



EFFECTS OF ARABIC AND ENGLISH SPEAKING TEACHERS ON HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' WRITING ACHIEVEMENT

Omar Al Noursi¹

Dr., Lead Faculty at the Institute of Applied Technology,
Adjunct Faculty at Abu Dhabi University, UAE

Abstract

This research investigates the effectiveness of English Speaking Teachers in comparison with Arabic Speaking Teachers on secondary Arabic-speaking students' achievement in writing as measured against overall essay writing achievement and four individual writing abilities, namely communicative effectiveness, the range of vocabulary, accuracy, and mechanics of writing. Data was collected from 196 students' written essays from a high English- medium school where both Native-English speaking teachers of English and Arabic- Speaking teachers of English taught monolingual students. The results showed that there was no significant difference between students' overall achievement in writing skills due to the teachers' native language. However, there was a significant difference in the vocabulary range and accuracy areas due to teachers' native language in favor of the Native English Speaking Teachers (NEST) in the former and in favor for the Non-Native English- Speaking Teachers (NNEST) for the latter. It also revealed that there was no significant difference between the two groups in the communicative range and mechanics of writing skills.

Keywords: accuracy, NEST, None-NEST, rubrics, mechanics of writing, writing abilities

1. Introduction

Beyond doubt, learning to write coherently, and in a way that is appropriate for one's purpose and audience, is something that many students never achieve in their first language. The process, then, is a bit more difficult in a second language as it requires development in all other language skills including grammatical, lexical, functional and outlining skills. Nonetheless, for high school students, strong writing skills may enhance their chances for success not only English but also other content areas as English is increasingly used as a language of instruction in many programs and institutions.

¹ Correspondence: email omar66noursi@gmail.com

Therefore, the field of second language writing has raised theoretical concerns about how students improve writing skills. While some authors have looked into process writing as the optimum way to improve the skill (Roca de Larios, Murphy, & Marín, 2002), others have explored the effects of error feedback on writing proficiency (Al Noursi 2015), and the processes involved in reading-to-write (Ruiz-Funes, 2001). Silva (1993), maintained the impact of mother tongue language composition theories on improving the second language writing. However, due to the complexity of writing skill in second language, teachers play a major role in facilitating the development of writing skills. It is the teachers' job to improve students' essay writing and motivate them to write more and better; they can select the best techniques that fit learners' needs, and so choose or even improvise what they think would be effective to teach writing skills.

Developing writing proficiency, widely acknowledged as an essential element in the process of teaching, requires considerable efforts by the teacher to build such proficiency in his/her students. Solid subject knowledge of teachers is critical in shaping the students' essays because it is he/she who gives what students write in the official documents. For this reason, it is widely believed that Native Speaker of English Teachers (henceforth, NESTs), due to their mastery of the language, are more effective in teaching English in general and writing as a language skill in particular to foreign and second language learners. Based on their intuitions about the language, they are able to improve students' writing ability by providing them with correct, idiomatic, statements as well as the ability to recognize acceptable versions, styles, and background knowledge and skills of the language (Harmer, 1991). A large number of researchers and educators (Watson, 2004) believe that employing native speakers, enforcing "only English environment" and western pedagogy would improve students' achievements in general and in academic writing in particular.

As an opposing view, some in the profession argue that the Non-native English-Speaker Teachers (hereafter, NNESTs) for a variety of reasons can be as effective or even more than their native English speaking counterparts in teaching writing to EFL and ESL learners. They can anticipate the difficulties that a second language learner may encounter when s/he is involved in the writing process, and therefore can be more empathetic with their students. Furthermore, if they share the same language with their students, as it is the case in this study, they can utilize students' ability in writing in mother tongue in teaching writing in the second language.

2. Literature Review

There are a quite good number of studies that have compared and contrasted the native English speaker teachers to their non-native English speaker counterparts in teaching the English language. Yet, most if not all these studies investigated different stakeholders' perceptions and attitudes and have used either surveys, questionnaires ,and interviews as study instruments. The author claims that there has not been a single

study that would investigate the impact of these two groups of teachers on students' writing abilities although Al Nawrasi (2013) examined the impact of the Native and Non-native English speaker teachers on their students' abilities in speaking skills. Therefore, the study review would concentrate on a) the strengths and weaknesses of native and non-native English speaking teachers, and b) difficulties that Arabic speaking students face while they write in English as a foreign language.

When the strengths and weaknesses of NESTs and non-NESTs are analyzed, the most striking point is that NESTs are thought to be more competent in speaking skills. However, Wardak (2014) studied and analyzed literature related to issues concerning the advantages and disadvantages of NEST and NNEST and devised his summaries in figure 1.

Figure 1: Summaries of the perceived advantages and disadvantages of both NEST and NNEST teachers

<p>A: NES teachers' Advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Adult ESL learners could comprehend standard native speakers' English better than non-standard English'. Eisenstein & Berkowitz (1981, cited in Butler, 2007, p. 737) • 'NES are perfect models for imitation'. Benke & Medgyes (2005) • 'NES are better qualified as language teachers'. Phillipson (1992, cited in Buttler, 2007, p. 732) • 'ESL students prefer to be taught by NES teachers'. Nemtchinova (2005, p. 235) 	<p>B: NES teachers' Disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'NES teachers tend to leave problems unexplained'. Benke & Medgyes (2005, cited in Llurda, 2006, p. 207) • 'NES teachers are often unable to empathize with students going through the learning process'. Barrate & Kontra (2000, cited in Moussu and Llurda, 2008, p. 322) • 'Native speakers know the destination, but not the terrain that has to be crossed to get there; they themselves have not travelled the same route'. Seidlhofer (1999, p. 238, cited in Moussu and Llurda, 2008, p. 320) • 'Teachers who share a common language with their students are more effective'. McNeill (2005, cited in Braine, 2010, p. 72)
<p>C: NNEST teachers' Disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'NNEST English teachers had long being considered second rate, which in turn may have caused a certain lack of self-confidence among NNEST teachers'. Braine (2010, p. 5) • Teaching Competence: 'NNEST teachers are sometimes afraid that they are going to make a mistake when speaking.' Kamhi-Stein, Aagard'. Ching, Paik, & Sasser (2004, cited in Braine, 2010, p. 23) • 'NNEST teachers are "preoccupied" with accuracy and more formal features of English'. Reves & Medgyes (1994, cited in Braine, 2010, p. 28) • 'Teachers with foreign accents are perceived by students to be less intelligent' Nelson (1991; Solomon, 1991, cited in Butler, 2007, p. 734) 	<p>D: NNEST teachers' Advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'The defining characteristic is their experience in learning English as a second language, a characteristic which no NES teacher can claim'. Ellis (2002, cited in Braine, 2010, p. 22) • 'Empathy and being a role model: "The trait I had long given myself , as being sensitive and empathetic to the needs of my ESL learners, seemed fake and pretentious'. A NES teacher; Olivia"s Journal (April 19, 2002, cited in Samimy, 2008, p. 127) • 'Non-native teachers have the potentials to push the limits of standard norms of language use'. Kramsch and Lam (1999, cited in Shin, 2008, p. 63) • 'NNEST teachers are serious teachers'. Benke & Medgyes (2005)

As shown in Figure 1, the weaknesses of one group of teachers appear to be the reverse of the advantages of another. The soundest advantages of the NEST are their superiority in language speaking ability and their cultural background knowledge of English that may help them attract learner's attention by integrating the target language's culture into their courses. Those two merits of NESTs are the main disadvantages of the NNESTs who often learn English from books rather than direct contact with authentic sources. Most of them have few opportunities to speak English, which may make them feel insecure. Because of this lack of self-confidence, they often rely on textbooks more than NESTs.

When the literature related to the Arabic speaking students academic writing is analyzed, it is seen that their essays are plagued with different types of errors and that there are some difficulties they face when they write in English as a foreign or a second language. Arabic speaking English language learners have limited vocabulary. Therefore, students end up repeating the same words; this hinders creativity. Rabab'ah (2003), clarified that students couldn't give voice to their thoughts because lack the adequate stock of vocabulary. They don't use invented spelling and their written texts are restricted to words, which they know.

In a similar study, Al-Khatib (2001) examined Jordanian students' personal letter writing in English and found that Arab learners' sentences are very lengthy. Similar findings echoed an earlier study conducted by Koch (1983) who analyzed English essays by Arabic-speaking English learners and found that majority of the learners made extensive use of devices such as parallelism and the repetition of the most powerful words and phrases. Her conclusion was that certain features of Arabic discourse are transferred, and this may influence Arab students to repeat words or phrases in English.

Al-Khsawneh (2010) indicated that the students identified that the teaching method and the environment are the main causes of their weaknesses in English. Their weak qualification in English is either related to the lack of student motivation, or the teacher's interest. Many learners use their mother tongue because of the isolated culture. Yet, methods of teaching English included the medium of instructions, using Arabic in English classes, writing done in Arabic, teachers' low proficiency in English, and lack of writing practice in educational Institutions have contributed to students' low performance in writing

Khuwaileh and Al Shoumali (2000) analyzed the writing of Jordanian students in Arabic, their first language, and English as their second one. They reported that 55% of the students wrote compositions in their first language that lacked organization of thoughts and with no appropriate linking of ideas. In addition, Ahmed (2010) examined the writing of EFL Egyptian students and reported similar problems in terms of sequencing ideas and writing topic sentences.

Al-Buainain (2007) highlighted classroom instruction in teaching writing skills. He concluded that it is the teachers' responsibility to adopt, modify or even develop remedial procedures and techniques that can minimize the learners' errors and elevate

their level in writing. Students should always be encouraged to do remedial exercises in order to improve their writing ability.

As indicated by some of the studies above, what teachers know and can do in the writing lesson affect largely students' writing abilities. Ansari (2012) concluded that teaching a second language is not easy, but it can be taught effectively with patience and hard work identifying the needs of the learners and inventing the right methodology to help them improve their writing. Therefore, the writing instructor has, first of all, to study the problems and difficulties faced by his/her students in the process of learning English and to find the suitable tasks.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research problem

Writing is viewed as the most challenging skill for a significant number of high students in the UAE. However, research has emphasized the importance of improved writing among the younger generation and the role of the teacher in improving students' writing competency. This study aims at examining the impact of Native English Speaker Teachers (NESTs) in comparison with Non-native English Speaker Teachers (NNESTs) on students' overall achievement in the writing skill altogether with other four sub-areas, namely communicative effectiveness, the range of vocabulary, accuracy, and mechanics of writing.

3.2 Questions of the study

1. Is there any significant difference in students' essay due to the teacher's first language?
2. Is there any significant difference in the Communicative Effectiveness in students' essay due to the teacher's first language?
3. Is there any significant difference in the Range of Vocabulary in students' essay due to the teacher's first language?
4. Is there any significant difference in the Accuracy in students' essay due to the teacher's first language?
5. Is there any significant difference in the Mechanics of Writing in students' essay due to the teacher's first language?

3.3 Research Approach

The present study used the Ex Post Facto design (Group, posttest comparison) to explore the possible effects of the teachers' first language on students' achievements in writing abilities. This design is the most appropriate one since the independent variable in this study is an attribute rather than an active variable. This design then focuses first on the effect and attempts to determine what caused the observed effect that is in line with this study. The main advantage of the Posttest Comparison design is randomization. The post-test comparison with randomized subjects controls for the

main effects of history, maturation, and pre-testing; because no pre-test is used there can be no interaction effect of pre-test and X. Another advantage of this design is that it can be extended to include more than two groups if necessary.

3.4 Subjects of the Study

The sample of the study consisted of grade twelve Arabic and English speaking teachers and their students. The sample was divided into groups: group one which included the six classes that were taught by English native speaking teachers, and group two which comprised the rest of sections that non-native English speaking teachers were teaching.

The participating teachers were self-selected (the study was presented to them and they agreed to participate). The participating students were the students' teachers who agreed to participate. The targeted population consisted of 6 NESTs (2 Australians, 2 Canadians, an American and a British) and 6 NNESTs (2 Egyptians, an Iraqi, a Jordanian, a Tunisian, and a Moroccan), and 196 12th graders. All NNESTs hold degrees in English language and the NETS also hold degrees but not necessarily in the English Language. All teachers agreed to participate and responded positively to the invitation letter. Consequently, the students they teach were selected to be the subjects of the study. All teachers hold degrees in the English language and have been teaching in the UAE for two years at least. Table 1 below stipulates the number of the subjects and their percentage of the total number of 12th graders.

Table 1: Numbers and Percentages of the Subjects of the Study

Group	Members	Frequency	Percent
NESTs	Teachers	6	50
	Students	103	52.6
NNESTs	Teachers	6	50
	Students	93	47.4
Total	Teachers	12	100
	Students	196	100

3.5 Instruments of the Study

A writing achievement test was employed to assess the subjects' writing abilities. A scoring rubric was also used to assign grades for the essays. The writing test lasted for 45 minutes, and it is in the form of a written essay of about 250 words on a thematic topic. The aim of the test is to assess the students' ability to communicate effectively in writing.

A. The Validity of the Writing Test

In the beginning, the writing test asked the participants to write an essay of 250 words on a relevant topic of their choice from a given set of topics. After the same jury had reviewed the test, they suggested lowering the number of words to 200 and limiting the topics to one as different essays may affect the consistency in grading the essays.

B. Reliability of the Writing Test

The reliability of the writing test was verified through selecting an equivalent sample of 15 students of the study population and out of the study sample to assess their writing skill by the researcher and a certified IELTS examiner. The students were given 45 minutes to write on the target topic. A scoring rubric was used to assess students' essays; grades given by the researcher and the examiner were computed to find the correlation degree between the two assessors. The Pearson correlation coefficient (r) was calculated for the marks given by the researcher and the marks given by the examiner on the writing test and found to be 0.84. Thus, it is secure to say that the reliability of the writing test and the reliability of marking were achieved and verified.

3.6 Data Collection

Students were asked to write a well-developed and coherent essay of about 200 words on the chosen topic. Scoring rubrics (Appendix A) was used to assess the achievement in the writing skill. In assessing students' writing skill, the marker considered four different areas; each area weighs 5 points, totaling 20 marks per the essay. The marker assessed and gave a mark out of five based on the descriptors in the rubrics for each area (sub-skill). These areas are:

a. Communicative Effectiveness

This assessed the students' ability to write well-organized and logically developed coherent paragraphs. Use of appropriate linking and transitional words were also judged. The use of topic sentence and the development of ideas were also assessed.

b. Range of Vocabulary

This referred to the use of words and the range and accuracy of the vocabulary the student chose to use in his essay. Idiomatic usage and appropriateness of style were also considered in the final judgment.

c. Accuracy

The marker judged both the student usage of grammar and how correctly he used it. Therefore, the range of tenses, as well as the appropriate use of them, was important in all parts of the writing test.

d. Mechanics of Writing

This referred to the legibility of handwriting, punctuation marks, capitalization, and spelling.

To test the hypotheses of the study, the Ex Post Facto (Group, posttest comparison) design was used as mentioned earlier as the independent variables were not active and could not be manipulated. Teachers' native language was the independent variable in this study and it had two levels: a native speaker and a non-native speaker of English. The sections that were taught by NESTs were compared to those who were taught by NNESTs in terms of their writing skills. The study dealt with scores obtained from the two groups to establish whether there was a relationship between the dependent and the independent variables. Data collected from the writing test answered research inquiries of this study.

3.6 Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for Social Studies (SPSS) was used to calculate and find any significant statistical difference between the mean scores of the students who were taught by NESTs, and those who were taught by NNESTs. Descriptive statistics including mean scores and standard deviations were used to measure the subjects' achievement in writing. Means and standard deviation were computed to answer the research questions. Inferential statistics (t-test) for two independent samples was utilized in order to test if there were any significant differences between the achievement and the teachers' nativity (NESTs vs NNESTs).

4. Results

In order to answer the questions of the study, the researcher calculated the differences in students' overall achievement scores and the mean scores of the individual abilities achieved by the subjects in both groups of the study.

The first question of this study related to the potential effects that Native English speaker teachers (NESTs) and non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs) could make on their students' overall achievement in writing. The T-test was performed to answer statistically the question and to investigate whether there was a statistically significant difference among students' writing achievement test scores amongst 12th - grade students at ($\alpha = 0.05$) due to the native-ness of the teachers.

Table 2 divulges the mean scores, standard deviations and the overall results of the t-test of the students' scores in the writing test for both groups.

Table 2: t-test Results of the Students' Means Sub-scores and Standard Deviations in the Writing Test

The teachers' Nativity	No. of students	Means	Std. Deviations	DF	t-value	Sig
Native	103	9.48	2.32	194	0.923	0.876
Non-native	93	9.17	2.28			

The mean scores of the group taught by NESTs was 9.48 with a standard deviation of 2.32, while that of the group taught by NNESTs was 9.17 with a standard deviation of 2.28. Therefore, the t-test was used to find out whether or not the difference was significant. The table exhibited that there was no statistically significant difference at ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the mean scores of the students who were taught by NESTs and those who were taught by NNESTs in writing achievement test (T-value= 0.923, sig = 0.876) due to the native-ness of the teachers.

However, in addition to assessing the subjects' overall achievement in writing, the study examined the possible influences of the teachers' nativity on students' writing in four writing abilities, namely communicative effectiveness, accuracy, vocabulary, and mechanics of writing. The results revealed that while there were statistical differences among some abilities due to the nativity of the teacher, teachers' nativity was not significant to some writing abilities. Table 3 reports the mean scores, standard

deviations and the results of the t-test of the students' scores in the sub-skills of the writing test.

Table 3: t-test Results of the Students' Mean Scores and Standard Deviations in the Writing Abilities

Abilities	Group	No. of Students	Mean Scores (Out of 5)	Std. Deviations	DF	t-value	Sig
Communicative Effectiveness	N	103	2.56	0.98	194	0.045	0.964
	NN	93	2.62	1.00			
Vocabulary Range	N	103	2.57	0.90	193	2.296	0.023
	NN	93	2.28	0.86			
Accuracy	N	103	1.95	0.73	191	0.599	0.547
	NN	93	1.91	0.64			
Mechanics of Writing	N	103	2.43	0.75	194	0.893	0.373
	NN	93	2.56	0.84			

N: Students taught by Native English Speaker Teachers

NN: Students taught by Nonnative English Speaker Teachers

In the Communicative Effectiveness which is reflected in the second question of the study, the mean scores of the groups taught by NESTs was 2.56, with 0.98 for its standard deviation, while it was 2.62 with a standard deviation of 1.00 for the groups taught by NNESTs. To investigate the significance of this difference in the mean scores between the two groups, the t-test was used and the result showed that there was no statistically significant difference at ($\alpha= 0.05$) between the means scores of the two groups (T. value=0.045, sig= 0.964).

As far as question three which deals with the Vocabulary Range is concerned, the mean scores of the groups taught by NESTs was 2.57, with 0.90 for the standard deviation, while it was 2.28 with a standard deviation of 0.86 for the groups taught by NNESTs. The T-test was implemented to investigate the significance of this difference in the mean scores between the two groups, and the result demonstrated that there was a statistically significant difference at ($\alpha= 0.05$) between the mean scores of the two groups (T. value=2.296, sig= .023) in favor of the NESTs.

In relation with the Accuracy which is addressed in question four, the mean scores of the group taught by NESTs was 1.95, with 0.73 for the standard deviation, while it was 1.91 with a standard deviation of 0.64 for the groups taught by NNESTs. The T-test was used to examine the significance of this difference in the means scores between the two groups, and the results showed that there was no statistically significant difference at ($\alpha= 0.05$) between the means scores of the two groups.

For the Mechanics of Writing which is dealt with in question five, the mean score of the group that was taught by NESTs was 2.43, with 0.75 for the standard deviation, while it was 2.37 with a standard deviation of 0.84 for the group that NNESTs taught. The T-test was conducted to examine the significance of this difference in the means scores between the two groups, and the results showed that there was no statistically

significant difference at ($\alpha= 0.05$) between the means scores of the two groups (T. value=0.893, sig= 0.373).

5. Discussion of the Results

Based on the results of the study, there is no statistically significant difference between the students' mean overall scores in writing compositions due to the teachers' native language. The results indicated that the subjects' achievement in both groups (NESTS and NNESTs) was low as seen in table 2 where the mean overall scores was less than 10 (out of 20) in both groups. This finding is in line with many other studies (Al-Khatib, 2001) that investigated the field of writing in different Arab countries and concluded that essays written by Arabic speaking learners are plagued with a number of linguistic and stylistic errors. Though, they are not unique in this weakness; students from different linguistic background were reported to have similar weaknesses. As per the British Council 2014 statistics report, IELTS test takers' attainment in writing in 2014 was lower than their achievement in the other three language skills. The report demonstrated that test takers whose first language is Arabic were among the lowest groups in writing skill; their mean band score in writing was 4.9. This result may force us to give more attention to writing skills in ESL classes in order to prepare learners to cope up with the communicative and academic demands of real-life situations and college life.

However, when looking at the results of the rest of questions (two to five), the findings did not show much difference between the two groups of essays in the Communicative Range and Accuracy whereas the difference was significant in Vocabulary and Mechanics of Writing in favor of NESTs in the former and of the NNESTs in the latter. The significant difference in the vocabulary range between the essays written by the two groups might be viewed in the term of the NESTs language ability to provide their students with synonyms, correct, idiomatic, acceptable versions, formal styles, and background knowledge about the topic in question. On the other hand, NNESTs, due to their limited competencies, might use Arabic equivalent instead of providing students with synonyms or corresponding expressions to facilitate the writing task. Second language learners need to have a substantial vocabulary size that is essential for writing. Probably it's the proper usage of idioms and expression that explains feasibly the result that there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups of the students in vocabulary in favor of the group that was taught by NESTs.

The second finding showing significant difference in students' writing performance is associated with the Mechanics of Writing. The finding demonstrated that students taught by NNESTs scored higher than their counterparts taught by NESTs. One plausible interpretation for this finding is that the NNESTs, since they have learned the language rules and writing mechanics in structural contexts, probably have a better knowledge about such aspects of the language that they often apply these rules

and can link them to the new learners. Another possible explanation for the difference in the subjects' performance in the mechanics of writing area may be attributed to the NNESTs abilities to predict the challenges that their learners may face in writing as they encountered these challenges when they were students which make them more empathetic with their students. Moreover, they could have utilized their knowledge about the students' first language, which they share with the students, to assist the subjects of the study use their abilities in writing in their mother tongue in writing in the second language. In fact, using mother tongue in teaching a foreign language proves to be a valuable help for the learning of a second language and sometimes it interferes in the learning of a foreign language. Students in monolingual classrooms often have a common mother tongue which may benefit them in learning a new language. It is the teacher who can exploit his/her students' previous L1 learning experience to improve students' writing abilities. In other words, the NNESTs' understanding of this correlation between L1 and L2 writing may provide them with advantages over the NESTs to enhance students' efforts to write as they are familiar with the L1 writing process, style, and challenges that obstruct the learners to enhance their writing skills.

The results also showed that there were no significant differences in students' achievement in Accuracy and Communicative Effectiveness between the two groups due to the native language of the instructors. Probably, this finding might be attributed to the high level of the NNESTs in the study that is almost native-like and that they are well prepared linguistically and methodologically speaking. The impact of the teachers in helping students perform in the different language skills especially when writing essays is indisputable. A competent writing teacher would use communicative materials and activities that enhance students' writing abilities, would guide the learners to write coherently and in a way that is appropriate for one's purpose and the target audience, and would be able to coach the students to use the proper idioms and expressions that reinforce the final written product. Then, this finding supports the perception that the effect of modern methodologies and approaches on learning writing is more effective than the role of the teachers' native-ness. This is in accordance with Al-Buainain (2007) who maintains that modern methodologies of teaching writing in the English as the second language emphasize co-operative learning between teachers and learners, and accentuate that learners should be given more opportunities to think critically, to initiate learning, and to express themselves. Finally, this finding also supports that perception that certain common principles and practices of writing pedagogy are much more important in improving learners writing abilities than the teachers' native language. In other words, any qualified teacher, regardless of his/her native language can play a major role in empowering his/her learners with the mechanics, the techniques, and the tools necessary to produce a good piece of writing.

To sum up, apparently, the relationship between the teachers' Native language and students' achievement in writing is inconclusive. It is the writing pedagogy implemented in the class that enhances students' writing skills; the teacher plays a key role in effectively uses these techniques in teaching writing. One of the most valuable

perspectives to come out of this study and be incorporated into classroom teaching is that teachers should be equipped with all effective approaches that enrich students' ability and desire to write and root out challenges and practices that obstruct this ability. Rather than being expected to turn in a finished product right away, students are asked for multiple drafts of a work and taught that rewriting and revision are integral to writing, and that editing is an ongoing, multi-level process, not merely a hasty check for correct grammar.

References

1. Ahmed, H. (2010). Students' problems with cohesion and coherence in EFL essay writing in Egypt. Different perspectives. *Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal (LICEJ)*, 1 (4), 211-221. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Abdelhamid_Ahmed2/publication/266291409_Students'_Problems_with_Cohesion_and_Coherence_in_EFL_Essay_Writing_in_Egypt_Different_Perspectives/links/570c318708aea660813b21e6.pdf/download?version=vrp
2. Al-Buainain, H. (2007). Researching types and causes of errors in Arabic speakers' writing. In M. Sadiq, A. Jendli, & A. Sellami (Eds.), *Research in ELT Context* (pp. 195-224), Dubai: UAE.
3. Al-Khasawneh, F. (2010). Writing for Academic Purposes: Problems faced by Arab postgraduate students of the college of business, UUM. *ESL World*, 2 (28) vol. 9, 2010, from Retrieved from <http://www.esp-world.info>
4. Al-Khatib, M. (2001). The pragmatics of letter writing. *World English*, 20 (2), 179-200. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-971X.00208>
5. Al Noursi, O. H. (2013). The Effect of Native and Non-native English Language Teachers on Secondary Students' Achievement in Speaking Skills. *Jordan Journal of Educational Sciences* Vol. 9, No. 2, pp -243- 254
6. Al Noursi. O.H. (2015). Don't Get It Right, Just Get It Written.... Making Feedback Work. In Al-Mahrooqi, Roscoe and Thakur (2015). *Methodologies for Effective Writing Instruction in EFL and ESL Classrooms*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global. Doi: 10.4018/978-1-4666-6619-1
7. Ansari, A. A. (2012). Teaching of English to Arab students: Problems and remedies. *Educational Research*, 3(6), 519-524.
8. Harmer, J. (1991). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman
9. Khuwaileh, A. A. & Shoumali, A. A. (2000). Writing errors: A study in writing ability of Arabic learners of academic English and Arabic at university. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*. 13 (2). 174-183.
10. Gobert, M. (2008). Teaching writing mechanics to Gulf Arabic students. In C. Coombe, A. Jendli, & P. Davison (Eds.). *Teaching writing skills in ELF: Theory, pedagogy, research* (pp. 315-341). Dubai, UAE: TESOL Arabia.

11. Koch, B. J. (1983). Presentation as proof: The language of Arabic rhetoric. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 25(1), 47-60.
12. Nam, H.H. (2010). The pedagogy and its effectiveness among native and non-native English speaking teachers in the Korean EFL context. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. New York State University, USA.
13. Pajares, F., & Johnson, M. J. (1994). Confidence and Competence in Writing: The Role of Self-Efficacy, Outcome Expectancy, and Apprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 28(3), 313-331. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40171341>
14. Rabab'ah, G. (2003). Communication problems facing Arab learners of English. *Journal of Language and Learning*, 3(1), 180-197.
15. Roca De Larios, J., Murphy, L., & Marin, J. (2002). A critical examination of L2 writing process research. In S. Ransdell, & M. L. Barbier (Eds.), *New directions for research in L2 writing*, (pp. 11-47). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
16. Ruiz-Funes, M. (2001). Task representation in foreign language reading-to-write. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34, 226-234
17. Silva, T. (1993). Toward and Understanding of the Distinct Nature of L2 Writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(4): 657-677.
18. Wardak, M. (2014). Native and Non-Native English Speaking Teachers' Advantages and Disadvantages. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, Volume.5 Number.3, Pp.124- 141
19. Watson, D.T. (2004). *The Role of English in the Provision of High Quality Education in the United Arab Emirates*. Unpublished M.A thesis, University of South Africa

Omar Al Noursi
EFFECTS OF ARABIC AND ENGLISH SPEAKING TEACHERS
ON HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' WRITING ACHIEVEMENT

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).