

# Effect of team teaching and being the teacher native or non-native on EFL students' English language proficiency

Abdallah Baniabdelrahman

Curriculum and Instruction Department, Yarmouk University, Jordan.

Accepted 15 July, 2013

---

## ABSTRACT

This study attempted to investigate the effect of the use of co-teaching, being the teacher native or non-native, and the students' language proficiency level on first year university students' achievement in English. The sample of the study consisted of twelve male students' classroom sections, four sections of level one, four sections of level three and four sections of level six. The same number of sections was chosen from the female students classes in the second semester of the academic year 2012/2013. Then, one male and one female sections of each level were taught by two native teachers; two were taught by non-native teachers, two sections were taught by one native and one non-native teachers, and two sections were taught by single teachers. An English language proficiency test, which its validity and reliability were established, was used twice as a pre and post test. The results of the study did not reveal significant differences between the male and female students' mean scores except in level one. They also revealed that co-teaching, in general, resulted in achieving higher improvement in the students mean scores in comparisons with the students who were taught by a single teacher regardless of the students' gender and level of English language proficiency. They also revealed that a combination between a native and a non-native teacher resulted in better achievement in the students mean scores in comparisons with the students who were taught by a single teacher, two native teachers, or by two non-native teachers.

**Keywords:** Co-teaching, native and non-native teachers, English language teaching.

---

E-mail: Baniabdelrahman@yahoo.com.

---

## INTRODUCTION

There is a belief, which is becoming stronger and stronger and taken for granted, that a native speaker is by nature the best person to teach his/her language to students learning it as a foreign language (Merino, 1997). This belief affected most of the non-native speakers negatively. Non-native speakers of English usually feel unsafe using the language they have to teach (Medgyes, 1994). This situation does not exist only in the countries in which English is the first language, but also it has started spreading out in many of the countries where English is taught as a foreign language. In Saudi Arabia, the public universities have started in this decade replacing the non-native teachers of English by native speakers. Native speakers of English are now teaching the English language courses in the preparatory years in

most of the public universities. Furthermore, team teaching becomes the teaching styles in most of these universities.

Team-teaching has been partially practiced for a period of time in Saudi Arabia, but it has not received enough attention in the area of teaching English as a foreign language and it seems that there is still a lack of literature on team-teaching in the field of EFL teaching.

As the case in many countries where English is taught as a foreign language, the traditional English teaching method is the main feature of teaching English in most of the classrooms at the school and university levels in Saudi Arabia which can be described as both teacher-centered and test-driven. The English language classroom of a typical Saudi secondary school English

language classroom has between 30 to 40 students and sometimes more who are taught in the Arabic language by a Saudi or an Arab teacher. This situation continued to be the same till recently when Saudi universities decided to bring English language native speakers to teach the first year of university students. King Saud university, one of pioneer universities in shifting to have English language native teachers to teach first year university students, views team teaching as an effective means of instruction in teaching English and developing students' communicative competence.

A main theme in the literature about team teaching believes that the combination of a native speaker and a non-native speaker has benefits for the language learners. Team-teaching is a collaborative arrangement in which two teachers are simultaneously in the classroom sharing the roles of instructor and facilitator. Team-teaching also includes collaborative planning for lessons, discussion about students' progress and assessment. Team-teaching is also referred to in the literature as co-teaching and collaborative teaching as well (Baniabdelrahman and Abanmi, 2012).

The co-teaching arrangement makes sense in an informal way because as Glickman et al. (2007) point out, teachers routinely seek each other's advice, support and assistance more frequently than those of an administrator. Therefore, it is only natural that the development of teacher leaders, in formal as well as informal positions, would be an important means to provide instructional support to teachers in order to enhance learning for ELLs.

## ENRICHMENT VS. REMEDIATION

Many studies have tried to investigate the benefits of team teaching. Collier and Thomas (2004) take a longitudinal look at English as a Second Language (ESL) programs and formats in the United States. Their conclusions are significant to a conversation about team teaching in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) environment because of what they determined about 'enrichment' programs, dual language schooling for ESL students. Their findings show that dual language, enrichment programs, have better results in terms of closing the academic achievement gap in the second language (L2) than the single language 'remedial' models. There are EFL programs that resemble these remedial models as they are practiced in the United States and as a result, often their outcomes are similar to what Collier and Thomas (2004) have found. The remedial models are identified as Intensive English classes, English as a second language pullout, ESL content/sheltered instruction, structured English immersion, and transitional bilingual education. According to this research, these remedial programs may provide ELLs with important support for one to four years, but,

even four years is not enough time to fully close the achievement gap. Collier and Thomas (2004) have concluded that the remedial models offer support for the English language learner (ELL) over a one or two year period, but they do not close the academic achievement gap even after four years (Collier and Thomas, 2004); therefore, it is important for ESL and EFL programs to consider aiding student progress through the use of their native language in a supporting role. A team teaching model in which a native English speaking teacher (NEST) and a non-native English speaking teacher (NNEST) collaborate in the classroom may be an optimal arrangement.

Research has shown that *comprehensible input* in English language learning (Krashen and Biber, 1988) is an important element in successful L2 acquisition, academic language and literacy skills. The target of comprehensible input leads teachers to not only present the material but also to present it in a way that ELL students may comprehend the concepts through their limited English language skills. Collaboration between NEST and NNESTS in an EFL environment promotes the creation of comprehensible input and the shared use of the students' native language also adds to the generation of comprehensible input.

## Role definition: Teaching and support

The theory behind team teaching is that both the native English speaking teacher (NEST) and the non-native English speaking teacher (NNEST) bring specific qualities to the classroom discourse that can complement one another as well as provide the benefits of having two teachers in the room to support students as they negotiate their lessons (Dove and Honigsfeld, 2010).

Team teaching is conceptualized as a partnership between the two teachers. They share responsibility for all aspects of educating their students including planning, presenting, facilitating and assessing the students which amounts to a sharing of the large workload that a single teacher often manages by herself or himself. One of the primary issues to be overcome in a team-teaching arrangement is that of defining the role of each teacher. The pairing of two qualified professionals to share responsibilities has the potential to create animosity between the two as they struggle for dominance over the classroom and procedures. Dove and Honigsfeld (2010) stress the importance of the two teachers to come together and collaborate and negotiate early on so that they can establish what role each will play in the class. The relationship between the team teachers will benefit from planning and negotiation to define roles and come to an understanding about how to proceed. The co-teachers must collaborate to identify the goals for the class and carefully articulate them in terms of their purpose, process, and problem-solving strategies in order to be a

successful team and an effective one.

An immersion style content classes in the United States in which ESL students share the same content classes as English speaking students and receive the support of an ESL co-teacher is a different arrangement than and EFL co-teaching situation, but nonetheless is similar in the collaborative aspect. The subject teacher leading the class and the ESL teacher may work together to integrate their professional experience. Co-teaching teams (according to DelliCarpini, 2008) may work together to develop the following aspects of a well-structured course:

1. Designing effective instruction for ELLs in the [mainstream] classroom.
2. Building and activating background knowledge and creating contexts for meaningful, authentic interaction.
3. Identifying comprehensible input in terms of vocabulary and language structures used as well as in terms of literacy abilities.
4. Selecting appropriate material that targets a variety of ability and interest levels so that all learners have access to the curriculum
5. Planning for meaningful differentiation of instruction and integration of multiple instructional strategies.
6. Examining existing assessment procedures and integrate multiple modes of assessment of ELLs in the [mainstream] classroom.

### **Roles based on strengths and weaknesses**

The advantage of a team teaching combination of a native English speaking teacher (NEST) and a non-native English speaking teacher (NNEST) is that the NEST has strengths that are the relative weaknesses of the NNEST, who in turn has strengths that reflect the relative weakness of the NEST (Carless and Walker, 2006). There are many combinations of ways in which the team teachers can organize the presentation of their lesson, but generally speaking, it can be either native English speaking teacher (NEST) led or non-native English speaking teacher (NNEST) led. Each has unique advantages. When the NEST takes the leading role during an oral exercise, the NNET can support the students in many ways such as, minimize confusion by accessing the native language of the students to further explain when necessary, use appropriate idioms, harness intuition about usage and provide an insider's cultural knowledge of a target language community. These skills and insights are missing from the repertoire of the NEST because they do not have the experience and knowledge afforded to the NNEST who often shares the culture with the students and has had a similar experience of learning English themselves (Barratt and Kontra, 2000). On the other hand, the native English speaking teacher provides a need for students to engage in authentic English use, may be less reliant on textbooks as teaching aids, brings

different perspectives to materials and thus has some novelty value, at least initially (Carless and Walker, 2006).

Students develop a better understanding and sense of communication by mini-role-plays between NES and NNEST teachers and both teachers are available to support students when necessary as well as monitor or facilitate group activities (Tajino and Tajino, 2000). For instance, by observing real conversations in short dialogues, the learners can develop a pragmatic competence which helps lead them to understand how words and sentences can be meaningfully used in daily life, especially between conflicting cultural discourses (Carless and Walker, 2006). Additionally, the interaction among the two teachers has an effect on students' interest in that it is increased through an exposure to two different voices, teaching styles and presentations in one class (Jang et al., 2010).

Team teaching arrangements with a native speaker and a local speaker in the classroom is especially beneficial to the lower level and weaker students. Carless and Walker (2006) observed NNEST were able to support students during a NEST-led lesson by utilizing the students' first language for English-learning purposes or facilitate the smooth flow of the lesson. For example, the NNEST would briefly introduce the lesson's aims in the students' native language with weaker students, checking that students could supply translations for new words, delivering complex instructions in the mother tongue about the criteria for choosing suitable students for role plays, and working with weaker or less confident students during group work. The exploitation of the mother tongue was something that the NEST could not adequately do without the support of the NNEST (468). Storey et al. (2001) found evidence that lower ability students' English improved more when they were taught by a combination of NES and NNEST teachers rather than one of these on their own (Carless and Walker, 2006:465). The fundamental advantage of presenting more support to students also makes team teaching a highly recommended teaching approach since high levels of individual support facilitates on-task behavior and results in assignments and examinations being more effectively completed than in classes with a single teacher. The extra attention given to students by the two teachers helps to keep the students engaged as willing participants (Stewart, 2005; Jang et al., 2010).

Carless and Walker (2006:470) identified several reasons why student motivation was enhanced in a collaborative teaching environment as opposed to a single, NNEST or NEST class. "First, at a basic perceptual level, there was more varied input in that there were two voices, two accents, two speeds of speech delivery. Second, there was relatively higher situational authenticity in the NEST/NNEST interaction than in the somewhat stilted textbook dialogues often used as input in second language classes." Team taught collaborative

classes were more motivating than non-collaborative classes because they appeared to involve higher levels of student intellectual engagement. The increased motivation may be due to strengths of the NEST and NNEST being consciously exploited. In a class with low English proficient students, motivating cognitive activities might not be possible for a NEST who is a non-speaker of the students' native language. Conversely, some open-ended activities might put strain on the linguistic resources of the NNEST. From a theoretical perspective, NEST and NNEST collaborative teaching has positive impacts on second language acquisition in terms of the possible enrichment of the conditions for learning espoused in the SLA literature; namely comprehensible input (Ellis, 1999) with 'pushed' output (noticing a problem can 'push' learners to modify their output in doing so, learners may sometimes be forced into a more syntactic processing mode than might occur in comprehension (Swain, 1995), and motivation (Dornyei and Schmidt, 2001).

### **Benefits for teachers**

There are numerous benefits for the teachers engaged in a team teaching partnership such as, professional growth, cultural exchange and development of new methods and skills. These teachers have the opportunity to grow professionally by sharing knowledge, experience and observing each other's teaching strategies, techniques and styles (Carless, 2006; Liu, 2006; Robinson and Schaible, 1995; Stewart, 2005). Jang et al. (2010) give this example: In an ESL/EFL classroom, the NNEST can draw on his or her own experiences as an ELL to decide on which methods to retain or dismiss in terms of their effectiveness or ineffectiveness. The NEST has the opportunities to observe cultural and behavioral differences not only among students but also between the 'local' teacher and learners. This experience allows the NEST to develop methods and skills which are appropriate for the occasion and the milieu. Another advantage for the NEST was observed by Johnson and Tang (1993) who found NESTs faced discipline problems with less academically oriented and/or less motivated students, an inability to use the students' mother tongue being particularly disadvantageous.

### **Challenges**

Team teaching has been lauded as a positive arrangement both for the teachers in terms of professional development and the students as a supportive environment in which instruction and support are plentiful and bolster language acquisition, but there are also challenges that need to be overcome before these benefits can bear fruit. We have already pointed

out that it is a necessity for teachers to collaborate in determining each other's roles as well as conducting negotiations during planning and assessing stages because, in some cases, a rivalry for control of the classroom may develop. Tajino and Tajino (2000) have observed that in some cases there is a need for teachers to develop a positive attitude towards intercultural communication as a prerequisite for collaboration. It is common for one teacher to lead while the other assists. In this initial struggle for control teachers have been divided based on negative perceptions of the other partner. In some situations the "NES teachers have been described as human-tape recorders and NNEST teachers as interpreters or translators" (Tajino and Tajino, 2000; Jang et al., 2010). Reves and Medgyes (1994) observed that "an unbalanced relationship may make the working relationship between the educators problematic," and that in some contentious team teaching partnerships the teachers rarely communicate, thus eliminating the benefits mentioned for the teachers and the students.

Another challenge that arises is that it is difficult to evaluate the individual teachers' performances in the classroom since they have different strengths and roles. It is nearly impossible to compare the two teachers even though they are operating within the same environment because they come from different backgrounds, have varying teaching styles, and possess different strengths and weaknesses (Jang et al., 2010). In a team teaching situation, it would be necessary to reconsider the methods of evaluating the teachers. It may be most effective to evaluate them as a team and base it on the progress of student development. This approach would also encourage teachers to set aside any rivalry and collaborate to identify goals and determine roles.

Another complication with evaluating the NNEST against the NEST is that often the students perceive the NEST as more valuable because of the native command of the target language. The role of NNEST teacher is frequently marginalized despite their excellent qualifications and competence. In some cases, they become unsure of themselves as a result of the real or perceived inability on their part to acquire the pronunciation of native English speakers. This leads to NNEST as being seen as the superior teacher by students (Medgyes, 2001). The value of the NNEST cannot be denied. Their experiences allow them to empathize with the students since they have gone through a similar process of learning English as a teacher as well as a former learner. The NNEST teachers can bring a number of valuable teaching resources and since they are more familiar with the learning environment and culture than the NEST they can identify with students' different learning needs and behaviors as well as understand cultural and systemic peculiarities of the local school system including examinations. Their ability to speak the local-native language is an advantage in instructing the students as well as operating within the EFL institution.

### How to make the partnership effective

Team teaching in which two native English speaking teachers or two non-native teachers, or a native teacher and a non-native teacher collaborate with each other can be a productive arrangement in an EFL classroom. There are some hurdles that need to be cleared in order for this arrangement to work well and that is for teachers to be open to intercultural communication and collaboration on defining goals and roles. The most effective partnerships are based on shared values. Team teachers need to be open to discussions about their pedagogical philosophies and differences need to be negotiated and rectified. Teachers must share their opinions and ideas and must negotiate them during the planning stage. Stewart (2005) considers pre-planning to be a "vital aspect when goals need to be verbalized negotiated and rationalized." Planning time is an opportunity for each teacher to learn from one another, identify common objectives and mutually agree upon problem solving, decision making, lesson planning and roles. Stewart suggest that teachers should discuss aspirations and hopes in regard to outcomes and the school's expectations of progress, monitoring of students' performance, learning needs and teachers' professional development. Teachers must negotiate their roles and define their responsibilities together. Each teacher has to take into consideration the personal preferences and abilities of the other as they negotiate a fair division of labor. The team teaching situation requires tolerance and open-mindedness. Teachers have to consider their roles as learners in the classroom (Macedo, 2002); they must share their experiences and remain open to the cultural exchange.

### Description of the English language intensive program of the Saudi Arabia universities

Because of the importance of the English language in education, technology, business, and scientific research, preparatory year programs, which their main concentration is teaching English, are established in Saudi Arabian Universities. These Preparatory Years aim to achieve in the service of society and ultimately, the achievement of national goals and interests (The English Language Skills Program at King Saud University, 2009).

While taking part in the English-language program, students are subjected to intensive language training for two semesters with an average of twenty hours a week (that is, six hundred hours in the two semesters). The program aims to develop the students' competence in English and provide them with the language skills they need in their academic and professional lives.

Although the program concentrates on General English (which concentrates on communication) during the first semester, after the students acquire the general skills of the English language, the program in the second

semester moves into English for Academic purposes, which concentrates on reading and academic writing. During this period, students study English for Specific Purposes. This is done according to their different academic disciplines. Students also start preparing for the global standard examinations (IELTS/TOFEL and PET), and finally sit these examinations.

At the end of the intensive English language program, students are expected to achieve the following objectives:

1. Advancement in English language skills and linguistic competence.
2. Effective communicative English (written and spoken).
3. Acquire basic academic skills and the ways of learning necessary for academic success.
4. Preparing for the international standard for linguistic competence examinations (IELTS/TOFEL and PET) and at least meeting the minimum requirements.

The English-language programs are provided by British and American companies like Bell International and Kaplan in Partnerships with the University of Cambridge University Press and Pearson Longman, who are developing the curriculum and materials for the Preparatory Year Programs in line with local culture and norms.

Before the start of the academic year, there is a placement test to determine the levels of the students so they are placed in an appropriate level of study according to their abilities and language skills. The placement tests are online based, computer based or paper based tests. Based on their results in the placement test, students are divided into six levels (one through six).

The intensive English language program aims to develop the students' language competence in the basic language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. Attention is also given to grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. The overlap of studying these skills this way (integrated skills approach) is intended to improve students' fluency and accuracy.

The teaching staff is experienced and dynamic. Eighty percent of the teachers use English as their first language. The teachers are academically and professionally qualified; with no less than forty per cent holding master's and PhD certification in addition to the certificates in the Cambridge-based English language teaching (CELTA and DELTA).

As summed up by Tajino and Tajino (2000), team teaching rather well in saying the arrangement "possibly symbolizes what many students are striving for: the ability to converse at a level of communication which transgresses borders and cultures. Language learning takes on a dimension much greater than just the passing of an examination." Building on each other's strengths is based on the assumption that some roles may be better played by the NEST rather than the NNEST and vice versa. Teachers who accept the view that classroom

interaction is “not unilaterally in the teachers’ hands, but a co-production of all the participants” (Alwright, 1984) then benefits that have been mentioned in this review will have the opportunity to flourish. Tajino and Tajino (2000) make the suggestion to change the term to ‘team-learning’ because ‘team-learning encourages all the participants, teachers as well as students, to interact with one another by creating more opportunities for them to exchange ideas or cultural values and learn from their ‘team members’’. The cultural exchange component of team teaching creates better understanding and strengthens cross-cultural ties through improvements of communicative competence, enhancement of cross-cultural awareness and active involvement of both teachers and students (Liu, 2006; Wang, 2008; Jang et al., 2010).

Uçkun and Buchanan (2009) conducted a comparative study to examine the education culture in two Turkish universities involving native teachers, English speaking foreign teachers and their Turkish students in an attempt to understand the strengths, weaknesses, and challenges faced by both students and teachers. Four versions of a questionnaire which focused on classroom management and examination procedures, pedagogy, and other affective factors, were administered to 15 teachers and 228 students. The authors aimed to investigate students’ and teachers’ beliefs, perceptions and expectations of each other within the educational context and whether any differences could be accounted for by cultural differences between the two parties. The results revealed differences between the teachers and students’ beliefs, perceptions and expectations of each other within the educational context which could be accounted for by cultural differences.

Although a study conducted by Baniabdelrahman and Abanmi (2012) investigated the effect of co-teaching and being the teachers native or non-native on the students’ English language proficiency, this study is different in term of the variables included in the study. This study considered the language proficiency level as one of the main independent variables which was neglected in Baniabdelrahman and Abanmi’s study. This study is also comparing the effectiveness of classes with one single teacher with classes with two teachers which Baniabdelrahman’ and Abanmi’s (2012) did not also take into consideration.

### Objectives and questions of the study

This study attempted to investigate the effect of co-teaching, being the teachers, native or non-native, and the students’ language proficiency level on the Preparatory Year students’ achievement in English through exploring answers to the following questions:

1. Does students’ achievement in English language vary with respect to:

- a) co-teaching,
- b) being the English language teachers native or non-native,
- c) students’ proficiency level, and
- d) Students’ gender?

### Hypotheses

The study hypothesizes that:

- a) There are no significant differences among students’ achievement mean scores due to the methods of teaching (co-teaching and single teaching).
- b) There are no significant differences among students’ achievement mean scores due to the teacher’s types (native or non-native).
- c) There are no significant differences among students’ achievement mean scores due to the students’ language proficiency level.
- d) There are no significant differences among students’ achievement mean scores due to the students’ gender.

### METHODOLOGY

#### Participants

The sample of the study consisted of twelve male students’ classroom sections, four sections of level one, four sections of level three and four sections of level six. The same number of sections was chosen from the female students’ classes in the second semester of the academic year 2012/2013 from the preparatory year students at King Saud University. There were almost 20 students in each section.

#### Study design and procedures

This study is a quasi experimental study in which one male and one female sections of each level were taught by two native teachers; two were taught by non-native teachers, two were taught by one native and one non-native teacher, and two sections were taught by single teachers. The same thing was done with the sections of level three and level six.

A pretest was applied on all the sections to establish the equivalence of the groups before the study started (Table 1).

In order to avoid or at least minimize the difficulties which teachers in team teaching usually face, such as the lack of time to plan and run individual lessons and poor communication between teamed teachers, the team teaching teachers, as part of their daily schedule and load, were given an hour a day to meet and discuss their plans.

Every two teachers of the same class, except the sections which were taught by single teachers, had to prepare their lesson and lesson plans and to carry out the activities of the lesson together. The same teaching materials and the same units were used in the four groups. The study was carried out during the second semester of the academic year 2012/2013 and lasted for 15 weeks. The textbooks were Touchstone 2, ESP materials for Science major students, and a textbook of PET Test preparation.

#### The pretest

In order to ensure the equivalence of the groups before the study

**Table 1.** Subjects of the study.

Group	Students language proficiency level	Classes		Frequency	
		Male	Female	M	F
Non-native speaker teachers group	Beginners	1	1	22	21
	Intermediate	1	1	20	20
	Advanced	1	1	20	20
Native speaker teachers group	Beginners	1	1	20	19
	Intermediate	1	1	20	20
	Advanced	1	1	20	20
Mixed group teachers (native and non-native)	Beginners	1	1	20	19
	Intermediate	1	1	20	20
	Advanced	1	1	20	20
Single teacher	Beginners	1	1	20	20
	Intermediate	1	1	20	20
	Advanced	1	1	19	21
Total		24 Sections		241	240

started, a pretest was developed in the English language skills department in the preparatory year at King Saud University. It consisted of 100 question items. Although its validity and reliability were established, the researcher re-established both again. The test was given to five specialists to check its suitability and validity. All of them ensured that the test was valid and suitable for the purpose of the study.

The researcher then applied it on a pilot sample of the students from outside the sample of the study and repeated it three weeks later. The correlation coefficient was calculated and found 94.61%.

The pretest was also used as the post test. Then, the students' scores of the experimental group and the control group were compared.

#### Data collection

The pre test was applied at the beginning of the second semester of the academic year 2012-2013. The results ensured that the students sections of level one regardless of their gender were equivalent. The same thing was found regarding the sections of levels three and the sections of level six.

Then two male native speakers taught two sections of group one (level one) male students; two non-native teachers taught two sections; two teachers one native and the second non-native taught two sections; and two single teachers taught two sections. The same thing was done with the two other groups (levels three and six students). The same procedures which were used with the male students were also applied on the female students.

The study was carried out over a complete academic semester (four months). Toward the end of the semester and in week 15 of the study, the post test was applied.

#### Data analysis

In order to answer the questions of the study, the suitable statistics (descriptive statistics, means and standard deviations, ANOVA test, and Tukey test of Multiple comparisons) were used. ANOVA and Tukey tests were used because the independent variables of the

study were more than two or had more than two levels.

## RESULTS

**Results related to the question:** Does students' achievement in English language vary with respect to co-teaching, being the English language teachers native or non-native, and students' proficiency level?

#### Results related to level one

Table 2 shows that there are differences in the mean scores of students of level one. The mean score of the group taught by two native teachers is 71.00; the mean score of the students who were taught by two non native teacher is 72.56; the mean score of the students who were taught by a native and a non-native teachers is 81.17; and the mean score of the students who were taught by a single teacher is 68.28. The results show that the highest mean score was for the group of students who were taught by one native teacher and one non-native teacher. In order to check if the differences were significant, ANOVA test was run. The results are presented in Table 3.

The results show that there are significant differences among the students' mean scores due to the students' gender in favor of the female students. The female students achieved better than the male ones. Moreover, the results show that there are significant differences among the students mean scores due to being the teachers, native, non-native or mixed native and non-native. To identify for the benefit of which group the

**Table 2.** Students' mean scores and standard deviations in the post test.

Parameter	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Gender			
Male	82	69.32	12.96
Female	79	77.42	15.25
Native + Native	43	71.44	12.28
Teachers Non-native + Non-native	39	72.56	16.66
Non-native + Native	39	81.21	10.10
Single teacher	40	68.28	16.02

**Table 3.** Results of ANOVA test of the students of level one.

Source	DF	IISS	Mean square	F-value	P
gender	1	2529.82	2529.82	13.97	0.0003*
Type of teachers	3	3506.26	1168.75	6.45	0.0004*
Error	156	28246.71	181.07		
Corrected Total	160	34393.28			

**Table 4.** Results of Tukey test of multiple comparisons.

Group comparisons	Difference between means	Simultaneous 95%	
		Confidence	Limits
3 1	9.76	2.036	17.491**
3 2	8.64	0.728	16.555**
3 4	12.93	5.066	20.794**
2 1	1.12	-6.61	8.85
2 4	4.29	- 3.575	12.153
1 4	3.167	-4.510	10.843

**Table 5.** Results related to level 3 (intermediate).

Parameter	N	Mean	SD
Gender			
Male	80	79.53	12.36
Female	80	81.98	7.69
Native + Native	40	85.85	9.93
Teachers: Non-Native+ Non-Native	40	77.56	6.74
Non-Native + Native	40	86.28	6.27
Single teacher	40	73.33	11.27

significant differences were, Tukey test was run (Table 4).

The results (Table 4) show that there are significant differences between group three in one hand and groups one, two and four in favor of group three. The results show no significant difference among the other groups. The results indicate that students who were taught by a native and a non-native teacher scored better than the

other three groups which were taught by two native teachers, two non-native teachers, or one single teacher.

Table 5 presents students' mean scores and standard deviations in the post test. It shows that there are seen differences among the mean scores of the four groups. The mean score of the students who were taught by two native teachers is 86.28; the mean score of the students



**Table 6.** Results of ANOVA test of the students of level three.

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean square	F-value	P
Gender	1	240.10	240.10	3.14	0.0788
Teachers type	3	4876.25	1625.42	21.23	0.0001*
Error	155	11865.65	76.55		
Corrected total	159	16982.00			

**Table 7.** Results of Tukey test of multiple comparisons.

Tukey grouping	Mean	N	Group
A	86.275	40	1
A	86.85	40	3
B	77.55	40	2
B	73.33	40	4

**Table 8.** Students' mean scores and standard deviations in the post test.

Parameter	N	Mean	SD
Gender			
Male	19	87.58	6.93
Female	81	88.46	7.04
Native + Native	40	89.05	3.04
Teachers: Non-Native + Non-Native	40	87.43	3.70
Non-Native + Native	40	94.78	8.00
Single teacher	40	80.85	3.29

who were taught by two non-native teachers is 77.55; the mean score of the students who were taught by a native and a non-native teacher is 86.28; and the mean score of the students who were taught by a single teacher is 73.33. The observed differences were for the benefit of the students who were taught by a native teacher and a non-native teacher or by two native teachers. In order to check if the differences were significant, ANOVA test was used.

ANOVA test (Table 6) reveals significant difference among the students mean scores due to the teachers' types. On the other hand, the results do not reveal significant differences between the male and female students. To identify for the benefit of which group the significant differences were, Tukey test was run.

The results (Table 7) show that there are no significant differences between groups two and three and between groups one and four. The results show that there are significant differences between groups two and three in one hand and groups one and four in the other hand, in favor of groups two and three. The results indicate that the students who were taught by a native teacher and a non-native teacher or by two native teachers scored significantly higher than the students who were taught by

two non-native teachers and who were taught by a single teacher.

### Results related to level 6 (advanced students)

Table 8 presents students' mean scores and standard deviations in the post test. Table 8 shows that there are seen differences among the students mean scores. The mean score of the students who were taught by a native and a non-native teacher (94.78) is higher than the mean score of the students who were taught by two non-native teachers (87.43) and who were taught by two native speakers (89.60) or by a single teacher. ANOVA test was used to check if the differences were significant or not.

Table 9 shows that there are significant differences in the students mean scores due to the teacher's types but there are no significant differences due to the students' gender. To identify for the benefit of which group the significant differences were, Tukey test was run.

The results (Table 10) show that there is no significant difference between groups one and two. The results also show that there are significant differences between group three in one hand and groups one, two, and four in favor of group three. Students who were taught by native and

**Table 9.** Results of ANOVA test of the students of level three.

Source	DF	Type III SS	Mean square	F-value	P
Gender	1	30.50	30.50	1.26	0.2634
Teachers type	3	3952.01	1317.34	54.26	0.0001*
Error	155	3763.31	24.28		
Corrected total	159	7745.90			

**Table 10.** Results of Tukey test of multiple comparisons.

Tukey grouping	Mean	N	Group
A	94.775	40	3
B	89.050	40	1
B	87.425	40	2
C	80.850	40	4

non-native teachers scored significantly higher than the students who were taught either by two native, two non-native, or single teachers. This result indicates that co-teaching in which a native teacher and a non-native teacher work together in teaching a class is helpful for the students regardless of their English language proficiency level.

## DISCUSSION

The results of the study did not reveal significant differences between the male and female students' mean scores except in level one. This result is a normal result since male and female students in Saudi Arabia learn English in the public or private schools for the same number of years and the same number of hours per week. They are also taught English as a foreign language by teachers who have the same qualifications; and they study the same textbooks. Level one students are the ones who scored very low in the placement test which the Preparatory Year Deanship runs at the beginning of each academic year. Those students have to work more and more to catch up with their classmates of levels three and six. Saudi female students usually work harder because the Saudi society is a conservative one which does not give the same degree of freedom of leaving their houses as it does with the male students, and so they spend most of their time in study.

With regard to the type of teaching, the results revealed that co-teaching in general resulted in achieving higher improvement in the students mean scores in comparisons with the students who were taught by a single teacher regardless of the students' gender and level of English language proficiency. This result supports the previous studies which confirmed the effectiveness of co-teaching. In co-teaching, teachers usually seek each other's advice, and support and assistance which

improve the methods and situation of teaching.

As stated by Carless (2006), Liu (2006), Robinson and Schaible (1995) and Stewart (2005), there are benefits for the teachers engaged in a team teaching partnership which are reflected on the students' learning. Such benefits include professional growth, cultural exchange and development of new methods and skills. These teachers have the opportunity to grow professionally by sharing knowledge, experience and observing each other's teaching strategies, techniques and styles. For example, this study which reveals that team teaching is more helpful in improving the students' level of language proficiency is in line with Stewart (2005), Jang et al. (2010) and Carless and Walker (2006). The fundamental advantage of presenting more support to students also makes team teaching a highly recommended teaching approach since high levels of individual support facilitates on-task behavior and results in assignments and examinations being more effectively completed than in classes with a single teacher. The extra attention given to students by the two teachers helps to keep students engaged as willing participants.

The results also revealed that a combination between a native and a non-native teacher resulted in better improvement and achievement in the students mean scores in comparisons with the students who were taught by a single teacher, two native teachers, or by two non-native teachers. Team teaching arrangements with a native speaker and a local speaker in the classroom is especially beneficial to the lower level and weaker students. The NNEST could introduce the lesson's aims in the students' native language with weaker students, check that students could supply translations for new words, deliver complex instructions in the mother tongue about the criteria for choosing suitable students for role plays, and work with weaker or less confident students during group work. This result supports the same result of a study conducted by Baniabdelrahman (2012).

The results of this study support what Wada (1994) believes that students and teachers (non-NESTS, in particular) would benefit from team-teaching in the following ways: the students would be given good reason to use English in the classroom as a means of communication, and would be provided with an opportunity to become aware of differing cultural values. The teachers would be enabled to present a variety of situations (e.g. demonstrating dialogues between two persons), to develop teaching/ learning materials, and to

have a better chance to develop as teachers.

The results of the lower level of this group (level one) could be justified by the belief of Uçkun and Buchanan (2009) that students of lower levels of language proficiency might prefer a mixed co-teaching because they might not be able to understand everything said to them in English. Cultural diversity between students and teachers is a source of "miscommunication" that compromises the learning/teaching environment. Students may be accused of poor performance or teachers may be blamed for inadequate methodology.

For the students of higher level of language proficiency, they might be able to understand the native speakers better and the native teachers may offer them more opportunities to understand the cultural aspects and issues of the English language but still they are not English language major students which may make them concentrate more on their majors rather than focusing on learning the English language. It seems that the issue of being the teacher, a native or a non-native of English, depends on the students' language level of proficiency. The better the students in the language the more they understand the native speakers and be in contact with them.

Based on the results of the study, it is recommended to benefit from co-teaching in teaching the English language to EFL students. It is also recommended to use mixed co-teaching (a native teacher and a non-native teacher) in teaching EFL students to offer them being taught by teachers who are aware of their language difficulties and teachers who are aware of the cultural aspects of the language. Such co-teaching might motivate and encourage them to continue their study and learn the English language more proficiently.

## Conclusion

It can be concluded that team teaching proved to be a good way of teaching. The English language teachers are advised to use co-teaching in their classes. Having one native teacher and one non-native teacher working together in teaching an English language class proved to be effective in enhancing students' achievement. It is recommended to use such kind of co-teaching in the English language classes. Teachers have to vary their methods of teaching and they have to cooperate with their colleagues in planning their lessons and activities for the benefits of their students.

## REFERENCES

- Alwright RL, 1984. The importance of interaction in classroom language learning. *Appl Linguist*, 5(2):156-171.
- Baniabdelrahman A, Abanmi A, 2012. The use of team teaching and its effect on Saudi EFL students' English proficiency. *Indian J Res*, 1(5):58-63.
- Barratt L, Kontra E, 2000. Native English speaking teachers in cultures other than their own. *TESOL J*, 9(3):19-23.
- Carless D, Walker E, 2006. Effective team teaching between local and native-speaking English teachers. *Lang Edu*, 20(6): 463-477.
- Carless D, 2006. Collaborative ESL/EFL teaching in primary schools. *ELT J*, 60(4):328-335.
- Collier VP, Thomas WP, 2004. The astounding Effectiveness of Dual Language Education for All. *NABE J Res Pract*, 2(1):1-20.
- Dove M, Honigsfeld A, 2010. ESL co-teaching and collaboration: Opportunities to develop teacher leadership and enhance student learning. *TESOL J*, pp 3-22.
- Glickman CD, Gordon SP, Ross-Gordon JM, 2007. *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Dornyei Z, Schmidt R, 2001. *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition*. Honolulu, Hawaii: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Centre, University of Hawaii.
- DelliCarpini M, 2008. Teacher collaboration for ESL/EFL academic success. *The Internet TESL J*, 14(8).
- Ellis R, 1999. *Learning a Second Language through Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jang SH, Nguyen BH, Yang Y, 2010. Enhancing Pedagogical Roles of ESL/EFL Native and Non-Native Teachers through Team Teaching: How to make this 'International partnership' Successful. *The Int J Learn*, 17(9):249-257.
- Johnson K, Tang G, 1993. Engineering a shift to English in Hong Kong schools. In T. Boswood, R. Hoffman and P. Tung (eds) *Perspectives on English for Professional Communication*. Hong Kong: City Polytechnic of Hong Kong.
- Krashen S, Biber D, 1998. *On course: Bilingual educations' success in California*. Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Liu L, 2006. Co-teaching between native and non-native English teachers: An exploration of co-teaching models and strategies in the Chinese primary school context. *ESL/EFL actions on English Language Teaching*, 7(2):103-118.
- Macedo AR, 2002. *Team-teaching: Who should really be in charge? A look at reverse vs. traditional team-teaching*. Unpublished Master thesis, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston.
- Merino IG, 1997. Native English-Speaking Teachers versus Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 10:69-74
- Medgyes P, 2001. Teaching English as a second or foreign language. In M. Celce-Murcia (ED.), *When teacher is a non-native speaker* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) USA: Heinle and Heinle.
- Medgyes P, 1994. *The non-native teacher*. London: Macmillan.
- Reves T, Medgyes P, 1994. The non-native English speaking ESL/EFL teachers self- image: An international survey. *System*, 22(3):353-367.
- Robinson B, Schaible R, 1995. Team teaching: Reaping the benefits. *College Teaching*, 43(2): 57-60.
- Stewart T, 2005. Interdisciplinary team teaching as a model for teacher development. *TESL- EJ top*, 9(2):45-58.
- Storey PI, Luk J, Gray J, Wang-Kho E, Lin A, Berry RSY, 2001. *Monitoring and evaluation of the native-speaking English teacher scheme*. Unpublished research report: Hong Kong Institute of Education.
- Swain M, 1995. Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook and B. Seidlhofer (eds) *For H.G. Widdowson: Principles and Practice in the Study of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tajino A, Tajino Y, 2000. Native and non-native: what can they offer? *ELT J*, 54:3-11.
- Uçkun B, Buchanan J, 2009. Investigation of cross-cultural communication between native English-speaking lecturers and their students in Turkish Tertiary Education. *Gaziantep Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(1):101-129. Retrieved from (<http://sbe.gantep.edu.tr>).
- Wada M, 1994. Team-teaching and the Revised Course of Study' in M. Wada and A. Cominos (eds.).