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Abstract

The present study aims to investigate students’ perceptions of native English-speaking teachers (NEST) and non-native English-speaking teachers (NNEST) and the techniques used by both types of teachers to influence students’ motivation. Both qualitative and quantitative research methods were employed to answer the research questions. A sample of 82 Egyptian learners enrolled in the Intensive English Program (IEP) at the American University in Cairo (AUC) and a sample of two native IEP teachers and two non-native IEP teachers participated in the study. A questionnaire was sent to students to identify students’ perceptions of the instructional practices and motivational techniques utilized by both NESTs and NNESTs. A classroom observation scheme was also used to document the minute-by-minute motivational techniques used by teachers. Triangulating the results, the investigator conducted semi-structured interviews for further in-depth analysis of the research questions. The results showed that students hold more positive perceptions towards the instructional practices and motivational techniques used by the non-native English-speaking teacher. The findings also revealed that the motivational techniques used by both types of teachers in the teaching process varied.
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Chapter 1: Introduction
1.1 Introduction

Over the past three decades, a controversial strand of applied linguistics has developed targeting the dichotomy between native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) and non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) (Alwadi, 2013; Cook, 2000; Fathelbab, 2010; Llurda, 2004; Medgyes, 1994; Mermelstein, 2015). The mentioned studies have all approached the NEST and NNEST dichotomy from different angles. This heated topic dates back to 1965 when Chomsky argued that native speakers (NSs) are the only reliable source for English language, which fostered the notion of NEST favoritism. Paikeday was the first to criticize Chomsky’s claims, in his book The Death of the Native Speaker, stating that it ‘exists only as a figment of linguist’s imagination’ (1985, p. 12). Later, Phillipson (1992) discussed the traditional assumption of the notion “the native speaker fallacy” discussing the previously claimed idea that the ideal teacher must be represented by a native speaker of English. Ever since then, the topic has received a great deal of attention in the body of knowledge.

It is also worth mentioning that English has become the lingua franca in the world today, given that it is the official language or second language for over 50 countries (Mermelstein, 2015). Accordingly, notable books and studies delved into students’ perceptions in the context of EFL (English as a foreign language) and ESL (English as a second language) towards NESTs and NNESTs (Cook, 2000; Llurda, 2005; Reves & Medgyes, 1994). Considering earlier statistics reported by Canagarajah (1999), the number of NNESTs reached 80% of ESL/EFL teachers across the globe. Later, Kachru (2001) believed that the number of NNESTs will continue to increase. To this end, it has been the preoccupation of researchers to investigate the authenticity, identity, professional status, competence, self-perception, advantages and disadvantages of NNEST as compared to NEST by students and teachers (Amin, 2001; Doğancay-Aktuna, 2008;
Golombek & Jordan, 2005; Reves & Medgyes, 1994). Moreover, Ferlazzo (2011) and Mermelstein (2015) highlighted the necessity of investigating learners’ perceptions given its close links to students’ motivation. Therefore, this study will tap into students’ perceptions of their native and non-native teachers and how they affect students’ motivation, which is a construct that is seldom discussed in the literature. Although a study conducted by Fathelbab (2010) investigated students’ perceptions of both types of teachers in Egypt, NESTs and NNESTs’ teaching practices and their influence on students’ motivation remain unexplored.

1.2 Theoretical Background

1.2.1 Nativeness and Non-nativeness

It is of vital importance for the purposes of this study to introduce the definition of both terms: “Native” and “Non-Native,” which will be referred to as NEST and NNEST henceforth. As tackled in the literature, a native speaker is one who acquires L1 (in this case, English) in early childhood (Moussu, 2006). Medgyes (1994) explained that a speaker is identified as a native or a non-native speaker of English according to their birthplace and the national language of their country. Another factor that contributes to speaking English as a first language is being raised by an English-speaking family and living in a native-speaking context throughout infancy (Medgyes, 1994). Later in 1997, Boyle denied the attribution of the birth place or the first language to nativeness as he believed it restricted the meaning of nativeness. As an attempt to expand the definition of the term nativeness, Davies (2004) defined it as childhood acquisition of L1 (first language), proficient production of idiomatic forms, understanding of various L1 variations and fluent authentic and spontaneous production of discourse. It is still, however,
believed that the most immutable, tangible difference between a native and a non-native speaker is the acquisition of the language as an L1 (Hummel, 2014; Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014).

Holliday (2006) explained nativeness or native-speakerism to be “a pervasive ideology within ELT, characterized by the belief that ‘native speaker’ teachers represent ‘Western culture’ from which spring the ideals both of the English language and of English language teaching methodology” (p. 386). This ideology supports the concept of native-speakerism where native-speakers represent the idealistic source of language production and language teaching. Consequently, the non-native speaker’s qualification and professionalism seem undervalued and disregarded in the field of ELT. The definition was further deconstructed by Houghton and Rivers (2013) which they defined as “prejudice, stereotyping and/or discrimination, typically by or against foreign language teachers, on the basis of either being or not being perceived and categorized as a native speaker of a particular language” (p. 14). This reflects how non-native speakers/teachers are subject to stereotypes that manifest the current discrimination between both groups as a result of the native-speakerism and native-speaker fallacy. The dichotomy resides further in terms such as Western pedagogy and non-Western pedagogy. The former is categorized as the “good” educational system while the latter represents the “bad” educational system (Holliday, 2006).

1.2.2 Native and Non-native dichotomy

Native and non-native dichotomy was initially established when scholars debated over what it means to be a native speaker of English. In their research study about native and non-native identities, Moussu and Llurda (2008) highlighted Anglo-centrism position as a result of the native and non-native dichotomy. That is to say, being a non-native speaker could be viewed
negatively. Consequently, the incapability to communicate in English is interpreted as a professional drawback. Such perception affected non-native speakers significantly in terms of employability, academic positions, salaries and prestige, especially in the field of English language teaching (Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014). Notwithstanding, Árva and Medgyes (2000) believed that teachers should be hired not because of their nationality rather "on the basis of their professional virtue" (p. 358). Along the same lines, Phillipson (1992) argued that a successful teacher is not restricted to being a native-speaker. On a related note, Kachru (1992) stated that referring to the terms ‘native speaker’ and ‘non-native speaker’ reflect one's favoritism toward teachers from the inner-circle of English-speaking countries.

The hypothetical assumptions underpinning the native speaker favoritism is referred to as the native speaker fallacy. Even though such notion has been widely criticized, the dichotomy still exists in the TESOL profession. This has contributed to distorting the non-native teachers’ self-image as they try to cope with the feeling of inferiority. A study conducted by Fukunaga, Hashimoto, Lowe, Unser-Schutz and Kusaka (2018) investigating the native-speakerism and its effects on ELT (English Language Teaching) in Japan found that non-native teachers felt a lack of trust regarding their professionalism as viewed by their students and other colleagues. They were also devalued as compared to native speakers who represented authenticity.

Rejecting the native-speaker fallacy, some researchers referred to the native speaker as “dead” (Paikeday, 1985), “imaginary” (Kramsch, 1997, p. 255) or “a fiction” construct (Appleby, 2014, p. 13). To avoid native bias and compensate the negative attribution to the non-native speaker, researchers resorted to alternative terms to describe the non-native speaker such as “proficient user” (Paikeday, 1985, p.87), “competent user” (Holliday, 2015, p. 127) and “expert speaker” (Rampton, 1990, p. 99).
1.2.3 Student Motivation

It is the role of the teacher to create the conditions where students are motivated to learn and ready to develop self-motivation (Ferlazzo, 2011; Scrivener, 2006). Ferlazzo (2011) believed that in order to teach content knowledge, students need to develop thinking skills which depends mainly on self-motivation. As researchers have suggested, NESTs and NNETs have different teaching strategies and techniques (Arva and Medgyes, 2000; Diaz, 2015). Each deliver the content of the lesson through their own teaching style. For example, students appreciate a relaxing environment generated by the communicative approach which NESTs adopt when teaching. Students’ voices are heard; they are involved in classroom decisions and are free to err (Arva and Medgyes, 2000; Fukunaga et al., 2018; Diaz, 2015). They also feel comfortable in NNESTs direct teaching style especially in grammar (Fukunaga et al., 2018; Ma, 2012b).

Mahboob (2004) conducted a study on EFL learners in the United States; the results revealed students’ positive perceptions towards NNESTs for their varied teaching methods. However, Chit Cheong (2009) who conducted a study on students’ perceptions in Hong Kong found that students prefer NESTs because they implement creative activities and innovative teaching techniques which they perceive as entertaining and help them get motivated to study and learn new information.

A study by Radovan and Makovec (2015) found that the factors contributing to an optimal learning environment that fosters student motivation are all controlled by the teacher. They are stated as follows "teacher support, student interaction, authentic learning, autonomy, and personal relevance.” The study revealed students’ satisfaction with the knowledge they receive from their teachers that can be applied in real-life situations. They also feel
motivated when the learning process is authentic and the teacher supports their progress. Discussing topics in groups made students have more time to share their ideas which can be heard by others. The following results indicate that when teachers devote class time to activities that encourage autonomy, students are more likely to perceive the course as beneficial and will be intrinsically motivated during class time. Also, when students value the content and feel that they are valued by their teacher, they enjoy the class and are capable of sustaining motivation.

Relatedness, autonomy and value of behavior are three essential pillars of the Self-Determination theory (explained thoroughly in Chapter Two). SDT which was first developed by Deci and Ryan in 1985 is argued to include both types of motivation, intrinsic and extrinsic. In order to feel motivated, students need to enhance their sense of relatedness towards the language and the culture, which is best represented by their teacher. Moreover, relatedness is not sufficient because there must be a time where students practice the language and take part in setting classroom rules and choose the activities they enjoy. Autonomous actions and suggestions should be an integral part of the classroom. Also, they need to develop value for the course, which can be beneficial using the techniques that best suit the students.

1.3 Statement of the Research Problem
Dating back to major political events happening eight years ago, the social, political and economic state in Egypt has not been stable. One of the consequences of such events is low employability of native teachers in Egyptian educational institutions. In some contexts, NESTs are preferred over NNESTs by stakeholders; namely, administration (Mahboob, 2004, p. 121). However, this does not seem to be the case here in Egypt at the American University in Cairo (AUC). The IEP program has had only a single full-time native teacher for the past few years.
One of the administrators of the Intensive English Program (IEP) at the AUC states that it is because of the unavailability of full-time jobs in the past years. Native teachers’ chance of signing a job contract (same applies for NNESTs) is limited to a single semester. Such teachers are referred to as the One Semester Hires who normally receive a job offer in the Fall semesters, where students’ enrollment number is high. Meanwhile, there is only a single teacher from the inner-circle working as a full-timer. As a consequence, there happens to be semesters where classes at the IEP are only led by NNESTs. Accordingly, students are not exposed to the experience of being taught by NESTs.

The growing mass of research over the controversial topic of NEST and NNEST in the Arab region reported in significant results highlighting favoritism towards native teachers. Such results could be a threat if generalized among Arab countries. Over the past decade, the Gulf region has been concerned with research (Ali, 2009; Alseweed & Daif-Ullah, 2012; Alwadi, 2013; Javid, 2016) on the non-native professional status which has significantly decreased over the years due to students and stockholders’ favoritism towards the native speaker. According to the results of the mentioned studies, NESTs were viewed as ideal teachers. Given that Saudi Arabia and Egypt are both categorized to fit the expanding circle (Brown, 2013), the repercussions of such results could hold Egypt and other countries subject to the growing popularity of favoritism towards the native teachers.

Further, Kachru (1996) provided a clear illustration of the three divisions of English users that he referred to as the World of Englishs represented in: The Inner Circle, the Outer Circle, and the Expanding Circle. The first circle comprises countries that speak English as their mother tongue such as the United States, the United Kingdom, etc. These countries are regarded as the ideal speakers of English. The second circle encompasses countries that were introduced to the
language through colonization by the inner group such as Ghana, India, Kenya, Malaysia, the Philippines, etc. The last circle includes countries that learn English as a foreign language such as China, Japan, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and many others mentioned by Brown (2013).

With the growing number of EFL learners, non-native English language educators are increasing significantly. Over one billion educators are contributing to the proliferation of EFL/ESL in the education industry (Javid, 2010). Mahboob (2004) believed that NNESTs have the potential to overtake the education industry if they worked tremendously on their language skills and adopt NEST teaching practices. However, students should voice their opinions towards the effectiveness of both types of teachers since they are the ultimate objective upon which educational systems are constructed.

Another focus for this study pours in the fact that IEP students have positive opinions towards NNEST teaching speaking and pronunciation as an extra-curricular class. While previous research studies indicated that students conceptualize NEST as better teachers in oral skills (Medgyes, 1994; Amin, 1997; Cook, 2005; Ali, 2009; Alwadi, 2013; Mermelstein, 2015), IEP students might disagree. Last semester (Fall 2019) students expressed their own oral perceptions of holding more positive perceptions towards NNESTs who teach the speaking and pronunciation class. Does the NNESTs talent compensate for the assumption of NSs as better pronunciation teachers? Is it a matter of class atmosphere? Do NNESTs help set a supportive class environment? Are encouragement and reward factors that influence students’ motivation towards learning a language? Given these assumptions, a study is needed to investigate the influence of both types of teachers on students’ motivation. Also, according to Fukunaga et. al (2018), students' desires are not relevant to their needs of which they are unaware, especially students who are at a lower educational level and lack the confidence to produce the language.
When Holliday (2006, p386) reflected on the definition of a native-speaker, he stated that the Western culture is depicted by native speakers solely. As mentioned earlier, Self-Determination Theory highlights the effect of relatedness on student achievement and student motivation. Therefore, it is hypothetically possible that if IEP students already have a sense of belonging to the Western culture, they are likely to hold positive perceptions towards NESTs and will be more motivated throughout the semester. There is also a potential that NNESTs receive more positive perceptions if students were able to develop relatedness towards their NNESTs as successful models of English language learners (Medgyes, 1994).

Reflecting on the popular saying "where there is a will, there is a way,” Simmons (2014) expressed his concern about what teachers are capable of doing if students do not have the will of learning, and how teachers will be able to deal with demotivated students and those who have no goals. The heart of this study is targeted to address this concern and to reveal the techniques used by teachers to motivate students even when there is no will. This is regarded essential since IEP students are less motivated than other students since they have to study English for a whole semester before admitting to university because they did not meet the required English scores. It is, therefore, interesting to study the different teaching principles and teaching techniques adopted by language instructors at the IEP program taking into account that both NESTs and NNESTs are provided with the same training sessions and the same teaching materials.

1.4 Research Questions
1. What are IEP students’ perceptions of instructional practices of their native and non-native teachers?

2. What are the techniques used by native and non-native teachers to enhance student motivation?

1.5 Delimitations

The proposed study surveyed students at the American University in Cairo (AUC); therefore, the results of the research are not to be generalized to similar programs in Cairo. Moreover, variables such as educational background, age and social status were not the main scope of this paper; accordingly, they were not regarded in data collection. There is a possibility that the academic subject is a variable affecting the results of the data collected; however, the results were looked at holistically and not specifically. Further, questionnaires, class observations and interviews took place through the academic semester, not necessarily at the end of the semester. Accordingly, it is a possibility that students' responses and perceptions were affected. The researcher avoided the limitation of such variable by conducting the interviews and questionnaires at a time close to the end of the academic semester.

1.6 Definitions of Constructs and Variables

Native English-speaking teacher. NESTs are teachers who speak English as their ‘home language’ (Ma, 2016). They are speakers who come from English speaking countries (Medgyes, 2001).
Non-native English-speaking teacher. NNESTs are teachers who speak English as a second language besides their mother-tongue. They come from non-English speaking countries (Medgyes, 2001)

English for speakers of other languages. ESOL serves as a language taught to users who do not come from English speaking countries.

Motivation. It is an intangible covert behavior that can only be measured or observed through one’s own actions and response (Alkaabi et al, 2017). If a learner is motivated, he/she feels energized to reach a certain goal (Gardner, 1985)

1.7 Operational Definitions

Native English-speaking teacher. NESTs are teachers who speak English as their mother tongue language. This study will only look at IEP NESTs working at the AUC. NESTs include student-teacher, one-semester hires and full-time teachers. Bicultural teachers will not be considered as NESTs in this study.

Non-native English-speaking teacher. NNESTs are teachers who speak English as a second language. In this study, NNESTs refer to IEP teachers working at the AUC who speak Arabic as their mother tongue. NNEST include student-teacher, one-semester hires and full-time teachers and bicultural teachers. As perceived by students, if the teacher has an Arabic name, looks like an Arab, speaks Arabic or understands Arabic, they are perceived as non-native teachers which is one main reason why bicultural teachers will be excluded from this study.

Instructional practices. In this study, this variable refers to teachers’ language proficiency and professional competence along with the teaching techniques and strategies they
use in a classroom. In other words, they are the teaching principles, methods, techniques and skills teachers resort to within the learning process.

Motivation. It is the covert energy that drives students to perform better in the learning process. The variable in this context is only related to student motivation and students’ response towards their NESTs and NNESTs’ teaching techniques. In order to measure motivation in this study, classroom observations and semi-structured interviews will be conducted.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study is twofold. First, the study attempts to investigate students’ perceptions of the instructional practices by their native and non-native teachers. Second, it aims to explore the techniques (including teaching styles and practices) used by both types of teachers, which affect student motivation. In Chapter One, the theoretical background and statement of the research problem were discussed. The research questions, and definitions of the variables and constructs of this study were also presented. In this chapter, the researcher will review previous studies that contributed to the body of knowledge with respect to students’ perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs and the teaching practices used to generate student motivation.

2.2 Previous studies on students’ perceptions

Perceptions of students of both native and non-native language teachers have a substantial role on how teachers can elevate their pedagogical approaches and enhance their linguistic skills. With students’ perceptions being provided, teachers can take advantage of their respective strengths and weaknesses (Matsuda & Matsuda, 2004) and will also establish a better bond with their students based on teachers’ understanding of their language learning difficulties, culture shock as well as various sociolinguistic barriers in communication (Pasternak & Bailey, 2004).

Multiple studies confirm the phenomenon of NEST favoritism and monolingual bias regardless of being termed as a myth. A study conducted by Mermelstein (2015) on Taiwanese University EFL Students investigated students’ preference on six areas targeting language proficiency, teaching skills and central countries cultural literacy. The results of the statistical analysis explained that students would rather be taught by a NEST except for a single area which is teacher’s ability to identify learners’ difficulties, which indicated similar number of preferences
to both NEST and NNEST. Studies conducted in Bahrain, Saudi Arabia and Oman on students’ perceptions towards NEST and NNESTs reported a high percentage of favoritism towards NSs in language skills and teaching practices (Ali, 2009; Alseweed, 2012; Alseweed & Daif-Ullah, 2012; Alwadi, 2013; Javid, 2016). Alseweed (2012, p. 42) pointed out to the countries in the Arab region that offer higher employability rate for the NEST due to their preference for the native teachers in language learning: Kuwait, United Arab Emirates and Oman.

In regards to students’ perceptions, Ma (2012b) investigated students’ perceptions of 53 NNESTs in Hong Kong. The findings revealed that NNESTs’ classes were disinteresting, authoritative and demanding, whereas NESTs’ classes were innovative and interesting. Unlike NESTs who adopted a communicative teaching approach, NNESTs followed the traditional pattern of language teaching focusing on grammar and assisting students for examination. Moreover, Liu and Zhang (2007), who conducted a study on teaching practices of NESTs and NNESTs in China, found that 60% of the respondents confirm that NESTs are creative in terms of the teaching techniques used.

On the contrary, Medgyes (1994) and Cook (2005) believed that NNEST are privileged in a sense that they have firsthand experience in learning the language. This will enable them to understand and tolerate students’ errors, and is sometimes the reason why NNEST incorporate L1 in the teaching process in case of ambiguity. In addition, NNEST have the ability to explain grammatical rules which are considered self-evident by NEST (Medgyes, 2001). Arva and Medgyes’ (2000) emphasized that NNESTs are be able to deal with students’ homesickness and their experience of a cultural shock.

Furthermore, Mahboob (2004) conducted a study in the United States on Intensive English Program (IEP) students’ perspectives against what stakeholders believe to be true.
Administrations, that mainly profit from the prestigious image of a native speaker, offer job opportunities to NESTs believing that they are the only reliable source for L2. Results showed that students hold more positive attitudes towards being taught by a NNESTs. Suggesting that both NESTs and NNESTs have an equal opportunity of becoming effective teachers, Medgyes (1994) explained that an ideal NEST is the one who is able to master the learner’s L1 just like their own, while the ideal NNEST is the one who “has achieved near-native proficiency” in L2 (pp. 348-349). Further, he highlights the 6 positive features of NNESTs: (1) represent a successful model of language learning, (2) are able to teach L2 strategies effectively, (3) can offer more varied explanation, (4) understand learners’ needs, (5) can better foresee and identify with students’ difficulties, and (6) can switch to L1 for the benefit of students. He also reflected on their disadvantages which are the pessimistic feeling and aggressiveness they tend to depend on due to feeling unsafe using a different language than their own, especially in the presence of other competent native teachers. On the other hand, he stateed that the advantage of NEST is associated with their suppository in language production. In other words, they are superior English language users which is significant in their spontaneous discourse in different contexts.

Barratt and Kontra (2000) who focused on language awareness in their study, confirmed that students are more likely to feel discouraged by NESTs due to the fact that NESTs do not relate to students’ L1. That is to say, NESTs are less likely to identify with students status as novice learners of L2. Reporting in the same line, McNeill (2005) conducted an interesting study in which he compared older, more experienced teachers to novice teachers of both NESTs and NNESTs (who are Mandarin speakers). The results pointed out that novice NNESTs are better than expert NNESTs at predicting lexical complexity in accordance with student’s proficiency level. Surprisingly, novice and expert NESTs were unable to construct accurate assumptions on
which words could be difficult for EFL learners to comprehend. It is argued that language awareness and teaching experience are two factors that affect teaching reading comprehension as a skill and vocabulary as a sub-skill. It is also important for establishing a better communicative approach with the students. It is regarded preferable if the teacher is able to produce the language that they know their learners will be able to respond to. Moreover, Practicum supervisors have a similar perspective of NNESTs’ high degree of language awareness. In a study conducted by Llurda (2005b), supervisors suggested that NNS are better teachers for primarily low-level classes. This should not be regarded as a negative remark rather a point of strength that NNEST are able to establish connections with novice L2 users. It is a reference to their distinctive capabilities of enhancing and developing L2 production.

It is also worth mentioning that students’ expectations might not be met within a specific academic context. That is to say, teachers who lead classes and supported the new rise of instructional practices such as implementing activities using audio-visual materials, self-discovery of errors and pair work were regarded less motivating to students in migrant education programs in comparison to external error correction and activities that target enhancing pronunciation skills and vocabulary (Nunan, 1989b). Schmidt, Boraie and Kassabgy (1996) pointed out to the possibility of a wash-back effect on students’ motivation. Therefore, it is essential to study students’ perceptions of teachers and classroom methods to tailor activities according to their own preference which is expected to strengthen students’ motivation towards language learning.

Previous researchers clarified that NNEST points of strength reside in their ability to teach grammar better, while NESTs’ strength lies in their speaking and pronunciation skills and their ability to produce authentic speech (Medgyes, 1994). Surprisingly, regardless of all previous
studies that acknowledged non-native learners’ preference for NEST’s speaking and pronunciation skills and authenticity, NNEST pointed out that their major points of weaknesses that come at the very forefront are vocabulary, idiomatic expressions and appropriate use of English followed by speaking, pronunciation and fluency (Medgyes, 2001).

2.3 Motivation in an EFL context

Motivation affects students’ individual achievement goal orientation. It is the stride of educational psychology that focuses on what drives students to achieve success in any educational course. Moreover, Simmons (2014) attributed teachers who foster student motivation in a classroom to their effectiveness as educators. He stated that teachers are students’ guides towards achieving their goals. In addition, teachers are responsible for understanding students’ needs to create a motivational atmosphere that ensures students’ success. Tarone and Yule explained:

“The recognition of the fact that learners have needs in what may be termed the ‘affective domain’, which are at least as important as their needs in the ‘knowledge domain’, has resulted in the identification of a number of factors which are claimed to influence the learning process. Concepts, such as attitude, motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety are frequently invoked in discussions of what makes a successful language learner” (1989, p. 133)

2.3.1 What is motivation?

Providing a theoretical background to define the given behavior, motivation is an immeasurable and intangible construct that can only be assessed and observed through students’ attitudes and behaviors (Alkaabi, Alkaabi, & Vyver, 2017). According to Oxford online dictionary, motivation is a ‘reason for acting or behaving in a particular way’. Therefore, engagement is the tangible
attitude that comes as a result of motivation. According to Macmillan Dictionary, to motivate is “to make someone feel determined to do something or enthusiastic about doing it.”

The interest in motivation in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) dates back to the 1950s. Scholars defined motivation as a key to success (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002; Scrivener, 2006). The key role of teachers resides in the encouragement and motivation they are willing to generously provide to their students. Because motivation is an intangible, unmeasured construct, and is regarded as ‘a behavior’ within theoretical contexts, it is viewed in the literature to fall under the field of educational psychology. In this domain, motivation represents the core concept of behaviorism, where individuals respond to external stimuli (defined earlier as extrinsic motivation) (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Later after the wake of the universal grammar theory reinforcing human’s innate capacity of constructing language in 1965, motivation was looked at from a different dimension that taps into humans’ cognition and how they behave. Dornyei (1996a) pointed out that motivation theories are in constant search for answering “why humans behave as they do.” As a result, intrinsic motivation started to flourish in the field of linguistics, especially Second Language Acquisition.

Motivation is then divided into external motivation (also known as extrinsic motivation) which is undertaking a task in order to accomplish a specific target or goal (Mahadi & Jafari, 2012), whereas Internal motivation (also known as intrinsic motivation) is to get immersed in an activity for the love of learning or because of how fun it appears to be (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). It is regarded as the most desirable motivation in learning. The strength of such motivations is what drives students to spend time learning, to push themselves harder and to approach the process itself in a serious manner (Scrivener, 2006).
A significant theory that best explains the intrinsic versus extrinsic motives is Self-Determination Theory introduced by Deci and Ryan (1985). Vallerand (1997) reported that the former refers to the satisfaction sought to fulfill one's curiosity as well as the experience of joy achieved in a certain activity, while the latter stirs one’s motivation to a limited extent of either receiving a materialistic reward such as a desired career or avoiding punishment. According to Ryan and Deci (2000), amotivation is a third component of the self-determination theory. It takes place when learners do not see value in what they are learning. They do not foresee their successful future because of their belief that the learning process is beyond their capabilities. Therefore, amotivation is the absence of motivation. It should not be confused with demotivation, which can simply be defined according to the external factors that abate learners’ enthusiasm to participate in the process of learning. In other words, a decrease in one’s motivation (Dornyei, 2001).

Extrinsically motivated students are likely to quit the learning process if they did not achieve the social needs they were motivated to reach (Noels, Clement, & Pelletier, 2001). For example, if the language knowledge they acquired did not empower them to reach a certain status or they were not recognized as a good student by their teachers. This might encourage teachers to focus more on helping students develop their intrinsic motivation through providing a class atmosphere that stimulates autonomy, competence and relatedness (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Nevertheless, teachers should take into account that learners will soon lose their intrinsic interest in language knowledge if the tasks chosen lead to extrinsic requirement. Dornyei (1994) gave the example of compulsory reading at school which discourages students to develop love for reading.

That being said, Self-Determination Theory sheds more light on the power of intrinsic motivation in achieving outstanding progress in learning contexts. According to Deci and Ryan, teachers need to fulfill students’ innate needs of autonomy and self-initiated actions. That is to say,
implementing activities where students, as suggested by Deci (1992), are engaged in the actions of 'wanting, choosing, and personal endorsement' (p. 44).

In 1985, Gardner’s prominent contribution in this field represented a socio-educational model suggesting that there are other incentives that initiate motivation such as orientation. By this he means, setting goals which are referred to as “motivational antecedents” (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Accordingly, his study pointed out to two main orientations: (a) the integrative orientation which is the potential and longing to communicate and integrate with the L2 language group; and (b) the instrumental orientation which is learning L2 for materialistic advantages such as aspiration for a better position. Gardner (1985) examined other pedagogical factors that are mainly controlled or targeted to language teachers such as instructional techniques, effects of classroom environment, and students’ attitudes towards their teachers. Gardner’s results explained that attitude towards the learning context is the key constituent of the integrative motive/orientation.

In another study conducted earlier by Clement, Dornyei and Noels (1994), the researchers investigated the motivation level of Hungarian EFL students who studied English in school without being taught by any NESTs. The results highlighted the existence of motivation which can be displayed in light of “integrativeness, linguistic self-confidence, and the appraisal of the classroom environment” (Dornyei, 1994). It can be, therefore, concluded that students’ motivation is dependent on class climate, integrativeness, autonomy and self-confidence in language production. Dornyei (1994) linked this study to Gardner’s (1985) integrative motive construct. Later, he categorized L2 motivation to three dimensions: The Language Level (including L2 culture, values and community), Learner Level (e.g. students’ confidence) and Learning Situation (which is affected by class climate, the teacher, teaching methods, teacher personality, and peers). In addition, Julkunen (1989) conducted a study on both trait and state motivation in relevance to the
competence of Finish students in the sixth and eighth grade in academic English contexts. The results of the factor analysis indicated that teachers, classroom atmosphere, and integrative motivation are three out of the eight factors mentioned in their research study that orient students’ motivation (or demotivation). In other words, teaching methods, tasks and activities, attitude towards English and the inner circle’s culture are all considered part and parcel of student’s motivation incentives within an academic context.

Based on this line of research, Schmidt et al. (1996) carried out a research study on 1500 adults of Egyptian EFL learners. Their study investigated EFL learners’ motivation as well as their preference with regard to learning strategies and classroom practices. It adopted the factors mentioned in Dornyei (1994) and Julkunen’s (1989) studies because they "identified a motivational factor of attitudes toward teacher and teaching method” (Schmidt et al, 1996). Accordingly, a remarkable number of questions in their questionnaire were designated to encode learners’ acceptability of the classroom social environment and elicit students’ preferences for instructional activities. Such activities comprise their attitude towards the use of L1 in a classroom setting, teacher-oriented or a student-centered class, active or passive tasks, and feedback (such as reward and response to class or home activities). The results highlighted the importance of maintaining a good rapport with students, establishing an atmosphere where students do not feel threatened, giving immediate feedback, avoiding students’ criticism if they err, and maintaining discipline.

In an EFL/ESL classroom context, Madrid (1999) suggested that the following are elements upon which motivation is assessed: (1) how dominant the L2 is in the society, (2) qualities of NEST or NNEST, (3) teaching approach and methods implemented in a classroom, (4) Impact of the surroundings and the current atmosphere (such as teachers, friends and family). Guillauteaux
and Dörnyei (2008) added that the simplistic dynamic term can be defined depending on three components: groups, teachers and learning environment. To this end, all mentioned factors can be led and shaped by teachers.

The new wave of revisiting motivation in the 1990s has given rise to the vital role that language teachers take on during the learning situation (Dörnyei & Clement, 2001; Dörnyei & Otto, 1998; Ramage, 1990; Sakai & Kikuchi, 2009; Schmidt et al., 1996). In his study, Dornyei (2001) suggested that students’ perceptions of the teacher’s instructional practices and techniques used are the major scale of determining whether or not such strategies are deemed motivational.

2.3.2 Teachers’ role in motivating students

For all the above-mentioned reasons, both NESTs and NNESTs are very likely to represent a role model which inspires students to spare more efforts to learn the language. Lee (2000) and Cook (2005) stressed on the idea that qualified NNESTs could mirror a successful role model of L2 learner which Edge (1988) defined as ‘real’ models of the language. Foreign models, however, impact learners who have affinity for the native community, culture and the spoken language, also known as integrative motivation, resulting in developing the sense of belongingness to the native community. Such learners are willing to integrate into the community where the language is spoken. Cortazzi and Jin (1999) found that learners are influenced by the constructs of culture and identity. In the same line, Abu-Rmaileh, Elsheikh, and Al Alami (2017) suggested that the classroom is a small group of a larger society where they construct their sociocultural identities through interaction and cooperative work resulting in motivated students towards language learning.
The importance of motivation targets both types of educators. As long as native and non-native teachers work collaboratively together in the same job market, they will seek the same teaching objective, which is educating students to learn and master the English language. This should be the long-term goal of students and teachers throughout the academic course that they must be motivated to pursue.

To achieve this goal, Scrivener (2006) suggested that it is the ‘teacher’s job to create the conditions’ that keep students motivated since it can influence speeding or slowing the process of learning (Cook, 2000). Therefore, Cook (2000) highly recommended that teachers constantly motivate students, maintain developing activities and make the course material enjoyable without interfering in the process of learning. Through such process, students need short-term goals and rewards such as praise, positive feedback, open-discussions, etc.

Aside from teachers’ identity and origins, the effectiveness of a teacher is manifested according to teachers’ skills in motivating students (Dornyei, 1994). Therefore, teachers should know what they can actually do to motivate their learners. Oxford and Shearin (1994, p. 15) highlighted the necessity of motivation to teachers who want to trigger students' motivation in the learning process by asking a profound rhetorical question: "Without knowing where the roots of motivation lie, how can teachers water those roots?"

Oxford and Shearin (1994) set forth five teaching responsibilities the teacher ought to adopt in motivating students: (a) discover students’ motivation for learning L2, (b) assist students in setting goals that are not far-fetched, (c) guide students through the importance of learning L2, (d) create a relaxing class atmosphere; and (e) help students develop their intrinsic motives during the learning process. Therefore, teacher-related motivational constituents are teaching practices and methods, teacher’s personality and teacher’s behavior (Dornyei and Csizer, 1998)
Accordingly, Dornyei and Csizer (1998) conducted a survey on 200 Hungarian teachers of English working at different institutions in an attempt to come up with a list of the most useful motivational strategies that teachers can put into practice when teaching. These strategies are expected to simulate a motivation-conscious teaching principle that is expected to result in having intrinsically and extrinsically motivated students (see figure 2). Out of 51 motivational strategies, Dornyei and Csizer were able to reduce the number to *Ten Commandments for motivating language learners*.

![Figure 2. A List of Ten Commandments for Motivating Language Learners Cited from the Study by Dornyei and Csizer (1998)](image)

Integrating a communicative teaching approach in light of the previous strategies is thus essential and influential. Notwithstanding, practicing communicative skills has long been neglected in schools in Egypt especially public schools adopting the *Thanawya Amma* educational system. The limited opportunities of practicing English are attributed to not only educational constraints but also teachers’ competence with regards to the lack of knowledge of language and culture, and socio-linguistic sophistication (Nunan, 2003). Noels, Clement and Pelletier (2001) investigated the effect of teachers adopting the communicative style on students' intrinsic/extrinsic
motivation and found that teaching principles that promote autonomy bolster students’ intrinsic motivation.

Reflecting on the same framework, a study by Noels et al (1999) explored teachers’ positive feedback on students’ progress as well as being given autonomy needed for practicing the language. These are the two approaches that indirectly stand for extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. The results of the study showed that when teachers take part in encouraging students and praising their progress, students will accordingly feel more competent. The results also revealed that students like to be given the sense of ownership over class decisions which can be found in group/pair work, teaching roles and other minor decisions that will not significantly affect the timeline of the lesson plan. Such ownership will allow more use of L2 and give students time to speak the language and share thoughts and feelings; thus, maximizing intrinsic motivation.

Wu and Ke (2009) examined the elements affecting students’ motivation in language learning. The data collected tapped into students’ perceptions of their NEST who are highly discerned as assets in language teaching as well as possessing a fundamental role on students’ achievement. In the interviews conducted, students expressed their contentment with being given the opportunity to speak in English with a NEST; however, they argue that NEST do not respond to conversational errors in group discussions. Regardless of the lack of confidence when producing L2 with their NESTs (which never happened when they conversed with their local teachers), students hold positive attitudes towards their NESTs’ appearance, flexible teaching styles and oral discourse. In the same line, the study conducted by Javid (2016) on a Saudi preparatory year program revealed positive perceptions of NEST for their teaching methods which are deemed motivating. In the same study, however, the findings indicated that NNEST provide a relaxed atmosphere where students feel at ease when producing L2. Such class climate is very likely to
motivate students to study English in a context where they do not feel threatened or discomforted. This might be associated with the fact that students’ questions are understood by local teachers without having to bear any negative response (such as facial expressions or remarks that disclose the sense of incomprehensibility to what was said).

2.3.3 Maintaining motivation

In recent studies, scholars highlight the importance of maintaining motivation among learners. Dornyei and Ushioda (2011, p.118) pointed out to the probability of not reaching one’s educational goal in case of losing interest in certain activities or allowing attractive distractions to take over the classroom setting. Anderman and Anderman (2010), therefore, suggested that teachers ought to vary in their teaching styles, materials and references and activities assigned to students.

According to Dornyei and Ushioda (2011), teachers should also pay attention to foster students’ self-esteem and understand that students will not progress if they come to doubt their capabilities as L2 learners. First, teachers should put in practice learning autonomy. That is to say, students need to make classroom decisions on how they want to learn as well as on choosing course materials and sharing learning responsibilities. This will pave the way to self-regulation learning, peer editing/teaching and other tasks that promote self-initiated education. Second, providing rewards on what students can do instead of what they cannot and minimizing negative response towards students L2 production (Brown & Lee, 2015). If students were criticized or humiliated due to teacher’s failure to provide a less stressful and non-intimidating class context this will very likely break students’ social image who will later be alienated and amotivated due to their feeling of abhorrence towards the learning process.
Students’ perceptions of their NESTs and NNESTs’ insertional practices and the influence of motivation especially in Egypt have received little attention in the body of knowledge. This research study will highlight this matter from the perspective of IEP students at the American University in Cairo through questionnaires, interviews and classroom observations.
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study is to investigate IEP students’ perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs’ teaching practices and to examine the techniques they implement that affect students’ motivation. This chapter will discuss: the research design, data collection, the instruments and the procedures utilized to answer the research questions of this research study.

3.2 Research Design

The current study employed qualitative and quantitative data collection as it followed a mixed methods design. This study is explanatory in nature since it attempted to examine full-time ESL/EFL students’ perceptions of their native and non-native teachers at the IEP as well as the techniques used to prompt their motivation. A questionnaire and semi-structured interviews were designated to elicit their perceptions. Further, classroom observations aimed at gathering more data on teaching strategies that help students get motivated and engaged inside a classroom followed by personal interviews to students in order to triangulate findings and increase reliability.

3.2.1 Participants

IEP students are those who did not meet the required scores in TOEFL or IELTS, one of AUC demands in order to declare a major. It is based on an assumption that the largest proportion of the sample group graduated from public or international bilingual schools. IEP students are categorized into two levels according to their TOEFL or IELTS scores and the diagnostic test (which they take on the first day of the semester): Intermediate level or advanced level. These are categories within the novice level of proficiency. In this program, students are guided
through academic professionals (native and non-native teachers) to develop their academic writing, oral skills, reading comprehension, grammar and vocabulary through the integrated courses offered: connections (writing and grammar), perspectives (reading, vocabulary and grammar) and study skills (speaking and listening). IEP students are expected to follow a full-time schedule from 8:30 AM to 3:00 PM for a full academic semester to fulfill the expectations of the Intensive English Program. Since only six of 13 classes were co-taught by both NESTs and NNESTs, a total number of 82 of 228 IEP students at the American university in Cairo enrolling for Fall 2019 participated in the study. As for the students who were interviewed, only seven students who volunteered to participate in the study. They were all students from different classes of the 6 classes mentioned.

IEP teachers are also participants in this research paper. They can be divided into three categories: full-time teachers, part-time teachers (also known as the one-semester hires), and student-teachers (also known as teaching fellows). Teachers were asked for a permission to observe their classes in order to examine the techniques they use in the teaching process that promote motivation. According to the operational definition of a NEST and NNEST of this study, teachers who are bicultural, can understand and respond to students in Arabic, had Arabic names, or looked Middle Eastern as perceived by IEP students were regarded as non-native teachers. That being said, a total number of seven native teachers and six non-native teachers (N= 13) were the sample used in the study of which students expressed their perceptions in the questionnaire and interview. It should be taken into account that all teachers (either NESTs or NNESTs) are required to attend meetings, training sessions, norming sessions and any other teaching-related tasks/activities equally. It is also worth noting that they have all received an MA degree (or are enrolled in the MA TESOL program/ a teaching fellow).
3.3 Instruments

Three instruments were used to collect data: questionnaire, interviews and classroom observations. The study incorporated content analysis and inferential analysis using the two-tailed T-test in order to look into whether there is any difference between the two groups of teachers; in other words, learners who hold more positive perceptions towards either NESTs or NNESTs.

3.3.1 The Questionnaire. It comprised 34 statements written in English (17 statements related to NESTs and another 17 identical statements related to NNESTs) targeting teaching skills and language proficiency, which should not take more than 10 minutes to complete. Students filled in a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

The selection of questions were initially derived from the statements authored by Mermelstein (2015) examining six areas targeting language proficiency and instructional practices in a Taiwanese EFL context (Appendix A) and also questions obtained from Benke & Medyges’ (2005) comprehensive questionnaire in their study entitled differences in teaching behaviour between native and non-native speaker teachers: As seen by the learners (Appendix B). The researcher integrated the above-mentioned questionnaires to form a holistic comprehensive form that included not only teaching practices but also linguistic competence of both types of teachers. A number of statements were omitted due to the following reasons: statements are repetitive or statement results will not add to the content of the study. Questions omitted from the first questionnaire are: 5, 6, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, and 24; while those omitted from the latter are: 1, 11, 20, 12, 13 (see Appendix A and B). The researcher also added her own modification of questions so that they are suitable for the courses they take at the IEP. Moreover, the questionnaire encompassed statements targeting language skills and teachers’
teaching behaviors and techniques within the academic context. The whole version of the researcher can be viewed in Appendix C.

The e-questionnaire in the study encompassed four sections: (1) consent form, (2) Individual Background Questionnaire (IBQ), (3) Instructions and definitions, (4) statements that are adopted to assess students’ perceptions. The empirical data were analyzed using inferential statistics for each type of teacher to find the percentages, means, and standard deviations.

The purpose of using quantitative data collection, especially questionnaire, is to collect a large amount of data from students in a fast and precise manner. Richard and Lockhart (1994) illustrate that they are useful if the researcher is to assemble “information about affective dimensions of teaching and learning, such as beliefs, attitudes, motivations, and preferences” (p. 10), which is the core purpose of this research.

3.3.2 Classroom observation. Because there is a shortage of studies employing classroom observation to examine teachers’ teaching techniques and practices (Cots & D’iaz, 2005; Morita’s, 2007), there remains an urgent need for such an instrument in this domain (Moussu & Llurda, 2008). According to Scrivener (2006), observations that are conducted for the purpose of research data collection are technically for achieving a quantitative paradigm. It is also an integral part of the proposed study to assist in increasing the validity of the findings through triangulation. In order to eliminate any possible perspective that may be held subjective, the researcher followed the Motivation Orientation of Language Teaching (MOLT) observation scheme obtained from Guillautaux and Dörnyei’s study (2008), which they implemented in Japanese EFL classes. After extensive reading in the literature to find a suitable observation form, the MOLT scheme is deemed comprehensive since it integrates two frameworks: Spada and Fröhlich’s (1995) communication orientation of language teaching (COLT) scheme, and
Dörnyei’s (2001) system of motivational teaching practice. The reason why Guillautaux and Dörnyei resorted to the MOLT is because the earlier framework by Dörnyei’s (2001) did not look at student’s engagement and response to the techniques used by teachers. Since students are the target of the learning process, their attitudes and response are worth studying, which is the part incorporated in the COLT.

Moreover, the MOLT is outlined in a time-sampling format allowing the researcher to record every minute of a lesson, a total of 45 minutes. It is referred to as a real-time observation scheme (Guillautaux and Dörnyei, 2008). According to the primary focus coding strategy, if two events are taking place at the same time within the same sub-category, the dominating variable during the one-minute time is the one that will be recorded (Spada & Fröhlich, 1995).

The method can be simply divided into two categories: Teacher’s motivational practice (25 variables included, Appendix E) and learner’s behavior (towards these practices, 9 variables included). According to Guillautaux and Dörnyei a three-level scale is adopted in the ‘learner’s behavior’ category: “very low = a few students, low = one third to two thirds of the students, and high = more than two thirds of the students” (Guillautaux and Dörnyei, 2008). This is displayed more clearly in the scheme (see Appendix D). The participant organization in the MOLT scheme was modified to include only group work. Moreover, when conducting the piloting for this scheme, the researcher noticed that other features of teacher’s practice is redundant, included different wording of the same strategies used in teachers’ motivational practice. Therefore, it was omitted and not regarded in the analysis to avoid redundancy.

3.3.3 Semi-structured Interviews. The reason why the research encompassed qualitative approach through one-on-one semi-structured interviews is to support the simple responses gathered from questionnaires, triangulate results of classroom observation and compile rather
comprehensive information. They are sequential interviews taking place after the above-mentioned instruments, meaning that they are structured upon responses of the students and upon what the researcher discerns during classroom observations. Such instrument is needed to elicit detailed perceptions of how participants feel.

Interview questions tapped into students’ perceptions and the techniques used by NESTs and NNESTs to keep them motivated and engaged during the academic semester. The interview results are expected to support the data collected from the questionnaire and to explore their level of motivation and comfort in the classroom.

Questions of the semi-structured interview were mainly written in English. Given to the fact that asking students to answer in English will be restrictive, the researcher allowed students to reply freely and spontaneously. The researcher made clear that the information the participants provide are confidential and will not affect them negatively by any means. This should be helpful in informing accurate results of students’ perceptions.

According to Labov (1972, p. 209), a researcher should aim at avoiding the observer’s paradox where participants feel they are being observed and start to behave differently than they would in a natural situation. Consequently, the investigator participated in teaching an extra-curricular speaking and pronunciation class in order to establish positive rapport with IEP students at the beginning of the semester. They were asked personal questions, sharing humorous talks and activities, and other academic-related questions, where they get to respond freely. By the time of the interview, students already knew the teacher and answered the interview questions confidently.
Data analysis of all three methods used is necessary to understand how data were collected to answer the research questions. Data collection took place at the American University in Cairo in the Intensive English Program after the first month of the semester (Fall 2019).

**Questionnaire.** Questionnaires were sent via email to all IEP students who were taught by both native and non-native English-speaking teachers three weeks after the program has started (September 23, 2019). Students (N= 99) were sent daily reminders to fill out the questionnaire for three weeks. Students who did not fill out the form were sent a hard copy. The researcher used Google Forms to author the questionnaire of 34 items (17 statements duplicated for each type of teacher). A Likert scale of 5 points (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) was used to guarantee accurate results. Emails of students who responded were collected for a follow-up semi-structured interview. Since Google Forms displays the emails of those who did not respond, it was made convenient and easy for the researcher to send reminders. The responses of 82 students were collected and coded on both: Excel and SPSS version 26. The statements that targeted NESTs were coded on both sheets as x (x1 – x 17), whereas for NNESTs they were coded as y (y18 – y 34). The Means of all responses as well as the Standard Deviation (SD) were calculated. Further, an inferential analysis of a two-tailed T-test (paired samples T-test) was adopted to conduct this study to calculate the p-value which will determine the statistical significance between variables. If p-value was found to be greater than 0.05, this should indicate no significant differences among both types of teachers in a specific area/ in the statement presented.

**Classroom observations.** On an Excel sheet, all categories and sub-categories of the observation scheme were decoded along with the observational data represented in tally marks.
for each behavior. All marks of both the Learner behavior and Teacher’s motivational practice eventually indicated a certain number of minutes that represent the total number of minutes that were designated for a certain activity.

Furthermore, the number of minutes for each category on the observation scheme were totaled and averaged for teachers of the same type (Thayne, 2013). All sub-categories that fall under a certain category represent a certain construct (either teacher behavior or Student behavior). The percentages were calculated to test the relation between the teacher’s teaching practices and student’s behavior. After calculating the minutes of all categories, they were transformed into percentages to easily identify the strategies that took place more frequently in class.

Two weeks after the questionnaires were electronically sent, the researcher started classroom observations. Each class lasted for 60 minutes; however, only 45 minutes of the class was observed. Unlike Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008) who standardized the time using SPSS, the researcher used the ready-made standardized scheme. The class was observed 10 minutes after the scheduled start time to avoid any class distractions such as late comers, class preparation, questions about previous assignments, signing the consent form etc. The fifth period (the last period) was always disregarded drawing on the assumption that students will behave differently in class regardless of the motivating techniques used by any of the teachers in class, which might result in collecting inaccurate data. The investigator audio-taped the observation to ensure that the coding of each observation was tallied accurately. They were listened to twice to increase the reliability of the results.

The researcher observed 2 of 6 classes. First, a NEST and a NNEST of different classes were observed teaching the same subject, Study Skills, which focuses mainly on listening and
speaking skills. Second, a NEST and a NNEST of different classes teaching writing skills were observed. All four teachers, who were each observed only once, were not told about the topic of the research study, however, mentioned in the consent form. The investigator just mentioned that the study is about native and non-native teachers to guarantee a natural, spontaneous classroom atmosphere. Content analysis is employed to discuss the activities used by both types of teachers to keep students motivated.

**Interviews.** Students received emails to participate in the interview after filling out the questionnaire. Students’ responses were recorded, transcribed and included in the study upon their consent. Content analysis was used to assess students’ responses. Color codes were employed in order to compile all similar responses and patterns, analyzed later into themes. Color coding was revisited to guarantee a precise classification of patterns and themes.

Further, the interview lasted for 10 to 20 minutes. Since the time of the semester on which the interviews are conducted is a variable that will affect the responses given by the participants (Moussu & Llurda, 2008), interviews were conducted at the near end of the semester so that students have experienced a sufficient amount of exposure of language learning being taught by both types of teachers.
Chapter 4: Results

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study is to investigate IEP students’ perceptions of the instructional practices used by their non-native and native teachers, and the techniques they utilize to enhance student motivation. This chapter includes the results of the data collected using the following instruments: questionnaire, semi-structured interviews and classroom observation. In this chapter, the results sections that include the questionnaire results and the interview results are the ones that answer research question 1, whereas research question number 2 is answered using the questionnaire, classroom observation and interviews.

4.2 Results of research question 1

This section mainly discusses the results of the questionnaire and interview answering the first question of this research study. It presents how students perceive both their native and non-native teachers in terms of instructional practices (Table 4.1) which are tackled in the questionnaire items 4 and 21; 7 and 24; 9 and 26; 10 and 27; 11 and 28; 12 and 29; 13 and 30; 14 and 31. These numbers represent the statements in the questionnaire: The former numbers are related to NESTs and the latter are duplicated statements for NNESTs (see Appendix C). Below is the table that shows the means and statistical significance between both types of teachers as perceived by students, where the p-value is p<0.05. The items are ordered in accordance with how they were first mentioned in the questionnaire.
### Table 4.1

*Means and Point-Value of the Questionnaire Items, n = 82*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>NEST’s mean score</th>
<th>NNEST’s mean score</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed) p&lt;0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S4 &amp; S21: Explains difficult concepts well</td>
<td>3.792</td>
<td>4.292</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7 &amp; S24: Pays attention to speaking skills</td>
<td>3.707</td>
<td>3.987</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10 &amp; S27: Answers questions and/or provides adequate explanation</td>
<td>3.914</td>
<td>4.390</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11 &amp; S28: Able to correct learner’s speaking errors</td>
<td>3.878</td>
<td>4.207</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12 &amp; S29: Able to correct learner’s writing errors</td>
<td>3.756</td>
<td>4.353</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13 &amp; S30: Able to understand student’s difficulties related to learning English</td>
<td>3.658</td>
<td>4.170</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14 &amp; S31: Makes a good English Language teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.378</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items 9 and 26 which look into students’ level of agreement and disagreement on teacher’s correct pronunciation answering the first research question are not presented in table 4.1 because the p-value is greater than 0.05 indicating no significant difference in students’ perceptions, where the NEST’s mean score is 4.438 and the NNEST’s mean score is 4.341 with a point-value 0.472. Students seem to agree that both teachers have correct pronunciation regardless of the slight difference in the mean scores of each type of teachers.
4.2.1 The Ideal Speaker

As supported by the results provided earlier in the questionnaire, students did not express significant differences between the NEST and the NNEST when asked about the ideal example of an English speaker in terms of teachers having correct pronunciation. Madgyes (1994) believed that the strength of the native teacher is manifested through their representation of authentic speech through their unrestricted ability of linguistic features; namely, speaking and pronunciation. Interviewee 7 explains, however, that he did not know that his non-native teacher “was non-native. I thought that she was native.” He was astonished to discover throughout the semester that his teacher is a non-native English speaker. Regardless of the slight differences between a native and a non-native teacher producing correct pronunciation, students agree that NNEST pay more attention to speaking skills with a p-value 0.034. Not only do NNESTs focus on oral skills, but are also keen to correct speaking errors as represented in the p-value 0.01.

Further, students defined an ideal speaker of L2 through the use of vocabulary. A student said that native teachers “use English as a mother language. So, they use more vocab than non-native use.” Moreover, Madgyes (2001) argued that the non-native teacher points out to their primary weakness in ESL, which is vocabulary. Likewise, a student complains that NNESTs “see you, they need to speak in simple way, very simple way. But they shouldn’t.” This means that non-native teachers are not using varied or difficult vocabulary as demanded by the students. Unlike interviewee 4 who described her teacher to have wide experience which contributed to her perception of her NNEST as an ideal English speaker: “she has a wide experience. She keeps adding vocabulary to our dictionary and useful vocabulary. And she also teaches us how to use the vocabulary in sentences and paragraphs in different ways and different grammar forms as well.”
Moreover, when students were asked about which class they were motivated in the most, the students who responded with “in the NNEST’s class” mentioned that it was because they represented an ideal model of an L2 speaker as explained earlier by Medgyes (1994).

“It’s okay both ways. But I would really like to see a non-native speaker just like the way I am, who speaks very fluently and nicely and perfectly. I get motivated more to learn.”

*Interviewee 4*

Instructional practices are linked to motivation in this extract. Speaking here is also linked with students’ ability to identify with their difficulty encountered in fluency and other oral matters. Such identification can better be exemplified in how far teachers tolerate and understand students oral or written errors which will be tackled in the following section.

**4.2.2 Good English Teacher**

Students were asked earlier in the questionnaire to express the level of agreement or disagreement with the statement that identifies a teacher as ‘a good English teacher.’ The level of agreement was higher for NNESTs with a mean score of 4.378 whereas NESTs’ mean score is 4. The adjective ‘good’ is rather subjective according to individuals’ definition of ‘good.’ Therefore, to study further the qualities attributed to a good teacher the following explanations were provided by the interviewees:

*Understanding difficulties.* In the questionnaire students held more positive perceptions towards the non-native teacher with a mean score of 4.17 and 3.658 for native teachers which is a remarkable difference. Moreover, it is worth mentioning that six of seven students mentioned that they view a teacher to be good when they are able to sympathize with their linguistic difficulties. Interviewee 2 confirmed that NNEST “understand what we are confused about. They
have passed what we are passing. They can conclude what is the problem we are having in this
problem”. IEP students regarded their non-native teachers to have gone through the same
experience they have been through. The following is an extract from Interview 7 to illustrate
further this point:

**Researcher:** OK. Do you think your native English-speaking teacher makes a good
English teacher?

**Interviewee 7:** I would say yes, but not for all classes.

**Researcher:** OK. Not for all classes, why?

**Interviewee 7:** Because I think some classes like the writing class. It's better to have a
non-native teacher. Because like a lot of us, like, students do mistakes in writing like
some of the things they do, they translate the ideas from Arabic. So, it would look like
Google Translate. Mm hmm. So, you know, like the non-native teacher would understand
what they mean and try to, like, give them or help them make it better. But if it was a
native teacher, he would consider it as a mistake or that student has a problem with the
grammar, things like that.

The student, here, illuminates the conflation of a good teacher by mentioning the ability
of the non-native teacher to understand and tolerate L2 errors. He further explains that he does
not know “if it has to do with native or non-native teacher. But non-native teachers explain
things better,” which is another strand that supports the research findings of the questionnaire
related to NNEST’s ability to explain certain language components. In the questionnaire, there
seems to be a significant difference between NESTs and NNESTs’ ability to correct students’
writing errors where the p-value equaled 0 with a mean of 3.756 for NESTs and 4.353 for
NNESTs. Moreover, highlighting what interviewee 7 mentioned earlier regarding how “non-
native teachers explain things better” is also in line with the results of the questionnaire represented in items 4 and 21. The scores of NESTs figures at 3.792 whereas for NNESTs it is 4.292 showing a major difference in teachers’ ability to explain difficult concepts well. In a similar vein Interviewee 5 mentions that NNEST “understands the difficulties but I think this is her personality not about the teacher.” The word difficulties is also dependent on other factors that is summed up in the following extract:

“But maybe in the session of the non-native speaker. She... understands us. She knew our weaknesses and strengths. So, she always remind us with our things that we made good. And maybe something personally sometimes” Interviewee 6

An interesting reply from a student was his experience with his native teachers who he knows that they speak fluent Arabic. He thought that because they are proficient L2 users of Arabic, he might as well be a proficient L2 user of English.

“You would have just the feeling that you that you’re speaking to a native. You focus on your English. You feel motivated to learn English. It would give you like a boost to learn English better. And actually, you know, the fact that these teachers studied Arabic and they speak Arabic fluently, like some of them actually, like, would make me work hard on my English. It would motivate me to learn English.” Interviewee 7

In this situation, like other respondents who thought non-native instructors would understand students’ difficulties, interviewee 7 believes that NEST did go through the same experience he is going through yet in learning a different language.

High expectations for ESL learners. Most of the students perceived the NNEST teachers to be good teachers. Their feeling of disorientation, however, was because of their experience with their native English-speaking teachers who thought highly of them. Interviewee 7 explains
that “native teachers, they think that, like, they say something and they expect that I know it, like, took it school.” Another word articulated by interviewee 2 is the native teachers’ belief that “they see we are geniuses and give us more information.” Moreover, interviewee 3 expresses the difficulty they face trying to comprehend the native teachers’ instructional practices.

_Culture._ A point mentioned by only one student is the idea of culture. He explains how culture plays a major role in teachers’ perceptions and understanding of students. The student explains that the miscommunication happens because of culture.

“I think as I said, non-native speaker. They are so close to us, they feel us. And her culture is like our culture. So she can deal with us more easily and more comfortably. But native speaker or native teachers have different roles, have different traditions and have different thoughts. For example, I might do something that is natural or normal for me, but to her or to my native speaker, native teacher, no it's Guilty or It's causes something of guilt or it's immoral. It's unethical.” _Interviewee 3_

He further explains that culture also affects students trying to adapt to the teacher’s teaching style, “I think… if we were Americans, we would adapt to her style of teaching.” His interpretation of understanding difficulties was based on a larger scale of understanding culture. The notion culture plays an integral role in students’ motivation in the learning experience. Therefore, it will be tackled extensively in the second research question since it is classified by Dörnyei (2001) as a factor affecting motivation.

### 4.3 Results of research question 2

This section tackles the results of the questionnaire, the interview and the MOLT scheme to answer the second research question. Students were also asked to state their agreement or
disagreement with the statements provided in the questionnaire on the techniques used by their NESTs and NNESTs. The questions that answer the second question of the research study are referred to in statements 1 and 18; 2 and 19; 3 and 20; 5 and 22; 6 and 23; 8 and 25; 15 and 32; 16 and 33; 17 and 34. They are mentioned in accordance with how they were first mentioned in the questionnaire (see Appendix C).

Table 4. 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEST’s mean score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST’s mean score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed) p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 &amp; S20: Directs students towards autonomous learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5 &amp; S22: Corrects errors consistently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6 &amp; S23: Provides extensive information about the culture related the English language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8 &amp; S25: Interested in student’s opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15 &amp; S32: Students are comfortable in using English during class time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16 &amp; S33: Runs interesting classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions 1 and 18, 2 and 19, 17 and 34 that answer the second research question are included in a separate table since the results are greater than 0.05 (see table 4.3) presenting no significant difference in the techniques used by both types of teachers to prompt students’ motivation.
Table 4.3

Means and Point-Value > 0.05, n = 82

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>NEST’s mean score</th>
<th>NNEST’s mean score</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 &amp; S18: Assigns a lot of homework</td>
<td>3.512</td>
<td>3.597</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 &amp; S19: Uses group work in class regularly</td>
<td>4.024</td>
<td>4.024</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17 &amp; S34: Speaks most of the time during lesson</td>
<td>3.573</td>
<td>3.621</td>
<td>0.683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not only does table 4.3 show no significant difference between both teachers, the results of statement 2 and 19 indicate no slight difference between any of the teachers. This means that both NESTs and NNESTs used group work equally. It is surprising that students had different perceptions about their teachers in questions 3 & 20, and 17 & 34. That is, if both teachers speak less during class time this indicates that both types of teachers allow more time for students to speak and express their thoughts and opinions which might as well mean that both types of teachers direct students towards autonomous learning.

Moreover, classroom observation is used to display the techniques used by each type of teacher that oriented students’ behavior to be alert, to volunteer and/or to participate. The MOLT has been used earlier by researchers to investigate the correlation between the activities used by teachers in class and students’ response to such motivational practices. It was also integrated with another method such as a postlesson teacher evaluation scale or a learner survey (Guilloteaux & Dornyei, 2008; Mullen, 2015). However, it was never used as an instrument to showcase the techniques used by two types of teachers in the same workplace. Therefore, the results of this instrument will be employed differently than the one developed by Guilloteaux and
Dörnyei (2008) because (a) the current study is not using another instrument to blend it with the current scheme, and (b) the MOLT scheme was used for different purposes (comparing two types of teachers); thus, measuring different aspects. For this reason, neither the composite score nor the standardized scores (z scores) calculated earlier by Guilloteaux and Dornyei (2008) employed to combine data from two different instruments will be required in the case of this study.

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher's Motivational Practice</th>
<th>Range of minutes (NEST 1)</th>
<th>Range of minutes (NEST 2)</th>
<th>Total minutes for both Ts</th>
<th>Range of minutes (NNEST 1)</th>
<th>Range of minutes (NNEST 2)</th>
<th>Total minutes for both Ts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social chat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signposting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stating the communicative purpose of the activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing relevance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting integrative values</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting instrumental values</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousing curiosity or attention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting cooperation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting autonomy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referential questions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible reward</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since this scheme mainly aims at measuring the frequency of strategy use through a minute-by-minute observational scheme, table 4.4 shows the number of minutes spent on each motivational practice by both kinds of teachers. To maintain reliable results, for one academic subject two teachers were observed (one from each type). That is, NEST 1 and NNEST 1 both teach Connections while NEST 2 and NNEST 2 teach study skills (defined in chapter 1).

### 4.3.1 Motivational strategies

**Student autonomy.** The results of the teacher’s motivational behavior in the MOLT scheme (figure 4.1) illustrate that NESTs rely on autonomous learning. Results reveal that the native teachers depended most of the class time on autonomous learning which totaled 40% of the class time with only 4% more than the non-native speaker. The results slightly contradict what was found earlier in the findings of the questionnaire where students agree that NNESTs are the group of teachers who resort to this strategy more often with a mean score that equaled
3.951 while NESTs’ mean score equaled 3.634. However, there is a possibility that students did not know what autonomous meant which is obvious since they had different perceptions when asked about their level of agreement on whether teachers speak most of the time during a lesson.

Students believe that both types of teachers speak less during a lesson with a mean score of 3.573 for NESTs and 3.621 for NNESTs. Thus, allowing more student talking time and, consequently, student autonomy. Students had the same perception towards their native teachers when conducting the interviews. To ensure that students understand what autonomous learning means, it was further explained through the notion of student-centered and not teacher-centered classroom setting. Although most of them mentioned that both types of teachers implemented it, the results of teachers using this technique was more towards the native teacher (as proposed by the questionnaire and the classroom observation). Additionally, students seem to hold positive perceptions towards this technique.

*Figure 4.1. The Percentage of Each Strategy Used in the Teacher Discourse Variable*
“this technique in teaching I support it, but some classes students might suffer from that. Not all the students, not all of the students are hard workers. Personally, I support it, cause It depends on you. If you want to pass, you will do assignments. You will depend on your own. You’ll strike out on your own. But yeah I support it, I support it. I think non-native speakers more than the native speaker” Interviewee 3

“Both of them. I would like to have a voice in the class. I’d like me and my friends to be owning a classroom, to decide what to want to do and what not we want to do. We thought that we would work more in the PBS. But in fact, in the writing class, our teacher keeps ask asking us to complete the statements after each other. I mean, to keep cooperating, to try to write a paragraph. Finally, she gets us all involved. Explanations. So, we are explaining not her.” Interviewee 4.

The idea of autonomous learning was defined by the students as having “voice” in class, allowing students to generate rules and decide on the activities they desire such as asking “what do you guys want to do next.” It was also associated with classroom discussions, sharing “experiences in life,” respecting opinions and feelings, thinking critically and creatively. Another definition of autonomous learning that is rather distinctive is being forced to interact in English especially if the class was taught by a NEST as explained by interviewee 7:

“I think it is the native English teacher. For our student ... students it would be better, if we feel like we will be... like, for English it would be perfect because we would have to interact using English a lot in class. So, for us students learning English, independent learning it be great. It would help improve our English more and more.”

Therefore, the time allotted to class work is considered a time worth spending since students get the chance to lead classroom discussion and group work in English that will help
them improve their L2, which is the paramount importance of the learning process as an IEP student.

*Group work.* The questionnaire, the classroom observation and the interview results imply that both types of teachers apply group work in class. In the graph below (figure 4.2), it is revealed that NNESTs relied on group work for more than 60% of class time. As for the native teachers, they only resorted to group work activities for 41% of the 45 minutes observed in class. Unexpectedly, the results contradict that of the questionnaire where students agreed that both the NEST and the NNEST used it equally in class with a mean of 4.024 for both groups. It is worth noting, however, that this is the result of a single classroom observation.

![Figure 4.2. The Percentage of the Participant Organization during Class](image)

What is interesting is that students find this technique very motivating. When asked about what made them feel motivated in class, almost all seven students mentioned group work (and competitions). These are some of their responses:

“*Most of the time we are working or we are learning as peer work as peer workers.*”

*Interviewee 3*
“when she first comes in, she said, put your tables, as groups. We as friends, we like to sit beside each other. Sitting in groups and working together as if we have the class.”

**Interviewee 4**

“group work or using group work, um, projects like, uh, projects. Because group work in general would make me feel like more independent and more proud. I would feel like I have more responsibility. It would make me feel more mature. We use something called teaching time. Yeah. So, um, we're like four groups, at least maybe five groups. And we'll, uh, each group takes like a part in grammar.” **Interviewee 7**

Their replies are attributed somewhat to autonomous learning and their desire to feel that their voice is heard and that they are the ones leading the class. They also find it fun since they get the chance to sit next to their friends.

*Team/individual competition.* Not only do non-native teachers resort more to group work, but also team competitions. It seems that NNEST utilize team competitions for 23% of the time, which is a great percentage (figure 4.3). Native teachers, as well, apply competitions (individual competition) scoring a percentage greater than NNESTs.

---

![Activity design](image_url)

*Figure 4.3. The Percentages of the Strategies Used in the Activity Design Variable*
Students conveyed their positive attitude towards competition considering it as a group work that does not necessarily require students to work together since, sometimes, they challenge each other. What all responses had in common were strategies of what made students motivated the most in class.

“I think competition. Sometimes we be in individual competitions and sometimes we be in group competitions. They suggest if a team win or an individual wins, they get a bonus points.”  **Interviewee 2**

Students translated their definition of competitions to be websites such as “Kahoot” and “The Game of Millionaire”, games, and bonus points. Not only are they concerned with the concept of a competition, but also the idea of reward. When students were asked about the teacher who gives more tangible rewards such as candies or prizes in general, it was always associated with competitions. Most of the students suggested that this technique is more practiced by NNEST whereas two students suggested otherwise.

“Our non-native teacher. She always says those who come those who will come first will have a reward in the next essay. Something like that.”  **Interviewee 3**

“The native teacher. Sometimes when it gets boring, she says, Let's be done with this one. And then later on, maybe I can I can maybe decrease the homework assignments that you have or something.”  **Interviewee 4**

“Our non-native teacher speaker teacher does that more often, yes. She... From a time to another, she get the whole class Pringle’s.”  **Interviewee 4**

In figure (4.3), it is pointed out that the greater percentages are attributed to the non-native teachers in all components except tangible reward which none of the teachers implemented during the classes observed and in individual competition. Since the interviews
triangulate results, it is revealed that NNESTs resort to rewards more than NESTs do. Unlike the rest of the responses, interviewee 4 interpreted tangible rewards as being given less assignments to motivate them get the classwork done. In this situation, tangible rewards are also given as a way to get students more engaged in an activity.

*Feedback.* Students were questioned in the interview to talk about the teacher who gives more encouraging feedback. All seven students agreed that the non-native teacher used this motivational strategy more than NESTs did. This was also obvious in the class observation conducted where praise and class applause were neglected by the NEST. This is an example of how the non-native teacher expressed her feedback:

“*she has this comment down there like overall bravo and exclamation marks. She makes it so big and obvious that you can see. And then she write in small letters but you have this part that needs improvement. She have constructive comments*” *Interviewee 4*

“*she would motivate us frequently by saying very motivated words for everyone.*”

*Interviewee 6*

In the above-mentioned extracts, the way the teacher chose to motivate students made them more engaged and excited to learn. It also made them build a stronger rapport with their teachers. Encouraging feedback inspired students to work harder as well as praise which are embodied in the following extracts:

“*Any anyone who comes first in writing an essay my non-native teacher puts his name on the blackboard and gave them like a certificate to appreciate them.*” *Interviewee 3*

“*you know, non-native speaker teaches speakers, keeps mentioning that she likes the way I pronounce my words. So, she said I like the way I love the way you’re pronouncing your words. gives me motivation. And our native teacher speakers and native speaker, teacher,*
she keeps saying it's okay to make mistakes. We as natives, we make mistakes.”

Interviewee 4

Teachers resorted to multiple ways to express praise and student motivation. They used written and oral praise generally shared with the whole class and not on a one-on-one basis. There is also the conception of consistency which resides in what the interviewee mentioned as “she keeps saying” and “she keeps mentioning” which refer to how teachers practice praise and support consistently with L2 learners.

![Encouraging Positive Retrospective Self-evaluation](image)

Figure 4.4. The Percentage of NESTs and NNESTs’ Evaluation of Students during Class

Figure (4.4), presenting *encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation*, previews how NESTs and NNESTs give feedback and evaluate students. Along the same lines, NESTs, who relied on autonomous learning, employed elicitation of self or peer correction which is a strategy associated with independent learning. However, the NESTs never applied process feedback to evaluate students work or allowed class applause. On the other hand, these two techniques, albeit for a very short time, were used by the NNESTs. Furthermore, the highest percentage for NNESTs is neutral feedback, feedback on students’ performance for enhancing their
performance in future activities. Also, NNESTs provide more effective praise. This kind of feedback does not comprise “thank you” or “right/correct answer” to a student, rather more effectual phrases.

*Developing positive attitude towards learning.* Students were asked about the teacher who makes them develop a positive attitude towards learning L2. Most of the responses suggested equal preference for the NNEST and NEST. However, two of the students pointed out to the native teacher for motivating students to view L2 differently

“Our native teacher. she always tells us that we shouldn't use Arabic in class as we are in an English class. And she she tells tell us that you will be native speakers after maybe some years in the near future. You will be English speakers or even you will maybe you will be native speakers. So, she always tell us or motivate us to learn and improve and enhance our English.” *Interviewee 3*

Emphasizing the use of L2 in class, the teacher resorted to intrinsic motivation. The idea of becoming a native speaker in the near future made the student develop a more positive attitude to learn the language. Moreover, as per Cortazzi and Jin (1999), learners are influenced by the construct of culture in developing a positive attitude towards language learning. In the questionnaire, learners agreed that none of the teachers provides extensive information about the culture related to the English language. However, there is a major difference in the means provided in the questionnaire in the item regarding teachers providing information related to the English language where NESTs’ mean score accounts for 3.219 while for NNESTs it is accounted for 3.695. Such results show NNESTs attempts to develop a positive attitude towards L2. Likewise, NESTs assist in encouraging students to how positive perception of L2 learning through establishing relevance (see figure 4.1). Surprisingly, the native teachers established more
relevance in their discourse than the non-native teachers who already know about students’ culture and mindsets.

Social chat. It appeared in the classroom observation that both the native and the non-native instructors initiated social chat equally in classes (figure 4.1). However, all students interviewed confirmed that the NNEST is the one who develops more humorous chats, which make students laugh. Only a single student believed that both NESTs and NNESTs cracked jokes and told funny stories. As for the native teachers, they utilize social chat as to develop intrinsic motivation, which guarantees longer term motivation.

“We use Google Classroom, she sends messages of Good morning, guys. Remember, we're going to meet at lab. I mean, get your coffee or something. And be I mean, be motivated to start or something, we're going to start” Interviewee 4

“At the PBIS class, coming up with new ideas and she always gives us this, do it as if you are going to do it for real. So, we have this project where we're going to redesign some area, so she said, just design it, just make a design [...] as if you're going to do it for real. This is very interesting. Well, it's nice. It's involving everyone working together on something other than a pen and a paper.” Interviewee 4

A cup of coffee is what made a student feel motivated to start a class. Also, reimagining a project as though it is implemented in reality reflected intrinsic motivation practiced by the native teacher. The results, then, of the interview agree with that of the observation.

Creative activities. In the observation, both native and non-native teachers were observed using creative activities. It was also clarified in the observation results’ (figure 4.1) that NESTs used various teaching techniques than NNESTs who depended on cooperative and autonomous techniques most of the time. Moreover, in figure 4.3, NESTs are scoring their highest percentage
in establishing activities that promote elements of interest, creativity or fantasy. The results are also similar in the interviews. In the interviews, students praised their native teacher for implementing different techniques that help create a motivational atmosphere in class.

“Our native teachers, they have extraordinary ideas about how to teach. That is, how to send knowledge and information to us in various ways. In the NNEST’s class, it is one way. We always take the same way for learning. We don't change how we are taught”

**Interviewee 2**

“The creative ideas she come with. Like some games during the class as she showed us some videos and some interesting visual aids.” **Interviewee 6**

“So I remember one activity we did [...] we were in groups and we had to like think of a way to stop time. So we have like crazy ideas. And it was like we were practicing divergent thinking, so no ideas are too crazy. And these kinds of practices help help us think more creativity. Like creativity, we do that all the time” **Interviewee 7**

As the previous extracts highlight the point of how native teachers emphasize using various and creative activities supporting the results of the observation, the following extracts point out to the creative activities used by the NNESTs.

“whenever we start each class she does something called the energizer which is pretty much like an activity to wake us up or like we talk about certain subjects, things like that..” **Interviewee 1**

She gives us this part of the class every time for news, to say what's going on everyday. And teaching time, we teach power using point presentation with my colleagues and I think that is really interesting.” **Interviewee 5**
It is clear that both types of teachers implement creative activities in their classes. Even the extracts fostering the results of the observation that the non-native teacher promotes more cooperation is referred to in the following extracts with different use of wording.

“I think that she makes education or learning with fun.” Interviewee 3

writing is boring, but she makes it interesting somehow. I mean. She she speaks about experiences in her life, she likes to share stories and to have this brainstorming, brainstorming of ideas. Those ideas. I mean, later on when we have a writing task, I have different ideas from different stories that she shared, those ideas of what we listened to as stories but we write them academically.” Interviewee 4

“She’s not very strict to make us feel horrified with whatever she’s giving us. But she’s sticking to whatever in a good way. She makes us love what she's giving us” Interviewee 5

The non-native teacher makes the learning experience more fun, provides more support and makes students love what they do. This is equivalent to the definition of promoting cooperation in the MOLT scheme (figure 4.1) where the non-native teachers relied on promoting cooperation in class with a 17.7% difference from the native teacher, which is a significant difference. The questionnaire results complement the results of the observation and interview in which it manifests NNESTs interest in students’ opinion with a mean score of 4.134 (and 3.768 for NEST). They also personalize the activity for students to have them more engaged. One should not confuse establishing relevance in the teacher discourse (figure 4.1) with personalization in activity design (figure 4.3), for the former in associated with teacher’s utterance while the latter is attributed to the content of the activity and how it is designed.
In this section, the interview encompassed results holding more positive perceptions towards the non-native teacher. Likewise, according to the questionnaire, students believe that NNESTs are better in leading interesting classes with a p-value 0.003. As for the classroom observation, students are found to be more engaged in the classes taught by NNESTs.

Table 4.5

The Means and Percentages of Learners’ Motivated Behavior According to the Motivational Activities and Techniques Used by Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>LEARNERS’ BEHAVIOR (NUMBER IN %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alertness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST 1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST 2</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST 1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST 2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results are supposed to tell the relation between teacher motivational practice and learners’ motivated behavior, as per the MOLT scheme. Therefore, the following table (4.5) illustrates the percentage of learners’ behavior as a response to the practiced techniques by the NESTs and the NNESTs.

According to table 4.5, learners were less alert during the NESTs’ class since the percentage for students’ alertness is most of the class time either very low or low with a percentage total of 57% which is slightly greater than the time during which students were alert. Unlike NESTs classes, learners in the NNESTs’ class were 83.2% alert, which is a high percentage that mirrors students’ level of concentration on the teacher’s teaching techniques. As
for participation, there seems to be rather a low to very low participation percentage of a total number of 47.6% in the NESTs’ class reflecting that one to two students were participating most of the time in class. Whereas in the NNESTs’ class, the participation percentage is high almost all the time that is reflected in the percentage number of 73.2% of the 45 minutes of class. Lastly, students needed encouragement to volunteer in activities most of the time in the native teachers’ class with a totaled percentage of 16.6 % while they were eager to volunteer and take part in the non-native teachers’ class with a percentage of 69.9.

4.3.2 Using L2 in class

The questionnaire points to the significant difference in the level of comfort students feel in a non-native English class with a p-value 0.002. The sample chosen for the interview, however, suggest that they feel equally comfortable in classes taught by NESTs. When students were asked about whether they felt pressured to produce well-structured English in a native English teacher’s class, they mentioned that they, on the contrary, feel motivated for the following reasons:

“I think I feel comfortable cause I think that she's a native speaker, then all the class will pronounce all words speaking English. None of us will pronounce non-English or will speak Arabic. We feel free to just have an English class.” Interviewee 3

“I like they interact with us using English all the time. But non-natives… Sometimes use Arabic to like. Um. Explain a point. So, for me they use Arabic, I mean, like I wouldn't feel that that restrict on using Arabic.” Interviewee 7

The responses reveal that feeling compelled to communicate in L2 makes students feel comfortable in using English the right way during their educational journey. Although students
might long to use their L1, they expressed that they enjoyed having a whole class free from Arabic.

4.3.3 Error Correction

In the questionnaire, NNESTs were viewed to correct learners’ mistakes more than NEST with a 0 p-value indicating a significant difference. It is, therefore, essential to explore students’ perceptions of this strategy. As the findings of the questionnaire suggest, students viewed the non-native teachers to practice this strategy more than NESTs even after many elaborations that mostly all teachers do not do consistently. Generally, all students agreed on the substantial advantage of their mistakes being corrected by teachers; however, they disagreed on the word “consistently.” The following are students’ perceptions of the strategy:

**Researcher:** Ok. And who does this more? In your class? Is it your native or non-native?

**Interviewee 6:** I think it is the non-native

**Researcher:** and you don't like it sometimes.

**Interviewee 6:** Maybe. But especially when we are in discussion for a specific topic. And I say any grammatical mistakes. So, she. She said it's not perfect. But sometimes when I speak, I don't focus on the grammar. And like I focus on writing. So, I just want to deliver the idea. And then when I write it, I will. I will. Correct it. It makes me to not be self-confident. I won't be motivated to speak because I will be criticized for every mistake I made. But if the teacher like takes note for my mistakes and at the end he or she discuss them with me. So, I will in the next time I would focus on improving that.
“Like being corrected is good because it helped me fix my mistakes, but not on the spot, like after I finish the conversation. It's OK in front of everyone because, yeah, it would help me fix my mistakes. And if any other people have the same mistake, it would help them improve.” Interviewee 7

In both extracts the concepts of interruption and self-confidence are manifested. The former interviewee explains the discomforted state she would be put in if the teacher corrected her consistently especially in oral contexts. She also attributes her state of discomfort to being demotivated to take part in oral activities. While the latter fears being interrupted drawing on an assumption that he might lose his train of thoughts or feels not being listened to attentively.

4.3.4 Motivation is subject-related

Although the research study is based on students’ perception of both native and non-native English-speaking teachers, some students refer to the fact that developing motivational behavior is more or less dependent on the subject itself and not on the teacher. Some others believe it is associated with the teacher’s personality.

“I think it not about whether they are native English speaker or non-native English speakers. It depends on the subject itself. If the subject is not interesting, then I'm not interested and if the subject is interesting then I'm definitely engaged and interested.”

Interviewee 1

“I have 2 native teachers one is interesting and the other not interesting. And I have a non-native only half of her session is interesting the other half not interesting. It depends on what they are explaining to us and not on them.” Interviewee 2
“It's more of the teacher's behavior. Maybe or ... I don’t know. A native speaker, can be good at speaking, but as a teacher, he's not attracting students to learn. You might just be ... he, she, he or she can might be native or non-native, but that most important characteristic that you would have is is how to get the students involved in the class. This is the most important one.” Interviewee 5

These students believe that it is according to the personality of a teacher or the requirements of a certain subject that determine whether or not a class promotes motivational activities. Other students, however, believe otherwise. That is to say, that the teacher’s nativeness or non-nativeness is what really determines the strategies used in class.

Interviewee 6: I think it is the native speaker, teacher, because she basically gives us the PBIS class. And that's all the main base for this course to work in groups and in teams.

Researcher: Do you think it is more or less dependent on the course?

Interviewee 6: May be, but I think the native teacher is also prefer this way of teaching because she applied the same thing in Study Skills. And we also work on ourselves to do to get more ideas to improve our PBIS

In this domain, the ESL learner believes that motivation and teaching techniques are dependent on the teacher. This student was able to reach this conclusion when she recalled the native instructor teaching in two different contexts using the exact same technique that promotes autonomy.
Chapter 5: Discussion
5.1 Introduction

The aim of this study is to investigate students’ perceptions of their native and non-native teacher’s instructional practices as well as to know the techniques used by each type of teacher at the Intensive English Program at the American University in Cairo. Three methods were employed to answer both research questions. The researcher was able to detect areas that prompted students’ motivation and to explore their perceptions of both types of teachers.

5.2 Research question 1: What are IEP students’ perceptions of instructional practices of their native and non-native teachers?

In light of the acquired data, students seem to have a positive attitude towards their non-native teacher’s instructional practices in most of the areas tackled in the questionnaire and interview. First, the questionnaire generally points out to students’ preference for the non-native teacher than the native teacher. In the questionnaire, students were asked to respond with how far they agree or disagree on whether their native and non-native teachers explain difficult concepts well, answer questions and provide adequate explanations. Medgyes (1994) pointed out the uniqueness of the non-native teacher in providing language learning strategies that are more effective and are able to deliver more information to EFL/ESP/EAP learners in an adequate manner. In the same vein, results show that students perceive the non-native teacher to be more effective in explaining difficult concepts and providing adequate explanation that satisfies IEP students. When Benke and Medgyes (2005) conducted the questionnaire investigating the same item, they found that learners had a positive perception towards the non-native speaker for reasons such as NNESTs’ help in teaching the content using translation skills and providing the equivalent words in the learners’ L1. Moreover, according to the findings of the interview and to Madgyes’ (1994)
study, NNEST are better teachers at teaching L2 strategies effectively. The native teacher, however, does not spend the time that a non-native teacher spends over the explanation of teaching practices. NESTs, therefore, hold high expectations for ESL learners as they rely on students’ knowledge to understand basic information and concepts as interpreted by the native-speaker.

Second, having performed the T-test for statistical significance, most of the results indicate significant difference in favor of the non-native speaker with the exception of one item which is correct pronunciation. Students agreed that both the NEST and the NNEST have correct pronunciation. The results at the bottom of the p < 0.05 scale suggest that non-native teachers pay more attention to speaking skills. In contrast, it was the highest p<0.05 value in Benke and Medgyes. This suggests that non-native instructors are more focused on speaking skills and assisting students’ oral proficiency than NEST. Surprisingly, all of the three items that triggered speaking skills were not in favor of the native-speaker unlike most of the studies in the literature review have argued. Studies suggest that the native teachers are ideal teachers for pronunciation and speaking skills (Mermelstein, 2015; Moussu, 2002). The results of the t-test for this study, however, reveal no significant difference between both the native and the non-native teacher. Students’ responses in the interview provided in chapter four agree with the study by Phillipson (1992) who supported the NNEST, illustrating that a successful teacher is not restricted to being a native-speaker. This is clear when the student said:

"It's more of the teacher's behavior. Maybe or ... I don't know. A native speaker, can be good at speaking, but as a teacher, he's not attracting students to learn. You might just be ... he, she, he or she can might be native or non-native, but that most important"
characteristic that you would have is is how to get the students involved in the class. This is the most important one.” *Interviewee 5*

In this case it refutes what was tackled earlier by other studies claiming that students conceptualize NEST as better teachers in oral skills (Ali, 2009; Alwadi, 2013; Amin, 1997; Cook, 2005; Mermelstein, 2015). Not only do results contradict studies perceiving NESTs to be better teachers in speaking skills but they also identify the NNEST as a competent speaker whose language is identical to that of the native speaker as mentioned by the interviewee 7: “I didn’t know she was non-native. I thought that she was native.”

Non-native teacher’s ability to correct errors could be due to the mutual language that the learners and the teachers share enabling them to detect the error and relate it to the possible reasons behind it. Despite non-native teachers’ acquaintance with L1 to L2 transfer, they could also resort to learners’ L1 in ample instances especially that students know that their teacher can respond in Arabic. Such experience is rather considered as a drawback that will hinder students’ progress in acquiring the language. Another reason associated with the results of this item could be attributed to the fact that the non-native teacher is aware of the Egyptian education system, particularly in public schools. The majority of public-school students were never assessed on or studied listening or speaking. Because NNEST are aware of this fact, they try to put more emphasis on speaking skills as a means to catch up with what students have been missing out on the past academic years.

Third, it is worth noting that the statement ranking number one in terms of significant difference is teachers’ ability to correct learners’ writing errors. The results indicate contradiction with Mermelstein’s study (2015) that showed that NESTs have a better ability to correct learners’ writing errors with a mean of 3.384 (NNESTs’ mean is 1.915). In this study,
however, students agree that NNESTs have a better ability to correct learners writing errors with a mean of 4.353 (NESTs’ mean is 3.756). Writing includes many sub-skills, one of which is grammar. According to Benke and Medgyes’ questionnaire items, the non-native teacher seems to put more emphasis on grammar rules which shows the similarities between both studies and learners. The results of the questionnaire were in line with the results of the interview in which the NNEST was portrayed to represent a better writing teacher for identifying with students’ writing errors.

According to Mermelstein (2015), instructional behavior is related to motivation in a sense that students might lose their intrinsic motivation if they doubt their teacher’s ability to help them assess their language learning which is reflected in writing skills and speaking skills. Therefore, this item might reflect not only students’ satisfaction with their non-native teacher in their ability to assess their written progress, but also mirrors their willingness and motivation developed towards language learning. It also reinforces Medgyes (1994) belief in the different strengths of the non-native speakers for their effective language learning strategies.

Fourth, one can easily speculate the results of the item stating the ability of teachers to understand students’ difficulties related to learning English. As mentioned earlier in the literature review (Cook, 2005; Medgyes, 1994), researchers stressed the main advantage of the non-native teacher which is that they can empathize with the learners since they are both native speakers of the same language and encountered the same difficulties. That being said, NNEST can prepare students ahead of time in their learning experience. Drawing on this conclusion, the results show a significant difference with a point-value of 0.002. The mean value of 4.17 shows that learners perceive NNEST to be more understanding of students’ mistakes and difficulties to acquire the language.
Last but not least, to answer the first question, it is essential to know students’ perceptions of whether or not they behold their teachers to be ‘good.’ There was no definition of good given to students to keep it general according to one’s own perception of good. When Mermelstein (2015) comprised this question in his questionnaire, he attributed the definition of good to teachers who have extensive knowledge about the L2 culture, which might be somewhat subjective according to students’ answers to this previous item. Therefore, a good teacher is generally what students perceive to be an effective teacher. In this study, learners believe that NNESTs can make better English language teachers.

The results of the interviews complement the results of the questionnaire providing adequate explanation to such level of agreement. According to Cook (2005) and Madgyes (1994), the privileges of a NNEST reside in their familiarity with students’ difficulties in educational contexts. This is due to the fact that they have firsthand experience in going through the same process. Likewise, the results of the interview confirm that students are able to adapt to NNESTs’ instructional practices since the non-native teachers are more familiar with students’ academic needs. Moreover, the notion of culture was tackled earlier by Arva & Medgyes’ (2000) who suggested that NNESTs can deal with learners’ experience of a cultural shock. Accordingly, the instructional practices developed in class as well as the certain techniques implemented are all derived from the teachers’ knowledge of students’ psychological state in dealing with the language.

The findings of both the questionnaire and the interview on teacher’s instructional practices suggest that NNEST are (a) better at explaining L2 materials, (b) competent, near native speakers, and (c) understanding and sympathetic towards ESL learners’ mistakes. The
results also manifest the native teacher’s unrelatedness to learners’ difficulty in language acquisition.

5.3 Research question 2: What are the techniques used by NESTs and NNESTs to enhance student motivation?

First, in order to make sure learners understand what autonomous learning means in the questionnaire, independent learning was put in brackets next to it indicating synonymy (see Appendix C). In the questionnaire conducted by Benke and Medgyes, they found that NNESTs’ mean equaled 2.73 and a mean equaled 2.52 for NESTs which indicates that students believe that their non-native teachers are the ones allowing independent learning, also known as student-centered classroom setting. Likewise, this study reveals results that show significant difference of p-value 0.012. According to the MOLT scheme, the results contradict what was tackled earlier in the questionnaire and in the study by Benke and Medgyes that signified a higher mean for the non-native speaker to apply autonomous learning in class. The results of the MOLT, however, reveal that the native teacher resorts more to autonomous learning strategies, whereas the non-native teacher is more likely to promote cooperation in either discourse or cooperation during group activities such as moving around the groups and helping students in case they require assistance. It is worth mentioning, however, that the difference between the native and the non-native teacher in the first index, which is promoting autonomy, is slight with only 4% difference while the second index, which is promoting cooperation, the difference is 17%, which is a large difference. Moreover, the contradiction between both results could be due to the fact that students were not familiar with what autonomous learning means. This assumption was made based on students’ answers on what this strategy meant during the interview. The reason behind
mentioning this assumption is that the results of the interview reveal that NEST implement autonomous learning in class where the classroom shifts from being teacher-centered to student-centered.

Second in the teacher discourse in the MOLT scheme, it is worth mentioning that the techniques that both types of teachers depended on the most during class were: promoting autonomy, promoting cooperation, and scaffolding. Teachers also used other techniques to establish motivation such as social chat, signposting, stating the communicative purpose of the activity and establishing relevance. Regardless of the insignificant difference, the native speaker scored higher percentages in signposting, establishing relevance and scaffolding. This indicates the various techniques used by the native speaker over the 45 minutes observed. As for the non-native teachers they focused more on using two strategies interchangeably in their discourse or behavior: promoting autonomy or cooperation. They sometimes switched to scaffolding and arousing curiosity or attention to engage students in the activities implemented. This suggests that the native speaker somewhat balanced the time spent on the techniques suggested in teacher discourse whereas the non-native speaker concentrated on assisting students and allotting more time to them to express their feelings, thoughts and ideas. These results were similar to the findings by the interviews where students believed that NESTs used various teaching methods while NNESTs used only a few. A study by Chit Cheong (2009) revealed that students preferred NESTs for developing creative activities that entertain the students and help them have a positive attitude towards language learning. Furthermore, Self-Determination Theory developed by Deci and Ryan (1985) referred to two types of motivation: intrinsic and extrinsic. A teacher would be applying this theory if they are establishing relatedness, autonomy and value of behavior in a classroom, which is what native teachers do.
Third, mentioning the notion relatedness, students were asked about their degree of agreement (or disagreement) with whether their teachers provided extensive information about the culture related to the English language. Unsurprisingly, students in the study by Mermelstein were more confident in the native teachers to understand English speaking cultures. As for this study, it seems like it is the non-native teacher who puts more emphasis on English cultures. Moreover, language learning is not only associated with teaching learners the English language, but also the culture of L2, which is considered a key factor affecting students’ perspective of the language and may interfere in a negative transfer of L1 if students lacked L2 cultural awareness. Further, if students are able to acquire cultural knowledge, they will be motivated to develop a positive attitude towards language learning. It is due to the fact that students are motivated to learn a language from the movies, videos, tutorials and social media, which reflect the L2 culture. Beare (2013) suggested that the native teacher has more comprehensive knowledge of the L2 culture and may be able to assist in offering a better experience for L2 learners in this regard. However, this should not contradict the fact that the non-native teachers can provide the culture awareness learners need. This could be due to the fact that the non-native teacher is aware of the cultural differences since they have experienced the L1 culture and have reasonable knowledge of the L2 culture.

Fourth, correcting errors consistently is a technique used by some teachers with the belief of its positive results while neglecting the drawback linked to it. One main drawback attributed to correcting errors consistently is distorting learners’ self-image; thus, demotivating them to learn the language. The results of this study for this item figures at the top of the list in terms of significant difference indicated in the point-value zero. Students agree that non-native teachers were using this technique most of the time. In the interview section, the results provided
comprehensive information on how students feel about this technique implemented in class. Based on the findings of the interviews, it is reported that non-native teachers correct students’ mistakes more frequently than native teachers do. Most of the students expressed their feelings of nonchalance towards whether or not teachers practiced this strategy consistently. The findings partially agree with the results of the study by Wu and Ke (2009) that suggested that ESL learners were displeased with the fact that NESTs did not correct their conversational errors.

Fifth, if a teacher is interested or pretended to be interested in what his/her learners say when they express their feelings, students will feel praised, engaged and motivated to learn and to contribute to class activities. Benke and Medgyes reported higher results with a mean of 3.19 to the native teacher who is interested in students’ opinions. As for this study, it is reported that the non-native teacher is more interested in students’ opinions. To do this, teachers are required to have enough patience to allot time to students to speak. The interviews also suggest that NNEST are supportive and interested to listen attentively to students’ opinions as mentioned by a student whose NNEST tells them that “she's a psychiatrist, by the way, and she knows how to. I mean, how to motivate students to learn.”

Sixth, because the non-native speaker is reported to have a higher mean in correcting students consistently, it is expected that students feel more comfortable using English in a native teacher’s class. This is not, however, the case. The results show higher results to the non-native speaker. This is also linked with the results of students’ responses on how interested teachers are in students’ opinions, which illustrate positive results towards the non-native teacher. The interview responses, however, suggest that learners are equally comfortable.

Seventh, one of the most significant differences between NEST and NNEST that Benke and Madgyes (2005) investigated is the item that triggers assigning a lot of homework with a
mean score of 2.33 for the NEST and 4.04 for NNEST as tackled in their study. Surprisingly, the results found show no significant difference between the two. It would be critical to draw on an assumption that NNEST assign more homework with the slight difference of a 0.08 found. It seems that at the IEP teachers do assign a fair amount of homework to students.

Not only this item in the questionnaire that indicated no significant difference, but also items that reflect how both types of teachers implement group work and whether they speak most of the time during a lesson. While Benke and Madgyes provided data that illustrate students’ preference for NESTs for using group work regularly in class, students at the AUC seem to agree that both teachers were able to implement group work at the exact same level with a mean of 4.024 for both the native and the non-native teachers. According to the MOLT scheme, the participant organization index suggests that NESTs and the NNESTs implemented group activities including pair work which is a teaching strategy that ensures a student-centered classroom and promotes student talking time. This teaching technique made learners feel very motivated to acquire L2, as per the interviews. Moreover, the results reveal that the native teachers relied on group work 45.5% of the time while the non-native depended on group work 67.7% of the time which is more than half of the classroom duration. All in all, it can be concluded that both teachers use this technique equally.

Eighth, mentioning the various techniques used by teachers indicates that teachers use less teacher talking time and allot most of the class time to student talking time (STT), as shown in the results of the questionnaire. Unlike studies that were in favor of the native teacher, this study explains that students at the Intensive English Program favor both types of teachers equally in these three components. That is to say, students are motivated to receive knowledge related to the English language from both types of teachers using the same teaching technique.
Ninth, in the MOLT observation scheme, the activity design does not follow the primary focus coding strategy, as per Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008). That is, more than one index can be checked within this component. For example, an activity can have an element of interest while students are working on a tangible task product in a team competition. Moreover, the results reveal that non-native instructors were able to maintain more strategies that prompt students’ motivation except in individual completion since the non-native teachers depended more on team competition. Such activities can be best described as: personalized, included elements of interest or creativity, promoted intellectual challenge, was a tangible task product and organized for a team competition. Regardless of the significant difference compared to the NNESTs, NESTs relied on personalizing the activities as well as establishing an element of interest and creativity. However, team competing and tangible rewards were completely absent during the classes observed. Moreover in the classroom observation, NNESTs used motivational strategies in designing an activity for 11.7% of the class time whereas the NESTs designed motivational activities for only 5.2%.

Lastly in encouraging positive retrospective self-evaluation, autonomous learning was more thought of by the native teachers. It comes as no surprise that the strategy they use in giving feedback or evaluating students is elicitation of self or peer correction. This suggests that it is the students who voices their opinion in the work done by their peers including peer or self-correction of assignments. It is also worth mentioning that the NESTs only focused on two indexes which are: neutral feedback and elicitation of self or peer correction, overlooking the strategies that include praise for students on the answers they got correct or on the hard work they spared on an activity. As for non-native teachers, they focused more on neutral feedback and effective praise. NNESTs devoted time to all indexes in this component even if it were for a
short time during the class. Students were praised in multiple ways; they were evaluated through all three techniques mentioned. That is, they were told the correct answer, what and how to learn from their mistakes and were given the chance for peer/self-correction. NESTs can be viewed to be straight forward when it comes to evaluation, whereas NNESTs can be considered in light of their initial mentioned-above assumption to be more cooperative in class. That being said, non-native instructors look for various strategies that reflects cooperation with the learner. Such strategies were all reflected in using all indexes of this component such as providing all kinds of feedback as well as praise.

Highlighting similar results from the interviews, non-native instructors were also perceived to praise students and give rewards more than NESTs. Rewards are considered to be essential for extrinsic motivation. As per Noels, Clement and Pelletier (2001), students are likely to quit the learning process if they were not extrinsically motivated. Rewards, as mentioned in chapter four, were always associated with competitions. Students enjoyed the concept of a challenge either individual challenge or team competition that compels them to think creatively, critically and quickly to win the competition. In addition, students were entertained by the humorous chats initiated by their non-native teachers in class, which is essential for intrinsic motivation. It made them relax and got them detached from the workload they had to finish. As the results of the questionnaire suggest, students perceive NNESTs’ classes to be more interesting, apparently of the abovementioned results, unlike the study by Benke and Medgyes.

Last but not least, the motivational teaching behaviors utilized in the MOLT scheme reflect the motivational techniques used by each teacher to perform a certain activity. Students’ response to such techniques is important to triangulate the research results and perceive the data from different perspectives. This part of the discussion will elaborate on how students responded
to each teachers’ techniques. In table 4.5, the results reveal that students in NNESTs’ class were highly alert with a percentage of 83.3%. This means that they responded positively to the techniques above-mentioned. On the other hand, students in the NESTs’ class were highly alert with a percentage of 42.7%, which means that 57.3% of class time students were not alert. According to Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008), students who are reported to be highly alert are the ones who are on-task or attentive as a response to teacher’s motivational practices. In other words, they were focused when the teacher was talking, they responded correctly or appropriately, worked in groups as told, took an active role in activities assigned. If the results reported a higher percentage on low or very low in the component of alertness, which is the case with the native teachers, this could be variously interpreted as students focusing on off-tasks activities. According to Guilloteaux and Dörnyei, such activities could be side talks, using their cell-phones for unacademic purposes, day-dreaming or finishing up other teachers’ assignments.

In addition to the techniques used by NNESTs, they used their loud voice to ensure that students were focused and attentive. When students showed tendency to digress from the lesson, the teacher addressed the students, especially those who are unfocused or those who are causing the distraction.

Participation does not only refer to students raising their hands or engaging in the activity assigned by the teacher. It is also associated with taking part in class and in every event established in class. This includes group work, physical tasks, competition or a mere response to the teacher. A high participation is reflected by students in the NNESTs’ class. As for the NESTs, students showed high tendency of participation in only 23.3% of the time. These percentages are attributed to the activities employed in class. Therefore, the more group work and competitions a teacher applies, the higher students’ participation will be.
When students show eagerness to volunteer during oral activities as a response to teachers’ questions or even in group work with their classmates, this should be manifested in shouting “Me” or “Ms./Mr.” or any other gestures that can be translated to student’s willingness to take part in class. At this point, if more than one third of the students are willing to volunteer, this should be sufficient to mirror a representative sample. In this situation the index referring to the teacher nominating students or that students need encouragement to volunteer this means that less than one third of the students showed enthusiasm to contribute to a certain activity. The investigator only checked on teacher nominates students’ index when in situations where no one (or only one to two students) is raising their hands and the teacher, however, nominates someone else to express that they need to focus in class. If the teacher nominates a student, this should not be considered as a negative strategy, rather a solution that the teacher resorted to in order to keep students alert, for they are required to pay more attention during class. According to the findings of the MOLT scheme, it seems that the activities and teaching techniques used by NNESTs made learners very eager to volunteer with a percentage of 69.9%, while students responded to the NESTs activities with only 9.9% of willingness to voluntarily contribute to classroom activities.

According to the findings of the questionnaire, the MOLT observational scheme and the interviews for answering the second research question, it is interpreted that the native teacher (a) promotes autonomous learning, (b) develops creative activities, (c) uses varied motivational techniques, (d) establishes relatedness, (e) is concerned with intrinsic motivation. As for the non-native teacher, the results illustrate that the non-native teacher (a) is supportive and cooperative, (b) gives more encouraging rewards, (c) praises students for their linguistic progress, (d) develops more competitions in class, (e) establishes humorous entertaining chats, (f) is focused
on extrinsic motivation. The results also manifest that both types of teachers used group work equally and led interesting classes.

5.4 Implications

According to the findings of students’ responses in the interview, it seems that most of the students feel more motivated in the classes led by non-native teachers. Regardless of the different reasons they provided, most of the students seem to have one perception in common, which is understanding the ESL learners’ difficulties in acquiring the language; thus, tolerating their errors and appreciating their L2 production. As a result, students hold more positive perceptions towards being taught by the non-native English-speaking teacher. The findings of the interviews were as well supported by the results of the questionnaire and the learner’s behavior of the MOLT scheme in which it reveals students’ higher participation, alertness and eagerness to volunteer in classes taught by non-native English-speaking teachers. The implication of this study is not pointing out to the potential of non-native English-speaking teachers to overtake the education industry; rather, to shed light on the possible implication which is “which teachers can be more effective for lower levels of language proficiency in terms of instructional practices and motivational techniques? NEST or NNEST.” The study by LLurda (2005b) suggested that NNESTs are better teachers for low-level classes for the reasons mentioned such as sympathizing with students’ difficulties and understanding their feeling of attachment to their L1 or what other researchers describe as homesickness.

Also, the results highlight a new strand in teaching which is the concept of team-teaching suggested earlier in the study by Matsuda & Matsuda (2004). This concept fosters eclectic practice of both native and non-native teachers in the teaching process to provide better
education quality. Native teachers’ classes are more concerned with adopting the Self-determination theory in developing autonomy, competence and relatedness (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Applying this theory in the classroom will guarantee stimulating students’ intrinsic motivation. As for non-native teachers, a study by Noels et al (1999) pointed out to encouraging feedback and praising students’ progress will eventually orient them towards their needs as students; thus, prompting extrinsic motivation. It was also highlighted earlier that the sense of ownership given to students in group work and allowing more student talking time is expected to result is maximizing intrinsic motivation which both teachers have focused on in the learning process.

According to the results, teacher training and teacher education programs are required for both groups in order to address the various skills that should be developed and implemented in a classroom. NESTs and NNESTs need to identify with their points of strengths and points of weaknesses tackled in this study in order to improve their teaching methodology. Those programs and training sessions should also foster peer classroom observation, which will allow teachers to experience a panoramic view of the learning process and identify with both the teachers and students. The ELI, however, is constantly heading towards providing teachers with ample professional development programs and conferences to train AUC professors. Meetings, conferences and norming sessions are held regularly for teachers to share their experiences and teaching techniques. Along the same lines, acknowledging the differences of both types of teachers reinforces the fact that each type of teachers complements the other.

Another implication to highlight is the fact that the growing mass of research studies (Ali, 2009; Alseweed & Daif-Ullah, 2012; Alwadi, 2013; Javid, 2016) highlighting favoritism towards the native speaker in the education industry in the Arab region cannot be generalized. Therefore,
it is dependent on the geographical area of a country and the academic conditions it entails. The notion of native favoritism is not applicable in Egypt at the American University in Cairo with IEP students.

5.5 Limitations

While investigating the research questions, there were some restrictions and limitations that the researcher encountered. This study did not put into account variables such as the academic subject taught (e.g. Study skills, Perspectives, Connections, or Project based integrated skills) and the number of teaching hours taught by each type of teacher. During the interviews, some students pointed out that it depends on the subject that is taught (sometimes the personality of the teacher) and based on their nativeness (or non-nativeness). That is, if a subject depended mainly on activities such as PBIS and SS, students were more motivated to take part in the class. As mentioned earlier, some students had answers such as “I have 2 native teachers one is interesting and the other not interesting. And I have a non-native only half of her session is interesting the other half not interesting. It depends on what they are explaining to us and not on them.” If the subjects were standardized and limited to a certain subject or specific skills, students would have been more certain when articulating their responses.

Another limitation that was completely out of the investigator’s hand is the distribution of teachers for this academic semester, Fall 2019. Only six of 13 classes were taught by NEST and NNEST together. The sample size is only 89 of 228 students. For this reason, the sample size was inadequate which led to collecting limited responses than expected. Like Benke and Madgyes (2005), this study is also limited in geographic terms; that is, only in Cairo. Therefore,
inducing further research in this area is recommended for generalization, especially in the Arab region.

5.6 Suggestions for further research

At the AUC, students who graduate from the Intensive English Program are expected to either enroll in English 0210 course or RHET 1010 (a core course in the Department of Rhetoric and Composition) according to their grades. Students who score 74% in the writing component and 80% on an average are expected to admit to RHET 1010, students scoring below the mentioned scores will have to admit to English 0210. Students who enroll in either courses will not get full exposure of being taught by both types of teachers because they have a single class of English that is either taught by a native or a non-native. It would be interesting to investigate the perceptions of students who had to take IEP before being admitted to any of these courses. This will help the researchers evaluate whether students’ perceptions will change based on their needs as being enrolled in an advanced course for intermediate/advanced English users.
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Table 1. The Correct Use of English in the Classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>NEST's mean score</th>
<th>NNEST's mean score</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed) p&lt;0.005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 and Q2: Ability to use English correctly in class</td>
<td>3.819</td>
<td>2.921</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 and Q8: Correct pronunciation</td>
<td>3.882</td>
<td>2.641</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. The Ability to Help and/or Assist Students’ Language Learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>NEST's mean score</th>
<th>NNEST's mean score</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed) p&lt;0.005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3 and Q4: Ability to answer questions and/or provide adequate explanations</td>
<td>3.661</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 and Q10: Ability to correct learners’ speaking errors</td>
<td>3.839</td>
<td>1.903</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 and Q12: Ability to correct learners writing errors</td>
<td>3.384</td>
<td>1.915</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21 and Q22: Ability to accurately assess learners overall English abilities</td>
<td>2.738</td>
<td>1.941</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Teaching Methodologies and Pedagogy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>NEST's mean score</th>
<th>NNEST's mean score</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed) p&lt;0.005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q13 and Q14: Using textbooks as curriculum or main resource for teaching</td>
<td>2.114</td>
<td>3.479</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 and Q16: Use of authentic English teaching resources</td>
<td>2.835</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>NEST's mean score</td>
<td>NNEST's mean score</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) p&lt;0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19 and Q20: Ability to understand the difficulties learner's have learning ESL/EFL</td>
<td>2.377</td>
<td>2.323</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q=question

Table 4. Understanding L2 Learner’s Difficulties and Teachers’ Empathy towards Learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>NEST's mean score</th>
<th>NNEST's mean score</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed) p&lt;0.005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5 and Q6: Understanding of English speaking cultures</td>
<td>3.859</td>
<td>1.684</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17 and Q18: Make good English language teachers</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.039</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q=question

Table 5. General Perceptions towards their English Teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>NEST's mean score</th>
<th>NNEST's mean score</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed) p&lt;0.005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q23 and Q24: Comfortable using English in their classroom</td>
<td>2.281</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q=question

Table 6. Perceptions Regarding Their Own Comfort Level in the ESL/EFL Classroom.
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On native teachers

Please decide whether the following statements are typical/true of your native teachers of English and indicate the extent to which you agree with them.

Strongly disagree - 1
Disagree - 2
Neither agree, nor disagree - 3
Agree - 4
Strongly agree - 5

The native speaker teacher …

1. NS sticks more rigidly to lesson plan 1 2 3 4 5
2. NS is too harsh in marking 1 2 3 4 5
3. NS prepares learners well for the exam 1 2 3 4 5
4. NS applies pair work regularly in class 1 2 3 4 5
5. NS applies group work regularly in class 1 2 3 4 5
6. NS prefers traditional forms of teaching 1 2 3 4 5
7. NS speaks most of the time during the lesson 1 2 3 4 5
8. NS sets a great number of tests 1 2 3 4 5
9. NS directs me towards autonomous learning 1 2 3 4 5
10. NS is impatient 1 2 3 4 5
11. NS is happy to improvise 1 2 3 4 5
12. NS focuses primarily on speaking skills 1 2 3 4 5
13. NS puts more emphasis on grammar rules 1 2 3 4 5
14. NS prefers teaching ‘differently’ 1 2 3 4 5
15. NS relies heavily on the coursebook 1 2 3 4 5
16. NS prepares conscientiously for the lessons 1 2 3 4 5
17. NS corrects errors consistently 1 2 3 4 5
18. NS runs interesting classes 1 2 3 4 5
19. NS assigns a lot of homework 1 2 3 4 5
20. NS uses ample supplementary material 1 2 3 4 5
21. NS assesses my language knowledge realistically 1 2 3 4 5
22. NS provides extensive information about 1 2 3 4 5
the culture of English-speaking countries
23. NS is interested in learners’ opinion 1 2 3 4 5
**On non-native teachers**

Please decide whether the following statements are typical/true of your native teachers of English and indicate the extent to which you agree with them.

| Strongly disagree | - 1 |
| Strongly agree   | - 5 |
| Disagree         | - 2 |
| Neither agree, nor disagree | - 3 |
| Agree            | - 4 |

**The non-native speaker teacher ...**

1. NNS sticks more rigidly to lesson plan  
2. NNS is too harsh in marking  
3. NNS prepares learners well for the exam  
4. NNS applies pair work regularly in class  
5. NNS applies group work regularly in class  
6. NNS prefers traditional forms of teaching  
7. NNS speaks most of the time during the lesson  
8. NNS sets a great number of tests  
9. NNS directs me towards autonomous learning  
10. NNS is impatient  
11. NNS is happy to improvise  
12. NNS focuses primarily on speaking skills  
13. NNS puts more emphasis on grammar rules  
14. NNS prefers teaching ‘differently’  
15. NNS relies heavily on the coursebook  
16. NNS prepares conscientiously for the lessons  
17. NNS corrects errors consistently  
18. NNS runs interesting classes  
19. NNS assigns a lot of homework  
20. NNS uses ample supplementary material  
21. NNS assesses my language knowledge realistically  
22. NNS provides extensive information about  
   the culture of English-speaking countries  
23. NNS is interested in learners’ opinion
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEST assigns a lot of homework</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST uses group work in class regularly</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST directs me towards autonomous (independent) learning</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST explains difficult concepts well</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST corrects errors consistently</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST provides extensive information about the culture related the English language</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST pays for attention to speaking skills</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST is interested in student's opinion</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST has correct pronunciation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>☐</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>NEST answers questions and/or provides adequate explanation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST is able to correct learner's speaking errors</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST is able to correct learner's writing errors</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST is able to understand student's difficulties related to learning English</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST makes a good English Language teacher</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are comfortable in using English in your Native English Speaking Teacher’s (NEST) class time</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST runs interesting classes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEST speaks most of the time during lesson</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST assigns a lot of homework</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST uses group work in class regularly</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST directs me towards autonomous (independent) learning</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST explains difficult concepts well</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST corrects errors consistently</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST provides extensive information about the culture related the English language</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST pays more attention to speaking skills</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST is interested in student’s opinion</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST has correct pronunciation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST answers questions and/or provides adequate explanation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST is able to correct learner’s speaking errors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST is able to correct learner’s writing errors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST is able to understand student’s difficulties related to learning English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST makes a good English Language teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are comfortable in using English in your Non-native English Speaking Teacher’s (NNEST) class time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST runs interesting classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNEST speaks most of the time during lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>OTHER FEATURES OF TEACHER'S PRACTICE</td>
<td>TEACHER'S MOTIVATIONAL PRACTICE</td>
<td>ENCOURAGING POSITIVE RETROSPECTIVE SELF-EVALUATION</td>
<td>LEARNERS' BEHAVIOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(PO) Participant Organization</td>
<td>Teacher Discourse (TD)</td>
<td>PO Activity Design</td>
<td>Alertness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUB-TOTALS

**Motivational Orientation of Language Teaching (MOLT) Observation Scheme: Part A**  
© Guilloteaux & Dörnyei 2009
### Appendix E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s Motivational Practice</th>
<th>Discerption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Chat</strong></td>
<td>A chat irrelevant to the lesson. Can also be a humorous chat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signposting</strong></td>
<td>Referring to the objectives of a lesson/activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stating the communicative purpose or utility of the activity</strong></td>
<td>How an activity can be useful outside a classroom context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Establishing relevance</strong></td>
<td>relating an activity to what we face in real lives or relating it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promoting integrative values</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promoting instrumental values</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arousing curiosity or attention</strong></td>
<td>Teacher is changes intonation, speaks loudly, tells a story or asks a question in a way that arouses curiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scaffolding</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promoting cooperation</strong></td>
<td>Teacher roams around during group work, gives further instruction or answers random questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referential questions</strong></td>
<td>Teacher asks questions s/he does not know an answer to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group work</strong></td>
<td>Students work together in groups or answer questions as a whole class (without nominating a certain individual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair work</strong></td>
<td>Students work in pairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tangible reward</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personalization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Element of interest, creativity, fantasy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual challenge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tangible task product</strong></td>
<td>A tangible product that the students produce like creating a machine, a toy, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual competition</strong></td>
<td>Ss are competing against each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team competition</strong></td>
<td>Groups of Ss are competing against each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neutral feedback</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process feedback</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elicitation of self or peer correction</strong></td>
<td>Students reflects and corrects themselves or their peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective praise</strong></td>
<td>Praise that is more than merely saying excellent or good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class applause</strong></td>
<td>Most of the class claps for someone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>