails (Al-Omrani, 2008).

The findings of this dissertation showed that native English teachers and non-native teachers have their own particular advantages and disadvantages. Native English teachers are superior in teaching oral skills as they have the advantage of language fluency and accuracy. They also motivate students by expanding their exposure to language as learners are obliged to communicate only with their native teachers. In addition, they have the advantage of their knowledge of English culture and literature. Arab teachers of English benefit from their previous experience as foreign or second language learners and the superior ability to anticipate language learning difficulties and challenges that this gives them. This will grant teachers the ability to provide learners with some appropriate solutions and learning strategies as they are thoroughly aware of these learners' linguistic needs, difficulties and problems.
Furthermore, sharing the same mother tongue and culture with the learners enables the teacher to choose the most appropriate themes, materials and topics. Besides, participants stand for using Arabic that can be effective in vocabulary and grammar class sessions. On the other hand, the non-native teacher’s lack of knowledge about English literature and the cultural background is a disadvantage. Therefore, non-native speaking teachers need to enrich their knowledge about English literature and culture, and native speaking teachers are urged to learn about the learners’ culture. In contrast, the results indicate that there are other factors that are considered distinctive features of an excellent English teacher, such as the teacher’s qualifications and teaching experience (Al-Omrani, 2008).

The researcher believes that creating an ideal English language learning situation as a foreign or second language requires the co-operation of both NETS and NNETs as learners can get benefits of their strength. Also, the researchers totally agrees with Dr Al-Omerani that both native and non native speaking teachers are superior in different areas of language teaching and learning, so programs for each type of teacher should be designed accordingly. He also recommends co-operative work between native and non-native teachers, to complement each other in their points of weaknesses and strengths. This study is very similar to the UAE context in terms of the cultural background of participants. The ideal school is the environment where there is a good balance of native English teachers and non-native English teachers, who complement each other in their strengths and weaknesses (Al-Omrani, 2008).

One study which emphasizes the fact that the two types of teacher have different skills is Muramatsu (2008), who conducted a research study to investigate learners’
attitudes towards native and non-native English teachers in writing composition. The study also aimed to explore to what extent students' attitudes change after they were taught by both native and non-native speaking teachers. Muramatsu used quantitative and qualitative methods to ensure the credibility of the results; the researcher also collected his data through multiple sources like a questionnaire, which was distributed to forty three students taking a composition course given by NS and NNS teachers, and explored student attitudes towards teachers. Other data sources were used such as individual interviews, focus group interviews and conference video recording.

The results of this study were revealed in 4 tables of the strengths and weaknesses of native speakers and non-native speaking teachers. Although the participants' responses were directly related to composition teachers based on nativeness; they gave us indicators about the English teachers in general (Muramatsu, 2008). Regarding the points of strength of a native speaking teacher, it was considered he had better knowledge of English and perfect fluency. He was also more relaxed and confident when teaching English in general, and writing in particular. In addition, he was open to discuss all types of current issues and other modern topics. Also, the participants claimed that this teacher had the knowledge sufficient for teaching mixed group classes and provided better feedback.

Another important point was the teacher was familiar with American culture and literature, which were the learning context of the language. On the other hand; the participants identified some weaknesses of the NS teacher. For instance, he spoke too fast and students found it hard to follow and understand the lesson. He was also too busy to give enough support for non-native speaking students. Then he had little interest in global issues and little experience with non-native learners (Muramatsu, 2008).
In contrast, the participants also had more positive responses towards the non-native teachers, like the fact he could bring a global flavor to class. They added that a NNET teacher is more likely to understand non-native English students and sympathize with them. Also, the NNET teacher was more knowledgeable about some issues such as grammar and spelling as he had the same experience in learning them. Furthermore, he had the ability to interact with all students and he was even open to learning from them and varying his teaching styles. The last point is that he was well-organized and more helpful. The NNET teacher has his own difficulties, such as with effective communication due to limited English. Also, he is not knowledgeable of all aspects of the language like idioms, slang, and rhetoric. In addition to the communication difficulties they face a lack of knowledge in literature and cultural background. The factors that students use to evaluate teachers like teachers' expertise, performance, personality traits, and so on, offer implications in developing teacher training programs. He recommended developing further research with more focus on professionalism, the classroom become pedagogically meaningful without being restricted by labelling based on NS or NNS status (Muramatsu, 2008).

Another study that directly contrasted the performance of Native and non-Native speakers was conducted in Korea. Jung-Ok Kim (2008) initiated a qualitative study to investigate issues related to native and non-native teachers of English in Korean private schools. His research study aims to investigate the perceptions of native and non-native English teachers and Korean students of teachers' roles in teaching and learning. He collected information through open-ended interviews with students and teachers, class observations, informal conversations, and school documents. The results showed that
Korean English teachers (NNETs) play a major role and native English teachers (NETs) play a minor role in issues related to punctuality, discipline classroom management that could impact learners' attitudes toward learning English. NNETs are advantaged in sharing the first language with the students, culture and learning experience in learning the second language. Thus, they are more capable to motivate students. Both types of teachers support students to achieve high-English competence in authentic communicative situations. Also both native and non-native teachers are required communicate and collaborate in order to improve their performance and to develop their strengths. Another point to raise is that native speaker teachers should become critical about the idea of being superior to non-native speakers due to their English proficiency (Kim, 2008). They need to allow themselves to change their view from "who you are" to "what you know" (Rampton, 1999, p.99).

Kim (2008) and Davis (2003) agreed with what Chomsky considered native speakers as the idealized speakers of the English language but this does not necessarily guarantee that they are the most qualified teachers. A native English teacher can provide authenticity and genuine cultural background but he might be inexperienced in teaching English. Kim suggested that native and non-native teachers' roles are difficult to generalize due to the individuality of each teacher and his abilities, experience and expertise. Also, teachers' roles and learners' perceptions of the roles tend to be different depending on his performance in class (Kim, 2008).

A Texan study showed that preferences varied according to the area of language study. Torres (2004) employed quantitative and qualitative methods to explore the learners' preferences for native and non-native speaking teachers. A 34 item questionnaire
was delivered to one hundred and two students taking ESL programs in Texas in 2004. Then thirty-two students volunteered for interviews talking about their preferences. The main two research questions focused on whether adult ESL students show general preferences for native or non-native English teachers and the second question is based on learning a specific language skill area like pronunciation, American culture, or grammar.

The study results indicated that adult ESL students have a general preference for native English teachers over non-native speaking teachers (Torres, 2004). They also showed that ESL learners have strong preferences for NETs in teaching production skills such as pronunciation and writing. The researcher concluded that they feel positive towards attributes inherent in each type of professional teacher, and native language status alone is not the only distinctive feature of a qualified language teacher (Torres, 2004).

Choe (2005) reveals some of the impact the emphasis on recruiting Native Speakers can have. The main aim of his research study was to investigate how the native speaker model affected non-native English teachers in Korean English Language Teaching (ELT). He also collected his qualitative data through interviews, classroom observations and personal conversations. It has been noticed that the native speaker model has been profoundly embedded in the Korean context of English language teaching, and it has negatively influenced the participants who were non-native English teachers in negotiating their status as English teachers.

The results of this study showed that the participants perceive English as a threat not only to the Korean language but also to its culture and identity. In addition, the participants showed a negative self-image as a result of using the native speaker model only as a standard to evaluate teachers. In contrast, the participants construct positive
images depending on whether they hold TESOL training certificates and their cultural
background and experience as EFL learners. This study dealt with the issue in a foreign
language learning context that is similar to the UAE context. It aimed to develop a better
understanding of NNETs’ negotiation of their status in the context of EFL, and the status,
roles and position of Korean EFL teachers. The study also aimed to develop programs for
teacher training and curriculum improvement in English for Korean students to meet
trainee teachers’ needs. The participants in this study showed psychological and cognitive
conflicts with the dominant native speaker model and they claimed that their unstable
status influenced their performance in classroom (Choe, 2005).

Another study emphasized the contrasting strengths of the two types of teacher.
Etelvo Ramos Filho (2002) initiated a study entitled “Students’ perception of non-native
ESL teachers”. This qualitative research study aimed to explore how ESL students
perceive their non-native speaker teachers. The researcher collected data through a
questionnaire and class observations of 16 participants, then two non-native teachers, who
taught the participants, were interviewed. While collecting and organizing the data, five
areas were taken into consideration; non-native speaker teachers’ characteristics, teachers’
credibility, teachers as models, students’ preferences and former experiences with other
NNS teachers (Filho, 2002).

The results showed positive responses towards non-native teachers in spite of some
negative perceptions. The participants prefer to be taught oral communication, writing,
and American culture by native speaker teachers; whereas, NNS teachers are preferred to
teach vocabulary and grammar. On the negative side, students were dissatisfied at some
teachers’ accents and poor pronunciation. The participants praised the non-native teachers
for their patience, good command of grammar and sympathy towards students’ problems and learning difficulties. Many participants’ concern was of NNS teachers’ pronunciation: thus teachers are urged to improve their pronunciation. The researcher recommended replicating this study in other contexts where students are not told about the benefits of having NNETs as teachers (Filho, 2002).

Another piece of research brought out the differences clearly. Moussu (2006) carried out a research project to explore ESL learners’ attitudes towards native and non-native English teachers. The researcher surveyed the attitudes of 1040 ESL students and the variables used in the quantitative study were teachers’ native language, students’ mother tongue, gender, level and grade as well as changes in students’ attitudes over time. Online and paper questionnaires were given to students at the beginning and the end of fall semester in 2005 (Moussu, 2006).

The results of the study showed some significant points. For example, students showed more positive responses towards native speaking teachers than non-native speaking colleagues. Then, positive attitudes increased significantly towards both types of teachers with time and exposure. Next, results revealed sharing the first language with teachers influenced the students’ responses towards their teachers. After that, students do not view non-native teachers necessarily as grammar experts. In addition, non-native teachers showed a lack of confidence in their linguistic and teaching skills. However, the respondents praise the non-native speaking teachers’ learning experience that can be used to anticipate learning challenges and problem solving.

The final point to raise is that “nativeness” is not the key criteria: distinctive features for the successful teacher include three other issues that are to be taken into
consideration; linguistic preparation, global awareness and teaching experience. To sum up, participants in this study appreciate their non-native teachers for their knowledge, caring, experiences and preparation despite some negative responses, and they do believe that both types of teachers complement each other in their points of strength and weaknesses. Besides, it is a stereotype that students who go to the USA prefer to study English with native speaking teachers (Moussu, 2006).

Non native teachers are reducing in relative numbers. Mahboob (2003) wrote a dissertation to explore the status of non-native speaking teachers in USA from various perspectives. This mixed method study aimed to investigate the reason behind the decreasing number of non-native teachers in ESL despite the increasing numbers of students. The results of the first part of the research study that were collected by a questionnaire given to 122 ESL program administrators showed that the number of non-native teachers is low. The results of the second part of the study, collected from qualitative data, stated that the participants’ attitudes were complex. The participants felt that the native and non-native English teachers complemented each other and they preferred to study with both of them. Also, the results showed the low number of non-native speaker teachers in ESL is a result of program administrators’ focus on hiring native speakers. The students who participated in the study don’t simply prefer teachers due to their “nativeness” status. In addition, students thought that both types of teachers together can contribute uniquely to language learning. They feel that native and non native teachers can create a conducive learning environment. The participants perceived that native speaking teachers teach grammar better, whereas non-native speaking teachers were strong in teaching oral communication (Mahboob, 2003).
The administrators who were interviewed showed that there are other important features beside native status that should be used to judge language teachers, like expertise and professional qualifications. To conclude, the students who participated in the interviews did not show a clear preference for any type of teacher, either native or non-native: they felt that both had unique qualities and the ideal situation for language learning and teaching is when both are working together (Mahboob, 2003).

Sue Yung Bae (2006) concluded that both types of teachers have their own significant varied characteristics Sue Yung Bae conducted a research study on “Language Learners’ Perceptions of Non-native English teachers of English” in December 2006. This mixed method study aimed to explore how ESL students perceive their non-native speaking teachers. This dissertation also investigated the areas in which non-native speaking teachers show better or less expertise in comparison with the native speaking teachers. In order to develop an understanding of students’ perceptions, Bae (2006) used a qualitative method to collect data through interviews and content analysis of 43 pieces of composition written by learners about their perceptions’ and attitudes toward non-native speaking teachers.

The study results showed that the participants gave positive responses to non-native speaking teachers for their capabilities and knowledge in explaining grammatical rules, and predicting the learners’ challenges and difficulties. The participants feel that non-native speaking teachers are a good role model for second language learning. The students found that non-native teachers exhibited a higher level of affective factors like caring, patience and understanding of students’ learning needs. In contrast, the students felt that they lack oral fluency and accurate pronunciation as well as having strange
accents. In fact, the participants showed generally positive responses to non-native teachers of English who were considered capable in many areas of language content and teaching skills, and even better than their native counterparts. The researcher recommended that both types of teachers should work together and co-operate for the benefit of teachers and students as well. He suggested a collaborative model that enables both types of teacher to exchange expertise and experience. Such an environment would raise the chance of creating an appropriate learning context (Bae, 2006).

Üstünlüoğlu (2007), on the other hand, carried out a research study at one of the Turkish university to examine its students’ perceptions about NETs and NNETs and to reveal their deficiencies and needs in the teaching process. 311 students were surveyed to evaluate 38 native and non-native speaking teachers. The 30 items of the questionnaire covered items related to teachers’ role, individual features, class management and class communication.

The results showed that there is a significant difference between these types of teachers from the students’ perspective. The participants showed that non-native English teachers perform better at class management and teaching whereas native speaking teachers are doing better in communication skill and enjoy more favorable qualities. In addition, the students thought that Turkish teachers of English were more serious and strict, while native English teachers were more energetic and cheerful. The researcher suggests informing native speaking teachers about the cultural background of the students and he recommended the idea of co-operation between the two kinds of teachers.

Ngoc (2009) carried out a similar research study about teaching efficacy of NETs and NNETs in Vietnam. He also tried to triangulate the opinions and perception of
teachers and students regarding language teaching and learning context in Vietnam. This study surveyed three groups: 30 NETs, 30 NNETs, and 30 NNS students in Vietnam. These participants were given two versions of a questionnaire, one for the Students and the other for the teachers (NET, NNET). The questionnaire tackled four areas of teaching efficacy: the four language skills, language aspects, methodology, and assessment.

The results of this study indicated that all the participants (NETs, NNETs & students) showed no significant differences on the teaching efficacy of NETs and NNETs. They also showed positive responses towards both types of the teachers regarding their teaching efficacy. In addition, they showed preferences to NETs in pronunciation; teaching culture; dealing the speaking skills; engaging students in classroom; classroom management, pair work, and group work; measuring and evaluating students' progress; and implementing grading system. On the other hand, NNETs are more efficacious in grammar teaching and giving feedback. Both NETs and NNETs were found equally effective in teaching the listening, reading and writing skills as well as teaching vocabulary, classroom enhancement, and giving appropriate exams.

Summary

Throughout navigating through the literature of this topic, the researcher found that three main perspectives; the first one concludes that native speaking teacher is the best one to teach the language due to his natural efficiency and spontaneous competence. In contrast, other educators allege that non-native speaking teachers are more appropriate to teach English as they anticipate the difficulties and challenges of learning the language. Regarding the perspective, the best and ideal teaching environment should include both kinds of teachers; native and non-native. As far as the researcher is concerned, the third
perspective is the best and he recommends co-teaching to enable students to get the benefits and merits of both native and non-native speaking teachers.

The studies have many findings in common – a clear pattern emerges. An equally clear conclusion can be drawn – native speakers and non-native speakers complement each other so well that the ideal must be to offer courses where the two types of teachers share responsibilities. On the other hand, another important point that the studies emphasize is that it is not always possible to divide teachers according to the choice of non-native versus native speakers: each teacher has strengths and weaknesses which are reflections of other qualities, such as personality, professional qualifications and experience. In fact, most of the studies do show positive responses towards native and non-native speaking teachers; however, each one has his own advantages and disadvantages. The ideal learning environment is the place where you can see both types of teachers to complement each other and learn from the strengths of their counterparts.

As an overall trend, native speaking teachers are superior in language fluency and accuracy, which grants them confidence and spontaneity in the classroom. In addition, they tend to be more competent at oral communication, accurate pronunciation, and they have a good command of English culture and literature. In contrast, they often have little knowledge of the learners’ culture, interests and social needs. The non-native speaking teachers are superior in their capabilities of anticipating the learners’ challenges, difficulties and problems; they have the same experience in learning the same foreign language. Furthermore, they share the learners’ culture and can understand students’ learning styles better.
Besides, their bilingualism grants them an opportunity to communicate better with the students, teach vocabulary and manage the class more efficiently, and take some useful insights from mother tongue transfer. From another side, non-native teachers can sometimes be less confident in the classroom, and they exhibit some weaknesses in accent, pronunciation and other oral skills. It would also be of great interest to have more quantitative research to find out how much student performance varies for each type of teacher, there is a need to assess the various perceptions towards the two types of teachers.

In conclusion, both native and non-native English teachers teach oral skills and both native and non-native English teachers have varied capabilities, skills and knowledge that benefit learners in different areas so their cooperation will create an ideal language learning environment that is conducive to learn English in an appropriate way; they also balance each other in their strengths and weaknesses. For example, native English teacher can teach oral and conversational skills while non-native teachers can teach grammar and writing. They can also learn from each other, one can be a model for pronunciation while the other can be a model for learning the language and understand better the language and cultural needs and concerns.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

This chapter deals with the research methods used in this study. Both quantitative and qualitative methods of research were used to explore the perceptions of the students and English teacher advisors on NETs and NNETs. It describes the research design and gives information about the instruments used as well as the participants. It also explains the methods of data collection and analysis.

Research Design

This study employed both quantitative and qualitative methods to collect data from two groups of participants. The questionnaire, featuring like items, represents the quantitative aspect of this research and interviews represented the qualitative aspect. Gay and Airasian (2003) stated that the quantitative method depends mainly on numerical data collection and analysis obtained from a large number of participants by a questionnaire, while the qualitative method depends on non-numerical and descriptive data obtained through interviews of a small number of participants. Thus, the research conducted here combining both qualitative and quantitative methods in a combined method approach to verify the sources data collection.

Procedures

After reviewing the literature and related research; master theses and doctoral dissertations as well as ADEC professional standards for teachers, the research methodological instruments have been developed for this research study. A jury of referees was asked to revise and measure the validity of the research instruments; questionnaires and interview questions. Then, these instruments were piloted on a small
group of participants. After that, they were revised in light of referees' comments and pilot questionnaires and interviews. Finally, two versions of the questionnaires and interviews were developed and available for implementation. The researcher got permission from Al-Ain Educational Zone as shown on appendix G. The department of the curriculum usually reviews questionnaires or research instruments to ensure that such things would not cause any psychological or physical harm to participants. In addition, Al-Ain Educational Zone sent an official letter to all the schools to facilitate the work of the researcher. Then, the researcher started coordinating with the school principals and all the stakeholders to distribute the questionnaires and collect them, and then to carry out the interviews with the students and the teacher advisors.

**Participants**

The participants of this study came from a large population, students at public secondary school students in Al-Ain, aged from 16-18 years. These students have been learning English since grade one and have been taught by non-native English teachers. These students came from these schools and varied in gender and parents' educational and social backgrounds. There are about 42 public secondary schools in Al-Ain and the combined headcount in these schools is about 9000, according to Al-Ain Educational Zone statistics. Almost all have had the same educational experience in English – that is they have had a NNET since they began formal schooling. According to the latest statistics taken in March 2011 from Al-Ain Educational Zone, the total number of English teachers in all the three cycles is about 985, Males teachers are 407 and females are 578. NETS are about 40 males and 54 females in Cycle 3; 93 males and 190 females in Cycle 1; NNETs or Arab bilingual teachers of English are about 334females and 274 males. Thus,
NETs in all schools are 377 and Arab teachers are 608. These students are separated by gender and all are either Emiratis or Arabs of other nationalities. This population implies that they have many similar characteristics and a common cultural background. As adolescents, they are psychologically in the "formal operations stage" in which logical reasoning processes are applied to abstract ideas as well as to concrete objects (Ormrod, 2008).

Each week the students have ten periods (45 minutes each) for learning English as a foreign language. The teachers of English in most of the public secondary schools are native English speakers who have been recruited since last year or Arab bilingual teachers who used to teach English for a long time. The schools follow the ADEC standards based curriculum. The syllabus of English does not include a certain textbook. The syllabus places a rather large burden on the teacher, as s/he has to select, refine and modify the required materials individually or in groups. Teachers are free to use any resources, which may include extracts from books, magazines, newspapers, websites, and any other possible resources.

The second group of participants in the study consisted of teacher advisors from the same schools the students were affiliated to. The respondents include English language supervisors, school principals, heads of English departments, and English native speaking advisors. The first group, the teacher advisors, includes nine Arab English language supervisors, mainly based at the Al Ain Educational Zone, who visit schools periodically to supervise, guide and observe Arab bilingual teachers only. They also conduct professional development for the teachers and follow up the students' work and progress. The second group consists of 40 school principals whose job is to guide and follow up the
work and progress of all their teachers, including both native and non-native English teachers. The third group includes English native speaking advisors who are allocated in schools. These advisors, who belong to Abu Dhabi Education Council or Education Providers, are categorized as consultants, curriculum directors, lead teachers or supervisors. As such, they have a long heritage in the spheres of teaching and learning strategies, means of improving and assessing teachers' performance. They have been held accountable for developing teachers' instructional practices and professional development. Assessment is a vital ongoing part of this process, and all the advisors use the official ADEC evaluation form to assess the teachers (See Appendix I).

Ten public secondary schools in Al-Ain were selected to represent the four geographical directions (north, south, east and west) as well as the city centre. This covered all the demographical regions. One boys' school and one girls' school represent each of the five areas mentioned above. Then, two classrooms were randomly selected in each school. The classroom populations range from 10 to 30 students.

Four hundred students from these schools answered the students' questionnaire and 40 of them volunteered to be interviewed in four focus groups. Regarding the teacher advisors, 59 out of 120 responded to the questionnaire and 10 of them agreed to be interviewed. The researcher translated the questionnaire into Arabic in order to ensure participants' full understanding of its contents for accurate responses to enhance the validity of the study.
Instruments

Questionnaires

Based on ADEC's professional standards for teachers, the researcher designed two different questionnaires approved by ten professional referees (see appendix H). Both questionnaires tackled four main areas; pedagogy, students' learning, teachers' competencies and cultural backgrounds.

The first questionnaire surveyed the students' perceptions about NETS and NNETs (See Appendix A & C). It comprised two parts: the first part consisted of general information about the type of teacher, school, and gender of school members; the second one was an adoption of a five-point Likert scale. According to the five-point scale, 1 refers to ‘Strongly Disagree’, 2 ‘Disagree’, 3 ‘Neutral’ 4 ‘Agree’, and 5 ‘Strongly Agree’. In a pilot study of 20 randomly selected students, the meaning of the terms ‘NS teachers of English’ and ‘non-NS teachers of English’ was verbally explained before the participants filled in the questionnaire. The feedback from the students was used to revise the questionnaire to ensure that all items were clear and eliciting useful answers before it was administered again to a larger group of participants in the main study. In addition four lead teachers were chosen to respond to the teacher advisors questionnaire to provide a pilot sample. Then, 59 participants responded to the second questionnaire (See Appendix E).

Interviews

Interviewing some of the participants was the second instrument used for collecting data. Cohen, Manion, Morrison & Dawson (2008) recommend conducting interviews as a major instrument for data collection, allowing the researcher to test hypotheses and/or supporting other data collection instruments. In this study the interview
allowed the researcher to follow up data from the questionnaire in more detail, and to seek more information regarding students’ perceptions of the two types of teachers. Moreover, it is used as a validating instrument for the questionnaire results. If opinions diverge wildly between the two instruments then the validity of the study would have to be called into question. McDonough & McDonough (1997) stated that an interview can be structured, semi-structured or unstructured. The design of interviews conducted in this study was structured. A structured interview is one in which the content and procedures are organized in advance, and the sequence and wording of the questions are determined by means of a schedule (Cohen et al, 2008). It was felt that carrying out a structured interview would focus on achieving the purpose of the research, instead of getting too much unwanted data, as well as eliciting answers that were quite easily comparable. (McDonough et al, 1997)

**Students’ Focus Group Interview**

As Arabic is the first language of all interviewees, the students were interviewed in Arabic and the questions were then translated into English to ensure deep understanding of the questions. The students were interviewed in four groups; two boys’ and two girls’, each consisting of ten participants from different schools. The duration of the interviews ranged about 20-30 minutes. These interviews served to confirm and broaden the data from the questionnaire. The first question elicited the type of English teachers interviewees prefer, and why. The second question sought interviewees’ views on the strengths and weaknesses of native teachers of English. The third question was about interviewees’ views on the strengths and weaknesses of non-native teachers of English.
The last two questions inquired about the areas in which each type of teacher (NET & NNET) is superior or inferior (See Appendixes B & D).

**Advisors' Interview**

This interview was carried out in English with eight participants and in Arabic with two principals. The interviews were conducted face to face and there was a person to write the responses of the participants who answered the questions, which were very similar to the questions included on the students' questionnaire. The first question inquired who is more competent in teaching English - an English native speaking teacher or an Arab bilingual teacher, and why. The second and the third questions inquired about the strengths and weaknesses of an English native speaking teacher and non-native English teachers, respectively. The fourth asked which of the two kinds of teacher is more beneficial to students, and how. The last asked about the key qualities of an English language teacher (see Appendix F)

**Validity and reliability**

A jury of referees were asked to measure the validity of the questionnaires and interviews questions, they provided some comments and suggestions that were very helpful in designing these instruments and the referees (UAEU professors, supervisors of English, lead teachers) approved the research instruments as shown on appendix H. These educators reviewed the questionnaires and the interviews questions with the researcher and provided some insights on deleting some items that were deemed to be too vague and difficult to be understood clearly by the students. They also suggested classifying the questionnaires into four major categories. In addition, they helped write
straight to the point and short sentences. They asked the researcher to delete some statements that are misleading and may fit in more than one category.

Erlandson, Harris, Skipper and Allen (1993) clarified that the research is valued and approved by its validity and credibility. The credibility can make readers believe that the findings and the results are accurate. The researcher used both questionnaires and interviews and focus group interviews to triangulate data in order to provide more convincing findings and results. In addition, the researcher carried out a few interviews after one month and asked some participants to fill in the questionnaire. They gave similar results. As for the reliability of the results, the researcher used SSPS to identify Cronbach's Alpha reliability degree of the two questionnaires. It was important to stand at the degree of the reliability of participants' responses to judge the consistency of their answers. Cronbach's Alpha was found .86 for the students' questionnaire and it is .92 for the advisors' Questionnaires.

Data Analysis

The data obtained from students and advisors' questionnaires were analyzed throughout descriptive statistics and the data were entered to (SPSS 17.00) Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. The mean score and T-test were calculated to assess the differences between the NET and NNET. The maximum mean score for each area was 5 (Strongly agree), and the minimum 1 (Strongly Disagree). The data were classified into four categories, pedagogy, competences, students' learning and cultural and social background. The data were summarized in ten tables for both students and advisors.

The data analysis of the interview was carried out into two steps transcribing and coding. The first stage was transcribing the interview's responses literally immediately after
carrying out the interview or in the same day. The second step was data coding in which
the data were summarized and categorized into themes like NETs’ and NNETs’ strengths
and weaknesses. In addition, the data were translated into English since the interviews
were carried out in Arabic.

Ethical Consideration

The use of anonymity to ensure confidentiality and to prevent any kind of privacy
invasion was adopted by the researcher. Thus, participants were given numbers to use in
the study so as not to make their performance public to prevent any kind of harmful
feelings some of them might feel. In addition, all participants were asked to join this study
willingly and voluntarily without any kind of force to prevent any kind of abuse. The
participants were told by the researchers that they had the right to withdraw from the
interview or not to complete the questionnaire if they like. In addition, permission was
issued by A-Ain Educational Zone to carry out the study.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

The purpose of this research is to investigate the students' and teacher advisors' perceptions about the efficacy of NETs and NNETs on teaching competencies and its impact on students' learning as well as understanding the cultural and social backgrounds. Through utilizing qualitative and quantitative methods to collect the data, the study also attempts to look specifically at what type of teachers are preferred or viewed to be more beneficial as well as their strengths and weaknesses. The chapter is divided into sections. The first one addresses the six research questions. Then for each research question, data is organized and written in essays and tables. The next section includes a summary that sums up the main results and discusses them in terms of other related studies to clarify the entire picture. These results are organized and displayed in eleven tables in order to address the research questions:

Research Question One

The first research question is "From students' perspective, is there a significant difference between the efficacy of NETs' and NNETs' teaching competencies and their effect on learning? To answer this question, the data was collected via the students' questionnaire and organized in tables that address four data under four categories; teaching, competences, students' learning and cultural and social background.

Firstly, the data collected from the questionnaire shows clearly that there is a significant difference in term of the efficacy of the teaching competencies category as a whole in favor of NNETs. Table 1 shows the means of both NETs and NNETs regarding the competencies. As an overall trend, the mean score for NNETs (3.77) is significantly
greater than the mean score for NETs (3.55) in the category of competencies. Thus, this table gives a clear indication that NNETs’ efficacy is generally judged to be greater than NETs.

Despite this general tendency to value the efficacy of NNETs more, the students respond more positively to NETs in two subcategories: first, they recognize that NETs have a good command of the subject matter, which is their mother tongue; and, second, they are believed to be more effective at improving students’ English Language skills. In contrast, students respond in favor of NNETs regarding the following competencies: engaging students in all activities, using effective teaching methods and strategies, relating the subject to students' needs and interests, and having the ability to control and manage the class very well.

Table 1

*The Mean of Students Responses Regarding Teacher Competencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Mean N</th>
<th>NN</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- I think my English teacher has a good command of the subject.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>5.367**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I learn a lot from my teacher as we are engaged in all activities</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.159**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- My English teacher uses a variety teaching methods.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- My English teacher relates the subject to our needs and interests</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.907**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I think my English skills are improving with this teacher</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.998 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- My teacher has the ability to control and manage the class well</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>10.581**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>2.853 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p < .05. **p < .01.*
Regarding the second part of the first research question, pedagogy, the results show no significant difference between NETs and NNETs in this category as a whole; however, there are significant differences in some subcategories as shown on Table 2. This table shows the means of both NETs and NNETs in this field. As an overall trend, the mean score for NNETs (3.64) is very similar to the mean score for NETs (3.64). But, there are significant differences between NETs and NNETs in four subcategories’ two in favour of each. First, NETs’ mean score rates higher in being a model for teaching conversation and speaking, and a model for teaching pronunciation. NNETs’ mean score rates higher in using varied evaluation methods and giving useful feedback. Both NETs and NNETs receive similar responses in other three subcategories; implementing different resources (modern technology), using appropriate varied strategies and techniques in teaching, and being clear and concise when giving instructions.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy</th>
<th>Mean N</th>
<th>Mean NN</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- uses appropriate varied strategies and techniques</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>-1.823-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- implements different resources (modern technology)</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is clear and concise when giving instructions.</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>-1.799-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gives us useful feedback.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>-2.298-*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- uses varied evaluation methods.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>-2.624-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a model for teaching conversation &amp; speaking.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>4.081**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a model for teaching pronunciation.</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4.208**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>-.186-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01.
Teaching and learning are an intermingled process so one questionnaire statement may fit in more than one category. Regarding the latter part of the first research question about students' learning. The data shows a significant difference in favour of NETs. NET's mean score (3.85) is higher than NNETs’ mean score (3.70). There are also significant differences in the mean score in six subcategories in favour of NETs and four categories in favor of NNETs and they are nearly similar in the other two subcategories. The differences in the six subcategories in favour of NETs can be summarized as follows; helping students communicate better when speaking, improving listening skills, improving communication skills in current English, developing spoken English abilities, encouraging better communication in English, and increasing knowledge of new words. In contrast, the significant differences in the four subcategories in favour of NNETs are anticipating students’ learning difficulties, being a model of foreign language learning, making the classroom a positive learning environment and helping students learn grammar. Both teachers receive similar responses in their effects on writing and reading.
Table 3

The Mean of Students' Responses Regarding Students' Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students' Learning</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NN</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- anticipates our learning difficulties.</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>-4.230-**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is model of foreign language learning.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>-2.236-*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- makes my class a positive learning environment.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>-5.543-**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- helps me communicate better in English.</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>8.632**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- improves my listening skills.</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>8.421**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- improves communication skills in current English.</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.845**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- improves my writing skills.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- helps become better at grammar.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>-2.679-**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- develops my spoken English abilities.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.414*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- helps me learn reading well.</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>-1.726-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- forces us to communicate in English.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>5.576**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increases my knowledge of new words.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.027*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.651**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01.

For the teacher's efficacy in the cultural and social domains, it is clearly shown that there is a significant difference in the mean scores between NETs and NNETs in the favor of NNETs. Table 4 presents the means of both NETs and NNETs. As an overall trend, the mean score for NNETs (4.01) is significantly greater than the mean score for NETs (3.21). NNETs are superior in four subcategories.
Table 4

The Mean of Students Responses Regarding Social and Cultural Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social and Cultural Background</th>
<th>Mean N</th>
<th>Mean NN</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- encourages me to learn English.</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>-0.083-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- builds social relationships with the class and with me</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>-0.580-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- helps me individually when I have a problem.</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>-4.759-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is sensitive to our culture and values.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>-4.932-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gives us opportunities to express our opinions.</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>-11.583-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gives examples pertinent to my cultural background.</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>-11.958-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>-11.889-**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01.

To sum up, the students show significant differences between NETs and NNETs as shown on Table 5 which presents an overall view of the students’ perception about the efficacy of NETs and NNETs on teaching and learning. The mean score of the whole categories for NNETs (4.01) is significantly greater than the mean score for NETs (3.56). NNETs receive higher and more positive responses in two subcategories; teaching competencies and cultural and social background, while NETs rate higher in students’ learning. They are similar in pedagogical effectiveness. In fact, the efficacy of NNETs’ competencies with regard to the social and cultural background is rated more highly than NETs; however, the impact on students’ learning is in favour of NETs.
Table 5

The Mean of Students Responses Regarding the Four Categories in the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean N</th>
<th>Mean NN</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>-2.853-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>-.186-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.651**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and cultural Background</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>-11.889-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>-4.988-**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01.

Research Question Two

The second research question is “Do students prefer to be taught by NETs or NNETs and why?” This part of the qualitative data collection was conducted in four focus groups; the first interview question was “Do you prefer to be taught by an English native speaking teacher or an Arab bilingual teacher? Why?” The students in the four focus groups show similar responses to both types of teachers, NETs and NNETs as shown on the table below.

Table 6

Percentages of Students’ preference on NETs and NNETs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NETs</th>
<th>NNETS</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 (girls)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (girls)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 (boys)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 (boys)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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All the groups show nearly similar preferences for both types of teachers whether native or non-native. The students who respond more positively to NETs' teaching prefer them in the following areas; they are seen as more accurate model in pronunciation, they have a good knowledge of vocabulary and explain it in English, in the process enriching students' knowledge in the area, and are considered to improve students' fluency, listening, conversation and communication skills. In addition NETs are preferred for being more capable of obliging students to use English and simply being experienced in the language itself.

In contrast, other students find many reasons to prefer being taught by NNETs, claiming that sharing the same language is advantageous because it helps teachers communicate better with students as they can use Arabic to explain issues related to grammar and rules. Similarities in cultural background allow them to better anticipate students' difficulties and needs, they can relate the subject matter to students' culture and interests. The shared linguistic background means they communicate better with them, using Arabic when needed, and all respondents note that they are accustomed to be taught by NNETs who use Arabic to clarify and translate, and these teachers can also understand students better as they have the same culture and traditions. Two respondents only prefer both types of teachers as they think that they will get the benefit of their combined strengths.

To sum up, as shown in table 11, students' responses are nearly similar for both NETs and NNETs in terms of preferences. About 40% prefer NETs, 42.5% prefer NNETs and 17.5% prefer both. And even boys and girls show no difference in their perception.
Research Question Three

The third research question is "What are the strengths and weaknesses of NETs and NNETs from the students’ perspective?" To answer this question, the data was collected from the students' questionnaire. It was noticed that NETs' strengths may represent the weakness of the NNET’s; and vice versa. The following is a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of each type of teachers from the students' perspective.

In fact, the two types of teachers do seem to complement each other in this area; an understanding of students’ social and cultural background are the NETs’ weaknesses and NNETs’ strengths; however, enhancing students’ learning is the strengths of NETs and the weaknesses of NNETs. The data was collected via questionnaire and focus group interview with students – this allowed for triangulation, thus enhancing the validity of the data collected via these research instruments.

NETs’ Strengths

The data triangulated from both instruments – the students’ questionnaire and the focus group interview - shows agreement in the following; learners perceive that they are able to help them communicate better when speaking, help them improve listening skills, and communication skills in current English, and enhance better communication in English in general, by helping and obliging students to communicate in English. They also help increase knowledge of new words. The students believe NETs have a superior command of the language and the subject matter, such as vocabulary resource and literature in the language; and they are a model of pronunciation. In addition, in the classroom they tend to integrate modern technology, and encourage learning through fun.
NETs' Weaknesses

Native speaking teachers are perceived to be weak in the following; engaging students in all activities, using a variety of effective teaching methods and strategies, relating the subject to students' needs and interests, and having the ability to control and manage the class. NETs are believed to be less able to anticipate students' learning difficulties, to be a model of foreign language learning, to make class a positive learning environment or help students learn grammar well.

In addition, it is perceived that they influence students' culture negatively and have a difficulty in understanding students' needs and culture because NETs do not share Arabic language and culture. Besides they have some difficulty in teaching grammar and as some of them are unqualified,

NNETs' strengths

Students consider that NNETs or Arab bilingual teachers of English are good at anticipating students' learning difficulties, needs and their cultural context, being a model of foreign language learning and teaching grammar. They can make class a positive learning environment with good classroom management. They are experienced in teaching and are knowledgeable in grammar; sharing the culture and language with students facilitates communication. They also give clear and simple instruction, display dedication and are very supportive.

NNETs' weaknesses

Non-native English teachers have demonstrated the following weaknesses; their command of the subject matter and their improvement of the language skills, helping students communicate better when speaking, improving listening skills, improving
communication skills in current English, developing spoken English abilities, and increasing knowledge of new words. They can also reveal inaccuracy, inaccurate pronunciation, a lack of knowledge in vocabulary and the language. Use of Arabic can be a problem as this will limit the exposure to English. They sometimes give inaccurate assessment, and are nervous and impatient.

**Research Question Four**

The fourth research question is “From teacher advisors’ perspective is there a significant difference between the efficacy of NETs’ and NNETs’ teaching competencies and their effect on students’ learning?” The perception of the teacher advisors is of great as it is a judgment of people who are experts and experienced educators. The data collected from these stakeholders’ questionnaire shows clearly that there is a view that NETs’ efficacy is significantly greater for the category overall.

Table 6 presents the means of both NETs and NNETs. As general trend, the mean score for NETs (4.10) is significantly greater than the mean score for NNETs (3.63) in the category of teaching competencies. NETs receive four out of five positive responses in subcategories while the NNETs receive only one positive response in the category of being a model of language learning. Thus, NETs are believed to be superior in the following areas: being a good model of accurate pronunciation, conversational skills, and language fluency in general, and the sharing of English literature and culture.
Table 7

The Mean of Advisors Responses Regarding Teacher Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Competencies</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- a good model of accurate pronunciation.</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.996**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a good model for conversational skills.</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.367**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a good model for English literature and culture.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.887**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a good model for language fluency</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.233**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a good model for foreign language learning.</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>-3.594**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.495**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05. **p < .01.

Regarding the teacher’s efficacy in the area of pedagogy, Table 8 shows no significant difference between the mean scores of NETs and NNETs over the whole category; however, there are significant differences in six subcategories; five where the NNETs are perceived more favourably and one in favour of NETs. The table also shows that the difference is significant in favour of non-native teachers in terms of classroom management, using clear instructions, easily understood by students and relating the subject matter to students’ needs and interests, catering for different abilities and learning styles through differentiation. In contrast, NETs are superior in integrating technology and self reflection and self assessment.
Table 8

The Mean of Advisors Responses Regarding Teacher Pedagogy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- plans lessons to meet students’ learning needs.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>-1.638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- uses appropriate strategies in teaching.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>-1.659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- uses appropriate activities and techniques in teaching.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- shows high capability of class management.</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>-4.811</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- makes use of proper learning resources (modern technology)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>2.041</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- uses clear instructions, easily understood by students.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>-2.966</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gives students appropriate and useful feedback.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>-1.796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relates the subject matter to students’ needs and interests.</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>-2.195</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- uses appropriate and varied evaluation methods</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-1.925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- caters for different abilities and learning styles through</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>-2.205</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differentiation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- engages students in reflection and self assessment to enable</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.095</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goals setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01.

For the category of the effect on students' learning, there is a significant difference between NETs and NNETs in the favour of NNETs. NNET’s total mean score (3.66) rates higher than NETs' mean score (3.59). There are also significant differences in the mean score in three of the subcategories in favour of NETs and four subcategories in favor of NNETs, while in the other two subcategories there is little difference in how the efficacy of the two types of teacher is rated as shown in the following table.
### Table 9

*The Mean of Advisors' Responses Regarding Students' Learning*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students' Learning</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- understands different learning styles.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>-0.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- anticipates learning difficulties.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>-3.074**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- makes class a positive learning environment.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- helps improve students' reading skills.</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.022**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- helps improve students' oral skills.</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.537**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- uses only English throughout the lesson and outside.</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.995**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- teaches grammar efficiently.</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>-2.366*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- improves the writing skills of the students.</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>-2.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- encourages students use new words in contexts.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>-3.101**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Total</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.651**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05. **p < .01.*

The fourth category clearly relates to how the teachers’ understanding of the socio-cultural background of the students impacts on their efficacy and clearly shows a significant difference in the mean score between NETs and NNETs in favor of NNETs. NNETs are perceived superior in 4 out of the 5 subcategories Table 9 presents the means of both NETs and NNETs. As an overall trend, the mean score for NNETs (3.28) is significantly greater than the mean score for NETs (2.48).
Table 10

The Mean of Advisors Responses Regarding Social and Cultural Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social and Cultural Background</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>NN</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- is sensitive to our culture and values.</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.273-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- helps students individually when having a problem.</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.309-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- builds social relationships with the students.</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.631-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- examples that are pertinent to students' cultural background.</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.048-**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- understanding of students’ cultural and social background</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.587-*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Total</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.981-**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01.

To sum up, the data collected about the teacher advisors’ perception shows clearly no significant difference between the efficacy of NETs and NNETs in the mean scores of the four categories. However, there are significant differences in two subcategories: teaching competencies are perceived to be more effective in the case of NETs, while positive responsiveness to cultural and social background is perceived to be more developed in NNETs. In the other subcategories; pedagogy and students’ learning they seem to be similarly efficacious.
The Mean of Advisors Responses Regarding the Four Categories in the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>NN</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>-1.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' learning</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>-0.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.495**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and cultural Background</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>-3.981**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>-1.909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01.

Research Question Five

The fifth research question “What are the strengths and weaknesses of NET and NNETs from the teacher advisors’ perspective?” is designed to shed light on the strengths and weaknesses of the two types of teachers as perceived by teacher advisors. In fact responses are very similar to what the students mentioned. Available data is thus triangulated via input from both students and advisors obtained via questionnaire and interviews. The results obtained from the teacher advisors’ questionnaire and in interview show no significant difference between NETs and NNETs overall; however, this is not the case in the individual subcategories. Hence, it is beneficial to tackle the issues separately in order to pinpoint the strengths and weaknesses of the different types of teachers.

NETs' Strengths

Overall, the strengths of NETs and the weaknesses of NNETs would be listed as follows: firstly, as far as directing learning is concerned, they are seen to be better at using proper learning resources and to engage students in reflection and self assessment to enable goal setting, and in terms of learning skills themselves, they are considered more effective at improving reading and oral skills, partly through using only English
throughout the lesson and outside, and they also model more accurate pronunciation, greater fluency in spoken English, and are excellent in developing communicative skills. Also they are more skilled at teaching authentic English, and have superior knowledge of English literature and culture, and language fluency. Clearly, they also have superior language knowledge, as well as offering new cultural interactions, experience and new use of technology in curriculum.

**NETs' Weaknesses**

As far as NET weaknesses are concerned, the following were identified; students cannot communicate easily with them, as they have not got the ability to translate from English to Arabic, which is needed for some explanation and abstract nouns, and they are not aware of the differences between English and their students' mother tongue so they can't anticipate their students' linguistic problems or cultural needs. Some have demonstrated an inability to build effective relationships with students due to a lack of knowledge about students' culture, needs and abilities. As they are often not highly skilled, difficulties in dealing with weak students, poor class management, control and monitoring are apparent.

**NNETs' Strengths**

On the other hand, the strengths of NNETs and the weaknesses of the NETs would be itemized as follows; show superior class management, for example, by using clear and specific instructions that are easily understood by students, catering to different abilities and learning styles through differentiation and anticipating learning difficulties. They are also deemed to be superior at relating the subject matter to students' needs and interests, in using pedagogical methods, modelling foreign language learning and teaching grammar.
efficiently. They are also perceived favourably for their skill at improving the writing of students, and encouraging students to use new words in various contexts. In the three areas, both NETs and NNETs earned similar responses for understanding different learning styles, making class a positive learning environment, and building social relationships with the students.

**NNETs' Weaknesses**

They demonstrate a lack of spontaneity in English, and a lack of competency in teaching a second language, as they lack fluency and may resort Arabic from time to time. In addition to the lack of fluency, they have a poor accent, and make inaccurate models of spoken English; they cannot help their students to speak English fluently and naturally.

**Research Question Six**

The sixth research question was “What type of teacher (NET or NNET) do the teacher advisors think is more beneficial?” The answer to this question was collected via interview. The responses can be summarized as follows; half of the participants thought students could benefit from both NETs and NNETs as they complement each other in their strengths and weaknesses. Students could gain from both because each brings a different style and experience so a combination of the two would be ideal to teach students. As of specific advantages of each type of teacher, two participants thought that students could benefit from NETs in listening and speaking skills to help their command of the language. Two participants thought that NNETs can be very useful in teaching skills like grammar and vocabulary; they also believe they understand the learners’ cultural and learning needs. One of the participants stated that it depends on the type of teacher and the type of the student - it was not easy to compare; otherwise, he believes that more research should
be conducted to find out who has a greater positive influence on students' learning and achievement.

Summary

This short summary tries to sum up the main ideas revealed by the six research questions, including both the students' and teacher advisors' perspectives on which of the two types of teacher demonstrates the greater effectiveness and competence. Generally, the results of students' data were congruent with the teacher advisors' data. The results show no significant differences between both types of results. The students' responses were nearly similar for both NETs (40%) and NNETs (42.5%) in terms of preferences. In contrast, 50% of the teacher advisors think that both are competent, 20% for NETs and 30% for NNETs. These results indicate clearly that the responses towards NETs and NNET are nearly similar.

The data collected from students' and teacher advisors' questionnaires are quite similar in most of the issues tackled, but different in others. For instance, students indicate that there are significant differences between the efficacy of NETs and NNETs in total mean scores; the mean score of students' questionnaire is (3.78) in favour of NNETs and (3.56) in favour of NETs. There are also significant differences in two subcategories: competencies and awareness of social and cultural background in favour of NNETs and students' learning in favour of NETs. In contrast, the teacher advisors' data reveals no significant difference in total score. However, there are significant differences in two subcategories: teaching competencies favoured NETs, while social and cultural background favoured NNETs.
The specific NETs’ strengths include as the students perceive them include: having a good command of the subject matter, improving students’ English Language skills, being a model for conversation, pronunciation and speaking, helping to improve listening, speaking and communication skills in current English, and increasing students’ knowledge of new words. From the technical point of view there are many similarities here teaching of oral skills mentioned above is again praised, in addition to making use of proper learning resources and engaging students in reflection and self assessment, and developing reading. They also have better knowledge of English culture.

In contrast, the strengths of NNETs would be listed by the student respondents as follows; they have superior skills in engaging students in all activities, by using effective teaching strategies, and relating the subject to students’ needs and interests. They also have the ability to control and manage the class very well, making class a positive learning environment and helping students learn grammar, encouraging students and helping students individually with problems. In addition, they use varied evaluation methods and give useful feedback, and anticipate students’ of learning difficulties. They make a better model of foreign language, are sensitive to culture and values, and give students opportunities to express opinions and give examples that are pertinent to students’ cultural background.

The teacher advisors share these perceptions too; a positive attitude to the classroom management of the NNETs as a whole, and an appreciation of the model of second language learning these teachers provide as well as the other strengths due to sharing cultural and learning experiences mentioned above. The advisors also appreciate NNETs work on writing skills and the teaching of new words in various contexts. Both
NETs and NNETs receive similar recognition for understanding different learning styles, making class a positive learning environment, and building social relationships with the students. They also have knowledge of English culture, and language fluency. It is revealed clearly from the tables and other data collected that overall NETs’ strengths are NNETs’ weaknesses while NNETs’ are NETs’ strengths.

The researcher attempts to find the most important qualities of the effective English language teacher so he added the following question to the teacher advisors’ interview “What are the key qualities of an English language teacher? . The key qualities can be summarized as follows:

• s/he has effective classroom management, using appropriate strategies, activities and techniques to promote student–centred teaching, and catering for individual differences.

• They give clear instructions, are a good model in speaking, reading and pronunciation and use mainly English, never tending to translate.

• The effective English teacher is being sensitive to students’ culture and values and has the ability to relate the individual students’ needs.

• S/he varies evaluation methods to assess students’ work and offers creative lesson planning and real life-like tasks and authentic contexts.

• Effective teachers have a knowledge of educational psychology and literacy in educational technology.

These qualities gain importance as they have been collected from experts in the field. Matching them to the teaching competencies and different perceived areas of efficacy discussed above, it becomes clear that both NETs and NNETs have particular advantages
and may be best used in some kind of combination. It can be inferred that these qualities are congruent with both NETs and NNETs.

**Discussion**

The findings of this research study are closely congruent with the findings of Al-Omerani’s dissertation (2008) which indicated that NETs and NNET have their own particular advantages and disadvantages. NETs are superior in teaching oral skills, as they have the advantage of language fluency and accuracy and knowledge of English culture and literature, while NNETs are superior in their ability to anticipate language learning difficulties, teaching grammar, and understanding the cultural background of the learners.

The results are also similar to Muramatsu’s (2008) findings regarding the NETs’ strengths in knowledge of English and perfect fluency and familiarity with language, culture, and literature. NNETs are, on the other hand, more knowledgeable about grammar, the ability to interact with all students, and openness to learning from students and varying teaching styles. However, the results are different from the findings that showed NETs are more competent in teaching writing (Muramatsu, 2008).

Torres’ study indicated that students have a general preference for NETs over NNET. Those findings are completely different from this research study, which showed general preferences towards NNETs. Students in this study showed preferences for NNETs in teaching writing, but Torres’ and Filho’s students prefer NETs for teaching writing (Torres, 2002; Filho, 2002). Filho’s results showed similar responses towards non-native teachers in regard to patience, good command of grammar and sympathy towards students’ problems and learning difficulties. Many participants’ expressed concern about NNETs’ pronunciation (Filho, 2002).
Moussu’s study showed some significant similarities with this study. The respondents praise the non-native speaking teachers’ learning experience which can be used to anticipate learning challenges and needs. They believe that both types of teachers complement each other in their points of strength and weaknesses (Moussu, 2006).

Mahboob’s findings agreed with this study findings. His participants felt that native and non native teachers can create a conducive learning environment. The participants perceived that NNETs teach grammar better, whereas NETs were strong in teaching oral communication. The administrators felt that both types of teachers had unique qualities, and that the ideal situation for language learning and teaching is when both are working together. This is congruent with this study’s findings (Mahboob, 2003).

This thesis is much closer to the findings of Mardid and Candado (2004). NETs are preferred due to their fluency, obtaining better outcomes in oral communication, better pronunciation, and knowledge of vocabulary and spelling rules. The students receive more time of exposure to language with NETs. NNETs were preferred in grammar, better understood learning process, and in building social relationships with the learners.

**Conclusion**

This chapter gains its significance through the findings of the study that answer the six research questions. From students’ perspective, the quantitative and qualitative data exhibit significant differences between the efficacy of NETs and NNETs, in general, regarding the categories of teaching competencies, pedagogy, students’ learning and cultural background. However, the qualitative data shows no significant differences between NET and NNET; the responses are nearly the same. From the perspective of the teacher advisors, both quantitative and qualitative findings indicate that, in general
categories, there are no significant differences between NETs and NNETs. This answers the first and fourth research questions.

Regarding the strengths and weaknesses of NETs and NNETs from the students’ and teacher advisors’ perspectives as discussed so far; it becomes clear that the NETs’ strengths constitute the NNETs’ weaknesses and NETs’ weaknesses constitute the NNETs’ strengths. In addition native teacher is more beneficial to teach the language due to his natural efficiency and spontaneous competence. In contrast, non-native teachers are more appropriate to teach English as they anticipate the difficulties and challenges of learning the language. To conclude, the best and most practical place for teaching and learning the language should include both kinds of teachers; native and non-native to enable students get the benefits and merits of them both. Moreover, both types of English teachers need to work in a cooperative climate to complement each other instructionally. Furthermore, each type of teacher has strengths that need to be reinforced and developed as well as weaknesses that should to be overcome by ongoing professional development programmes that meet the diverse needs of these teachers.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This concluding chapter presents a summary of the research problem, purpose and questions as well as methodology and its findings, and discusses implications of the study in detail. Suggestions and recommendations are offered for all stakeholders including teachers, principals, supervisors, superintendents, students and parents. Also ADEC decision makers would be able to use these recommendations in their strategic planning and design of professional development programs for teachers of English, as well as when recruiting them. Before concluding the chapter, limitations of the study are acknowledged and recommendations for further research are stated.

Summary

This present study investigated students' and advisors' perceptions about the efficacy of native and non-native teachers of the English language on teaching and learning. It has also been an attempt to specifically explore NETs' and NNETs' strengths and weaknesses. It examines how students and teacher advisors perceive NETs and NNETs in terms of teachers' competencies, pedagogy, students' learning, and social and cultural background.

In order to investigate the issue more deeply and pursue the perspectives of students and teacher advisors, a combined method approach was employed to collect data; the quantitative part of the study surveyed two populations; the first group consisted of 400 students from about 10 boys' and girls' schools. These students responded to a 31 item survey to give their perception about NETs and NNETs as well as their strengths and weaknesses.
The second population involved 59 teacher advisors members who were given a 30-item survey to show their perception, in the same way the students in the first group did theirs. Regarding the qualitative part of the research, forty of the students who answered the survey were interviewed in four focus groups and answered five questions. In addition, ten of the teacher advisors who were surveyed had interviews with the researcher.

This research study attempted to tackle six research questions to explore the differences in perspectives on the efficacy of NETs and NNETs. As of specific advantages of each type of teacher, two participants thought that students could benefit from NETs in listening and speaking skills to help their command of the language. Two participants thought that NNETs can be very useful in teaching skills like grammar and vocabulary; they also believe they understand the learners’ cultural and learning needs. One of the participants stated that it depends on the type of teacher and the type of the student, it was not easy to compare otherwise. He believed that more research should be conducted to find out who had a greater positive influence on students’ learning and achievement. After reviewing the literature and related studies, quantitative data was collected and organized in ten tables, and the qualitative data was very beneficial in gaining deeper insights into points tackled in the questionnaires.

From a student’s perspective, is there a significant difference between the efficacy of NETs’ and NNETs’ teaching competencies and their effect on learning?

The next section summarized the study findings and reviewed the research questions. The results obtained from the students’ survey answered the first research question and showed that there is a significant difference between student perceptions of the efficacy of NETs.
and NNETs teaching competencies. The results were in favour of NNETs: The strengths of the NNETs were seen to lie in two categories; teachers’ competencies and social and cultural background, while NETs were superior in the category of student learning. The second question focuses on the affective side of teaching, asking students if they preferred to be taught by NETs or NNETs and why this was the case. Here students expressed a slight preference (2.5%) in favour of NNETs.

The third research question asks about student perceptions of NETs’ and NNETs’ strengths and weaknesses. First, NET strengths as shown by the survey and interview can be summarized as follows: a good command of the subject matter, accurate pronunciation, accuracy, fluency, and improving students’ oral skills (listening and speaking), and technology integration. In contrast, the weaknesses of these teachers were poor classroom management, inability to understand students’ learning or social and cultural needs, and lack of variety in teaching methods. These points of weakness are very serious and they may further influence their efficacy by making it harder for them to capitalize on their strengths. For example, poor classroom management usually hinders any teacher from doing his work in the classroom properly, however skilled they may be in other areas.

The third research question also concerns NNETs’ strengths and weaknesses. First, their strengths as revealed by the questionnaire and interview: good classroom management; understanding students’ learning, social, and cultural needs, using varied teaching methods, anticipating learners’ difficulties and challenges; teaching grammar; and being a model of language learning. On the other hand, their weaknesses were inaccurate pronunciation, the overuse of Arabic, inaccuracy and lack of fluency, and lack of command in the subject matter.
The results obtained from the teacher advisors' questionnaire and interviews answered the fourth question and showed no significant difference between the efficacy of NETs and NNETs regarding learning in general scores: however, there were significant differences in two categories; teaching competencies were believed to be strongly in favour of NETs, and social and cultural background in favour of NNETs. The teacher advisors thought that both NETs and NNETs are competent in some areas.

The fifth question asked about NETs' and NNETs' strengths and weaknesses from the school advisors' perspective. NET strengths were: making use of proper learning resources in teaching, engaging students in reflection and self-assessment to enable goal setting, improving students' reading skills, and building on fluency by providing a good model and always using English. On the other hand, their weaknesses were poor classroom management and difficulty in using simple instructions. In addition, weak students find it difficult to understand and learn from NETs, there can be a lack of variety in teaching methods; they sometimes have heavy accents, as well as a difficulty in teaching grammar and writing. They can influence students' culture negatively, speak fast and cause difficulty in understanding their accents for weak students, and can be guilty of poor communication.

NNETs, on the other hand, were seen to have the following strengths from the advisors' perspective: good classroom management and control, understanding of students' learning needs and anticipating their difficulties, sharing cultural, traditions with students, providing better communication, and competency in teaching and instruction. In contrast, NNETs' weaknesses were overuse of Arabic, limiting exposure to English,
inaccurate pronunciation, lack of knowledge of vocabulary, lack of knowledge in teaching oral and conversational skills, and inaccurate use of the language.

As for school advisors' perceptions of the efficacy of the two types of teacher, two participants thought that students could benefit from NETs in listening and speaking skills to help their command of the language, while two respondents thought that NNETs can be very useful in teaching skills like grammar and vocabulary; they also believe their understanding of the learners' cultural and learning needs ensures better learning.

This present study investigates the students' and teacher advisors' perceptions about the efficacy of native and non-native teachers of English on teaching competencies and their impact on students' learning, as well as understanding the cultural and social background. It has also been an attempt to specifically explore NETs' and NNETs' strengths and weaknesses. In order to investigate the issue more deeply and pursue the perspectives of students and advisors, quantitative and qualitative methods were utilized; two groups of participants were surveyed; the first group consists of 400 students from about 10 boys' and girls' schools. These students responded a 31 item questionnaire to clarify their perception about the efficacy of NET's and NNET' teaching competences and their impact on learning as well as their strengths and weaknesses. The second involved 59 advisors who were given a 30-item questionnaire to show their perception as the students in the first group did. Regarding the qualitative part of the research, forty of the students who answered the questionnaire were interviewed in four focus groups and answered five questions. In addition, ten of the surveyed advisors were interviewed.

This research study attempts to tackle six research questions to explore the efficacy of NETs and NNETs on teaching and learning as well as their strengths and weaknesses.
After reviewing the literature and related studies, quantitative data was collected and organized in ten tables, and then qualitative data was very beneficial in gaining deep insights into points tackled in the questionnaires. The next section summarizes the study findings and reviews the research questions.

The results obtained from the students' questionnaire answer the first research question and show that there is a significant difference between NETs and NNETs in favour of NNETs. The strengths of the NNETs were in two categories; teachers' competencies and social and cultural background, while NETs were superior in the category of student learning. However, the qualitative part of the study showed a slight difference (2.5% in favour of NNETs) regarding the students' preferences. Also, there were significant differences in some points that would be summarized as strengths and weaknesses in the next questions.

The second research question asks about NETs' strengths and weaknesses. First, their strengths as shown by the questionnaire and interview can be summarized as follows: a good command of the subject matter, accurate pronunciation, accuracy, fluency, and improving students' oral skills (listening and speaking), and technology integration. In contrast, NETs' weaknesses were poor classroom management, inability to understand students' learning, social and cultural needs, and limited use of varied teaching methods. The trick is that NETs' points of weakness are serious and they may influence their ability to make benefit of their strengths. For example, poor classroom management usually hinders any teacher from doing his work in the classroom properly.

The third research question asks about NNETs' strengths and weaknesses. First, their strengths as revealed by the questionnaire and interview: good classroom
management; understanding students’ learning, social, and cultural needs, using varied teaching methods, anticipating learners’ difficulties and challenges; teaching grammar; and being a model of language learning. On the other hand, their weaknesses were inaccurate pronunciation, the overuse of Arabic, inaccuracy and lack of fluency, and lack of command in the subject matter.

The results obtained from the teacher advisors’ questionnaire and interviews answered the fourth and showed no significant difference between NETs and NNETs in general scores: however, there were significant differences in two categories; competencies in favour of NETs, and social and cultural background in favour of NNETs. The teacher advisors thought that both NETs and NNETs are competent in some areas.

Regarding the fifth question asked about NETs’ strengths and weaknesses. Their strengths were: making use of proper learning resources in teaching, engaging students in reflection and self assessment to enable goal setting, improving students’ reading skills, improving students’ oral skills, using only English throughout the lesson and outside, accurate pronunciation, conversational skills, knowledge of English literature and culture, and language fluency. On the other hand, their weaknesses were poor classroom management, difficulty in using simple instructions. In addition, weak students find it difficult to understand and learn from NETs, there can be a lack of variety in teaching methods; they sometimes have heavy accents, as well as a difficulty in teaching grammar and writing. They can influence students’ culture negatively, speak fast and cause difficulty in understanding their accents for weak students, and can be guilty of poor communication.
The sixth research question tackles the strengths and weaknesses of the NNETs from the teacher advisors’ perspectives, their strengths can be summarized as follows: good classroom management and control, understanding of students’ learning needs and anticipating their difficulties, sharing the culture, religion, language and traditions with students, better communication, understanding the students’ needs and their context, and competency in teaching and instruction. In contrast, NNETs’ weaknesses were overuse of Arabic, limiting the exposure to English, inaccurate pronunciation, lack of knowledge of vocabulary, and lack of knowledge in teaching oral and conversational skills, and inaccurate use of the language.

Conclusion

Throughout the findings of this present study, the students and teacher advisors show reasonable perception about both NETs and NNETs as is the case in few places all over the world. The results indicate that each type of teacher is preferred for different aspects. They perceive both types of teachers are required to create an ideal environment based on the integration and cooperation of two diverse and multicultural approaches. In addition, the students might exhibit negative responses towards native speaking teachers as they have not got acquainted with their teaching practices. These teachers are also representatives of a complete reform in educational practices, so students’ criticism may reflect as much on aspects of this as on the teachers themselves. In addition, the students might respond more positively to their Arab bilingual teachers as they have been teaching them for many years.

Furthermore, perceptions of these students might be skewed negatively against English native teachers because they belong to other cultural backgrounds. The teacher
advisors may share the reaction against the English native speaking teachers who are part of a reform which is perceived as a threat to their jobs. The data suggests that both native and non-native teachers are required to develop their strengths through communication and collaboration in order to perform as competently as possible. Students may build their perception of their achievement on marks given by the teachers rather than the actual leaning. They might achieve better results, but this may not in fact reflect better learning.

NETS often show competencies and efficiency in skills that they have acquired naturally, such as spontaneity, accuracy and fluency in the language, as well as the exposure to culture and literature. These capabilities are basics and essentials in learning language effectively, and NETs are advantaged in these language areas. In contrast, these issues are sometimes challenges and weaknesses to NNETS. However, non-native speaking teachers can turn this to their benefit as they gain more insightful experience in second language learning and anticipating language learning difficulties as they personally experienced the process of language learning. As a result, they can understand the learners' experiences and difficulties better, especially when they share the same language and culture. This will influence their abilities in classroom management and conduct.

Thus, both NETs and NNETs are advantaged in particular aspects and they complete each other on their strengths and weaknesses when working together in the same learning environment.

**Recommendations and Implications**

This current study is limited to the year 2010-2011 and a limited geographical area. Further research studies are needed to replicate this study or initiate other studies to include all schools of Abu Dhabi Emirate, the UAE and other countries. In addition, the
process of hiring native speaking teachers has been on-going for only two years and it needs some time for the schools and new native teachers to be acquainted to the new system. Thus future research studies will be more profound and succinct.

There is no doubt that native speaker status has become an important factor in recruiting English language teachers. Although research indicates that 80% of English teachers are NNETs, there is a tendency in a lot of countries to hire NETs over NNETs. Their rationale is that students prefer to be taught by native speaking teachers (Canagarajah, 1999a). However, the results of this present study show this not to be the case in the UAE. Students and advisors find their Arab bilingual teachers of English as capable in many areas and even better than their NET counterparts in others. At the same time, NETs are perceived to be more competent and proficient in areas where NNETs are least advantaged.

Hence, a collaborative environment in which both NETs and NNETs work together is the ideal model that benefits both teachers and students. Such a model would enable both types of teacher to support each other and share expertise, experiences and best practices. In addition, gathering both NETs and NNETs raises the opportunity of continuous dialogue and reflection to create a context that combines diverse talents and potentials for the benefits of students, teachers and school. In this section some implications derived from the findings of this research study are given.

1-While recruiting NETs and NNETs, more consideration should be paid to qualifications and teaching experience. The criteria adopted in hiring teachers may not be applicable in the UAE: there must be a review of criteria used in selecting teachers to reflect the fact that qualification and experience are more significant than being a native speaker or not.
In addition there must be a committee of experts and advisors of English to choose teachers of English.

2- Both Native and non-native English teachers need to develop their diverse strengths through communication and co-operation to improve their performance. It would be very beneficial if they could train each other. The teachers themselves are more capable to understand their needs, strengths and weaknesses.

3. It is recommended to have both NETs and NNETs teach the same class for maximum student benefit. Marrying two cultures in class enriches the process of teaching and learning. There is no one finished model of learning. The presence of local teachers can solve the problems of NETs and those in return can add some knowledge for their local peers. There are some abstract themes which the NETs cannot handle solely. This may be an ideal situation but budget may not allow for it. Also designing criteria for teaching in this environment will be practical as working together, is a model of team teaching. Therefore, schools need to establish a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of both NETs and NNETs and how they relate to their students and to each other.

4. NETs need professional development induction about the social, cultural and learning needs of students. Some NETs may unknowingly offer a class involving inappropriate behaviour which is accepted in some cultures but here it is a taboo. Issues of religion and politics must not be dealt with. They are sensitive matters. NNETs and NETs should initiate dialogue to exchange knowledge about the cultural and social background of students.

5. NETs need some training in classroom management and control. Sessions and workshops must be conducted on how to deal with students, manage their behaviour, and
tackle the issues of punctuality and discipline. Such workshops can be given by supervisors of English and social workers.

6. As most students prefer to learn oral and conversational skills by NETs due to their fluency and accuracy, administrators should consider this point and have NETs teach these skills while NNETs teach grammar and writing. This would help to address some of the problems with the current curriculum. For example, grammar is currently omitted from teaching English because English is taught at schools as a native language. On the other hand, students need to write essays in exams: but without grammar, no writing can be successfully taught. Fluency and accuracy in writing are needed side by side. Another major issue is that English language for our students is not a second language; it is a foreign language for them. Secondary school programs must be designed to meet this need.

7. Some students consider the use of Arabic is a mixed blessing. Thus NNETs are advised to minimize the use of Arabic as a successful language classroom involves the learners maximizing exposure and use of the target language. It can be used only when there is likely to be genuine difficulty understanding in English. There are aids available nowadays to help NNETs to use English more properly and effectively.

8. NNETs are recommended to integrate technology and use appropriate software to support them in accurate pronunciation and creating an authentic context. This is a focal point. Creating an attractive environment is crucial in language acquisition and learning. The use of technological aids can help fundamentally in learning. They can create life-like and authentic situations.
9. NNETs are recommended to improve their oral and conversational skills through communicating with their NET counterparts. NNETs often lack the perfect language delivery. Most of them resort to their own accent and find it part of their heritage. In Tunisia English local teachers are sent to the UK for 9 months to acquire the accent. In the UAE teachers present a plethora of accents and they resist professional development. They should be encouraged to improve their performance and they should be followed up by their advisors to solve this serious problem.

10. NNETs are invited to provide their NET counterparts with details about their experience in learning the foreign language and the areas in which they anticipate students’ difficulties and challenges. In the weekly meetings local staff can deal with the problems pertinent to their work as language teachers and agree upon a joint plan to be followed and reviewed regularly.

11. NETs should learn as much of the students’ L1 as possible, so that they have an insight into issues of mother tongue interference, enabling them to anticipate the linguistic needs of the learners. Such an orientation can be reached by the co-operation of NNETs through in-school meetings and the development of their own knowledge in their classes when dealing with their students. NNETs can help them when needed.

12. Professional development should be offered to both kinds of teachers, but it should take into account their diverse needs. Local English supervisors and experienced advisors in the UAE context could be beneficial for both types of teachers. The advisors can lead both because they are knowledgeable of the problems and challenges in the field. Neither type of teacher can be left without regular supervision from ADEC. It is unwise to leave schools without any sort of professional supervision and ongoing professional
development. Principals may be good at judging class procedures but may have less skill at looking technically at, for example, language lessons. If the principal visits a class, the focus will probably be on aspects like classroom management rather than other pedagogical issues. Thus, supervisors can offer better in-service development to teachers and improve their performance effectively in this way.

13. ADEC is requested to develop a suitable curriculum which will properly support NETs, and which can be profitably taught by NETs where English is being taught as a foreign language. At the moment, the whole semester is spent on an English Continuous Assessment Rich Task (ECART). This task is making a paper and presenting it by the end of the semester. The paper and the power point presentation are done outside schools and the presentation is not given before the class. The students seem to never exert any effort in preparing the project. This task, which occupies half of the syllabus in one semester, is sometimes not even done by the students themselves.

14. When a NET or NNET is judged incompetent after being visited by a committee three times, they should not be left in teaching to waste the time of students. In contrast, the teachers whose performance is very good should be rewarded and promoted.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

This current study is limited to the year 2010-2011 and a certain geographical area, Al Ain city of The UAE. It is also involved only public secondary students. Further research studies are needed to replicate this study or initiate other studies to include all schools of Abu Dhabi Emirate, the UAE and other countries. Also, more research studies are needed for private schools and primary and preparatory students. In addition, the process of hiring native speaking teachers has been started for two years and it needs some time for the
schools and new native teachers to be acquainted to the new system. This study and others can be replicated or initiated after two or three years. Furthermore, more studies are recommended to investigate the teachers' perceptions themselves about their own efficacy of their teaching competencies and students' learning. More research also needs to tackle the following questions:

Is learning English with a native speaker more important than retaining cultural heritage?
Is a prescribed model of team teaching with native and non-native practically plausible?
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APPENDIX A: STUDENTS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Student,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information about your perceptions towards English language teacher; English native speaker or Arab bilingual speaker. The questionnaire consists of two parts, please fill in and choose from the following.

Part I

School Name ..............................................................................................................

Last Score in English ................................................................................................

Type of English teacher: 1. English Native Speaker 2. Arab bilingual Speaker

Teacher Gender: 1. Male 2. Female

School: 1. Boys 2. Girls


Grade Level: 1. 10th 2. 11th 3. 12th

Part II

In this part of questionnaire you will find each statement followed by numbers (1, 2, 3, 4 & 5) and each number means:

“5” Strongly agree
“4” Agree
“3” Not sure
“2” Disagree
“1” Strongly disagrees

C1- I think my English teacher has a good command of his subject matter. 5 4 3 2 1
C2- I learn a lot from my teacher because he engages us in all activities. 5 4 3 2 1
C3- My English teacher uses varied teaching methods and strategies. 5 4 3 2 1
C4- My English teacher relates the subject to our needs and interests. 5 4 3 2 1
C5- I think my English Language skills are improving with this teacher. 5 4 3 2 1
C6- My teacher has the ability to control and manage the class every well. 5 4 3 2 1
**My English teacher always**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T 1- uses appropriate varied strategies and techniques in teaching.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 2- implements different resources (modern technology) in teaching.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 3- is clear and concise when giving instructions.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 4- gives us useful feedback.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 5- uses varied evaluation methods.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 6- is a model for teaching conversation &amp; speaking.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 7- is a model for teaching pronunciation.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 1- anticipates our learning difficulties.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 2- is model of foreign language learning.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3 - makes my class a positive learning environment.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4 - helps me communicate better when speaking at slower pace.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5 – improves my listening skills.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 6- improves my communication skills.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7 – improves writing skills.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8 - helps become better at grammar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 9- develops my spoken English abilities.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 10- helps me learn reading well.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 11- encourages us to communicate better English.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 12- Increases my knowledge of new words.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC 1-encourages me to learn English.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC2- builds social relationships with the class and with me.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC3-helps me individually when I have a problem.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SC4—is sensitive to our culture and values.  5  4  3  2  1
SC5—gives us opportunities to express our opinions.  5  4  3  2  1
SC6—gives examples that are pertinent to my cultural background.  5  4  3  2  1
APPENDIX B: STUDENTS' INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The purpose of this interview is to collect information about the type of English teacher you prefer; an English native speaker or an Arab bilingual speaker.

1-Do you prefer to be taught by an English native speaking teacher or an Arab bilingual teacher? Why?

2-What are the strengths and weaknesses of an English native speaking teacher?

3-What are the strengths and weaknesses of an Arab bilingual teacher?

4--Drawing from your own experience, in what areas do you benefit more from an English native teacher?

5-Drawing from your own experience, in what areas do you benefit from an Arabic bilingual teacher?
استبانة عن معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية

معلومات عامه

أختر من الآتي:

لغته الأم اللغة العربية
لغته الأم اللغة الإنجليزية

جنس المعلم: ذكر

المدرسة: بنين

الصف: 11

الفرع: الأدبي

العلمي

اسم المدرسة: 
آخر علامة في اللغة الإنجليزية: 

عزيزي الطالب. السلام عليكم ورحمة الله.

تحب طبيبه وبعد

تهدف هذه الاستبانة لجمع معلومات حول الصفات التي تحبها و تفضلها في معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية الذين يتقنون الأم العربية أو الإنجليزية.

ستجد في هذه الاستبانة جملة متبوعة بأرقام من 1 إلى 5 و عليك اختيار واحدًا من الخيارات الخمسة هي:

أوافق بشدة "5"
أوافق "4"
أنا لم أتأكد "3"
لا أوافق "2"
أعترض بشدة "1"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم المسؤولة</th>
<th>رقم الطلب</th>
<th>نوع الطلب</th>
<th>موافق مستخدم</th>
<th>رقم الطلب</th>
<th>الفرقة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>يتم معلمنا إجمالاً جيداً بموضوع المادة التي يدرسها.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>أتعلم الكثير من معلمنا لأنه يشركتنا في جميع النشاطات المدرسية.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>يقوم معلمنا باستخدام استراتيجيات واساليب تعليمية ملائمة.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>يربط المادة الدراسية بالاحتاجاتنا واهتماماتنا.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>إن مهارات اللغة في اللغة الإنجليزية تحسن مع هذا المعلم.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>يمتلك معلمنا الفرقة على الإدارة الصعبة الفاعلة.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>يستخدم أساليب ووسائل متنوعة في التدريس.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>يستخدم مصدر متنوعة وتقنية حديثة في التعليم.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>يعطي التعليمات بشكل واضح ومفهوم.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>يستخدم أساليب تقيم متنوعة.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>يربط المادة الدراسية بالاحتاجاتنا واهتماماتنا.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>يعطي تغذية راجعة مفيدة ويفحص الأخطاء.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>مثال يحتذى به في تدريس المحادثة.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>مثال يحتوي على قراءة في تدريس النطق الشمالي.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>فهم أساليب التعلم ومثبات بالصوتيات التي تواجه العائلة.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>مثال يحتوي على تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>يجعل معلمي من الحصة بيئة تعليمية جاذبة.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>أستخدم التدريس بشكل أفضل باللغة الإنجليزية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>لقد تحسنت مهاراتي في الاتصال.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>أصبحت مهاراتي في الاتصال والاتصال والاتصال أفضل باللغة الإنجليزية الالية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>أستطيع الكتابة بشكل أفضل.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>أنا أتعلم قواعد النحو بشكل جيد من معلمي.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>تحسنت قدرتي على التحدث باللغة الإنجليزية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>أستطيع القراءة بشكل أفضل.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>استخر للتحدث باللغة الإنجليزية فقط مع معلمي.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>تزداد معرفتي بالمفردات الجديدة.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>يشجعني المعلم على أن أتعلم اللغة الإنجليزية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>بنيت علاقة اجتماعية طيبة مع طلاب الفصل.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>يساعدني فردية عندما أواجه مشكلة.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>يراعي القيم والمثل العليا في نفقتنا.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>يعطينا الفرصة للتعبير عن أرائنا.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>يعطي أمثلة مسؤولة من خلفيتنا الثقافية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

101
أسئلة للمقابلة

تهدف هذه المقابلة لجمع معلومات حول الصفات التي تحبها و تفضلها في معلم اللغة الإنجليزية الذين لغتهم الأم العربية أو الإنجليزية.

1. هل تفضل أن يدرسك مادة اللغة الإنجليزية مدرسون لغتهم الأم اللغة الإنجليزية أم مدرسون عرب؟ لماذا?

2. ما نقاط القوة والضعف لمدرس اللغة الإنجليزية الأجانب الذين لغتهم الأم اللغة الإنجليزية؟

3. ما نقاط القوة والضعف لمدرس اللغة الإنجليزية العرب الذين لغتهم الأم اللغة العربية؟

4. اذكر المهارات والممارسات التي تجدها مدرس اللغة الإنجليزية الذين لغتهم الأم اللغة الإنجليزية أكثر فائدة؟

5. اذكر المهارات والممارسات التي تجدها مدرس اللغة الإنجليزية العرب الذين لغتهم الأم اللغة العربية أكثر فائدة؟
APPENDIX E: TEACHER ADVISORS’ QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire aims to collect information about the type of English teacher you think is better; English native speaker or Arabic native speaker.

I-General Information

1) Supervisory member Position:

2) Teacher Gender:
   1. Male        2. Female

3) Type of teacher:
   1. Native English Speaker    2. Arabic native Speaker

4) School:
   1. Boys        2. Girls

II) In this questionnaire you will find each statement followed by numbers (1, 2, 3, 4 & 5), and each number means:

“5” Strongly agree
“4” Agree
“3” Not sure
“2” Disagree
“1” Strongly disagree

Questionnaire Statements

Please comment on the English teachers in regard to the following statements:-

A) Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 a good model of accurate pronunciation.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 a good model for conversational skills.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 a good model for English literature and culture.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 a good model for language fluency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS - a good model for foreign language learning.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 - plans lessons to meet students’ learning needs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 - uses appropriate strategies in teaching.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 - uses appropriate activities and techniques in teaching.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 - shows high capability of class management.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 - makes use of proper learning resources (modern technology) in teaching.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6 - uses clear and specific instructions, easily understood by students.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7 - gives students appropriate and useful feedback.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8 - relates the subject matter to students’ needs and interests.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9 - uses appropriate and varied evaluation methods to assess students’ work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10 - caters for different abilities and learning styles through differentiation.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11 - engages students in reflection and self assessment to enable goals setting.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students’ Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 - understands different learning styles.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 - anticipates learning difficulties.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>makes class a positive learning environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>helps improve students’ reading skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>helps improve students’ oral skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>uses only English throughout the lesson and outside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>teaches grammar efficiently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>improves the writing skills of the students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L9</td>
<td>encourages students and helps them use new words in various contexts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10</td>
<td>understands different learning styles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D) Social and cultural background**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sc1</th>
<th>is sensitive to our culture and values.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sc2</td>
<td>helps students individually when having a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc3</td>
<td>builds social relationships with the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc4</td>
<td>gives examples that are pertinent to students’ cultural background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc5</td>
<td>shows understanding of students’ cultural and social background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: TEACHER ADVISORS' INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The purpose of this interview is to collect information about the type of English teacher you prefer; an English native speaker or an Arab bilingual speaker.

1- Who do you think is more competent in teaching English - an English native speaking teacher or an Arab bilingual teacher? Why?"

2- What are the strengths and weaknesses of an English native speaking teacher?

3- What are the strengths and weaknesses of an Arab bilingual teacher?

4- Drawing from your own experience, do students benefit more from an English native teacher or an Arabic bilingual teacher?

5- What are the key qualities of an English language teacher?
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## Appendix H: Jury of Referees for Research Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>ESL Trainer, SSAT Abu Dhabi.</td>
<td>Simon Finnmore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Educational Consultant &amp; TESOL MA in Ed. Tech &amp; TESOL</td>
<td>Islam Muhammad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>SSAT School Lead and Curriculum Director</td>
<td>Tony McSheffey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>CO E.SL (Curriculum Director) SSAT</td>
<td>Maggie Finnmore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Head of English Department at A2B</td>
<td>Abdulnasir A1ghazali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The I, Education, UAE University</td>
<td>Chris Mowir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Dr. Majid, UAE University</td>
<td>Dr. Najib</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>English Language Instructor</td>
<td>Shab A. Azim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Senior Curriculum Director</td>
<td>A. A. Aqbal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 1: TEACHER OBSERVATION AND FEEDBACK SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Class:</th>
<th>Subject:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School:</td>
<td>Observer:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation Grade (circle outcome)</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generally, this teacher:**

1. Gives clear instructions that are understood
2. Demonstrates a good relationship with the students
3. Uses teaching methods and resources which enable all the students to learn effectively
4. Demonstrates and reinforces high expectations of student behaviour.
5. Provides students with opportunities to ask questions
6. Engages students in their learning, and is engaged with the students.
7. Assesses individual students effectively.
8. Plans effectively, making effective use of time, space and resources.
10. Avoids over long-periods of teacher explanation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas for Development:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets for next class (maximum 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Teacher signature: | Date: |
| Observer signature: | Date: |
تصور الطلبة والموجهين لفاعلية مدرسية اللغة الإنجليزية العرب والأجانب

في تعليم اللغة الإنجليزية وتعليمها في امارة أبو ظبي

ملخص الدراسة:

هدفت هذه الدراسة البحثية إلى استقصاء عن تصور الطلاب والموجهين لفاعلية مدرسية اللغة الإنجليزية العرب والأجانب (الناطقين بالإنجليزية) في تعليم اللغة وتعليمها في المدارس الثانوية الحكومية في إمارة أبو ظبي. وقد تم جمع البيانات عن طريق استطلاع أراء 400 طالباً و 59 من خلال الاستجابة للاستمارات وبعد ذلك إجراء المقابلات مع 40 طالباً و 10 موجهًا. وقد أظهرت نتائج هذه الدراسة فروقاً ذات دلالة إحصائية لصالح فاعلية مدرسية اللغة الإنجليزية العرب والأجانب، فيما يتعلق بالكفاءات التدريسية وطرق التدريس وبتعلم الطلاب وفهم خلفيتهم الثقافية والاجتماعية. ويرى الموجهون والطلاب أن مدرس اللغة الإنجليزية الإنجاز يتمتعون بجوانب إيجابية: مثل التمكن من اللغة والقدرة على تدريس مهارات التخاطب والمحادثة ومهارات التفاوض والثقافة والقدرة على التنبؤ بالصعوبات والتحديات التي يواجهها الطلاب وفي الإدارة الصعبة والقدرة على التعلم، وتفوزي بالاهتمام بالمؤسسات الدراسية والخبرة عند تعزيز مدراسي اللغة الإنجليزية العرب والأجانب على حد سواء. ويدعي كذلك تنمية المدرسين مهنياً بحسب احتياجاتهم وقواعدهم إلى هذا يتطلب مدرسين إلى برامج تدريس مهني نظراً لاختلاف احتياجاتهم وقواعدهم. و أوصت الدراسة بإيجاد بيئة تربوية تعمل بها المدرسين للعرب والأجانب بشكل متعاون وفعال على تحقيق قدراتهم الكاملة وتحسين عالمي التعليم والتعلم. وأخيراً، نرى ضرورة التواصل والتعاون بين الفئتين من المدرسين لتحسين الأداء وتطوير القدرات المتنوعة.
عناوين الرسالة:

فاعلية معلم اللغة الإنجليزية الناطقين وغير الناطقين بها في تعليم اللغة

وتعلّمها وفقًا لتصوّرات الطلبة والموجهين

اسم الطالب:

صبحي يوسف أحمد أبو حطب

المشرفون:

أ.د. محمد حاتم المخلافي
د. عبد الرحمن المخلافي
د. نجم الدين عمر الشيخ