

Research paper

**Native and Non-Native English Teachers Efficacy: Perceptions of Students
and Advisors**

Sobhi Yousef Abuhattab*, Ali Jamal Arafah

University of Nizwa

Abuhattab, S. Y., & Arafah, A. J. (2026). Native and non-native English teachers efficacy: perceptions of students and advisors. *Journal of new advances in English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 51-75.
Doi:10.22034/Jeltal.2026.8.1.3

* Corresponding Author Email: sobhiyousef@unizwa.edu.om

Abstract

The present study investigated the perceptions of the students and teacher advisors on the efficacy of native and non-native English teachers in language teaching and learning. This study employed both quantitative and qualitative methods to collect data from two groups of participants. The data were collected by surveying 400 students and 59 teacher advisors and interviewing 40 students and 10 advisors. The findings of this study indicated significant differences between the efficacy of both native and non-native English teachers in four aspects of teaching competencies, pedagogy, students' learning and awareness of students' cultural and social background. The students and teacher advisors perceived English native teachers as possessing the strengths of having a good command of the language, a superior ability to teach conversation and speaking, being a good model for teaching pronunciation and communication skills, having a good knowledge of vocabulary, as well as superior skill at teaching language, literature and culture. On the other hand, non-native English teachers possess strengths in teaching grammar, anticipating learners' difficulties, class management, understanding students' needs, engaging students in all activities, using varied teaching methods, and being an effective model of language learning. Both native and non-native English teachers need to develop their performance through reciprocal communication and co-operation. Creating an ideal environment in which native and non-native English teachers meet their full potential will be beneficial to improve teaching and learning.

Keywords: Native English Teachers; Non-Native English Teachers; Efficacy; Perceptions; Advisors, students

Received: 2025-07-17 **Revised** 2025-12-19 **Accepted** 2026-02-10

Introduction

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

As far as researchers are concerned, some advocate the native English teacher is a good model. For instance, Solovova (2019) believed that native English teachers had been one of the main factors of successful learning of English due to their fluency, obtaining better outcomes in oral and speaking skills. It could also be argued that native English teachers are better qualified to teach English, as they bring some unique skills to the classroom. This is because English is their mother tongue and they are simply more competent in English since they are a model for language learning (Novianti, 2018; Pae, 2017; Rasyid, et al., 2023). Zhang (2025) discussed how framing teachers as “non-native” could harm their agency and their students’ learning.

On the other hand, Llorca, (2014) claimed that non-native speaker teachers perform better in classroom management, since they have the knowledge of institutional culture, goals and classroom pedagogy. In addition, Kirkpatrick (2014) concluded that non-native teachers bring some unique skills to the classroom as they set realistic models for students in a way that native speakers cannot do. Moreover, Solano (2025) carried out a phenomenological study of non-native English speaking teachers' second language identity, experiences, and pedagogy. His study

revealed that nonnative English teachers' early experiences influenced their empathetic and asset-based approaches to teaching and became instructional tools that enabled them to connect with their students and create inclusive, empowering learning environments. In addition, Alemi et al. (2025) showed the advantages of non- native English speaking teachers' (NNETS) experience of learning, bilingualism and the equality of native English speaking teacher (NETS) and NNETs regarding their instructional competence in of the superiority of native speaking teachers (NSTs) due to their high level of language proficiency.

Two perspectives towards the efficacy English teachers; one stands for NETS and another stands for NNETS. The third perspective is represented by Mahboob (2018) who believes that an ideal English language-learning environment requires the co-operation of both native English teachers and non-native English teachers as learners can get benefits from both of their advantages. Additionally, Mahboob (2019) felt that the native and non-native English teachers complemented each other in their strengths and weaknesses. Moreover, Rao and Liu (2025) suggested a new model to examine the impact of co-teaching between native-English-speaker teachers (NETS) and nonnative-English-speaking teachers (NNETS) on students' learning of English. They found out positive effects on students' learning, behavior and assessment.

Tassev et al. (2025) carried out a mixed method study to explore students' attitudes towards English teachers (NETs) and non-native English teachers (NNETs). The results showed that participants were neutral in all areas of language instruction: empathy, grammar, learning materials, classroom, relationships, and motivation. However, they favored NETS in terms of fluency and cultural knowledge. The participants suggested that all teachers should be evaluated based on their personal pedagogical skills and knowledge rather than on their native language(s) backgrounds and/or nationality (Tassev, et al., 2025).

The main factor is the efficacy of native and non-native English teachers on teaching competencies and to what extent they influence students' learning. This difference of opinion is based on how much value is placed on the different expertise the two kinds of teacher offer – the perfect linguistic competence of the native speaker versus the fact that a non-native teacher has experienced a similar learning process to the students s/he will be teaching (Nagamine & Agudo, 2017).

In addition, these teachers are not necessarily more effective teachers in the Arab Gulf context due to cultural and social issues that may interfere with the learning process. Also, many factors can interfere and hinder the native speakers to do his job effectively such as understanding the students' needs, interests, culture, and methods of motivating them.

In fact, a few researchers would claim that non-native speakers are better-qualified language teachers than native speakers as they have struggled themselves to learn English and they know exactly where learners have difficulties (Nigar, & Kostogriz, 2019). Furthermore, non-native teachers have the ability to communicate in the native language when needed. This is especially useful in classroom management and during the explanation of some difficult learning issues like abstract concepts, some vocabulary, and grammatical rules. Sharing a mother tongue with students will also help in punctuality and discipline. Besides, non-native English teachers (NNETs) are more capable of understanding the students' cultural and social background. Hence, they can anticipate the challenges and difficulties that learners encounter due to their experience of both languages and their interference; they also understand learners' interests, needs and learning styles more profoundly (Hasanah & Utami, 2019; Hendriks, van Meurs & Usmany, 2023).

This research study aimed to investigate the students and advisors' perceptions about the efficacy of native and non-native English teachers in their teaching competencies and to find out

the strengths and weaknesses of NETs and NNETs. It has acknowledged so far that the general weakness of the students' English outcomes was due to the overall competencies of non-native English teachers and their effect on students' learning. Abuhattab (2017) stated that some Gulf Arab students have a significant deficit in their English language reading skills. Likewise O'Sullivan (2009) reported that English literacy problem is often seen as rooted in negative prior learning experiences from schools in the UAE.

Thus, many English native teachers had been hired to work in schools as a means of improving access to university and promoting a bilingual society. However, the problem was complicated, as English native speaking teachers had also brought observed drawbacks despite their personal familiarity with English language. In addition, some of their teaching competencies are less efficacious than expected and their impact on students' learning has not yet fulfilled expectations. Some of these drawbacks include poor classroom management, a mismatch between their own culture and students' culture and misunderstanding of students' cultural and social background, all of which has made the problem worse.

Some studies do not focus specifically on teaching efficacy, including instructional skills, classroom management, and assessment practices. Therefore, there is a lack of research that compares both students' and advisors' perceptions of the teaching efficacy of native and non-native English teachers within the same educational context.

To fetch the gap, the main objective of this study is to examine perceptions of teaching efficacy of native and non-native English teachers from the perspectives of students and advisors. In addition, to achieve the goal, the following research questions are prepared:

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

2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of NETs and NNETs from the students' perspective?
3. From teacher advisors' perspective is there a significant difference between the efficacy of NETs' and NNETs' teaching competencies and their effect on students' learning?
4. What are the strengths and weaknesses of NETs and NNETs from the teacher advisors' perspective?

Literature Review

It is beneficial to shed some light of the theoretical framework of the research. English teachers' efficacy is grounded in some motivational and social cultural theories. Both types of teachers usually construct their efficacy beliefs through experiences, social persuasion and other concepts like anxiety, confidence, feedback, adaptability (Bandura & Walters, 1977). For example, native speakers develop higher mastery experiences in English-speaking environments, whereas nonnative teachers might experience higher level at social persuasion in terms of feedback, encouragement and cultural adaptability with interacting with students. Additionally the social cultural theory emphasizes contextual, social, and cultural factors influencing efficacy development especially for nonnative speakers (Vygotsky, 1978).

Native English Teachers' Advantages and Disadvantages

Native English teachers are competent and knowledgeable in their language use, capable of serving as good models for learners (Deng, et al., 2023). Omord (2008) noted their role in pronunciation and linguistic accuracy, particularly in primary education; this emphasized that native teachers have the language knowledge advantage. In addition, Solovova (2019) stated that being a native speaker is a major factor of successful teaching since they provide authentic contexts

and motivate students. Furthermore, NETs are more competent in teaching writing (Tajeddin & Shayeghi, 2019; Wang, 2024). Moreover, some students preferred NETS for mastering language accuracy, fluency and accurate pronunciation (Deng, et al., 2023). Other studies stated that he NETs were strong in teaching oral communication (Guerra & Martínez Agudo, 2017). Likewise, Demir (2017) found out that students preferred native teachers for fluency, pronunciation, and vocabulary. However, Huong (2021) found out the NETS needed to realize their strengths and weaknesses and found solutions to minimize disadvantageous factors and maximize benefits to motivate students toward learning English in classes with foreign teachers. In contrast, Nghi and Khuong (2021) carried out a research to investigate communication problems between Vietnamese learners of English and Native teachers and found misunderstandings between them when they interpret things or present academic matters.

In addition, native teachers may reflect their cultural concepts and values on students, which can cause cultural conflicts and mismatch with their traditional culture (Fatahillah, 2024). Ke and Wu (2009) found that Taiwanese students expected more interaction and encouragement from native teachers, while teachers reported students' passiveness.

Non-Native English Teachers' Advantages and Disadvantages

Hendriks, Meursand Usmany (2023) reported that NNATs share cultural and linguistic backgrounds with students, enabling them to anticipate challenges and meet learning needs effectively as they understand students' culture and learning styles. In addition, other studies stated that he participants perceived that NNETs teach grammar better (Kiczkowiak & Lowe, 2024). Additionally, Ghane and Razmi (2023) claimed that non-native teachers might be more effective since they have experienced language learning themselves and understand students' difficulties

better. Non-native teachers can anticipate problems due to their shared culture and mother tongue as well as their learning experience.

On the other hand, some non-native teachers speak with strong accents or non-standard English, affecting pronunciation and fluency (Hasanah & Utami, 2019). Additionally, some participants expressed concern about NNETs' pronunciation (Wardak, 2014; Xu, 2012).

Creese et al. (2014) noted that native teachers have authenticity of language, while non-native teachers possess authenticity of pedagogy. Todd (2009) found that attitudes toward native and non-native teachers are complex, with explicit preference for natives but warmer feelings toward non-natives who may serve as realistic models and can motivate students effectively. Additionally, Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (2013) who believe that both types of teacher's complement each other in their points of strength and weaknesses. Additionally, both types of teachers had unique qualities, and that the ideal situation for language learning and teaching is when both are working together (Selvi et al., 2024)

Thus, two main perspectives have been found out, the first one stands for the NATS as a good model of Language teaching and another perspective stands for NNATS as a model of language learning. However, a third perspective stands between the two and states that the ideal environment should include both types of teachers who might create a good model of these teachers who might complement each other in their strengths and weaknesses.

Methodology

This study employed a descriptive approach using both quantitative and qualitative methods to collect data from two groups of participants. The survey represents the quantitative aspect of this research and interviews represented the qualitative aspect. Thus, the research conducted here

combined both qualitative and quantitative methods in a combined method approach to verify the sources of data collection and triangulate the results (Creswell, 2012).

Participants

The participants of this study came from a large population of public secondary school students in Al-Ain, aged from 16–18 years, who have been learning English since grade one and have been taught by non-native English teachers. Ten public secondary schools in Al-Ain were selected to represent the four geographical directions as well as the city center. Four hundred students from these schools completed the questionnaire and 40 of them volunteered to be interviewed in four focus groups. Regarding the teacher advisors, 59 out of 120 responded to the questionnaire and 10 of them agreed to be interviewed in a 2 semi structured focus groups.

Instruments

After reviewing the literature and related research, the research methodological instruments have been developed for this research study. The two different questionnaires were prepared according to answer the research questions. Both questionnaires tackled four main areas: pedagogy, students' learning, teachers' competencies and cultural backgrounds. Additionally, the interview questions as well as follow up ones were prepared.

Validity and Reliability

Both instruments had been reviewed and approved by a panel of experts and their notes were considered and modified. Cronbach's Alpha reliability was used to judge the internal consistency of their answers. Cronbach's Alpha was found .86 for the students' questionnaire and it is .92 for

the advisors' Questionnaires. The interviews were transcribed, prepared by two researchers to ensure interrater reliability. A jury of referees was asked to revise and measure the validity of the research instruments; questionnaires and interview questions. Then, both instruments were piloted on a small group of participants. After that, they were revised in light of referees' comments and pilot questionnaires and interviews. Finally, two versions of the questionnaires and interviews were developed and available for implementation. The researchers got permission from Al-Ain Educational Zone. The department of the curriculum usually reviews questionnaires or research instruments to ensure that such things would not cause any psychological or physical harm to participants. In addition, a formal letter was sent to all the schools to facilitate the work of the researchers. Then, the researchers started coordinating with the school principals and all the stakeholders to distribute the questionnaires and collect them, and then to carry out the interviews with the students and the teacher advisors.

Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

The data obtained from the participants' questionnaires were coded and analyzed through mean scores and Independent t test to assess the differences between the NET and NNET. The qualitative data collection was conducted in four focus groups; the first interview question was "Do you prefer to be taught by an English native speaking teacher or an Arab bilingual teacher? Why?" The data analysis of the interview was carried out by transcribing and coding the responses into themes like NETs' and NNETs' strengths and weaknesses.

Anonymity was used to ensure confidentiality and all participants were asked to join this study willingly and voluntarily. Permission was issued by Al-Ain Educational Zone to carry out the study. In addition, parents' consent was taken from participants' parents.

Results

The results of the first research question that address four categories; teaching, competences, students' learning, cultural, and social background, are displayed in Tables 1- 5. Table 1 shows the means of both NETs and NNETs regarding the competencies. As an overall trend, the mean score for NNETs (3.77) is significantly greater than the mean score for NETs (3.55) in the category of competencies.

Table 1

The Mean of Students Responses Regarding Teacher Competencies

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

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

Table 2 shows no significant difference between NETs and NNETs in this category of pedagogy as a whole; however, there are significant differences in some subcategories. As an overall trend, the mean score for NNETs (3.64) is very similar to the mean score for NETs (3.64). However, there are significant differences between NETs and NNETs in four subcategories' two in favor of each. First, NETs' mean score rates higher in being a model for teaching conversation and speaking, and a model for teaching pronunciation. NNETs' mean score rates higher in using varied evaluation methods and giving useful feedback.

Table 2

The Mean of Students Responses Regarding Teacher Pedagogy

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

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

Table 3 shows a significant difference in favor of NETs. NET's mean score (3.85) is higher than NNETs' mean score (3.70). There are also significant differences in the mean score in six subcategories in favor of NETs and four categories in favor of NNETs and they are nearly similar in the other two subcategories.

Table 3

The Mean of Students Responses Regarding Students' Learning

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

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

Table 4 shows a significant difference in the mean scores between NETs and NNETs in the favor of NNETs. As an overall trend, the mean score for NNETs (4.01) is significantly greater than the mean score for NETs (3.21). NNETs are superior in four subcategories.

Table 4

The Mean of Students Responses Regarding Social and Cultural Background

Social and Cultural Background	Mean		t
	N	NN	
encourages me to learn English.	3.39	4.32	-1-0.083-**
builds social relationships with the class and with me	3.59	3.65	-.580-
helps me individually when I have a problem.	3.18	3.73	-4.759-**
is sensitive to our culture and values.	3.08	3.64	-4.932-**
gives us opportunities to express our opinions.	3.02	4.34	-11.583-**
gives examples pertinent to my cultural background.	3.01	4.35	-11.958-**
Total	3.21	4.01	-11.889-**

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

Table 5 which presents an overall view of the students' perception about the efficacy of NETs and NNETs on teaching and learning. The mean score of the whole categories for NNETs (4.01) is significantly greater than the mean score for NETs (3.56). NNETs receive higher and more positive responses in two subcategories; teaching competencies and cultural and social background, while NETs rate higher in students' learning. They are similar in pedagogical effectiveness.

Table 5

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

Total	Mean		t
	N	NN	
Competencies	3.55	3.77	-2.853-**
Pedagogy	3.64	3.66	-.186-
Students' learning	3.85	3.70	3.651**
Social and cultural Background	3.21	4.01	-11.889-**
Total	3.56	3.78	-4.988-**

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

The second research question is "What are the strengths and weaknesses of NETs and NNETs from the students' perspective?"

NETs' Strengths

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

NETs' Weaknesses

Native speaking teachers are perceived to be weak in the following; engaging students in all activities, using a variety of effective teaching methods and strategies, relating the subject to students' needs and interests, and having the ability to control and manage the class. NETs are believed to be less able to anticipate students' learning difficulties, to be a model of foreign language learning, to make class a positive learning environment or help students learn grammar well. In addition, it is perceived that they influence students' culture negatively and have a difficulty in understanding students' needs and culture because NETs do not share Arabic language and culture. Besides, they have some difficulty in teaching grammar and as some of them are unqualified.

NNETs' strengths and weaknesses

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

NNETs' weaknesses

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

Similar to students' perspective, the results of the third research question data collected by advisors address four categories; teaching, competences, students' learning and cultural and social background, are displayed in Tables 7- 11.

Table 6 presents the means of both NETs and NNETs. As general trend, the mean score for NETs (4.10) is significantly greater than the mean score for NNETs (3.63) in the category of teaching competencies. NETs receive four out of five positive responses in subcategories; a good model of accurate pronunciation, conversational skills, and language fluency in general, and the

sharing of English literature and culture. In contrast, NNETs receive only one positive response in the category of being a model of language learning.

Table 6

The Mean of Advisors Responses Regarding Teacher Competencies

Teaching Competencies	Mean		t
	N	NN	
a good model of accurate pronunciation.	4.33	3.48	3.996**
a good model for conversational skills.	4.33	3.62	3.367**
a good model for English literature and culture.	4.43	3.55	3.887**
a good model for language fluency	4.37	3.41	4.233**
a good model for foreign language learning.	3.03	4.07	-3.594**
Total	4.10	3.63	3.495**

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

Table 7 shows no significant difference between the mean scores of NETs and NNETs over the whole category; however, there are significant differences in six subcategories; five where the NNETs are perceived more favorably like and one in favor of NETs. The table also shows that the difference is significant in favor of NNETs in terms of classroom management, using clear instructions, easily understood by students and relating the subject matter to students' needs and interests, catering for different abilities and learning styles through differentiation. In contrast, NETs are superior in integrating technology and self-reflection and self-assessment.

Table 7

The Mean of Advisors Responses Regarding Teacher Pedagogy

Pedagogy	Mean		t
	N	NN	
plans lessons to meet students' learning needs.	3.43	3.83	-1.638 -
uses appropriate strategies in teaching.	3.47	3.93	-1.659
uses appropriate activities and techniques in teaching.	3.57	3.48	.276
shows high capability of class management.	2.67	3.93	-4.811**
makes use of proper learning resources (modern technology)	4.13	3.69	2.041 *
uses clear instructions, easily understood by students.	3.07	3.86	-2.966 **
gives students appropriate and useful feedback.	3.40	3.90	-1.796
relates the subject matter to students' needs and interests.	3.37	3.90	-2.195- *
uses appropriate and varied evaluation methods	3.47	4.00	-1.925-
caters for different abilities and learning styles through differentiation.	3.70	4.21	-2.205-*
engages students in reflection and self-assessment to enable goals setting.	3.47	2.97	2.095*
Total	3.48	3.74	- 186-

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

Table 8 shows a significant difference between NETs and NNETs in the favor of NNETs. NNET's total mean score (3.66) rates higher than NETs' mean score (3.59). There are also significant differences in the mean score in three of the subcategories in favour of NETs and four subcategories in favor of NNETs, while in the other two subcategories there is little difference in how the efficacy of the two types of teacher is rated as shown in the following table.

Table 8
The Mean of Advisors Responses Regarding Students' Learning

Students' Learning	Mean		
	N	NN	t
understands different learning styles.	3.20	3.31	-.410-
anticipates learning difficulties.	3.83	3.66	-3.074**
makes class a positive learning environment.	3.67	3.66	.041
helps improve students' reading skills	4.23	3.52	3.022**
helps improve students' oral skills.	4.37	3.45	4.537**
uses only English throughout the lesson and outside.	4.47	3.83	2.995**
teaches grammar efficiently.	3.10	3.76	-2.366-*
improves the writing skills of the students.	3.27	3.79	-2.032-*
encourages students use new words in contexts.	3.17	3.93	-3.101**
Total	3.59	3.66	3.651**

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

Table 9 shows a significant difference in the mean score between NETs and NNETs in favor of NNETs in the whole category and 4 subcategories. As an overall trend, the mean score for NNETs (3.28) is significantly greater than the mean score for NETs (2.48).

Table 9
The Mean of Advisors Responses Regarding Social and Cultural Background

Social and Cultural Background	Mean		
	N	NN	t
is sensitive to our culture and values.	2.53	3.34	3.273-**
helps students individually when having a problem.	2.47	3.41	3.309-**
builds social relationships with the students.	2.63	3.10	1.631-
examples that are pertinent to students' cultural background.	2.40	3.38	3.048-**
understanding of students' cultural and social background	2.37	3.17	2.587-*
Total	2.48	3.28	3.981-**

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

Table 10 shows the results of the teacher advisors' perception that display no significant difference between the efficacy of NETs and NNETs in the mean scores of the four categories. However, there are significant differences in two subcategories: teaching competencies are perceived to be more effective in the case of NETs, while positive responsiveness to cultural and social background is perceived to be more developed in NNETs. In the other subcategories; pedagogy and students' learning, no significant differences were shown.

Table 10

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

Total	Mean		T
	N	NN	
Pedagogy	3.48	3.74	-1.496-
Students' learning	3.59	3.66	-.734-
Competencies	4.10	3.63	3.495**
Social and cultural Background	2.48	3.28	-3.981-**
Total	3.41	3.58	-1.909

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

The fourth research question, "What are the strengths and weaknesses of NET and NNETs from the teacher advisors' perspective?"

NETs' Strengths

Overall, the strengths of NETs are listed as follows. Firstly, they seem better at using proper learning resources and to engage students in reflection and self-assessment to enable goal setting. Secondly, they are effective at improving reading and oral skills, partly through using only English throughout the lesson and outside. Thirdly, they model more accurate pronunciation, greater fluency in spoken English, and are excellent in developing communicative skills. Fourthly, they are more skilled at teaching authentic English, and have superior knowledge of English literature and culture, and fluency.

NETs' Weaknesses

Firstly, students cannot communicate easily with them, as they have not got the ability to translate from English to Arabic, which is needed for some explanation and abstract nouns. Secondly, NETs are not aware of the differences between English and their students' mother tongue so they cannot anticipate their students' linguistic problems or cultural needs. Thirdly, some NETs demonstrated inability to build effective relationships with students due to a lack of knowledge about students' culture, needs and abilities. Fourthly, they are not highly skilled, difficulties in dealing with weak students, poor class management, and control.

NNETs' Strengths

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

NNETs' Weaknesses

They demonstrate a lack of spontaneity in English, and a lack of competency in teaching a second language, as they lack fluency and may resort Arabic from time to time. In addition to the

lack of fluency, they have a poor accent, and make inaccurate models of spoken English; they cannot help their students to speak English fluently and naturally.

Discussion

The two types of teachers are expected to be differentiated due to their differentiated backgrounds, knowledge, culture and their nature. The NETs have already acquired the language while NNETs are still acquiring the language. Moreover, NNETs have already lived the culture of the students and are more capable of understanding his social, cultural, instructional needs, challenges and readiness. Another important point is that teaching is not only giving instruction but it is also a comprehensive process of developing the students. Furthermore, this research was an attempt to seek insights not only from the targeted participants but also from the advisors who are experts and can grant the study insightful inputs and results.

This study sheds some light on the specific advantages of NETs and NNETS and congruent with the researchers Deng et al. (2023) who stated that NETs are competent and capable of serving as good models for accuracy. Similarly, the study was in line with other researchers (Demir, 2017; Omord, 2008; Solovova, 2019) noted that NETs have the language knowledge advantage who provide authentic contexts and motivate students and having superiority in fluency, pronunciation, literature and English culture. In contrast, native teachers may reflect their cultural concepts and values on students, which can cause cultural conflicts and mismatch with their traditional culture (Fatahillah, 2024).

The results also are consistent with other researchers that NNETs are superior in their ability to anticipate language-learning difficulties, teaching grammar, and understanding the cultural background of the learners (Walkinshaw & Duong, 2012; Wang, 2024). However, the results are

different from the findings that showed NETs are more competent in teaching writing (Tajeddin& Shayeghi, 2019; Wang, 2024). What is interesting is that the strengths of NETs are the weaknesses of NNETs and vice versa. For example, some participants expressed concern about NNETs' pronunciation (Wardak, 2014; Xu, 2012) while others preferred NETS for mastering the accuracy and pronunciation (Deng et al., 2023).

The results of the study showed significant differences in some categories and both NETs and NNETS have their own strengths and weaknesses. Such results are congruent with Samimyand Brutt-Griffler (2013)who believe that both types of teachers complement each other in their points of strength and weaknesses.Similarly to Mahboob(2019) whose participants felt that NETs and NNETs can together create a conducive learning environment. Also, other studies stated that he participants perceived that NNETs teach grammar better, whereas NETs were strong in teaching oral communication (Guerra &MartínezAgudo, 2017; Kiczowski& Lowe, 2024). Additionally, both types of teachers had unique qualities, and that the ideal situation for language learning and teaching is when both are working together (Selvi, et al., 2024).

Both NESTs and NNESTs contribute uniquely to English language teaching, which has important pedagogical implications. First, teacher recruitment and professional development programs should focus on teaching competence rather than nativeness (Deng et al., 2023). Studies show that NNESTs often excel in explaining grammar explicitly, anticipating learners' difficulties, and using learners' first language strategically to support comprehension . Schools and universities should promote collaborative teaching models where NESTs and NNESTs work together. Such collaboration allows students to benefit from NESTs' strengths in pronunciation, fluency, and cultural knowledge, alongside NNESTs' strengths in learning strategies, exam preparation, and empathy with language learners (Mahboob, 2010).

Conclusion

NATS are a good model of Language teaching NETs' strengths were found in good command of the subject matter, accurate pronunciation, fluency, improving students' oral skills, and technology integration. They have a few weaknesses like poor classroom management, inability to understand students' learning or social and cultural needs, and lack of variety in teaching methods. NNATS were found out as a model of language learning. NNETs' strengths were good classroom management, understanding students' learning and cultural needs, using varied teaching methods, anticipating learners' difficulties, and teaching grammar effectively. Their weaknesses were inaccurate pronunciation, the overuse of Arabic, inaccuracy and lack of fluency, and lack of command in the subject matter.

The ideal learning environment is the one where both NETs and NNETs collaborate and share expertise. NETs can model fluency, pronunciation, and authentic use of language, while NNETs can support learners through shared language, culture, and experience. This integration of strengths would ensure a balanced and effective teaching context. The findings of the study thus demonstrate that the most beneficial outcome occurs when native and non-native English teachers cooperate, complementing each other's strengths and compensating for weaknesses.

Both types of teachers are needed to create an ideal learning environment that promotes linguistic competence and cultural understanding. NETs bring authenticity of language, while NNETs bring authenticity of pedagogy. Their collaboration will enhance professional growth, improve teaching practices, and support student achievement. This study provides valuable insights into how both NETs and NNETs can work together in harmony, supporting each other's efforts to provide high-quality English language instruction in multicultural educational contexts.

The study is limited to only high school students and in one school year. Upon the light of the results, it is recommended the following: a) More research is needed and sample more stages, b) Quasi-experimental studies are also suggested to measure the impact of native and nonnative English teachers, and c) Recruitment standards and measures for choosing English teachers are advised to be revised and updated to ensure the selection of good models of teachers.

References

- Abuhattab, S. Y. A. (2017). *The impact of tablet digital texts vs. print texts on seventh grade students' reading achievements, strategies and motivation* (Doctoral dissertation, United Arab Emirates University, College of Education). Scholar Works@UAEU.
- Alemi, M., Tajeddin, Z., & Maleknia, Z. (2025). Struggling to create space for non-native teacher identity: novice and experienced EFL teachers' perspectives. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 13 (2), 1-16.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman.
- Creese, A., Blackledge, A., & Takhi, J. K. (2014). The ideal 'native speaker' teacher: Negotiating authenticity and legitimacy in the language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(4), 937-951.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th Ed.). Pearson.
- Demir, Y. (2017). What, how and why? A multi-dimensional case analysis of the challenges facing native and non-native EFL teachers. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, 54, 141-176.
- Deng, L., Zhang, L. J., & Mohamed, N. (2023). Exploring native and non-native English speaker teachers' perceptions of English teacher qualities and their students' responses. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1-9.
- Fatahillah, B. F. (2024). The challenges and strategies faced by native and non-native teachers teaching in an ESL context: A case study. *Journal of Research, Education, and Learning*, 19(19)1-18.
- Ghane, M. H., & Razmi, M. H. (2023). Exploring the effectiveness of native and non-native English teachers on EFL learners' accuracy, fluency, and complexity in speaking. *Education Research International*, 2023 (1), 1-8.
- Guerra, L., & Martínez Agudo, J. D. (2017). Students' perceptions and expectations of native and non-native speaking teachers. *Native and non-native teachers in English language classrooms: Professional challenges and teacher education*, 2017, 183-204.
- Hasanah, N., & Utami, P. T. (2019). Emerging challenges of teaching English in non-native English-speaking countries: Teachers' view. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 2(3), 112-120.
- Hendriks, B., van Meurs, F., & Usmany, N. (2023). The effects of lecturers' non-native accent strength in English on intelligibility and attitudinal evaluations by native and non-native

- English students. *Language Teaching Research*, 27(6), 1378-1407. <http://www.adec.ac.ae/english/pages/missionvision.aspx>
- Huang, Z., Huang, Z., & Zhang, Z. (2017). *Native and non-native English speaking teachers in China*. Springer.
- Huong, N. G. (2021). Effectiveness of English-speaking foreign teachers from the learners' perspective at Ho Chi Minh University of Food Industry. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 3(6), 101-106.
- Ke, C., & Wu, K. (2009). Haunting native speakerism? Students' perceptions toward native speaking teachers in Taiwan. *English Language Teaching*, 2(3), 44-52.
- Kiczowskiak, M., & Lowe, R. J. (2024). Native-speakers in English language teaching: 'Native speakers' more likely to be invited as conference plenary speakers. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 45(5), 1408-1423.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). The language (s) of HE: EMI and/or ELF and/or multilingualism?. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 4-15.
- Llurda E (2014) Non-native teachers and advocacy. In: Bigelow M and Ennsner-Kananen J (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Educational Linguistics*. New York: Routledge, 105–116.
- Mahboob, A. (2018). Beyond global Englishes: Teaching English as a dynamic language. *RELC journal*, 49(1), 36-57.
- Mahboob, A. (2006). Confessions of an 'Enraced' TESOL professional. In A. Curtis & M. Romney (Eds.), *Color, race, and English language teaching: Shades of meaning* (pp. 173–188). Mahwah, New Jersey and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Nagamine, T. & Agudo, J. M. (2017). The potential for non-native teachers to effectively teach speaking in a Japanese EFL context. In J. D. Martínez (Ed.), *Native and non-native teachers in English language classrooms: Professional challenges and teacher education* (pp. 151–170). Boston/Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Nghi, T. T., & Khuong, L. Q. (2021). A study on communication breakdowns between native and non-native speakers in English speaking classes. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 3(6), 1-6.
- Nigar, N., & Kostogriz, A. (2019). Deconstructing non-native English-speaking teachers' professional identity: Looking through a Hybrid Lens. *English Language Teaching*, 12(12), 76-87.
- Novianti, A. (2018). Native versus non-native English speaking teachers: An insight into Indonesian students' voices. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 18(1), 44-57.
- Ormord, J. E. (2008). *Educational Psychology: Developing learners*. Pearson. Phillips.
- O'Sullivan, A. (2009). Reading in the Gulf: Is it time for a re-focus? *Cultivating Real Readers* 2, 43-51. Retrieved from <http://marifa.hct.ac.ae/files/2009/04/Reading-in-the-Gulf-Is-itTime-for-a-Re-Focus.pdf>
- Pae, T. I. (2017). Effects of the differences between native and non-native English-speaking teachers on students' attitudes and motivation toward learning English. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 37(2), 163-178.
- Rao, Z., & Liu, F. (2025). The effects of co-teaching between native and non-native teachers on students' English writing proficiency in an EFL context. *Language Teaching Research*, 29(2), 374-396.
- Samimy, K. K., & Brutt-Griffler, J. (1999). To Be a Native or Non-Native Speaker: Perceptions of "Non-Native" Students in a Graduate TESOL Program. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-Native*

- Educators in English Language Teaching* (pp. 127-144). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Selvi, A. F., Yazan, B., & Mahboob, A. (2024). Research on “native” and “non-native” English-speaking teachers: Past developments, current status, and future directions. *Language teaching*, 57(1), 1-41.
- Solano, M. (2025). *Pedagogical Insights: A Phenomenological Study of Non-Native English Speaking Teachers' Second Language Identity, Experiences, and Pedagogy* (Doctoral dissertation, Southern New Hampshire University).
- Solovova, O. (2019). Opening up ideological spaces for multilingual literacies at the margins of the Portuguese education system? Ethnographic insights from a Russian complementary school. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 25(9), 161-190
- Tajeddin, Z., Atai, M. R., & Shayeghi, R. (2019). Native and non-native teachers' changing beliefs about teaching English as an international language. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, (Special Issue on Iranians Views of Cultural Issues), 7(2), 1-14.
- Tassev, V., Carlet, A., & Valls, M. P. (2025). Students' attitudes towards native and non-native English teachers in the Thai EFL tertiary context. *rEFLECTIONS*, 32(3), 1594-1610.
- Todd, R. W., & Pojanapunya, P. (2009). Implicit attitudes towards native and non-native speaker teachers. *System*, 37(1), 23-33.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Walkinshaw, I., & Duong, O. T. H. (2012). Native-and Non-Native Speaking English Teachers in Vietnam: Weighing the Benefits. *Tesl-Ej*, 16(3), 1-16
- Wang, C. (2024). Exploring students' generative AI-assisted writing processes: Perceptions and experiences from native and nonnative English speakers. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, 1-22.
- Wardak, M. (2014). Native and non-native English speaking teachers' advantages and disadvantages. *Arab World English Journal*, 5(3), 124-141.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1992). ELT and EL teachers: Matters arising. *ELT journal*, 46(4), 333-339.
- Xu, H. (2012). *Challenges native Chinese teachers face in teaching Chinese as a foreign language to non-native Chinese students in US classrooms*. Master Thesis. Department of Teaching, learning and Teacher Education, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, USA.