

Native and Non-native English Speaking Teachers' Teaching Styles and Their Effect on Their EFL Saudi Students' Achievement and Enjoyment of Learning English at Taif University

Nasrah Mahmoud Ismaiel¹

¹ English Language Center, Deanship of Supportive Studies, Taif University, Saudi Arabia

Correspondence: Nasrah Mahmoud Ismaiel, English Language Center, Deanship of Supportive Studies, Taif University, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: n.ismaiel@tu.edu.sa

Received: May 27, 2017 Accepted: July 14, 2017 Online Published: September 25, 2017

doi:10.5539/ijel.v7n6p148 URL: <http://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n6p148>

Abstract

The present research is going to assess the discrepancies between native and non-native instructors working at Taif University. The subjects have been 609 Saudi men and women EFL learners presenting themselves in a great English language plan at the preparatory year Science, Humanities and Health at Taif University. Moreover, 51 teachers (20 males and (31) females who are teaching staff members of the Taif University English Language Centre (TUELC) participated during the research. The research followed a descriptive analytical method. The Conti (1990) Principles of Adult Learning Scales (PALS) was used. Learning English Enjoyment questionnaire (LEEQ) that was developed by the researcher was used, too. Primary areas of investigation were teaching styles, students' achievement and students' enjoyment of learning English. Collectively, results provide some strong evidence that show a positive connection between native English speaking teachers' styles and the students' achievement and enjoyment. The effect of instruction experience, like the periods of instructing was considered in the present research. In addition, native and nonnative instructors who speak English are regarded also various in such domains as instruction strategies in the classes, levels of teaching tactical effectiveness.

Keywords: native as well as non-native English speaking instructors, instruction styles, enjoyment, gender, college students

1. Introduction

In Saudi Arabia, EFL teachers can be divided into two different categories: native subjects of the English language (NESTs) and non-native subjects of English (NNESTs). So knowing the discrepancies between native and non-native subjects of English teaching styles are important to designers of curricula to know which styles will be preferred by the EFL students and also which are more effective corroborated by the students' positive achievement. Furthermore, it is important to those teachers who teach English to Saudi students to know which teaching styles will be more beneficial for them. Moreover, teachers should be provided access to the preferred teaching training of teaching styles and its applications in the classroom.

It is significant for instructors to realize the characteristics of the learners with whom they will work because teachers' understanding of the nature of their students and their learning process will help them to achieve the educational goals that they set for their students. In teaching English, teachers need to increase attention to strategies that enhance students thinking and to build symbolic relationships among English concepts. Students, who each have different individual differences and cognitive development levels, need different teaching styles. So the teachers should meet the students' different learning styles. To know teachers' instructing methods can create a discrepancy in how instructors categorize their courses, how they tackle with the subjects, and how well their learners accomplish in the instruction content (Conti, 1989, p. 88). Finally, knowing the differences between native and non-native English speakers' teaching styles is important as these styles affect their students' achievement and enjoyment.

2. Method

For the teaching styles questionnaire, 51 teachers (20) males and (31) females who are teaching staff members of the Taif University English Language Centre (TUELC) participated at the time of the study. Teachers' age ranged from 23 to 67 ($M=36.313$, $SD=10.056$). The highest percentage of respondents held a Bachelor's degree. 31 held

Bachelor, 19 held Master and 1 doctoral.

For the English learning enjoyment questionnaire 609 students of PYP Science, Humanities and Health took part in the study. Students' age ranged from 17-29 years ($M= 19.349$, $SD= 1.065$).

3. Research Question

The present research is to specify if differences exist among teaching style preferences of TUELC teachers and selected variables. The first cause for this study is that learners' achievement is the most notable factor in the educational process. Educators should be aware what the factors are that can affect it. Knowles (1970) reported that the instructor is the most significant variable in the course for learner learning. The second reason is that the researcher is working in the English language Centre, Taif University, where many native foreign English speaking instructors are working, so she would like to find out what the differences are among those teachers in their teaching styles. Or in other words, what are the types of the teaching styles that native English speaking teachers prefer and how much do these various styles have an effect on their students' achievement.

Finally Students' enjoyment of learning English is another important factor that has a big effect on their achievement, especially because the English language, according to cultural beliefs and educational curricula in Saudi Arabia, does not focus very much on learning English, so the students have to be self-motivated in order to learn English. However the negative cultural bias towards learning English language is in the process of changing with the increased use of technology and the travelling of Saudi students abroad in the interest of gaining higher education. So students' enjoyment of learning English plays a notable section in contributing to Saudi learners to achieve English and increasing their motivation and achievement. This researcher hopes to discover the differences in students' enjoyment of learning English according to the variation of teaching styles of the native and foreign English speaking instructors.

Nevertheless, little focus has been given to the influences of the native and foreign English speaking instructors' teaching styles on their students' achievement and enjoyment. This study also strives to cover such a gap in the previous works and investigate the effects the effects of the native and foreign English speaking instructors' teaching styles on their students' achievement and enjoyment with respect to learning English in the Saudi EFL context.

The study questions for this investigation addressed the different instruction methods of native and foreign English speaking instructors (NNESTs) and their influence on learners' enjoyment and therefore their rate of success in learning English.

- 1). Explain the instruction methods of native and foreign English speaking instructors as determined by the Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS)?
- 2). To what extent is there a connection between instruction methods and the demographic variables of age, gender, country and the periods of instructing experience?
- 3). Are there any connections between the instructors' methods and their students' achievement?
- 4). Are there any differences between the females and males teaching styles?

3.1 Research Hypothesis

- 1). There exist discrepancies between male and female instructors in their instruction methods.
- 2). There are positive relationships between years of instruction experience, and instruction methods.
- 3). There are significant effects for streams and gender and their interaction on the English learning enjoyment.
- 4). There exist discrepancies between learners of native English speaking instructors and learners of foreign English speaking instructors in the enjoyment of English learning.
- 5). There are discrepancies between NESTs and NNESTs on instruction methods.
- 6). There exist discrepancies between native English speaking instructors' learners and foreign English speaking instructors' learners in their acquisition.

3.2 Significance of the Study

The present research is helpful to the domains of instructing English as a foreign language and adult instruction by giving the attitudes of Saudi EFL learners studying English in elementary year plans. Instructors and curriculum makers may discover this study helpful for enhancing curriculum structure and course methodology connected to the language student tactics applied by Saudi EFL learners.

3.3 The Aim of the Study

The aim of this research was to determine the instruction methods ELC native and foreign English speaking instructors in University of Taif, Saudi Arabia. It aims at achieving two major goals: first, the research aims at drawing attention to how teachers' teaching styles impact students' achievement. Secondly, the study intends to assess the connection between the teachers' teaching styles and their students' enjoyment of learning English.

4. Literature Review

4.1 Native and Non-Native English speaking Instructing Styles and Students' Achievement

Richards, Platt, & Platt, (1992) in their *Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics* characterized the native language as the language which someone learned in the early age. In the similar vein, Phillipson (1992) observed native subjects as the pattern of "standard grammar and vocabulary which teaching materials and sound recordings seek to reanimate," he further believed that their talent of "demonstrating fluent, idiomatically appropriate language, in appreciating the cultural connotations of the language" (p. 194). Phillipson (1992) astutely showed the significant relation between a language and the cultural facets that language implies. Native subjects not only possess the realization of language, but they also possess enough realization of the cultural facets within the language which makes them capable of speaking "natively." Their linguistic and social knowledge and the "native" accent have a notable role in language instructing tools.

Instruction method alludes to the obvious features presented by an instructor that are continuing from a context to another without reference to the content (Conti, 1989). To make a difference in student achievement, teachers must first realize their own instruction method and then perform classroom tasks related to that method while making a context convincing in relation to the various learning methods of their learners. To realize the instructing method of the instructors can make a discrepancy in how instructors set their courses, how they treat the students, and how well their subjects do in the realizing content (Conti, 1989, p. 88). While the results of Alghofaili & Elyas (2017) showed that instructors' native quality and presuppositions have no notable efficacy on the EFL Saudi learners' acquisition methods. And instead they attributed success in teaching to some other characteristics such as teachers' competence and experience, instructors sharing the learners' L1 play proper roles in the EFL acquisition process, instructors accent and teacher's personality. Corresponding to Mahboob (2004) and (Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014), NNESTs can be viewed as better at instructing reading, writing, grammar, and language-learning tasks because of their social realization and metalinguistic capability.

In the domain of English language instruction, some research have been done to assess the discrepancies between native and non-native language instructors concerning pedagogical good as well as bad points. (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999; Arva & Medgyes, 2000). Arva & Medgyes (2000) found out the discrepancies that are shown in three facets of instructions: own application of the language, overall thinking, and thinking about instructing the language. Concerning the higher command in English, native English-speaking instructors in their research inclined to deliver fewer exams and assignment and preferred free tasks, like work in teams or pairs, and the attitudes which had a great deal of instruments. In the opposite side, their nonnative subjects preferred more supervised tasks, like a translation task or practices, and got a more instructed attitude that needed a book and more assignment. Native instructors were viewed to be less competent to the instruction and less focused to learners' acquisition, while nonnative instructors were more astute and more adamant in instructing and had more realistic tackles with the learners' instruction. Regarding linguistic foci in instruction, native instructors wanted to concentrate such aspects as fluency, verbal tasks or colloquial registers, while nonnative instructors concentrated more on precision, grammar laws or formal registers.

Samimy & Brutt-Griffler (1999) noted the same discrepancies in instructing behaviors discovered in Arva & Medgyes's research. The subjects in Samimy & Brutt-Griffler's research believed that native-speaking instructors applied real English in communicating with learners, got various methods and tactics, and accentuated on interaction rather than test preparation. Nonnative speaking instructors believed to be cognizant of psychological facets of acquisition, more effective in instruction, but concentrating on the test preparation.

Moussu (2010) mentioned that previous studies have generally reported that native subjects of the English can be considered superior to their non-native subjects of English counterparts in the areas of pronunciation, vocabulary, idiomatic expressions, and Western cultures, whereas non-native subjects of the same language have been found to have a better understanding of grammar, teaching methods, and local education-related systems and cultures. Medgyes (1994) reported that most of the fore in subjects of English language approved the existence of discrepancies between native subjects of English language and non-native subjects of English in terms of their teaching behaviors, and noted a close relationship between native subjects of English and foreign subjects differences in their teaching practices and in their perceived linguistic competence.

4.2 Enjoyment and Teaching Styles

Early research on enjoyment is found in a study by Piaget (1962). He recommended that a baby in the game repeats his demeanor not in any further strive to acquire or assess but for the pleasure of learning it. Pleasure is a mode of feeling or psychological joy (Kuppens, 2008). Davis (1982) gave a causal approach of pleasure. The essential supposition is that an object of pleasure makes the speaker to have joy by causing concurrent attitudes that satisfy desires regarding the experience per se. The rate of pleasure can be characterized as a section of the learners' joy attributable to the object of pleasure. Ainley & John (2011) reported that pleasure is essential to connections between interest in knowledge, content of knowledge, and learners' delivered present and future works.

A number of former research believed that the experience of pleasure is a central element in specifying one's attitude for and continued attempt in task contexts (Kremer, Trew, & Ogle, 1997; Wankel, 1993). Pleasure and work are essential and preconditions of children's playful acquisition experiences (Malone, 1980; Prensky, 2001; Heidegger, 1990; Montessori, 1965). They all are needed for informal achievement and can be a benefit to real acquisition as well. Pleasure and funny works are famous to be influential in children's growth (Clements, 1995), both controlling and deepening the process of acquisition (Resnick, Bruckman, & Martin, 1999) as well as making the engagement easy and the attitude understandable. So, I selected them as the essential dependent variables assessed in this research. Scherer's study (1986) "revealed a relationship between teacher's enjoyment of teaching and student's enjoyment in learning process" (p. 12).

Prensky (2001) showed that a mixture of twelve factors make games fascinating. Fun and pleasure can be considered the most significant aspects of all these twelve factors. Al-Shara (2015) mentioned that students' enjoyment can be increased by focusing on operating learning resources in instructing and instigating learners who have low acquisition rates in the tasks. Nevertheless, he pointed out that the effect of learners' role on learners' pleasure was the least influenced element for learners who have lower acquisition level. Many studies pointed out absence or lack of enjoyment during the learning process affect negatively on the students' achievement and leads to failure to learn. In addition, student's enjoyment motivates him/her to learn (Kunter, Tsai, Klusmann, Brunner, Krauss, & Baumert, 2008).

5. Instrumentation

5.1 Pilot Study

The pilot study included two different samples of teachers and students. For the English learning enjoyment questionnaire the pilot research was accomplished applying the t-test style. The sample group numbered forty-two male and female students. The sample age ranged from 18-22 years ($M= 19.071$, $Sd= .808$). The students responded well to the survey questionnaire.

While the sample group numbered forty-nine male and female teachers. The Sample age ranged from 23-67 years ($M= 38.62$, $SD= 10.14$). The teachers participating are from different countries; they have been divided into two parts: native English subjects and foreign English subjects. They responded well to the survey questionnaire. The specific objectives for the pilot testing were: (1) to assure that the terminology and goal of every test have been realized by each subject. (2) To have recommendations to enhance the survey. (3) To specify the rate of period needed to complete the survey. (4) To determine the probable issues which may happen as the survey was designed to the learners. (5) To check the validity and reliability of the questionnaires.

5.2 Learning English Enjoyment Questionnaire

The Learning English Enjoyment questionnaire of 26 items was prepared and developed by the researcher. It is considered a self-reported measure. This researcher adopted learning-related enjoyment subscale of 10 items of the Accomplishment Feelings Survey that was designed by Pekrun, Goetz and Derry, 2005 and modified those items to be suitable for learning English as those items were written concerning learning, in general. The researcher generated 16 other items from personal teaching experience. So, the questionnaire became of 26 items and the final edition of the survey was revised and reviewed by the three English native speakers.

Enjoyment in this study was operationally defined as the students' ratings of their enjoyment and three relevant subscales on a one to five Likert style scale.

5.3 Psychometric Conditions of the Learning English Enjoyment Questionnaire in the Present Study

According to the case-total correlation two elements (4 & 11) were deleted, so it became 24 items instead of 26. To achieve trustworthy and prestigious responds from the learners and as the learners are foreign majors, the scholar translated the Learning English Enjoyment questionnaire (LEEQ) into Arabic language as the sample

students of the research are native speakers of Arabic. (See Appendix B). Based on the factor analysis items 9, 10, 18, 19 were also deleted. The final version of this questionnaire consisted of 20 items.

5.4 Case Validity and Inner Consistency for the Learning English Enjoyment Survey

The corrected case-total correlation rated from 0.39 to 0.70 ($p < 0.01$), recommending enough case prestige. The amended case-Subscale 1 (Enjoying to acquire new knowledge in English) correlation ranged from 0.35 to 0.70 ($p < 0.01$). For Subscale 2 (Motivational aspects/ affectional aspects) the correlation rated from 0.35 to 0.61 ($p < 0.01$). For Subscale 3 (having pleasure of taking part in English) the correlation rated from 0.45 to 0.65 ($p < 0.01$). For Subscale 4 (Enjoy doing English activities in the classroom) the correlation rated from 0.33 to 0.58 ($p < 0.01$). The correlation among elements rated from 0.40 to 0.79 but the correlation among elements and the total mark rated from 0.74 to 0.86. ($p < 0.05$ to $p < 0.01$).

The inner consistency was high for the whole survey ($\alpha = 0.90$), as well as for the minor scale 1 ($\alpha = 0.82$), minor scale 2 ($\alpha = 0.72$), minor scale 3 ($\alpha = 0.77$), minor scale 4 ($\alpha = 0.68$) the average total mark was 74.95 (S.D. = 12.08). The average for minor scale 1 was 27.83 (S.D. = 4.37), for minor scale 2 was 14.21 (S.D. = 3.17), for minor scale 3 was 19.07 (S.D. = 3.78) and for minor scale 4 was 13.83 (S.D. = 3.43).

5.5 Factor Analyses: Learning English Enjoyment Questionnaire

Principal-components factor analyses using varimax rotation were performed. The factor analysis yielded four-element solution for the marks in the "Learning English Enjoyment questionnaire" information. The four extracted elements considered below.

5.6 Element Assessment: Learning English Enjoyment Questionnaire

The four achieved elements considered for 61.78 of the whole variance. Equamax with Kaiser Normalization was then used. Table 1 shows a synopsis of the outcomes of the elements assessment of the "Learning English Enjoyment" information. The element loadings of every case in this part on the four circulated elements and tools, and standard deviations of the cases that were delivered in (see Appendix B). The questionnaire was designed according to a 5-point Likert-scale that ranged from indicating that the statement is strongly disagree through 5 the statement is strongly disagree.

5.7 Teaching Styles Questionnaire

5.7.1 Principles of Adult Learning Scales (PALS)

The researcher translated the Teaching styles questionnaire into Arabic as the students are non-English major and to get reliable responses from the students. The Arabic kind of the survey was debated and observed by skilled Arabic instructors to avoid any kind of vagueness in the wording of the survey and to ensure content validity.

Conti (1990) designed the Principles of Adult Learning Scales (PALS) that is a tool created to help persons in knowing their instructing method (Appendix B). This tool can help instructors to "pinpoint their specific classroom practices and relate them to what is known about teaching and learning" (p. 75). This 44-item instrument assesses the rate with which one exercises instructing/acquiring rules that are defined in the adult works. Good marks on the PALS show support for a student-centered attitude to instruction. Low grades show support for instructor-centered theory. The grades in the average range uncover a mixed attitude that draws on actions from every extreme. In addition to measuring overall tendencies toward either learner or teacher centeredness, and instructor's educational views on the following seven sub scores are provided: (a) student-Centered tasks, (b) enliven education, (c) connecting to practice, (d) evaluating learner requirements, (e) Climate Structure, (f) Taking part in the acquisition Process, and (g) Flexibility for Individual growth (Conti, 1985, p. 9).

5.7.2 Psychometric Conditions of the Teaching styles Questionnaire

Based on the item-total correlation for factors 16 items were deleted; 3, 6, 7, 9, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 32, 37, 40 & 42. So, the questionnaire became 28 instead of 44 items. To achieve a trustworthy and prestigious responds from the learners and as the learners are foreign experts, the scholar translated the Teaching methods survey into Arabic, as the sample students of the research are native speakers of Arabic (See Appendix A).

Item validity and internal consistency for Teaching Styles Questionnaire

The corrected item-total correlation ranged from 0.36 to 0.72 ($p < 0.01$), suggesting adequate item validity. The corrected item-Subscale 1 (Learner-Centered Activities) correlation ranged from 0.39 to 0.79 ($p < 0.01$), for Subscale 2 (Personalizing Instruction) the correlation ranged from 0.35 to 0.60 ($p < 0.01$), for Subscale 3 (Relating to Experience) the correlation ranged from 0.32 to 0.41 ($p < 0.01$), for Subscale 4 (Assessing Student

Needs) the correlation ranged from 0.35 to 0.47 ($p < 0.01$), but for Subscale 5 (Climate Building) the correlation ranged from 0.45 to 0.65 ($p < 0.01$), Subscale 6 (Participation in the Learning Process) the correlation ranged from 0.34 to 0.52 ($p < 0.01$), Subscale 7 (Flexibility for Personal Development) the correlation ranged from 0.44 to 0.74 ($p < 0.01$) suggesting adequate item validity. While the correlation between factors ranged from 0.29 to 0.65 and between factors and total score ranged from 0.45 to 0.89. ($p < 0.05$ to $p < 0.01$).

The inner consistency was high for the whole survey ($\alpha = 0.90$), as well as for minor scale 1 ($\alpha = 0.80$), minor scale 2 ($\alpha = 0.70$), minor scale 3 ($\alpha = 0.52$), minor scale 4 ($\alpha = 0.57$), minor scale 5 ($\alpha = 0.67$), minor scale 6 ($\alpha = 0.66$), and for minor scale 7 ($\alpha = 0.61$). The average Total grade has been 106.82 (S.D. = 23.36). The mean for minor scale 1 was 30.14 (S.D. = 8.48), for minor scale 2 has been 25.44 (S.D. = 5.81), for minor scale 3 has been 10.36 (S.D. = 3.08) for minor scale 4 was 6.86 (S.D. = 2.42), for minor scale 5 was 11.24 (S.D. = 4.11), for minor scale 6 has been 9.54 (S.D. = 3.09) and for minor scale 7 has been 13.10 (S.D. = 3.87).

6. Results

6.1 Hypothesis 1, There Are Significant Effects for Streams and Gender and Their Interaction (3×2) On the English Learning Enjoyment

Table 1. Gender and stream Crosstabulation

		Stream			Total
		Health	Science	humanity	
Gender	Male	146	56	72	274
	Female	140	118	77	335
Total		286	174	149	609

Table 2. Multivariate tests

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	η^2
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.951	2929.815	4.000	600.000	.000	.951
	Wilks' Lambda	.049	2929.815	4.000	600.000	.000	.951
	Hotelling's Trace	19.532	2929.815	4.000	600.000	.000	.951
	Roy's Largest Root	19.532	2929.815	4.000	600.000	.000	.951
Stream	Pillai's Trace	.090	7.095	8.000	1202.000	.000	.045
	Wilks' Lambda	.910	7.213	8.000	1200.000	.000	.046
	Hotelling's Trace	.098	7.330	8.000	1198.000	.000	.047
	Roy's Largest Root	.092	13.752	4.000	601.000	.000	.084
Gender	Pillai's Trace	.032	4.924	4.000	600.000	.001	.032
	Wilks' Lambda	.968	4.924	4.000	600.000	.001	.032
	Hotelling's Trace	.033	4.924	4.000	600.000	.001	.032
	Roy's Largest Root	.033	4.924	4.000	600.000	.001	.032
Stream * Gender	Pillai's Trace	.044	3.399	8.000	1202.000	.001	.022
	Wilks' Lambda	.956	3.410	8.000	1200.000	.001	.022
	Hotelling's Trace	.046	3.421	8.000	1198.000	.001	.022
	Roy's Largest Root	.038	5.719	4.000	601.000	.000	.037

Table 2 shows that through using Multivariate Tests (Pillai's Trace, Wilks' Lambda, Hotelling's Trace and Roy's Largest Root), F is significant. For the stream ($F(8, 1200) = 7.213 = P < 0.000$), Wilk's = 0.91 and partial Eta Square = 0.046. For gender, $F(4, 600) = 4.924 = P < 0.001$, Wilk's = 0.97, and partial Eta Square = 0.032. For the interaction between stream and gender $F(8, 1200) = 3.410 = P < 0.001$ Wilk's = .96, and partial Eta Square = 0.022.

Table 3. MANOVA for differences between gender and streams and their interactions on enjoyment questionnaire scores

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Stream	Enjoying to acquire new knowledge in English	1784.106	2	892.053	26.047	.000	.080
	Motivational aspects/ affectional aspects	244.450	2	122.225	9.804	.000	.031
	Enjoying participation in English	298.450	2	149.225	8.728	.000	.028
	Enjoy doing English activities in the classroom.	341.692	2	170.846	10.633	.000	.034
	Total score	8682.544	2	4341.272	17.920	.000	.056
Gender	Enjoying to acquire new knowledge in English	14.850	1	14.850	.434	.510	.001
	Motivational aspects/ affectional aspects	55.628	1	55.628	4.462	.035	.007
	Enjoying participation in English	73.906	1	73.906	4.323	.038	.007
	Enjoy doing English activities in the classroom.	191.707	1	191.707	11.931	.001	.019
	Total score	1139.374	1	1139.374	4.703	.030	.008
Stream * Gender	Enjoying to acquire new knowledge in English	692.092	2	346.046	10.104	.000	.032
	Motivational aspects/ affectional aspects	178.228	2	89.114	7.148	.001	.023
	Enjoying participation in English	292.004	2	146.002	8.539	.000	.028
	Enjoy doing English activities in the classroom.	127.310	2	63.655	3.962	.020	.013
	Total score	4530.302	2	2265.151	9.350	.000	.030
Error	Enjoying to acquire new knowledge in English	20651.706	603	34.248			
	Motivational aspects/ affectional aspects	7517.165	603	12.466			
	Enjoying participation in English	10309.735	603	17.097			
	Enjoy doing English activities in the classroom.	9688.932	603	16.068			
	Total score	146082.862	603	242.260			

Note. $\eta^2 = 0.01$ is a very small value, $\eta^2 = 0.06$ is an average effect, $\eta^2 = 0.15$ has a strong effect.

Table 3 reveals that there are effects for gender and stream on the students' enjoyment as factors and total score. There is an effect for streams (Health-Science-Humanities) on the students' enjoyment, whereas the total score of students' enjoyment questionnaire is $F(2, 606) = 17.920$, $P < 0.000$, $\eta^2 = 0.06$. This means that stream has an average effect on the students' enjoyment. For the effects of gender on English learning students' enjoyment, the total score of the students' enjoyment is $F(1, 607) = 4.703$, $P < .03$, $\eta^2 = 0.01$. This means that gender has a small effect on students' enjoyment. In addition, the interaction between stream and gender also effect on English learning students' enjoyment as factors and total score $F(2, 606) = 9.350$, $P < .000$, $\eta^2 = 0.030$. And to know the differences among groups according to the academic streams, **Scheffe test was used in the following table.**

Table 4. Multiple comparisons Scheffe test

Enjoyment questionnaire factors Dependent Variable	Mean Difference (I-J)		Std. Error	Sig.	
	(I) stream	(J) stream			
Enjoying to acquire new knowledge in English	Health	Science	1.9567*	.5627	.003
		humanity	4.1755*	.5913	.000
	Science	humanity	2.2189*	.6532	.003
Motivational aspects/ affectional aspects	Health	humanity	1.5850*	.3567	.000
Enjoying participation in English	Health	Science	.9815*	.3975	.048
		humanity	1.6405*	.4178	.000
Enjoy doing English activities in the classroom.	humanity	Health	1.9103*	.4050	.000
		Science	1.1031*	.4474	.049
Total score	Health	Science	4.4170*	1.4965	.013
		humanity	9.3114*	1.5726	.000
	Science	humanity	4.8944*	1.7373	.019

Note. Based on observed means.* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 4 shows that For *Factor 1*, There exist notable discrepancies between health stream ($M = 27.692$, $Sd = 5.103$) and science stream ($M = 25.736$, $Sd = 6.449$) in favor of health stream. As well as there are significant differences between health stream ($M = 27.692$, $Sd = 5.103$) and humanities ($M = 23.517$, $Sd = 6.757$) in favor of health. There exist notable discrepancies between science stream and humanities in favor of science. For factor 2, there are significant differences between health stream ($M = 14.0280$, $SD = 3.355$) and humanities (12.443 , $sd = 3.875$) in favor of health stream. For factor 3, There exist notable discrepancies between health stream ($M =$

18.573, Sd= 3.728) and science stream (M= 17.592, Sd= 4.403) in favor of health stream. There exist notable discrepancies between health stream and humanities (16.933, sd= 4.808) in favor of health stream.

For factor 4, There exist notable discrepancies between health stream (M= 14.273, Sd= 3.404) and humanities (12.362, sd= 4.087) in favor of health stream. There exist notable discrepancies between humanities science stream (M= 13.465, Sd= 4.978) in favor of science stream. For the total score, There exist notable discrepancies between the total score of the Health stream (M= 74.566, Sd= 13.650) and the total score of science stream (M= 70.149, Sd= 17.237) in favor of the Health stream. There exist notable discrepancies between the total of the health stream and humanities (65.255, sd= 17.993) in favor of health stream. There exist notable discrepancies between total score of science stream and total score of humanities in favor of science stream.

6.2 The Differences in Gender for English Learning Enjoyment

For factor 1, there are significant differences between males (M= 26.438, sd= 6.233) and females (M= 25. 845, sd= 6.107) in favor of males. For factor 2, there are significant differences between males (M= 14.699, sd= 3.417) and females (M= 13.329, sd= 3.152) in favour of males. For factor 3, there are significant differences between males (M= 19.404, sd= 3.298) and females (M= 17.707, sd= 3.958) in favor of males. For factor 4, there exist notable discrepancies between males (M= 15.0822, sd= 3.310) and females (M= 13.429, sd= 3.305) in favor of males. For the total score, there exist notable discrepancies between males (M=73.095, SD=16.591), and females (M=69.334, SD=15.842), in favor of males.

Table 5. Discrepancies between the students of native English speaking instructors and the students of foreign English speaking instructors in the English learning enjoyment

Enjoyment questionnaire factors	Teacher' type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	df	Sig																																												
Enjoying to acquire new knowledge in English	Native	247	27.3522	5.4117	4.124	606	0.000																																												
	non-native	361	25.2798	6.5074				Motivational aspects/ affectional aspects	Native	247	13.9879	3.5481	3.041	606	0.002	non-native	361	13.0803	3.6593	Enjoying participation in English	Native	247	18.4494	3.9143	2.634	606	0.009	non-native	361	17.5291	4.4347	Enjoy doing English activities in the classroom.	Native	247	14.2794	4.3081	3.473	606	0.001	non-native	361	13.1025	3.9585	Total score	Native	247	74.0688	14.5468	3.820	606	0.000
Motivational aspects/ affectional aspects	Native	247	13.9879	3.5481	3.041	606	0.002																																												
	non-native	361	13.0803	3.6593				Enjoying participation in English	Native	247	18.4494	3.9143	2.634	606	0.009	non-native	361	17.5291	4.4347	Enjoy doing English activities in the classroom.	Native	247	14.2794	4.3081	3.473	606	0.001	non-native	361	13.1025	3.9585	Total score	Native	247	74.0688	14.5468	3.820	606	0.000	non-native	361	68.9917	17.0761								
Enjoying participation in English	Native	247	18.4494	3.9143	2.634	606	0.009																																												
	non-native	361	17.5291	4.4347				Enjoy doing English activities in the classroom.	Native	247	14.2794	4.3081	3.473	606	0.001	non-native	361	13.1025	3.9585	Total score	Native	247	74.0688	14.5468	3.820	606	0.000	non-native	361	68.9917	17.0761																				
Enjoy doing English activities in the classroom.	Native	247	14.2794	4.3081	3.473	606	0.001																																												
	non-native	361	13.1025	3.9585				Total score	Native	247	74.0688	14.5468	3.820	606	0.000	non-native	361	68.9917	17.0761																																
Total score	Native	247	74.0688	14.5468	3.820	606	0.000																																												
	non-native	361	68.9917	17.0761																																															

Table 5 indicates that there exist notable discrepancies between the students of native English instructors and the students of foreign English speaking instructors on the English learning enjoyment questionnaire in favor of the students of native English speaking teachers in all factors and total score.

Table 6. Differences between students of native English speaking instructors and students of foreign in the achievement

	Teacher' type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Df	sig
Achievement	Native	266	77.8308	11.3973	3.789	607	0.000
	non-native	343	74.0729	12.6839			

Table 6 indicates that there exist notable discrepancies between students' achievement of NESTs and NNESTs in favor of students' achievement of native teachers. This is could be explained in the light of native English speaking teachers are more persuasive teachers inside the classroom as the English language their mother tongue. It might be because also focus on Student-centered -approach the teacher centered -approach more than foreign instructors. In addition, English instructors are more interested in using teaching aids inside the classroom those foreign instructors. Native teachers are more encouraging for the students' accomplishments.

Table 7. The discrepancies between English and foreign English speaking instructors in their instruction styles

Teaching styles questionnaire	Nationality	N	Mean	Sd.	t	Df	sig
Learner centered activities	Native	20	22.650	7.220	1.878	49	0.066
	ESL	31	19.032	6.3796			
Personalizing instruction	Native	20	14.800	4.262	1.602	49	0.116
	ESL	31	12.774	4.499			
Relating to experience	Native	20	8.700	3.131	1.473	49	0.147
	ESL	31	7.484	2.706			
Assessing student needs	Native	20	8.100	3.144		49	0.058
	ESL	31	6.613	2.319			
Climate building	Native	20	10.400	2.891		49	0.005
	ESL	31	8.226	2.376			
Participation in the learning process	Native	20	7.550	2.089		49	0.699
	ESL	31	7.323	2.006			
Flexibility for personal development	Native	20	8.3000	3.0796		49	0.008
	ESL	31	6.3871	1.9092			
Total score	Native	20	80.5000	19.3540		49	0.020
	ESL	31	68.4839	16.1428			

Table 7 reveals that there exist notable discrepancies between native and foreign English speaking instructors' instructing methods in favor of native English speaking instructors in their instruction methods in factors 5, 7, and total score.

Table 8. Teachers' gender differences among native and foreign English speaking instructors in their instruction methods

Teaching styles questionnaire	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	sig
Learner centered activities	Male	20	20.350	7.4004	0.083	49	0.934
	female	31	20.516	6.6577			
Personalizing instruction	Male	20	12.1000	3.5229	1.932	49	0.059
	female	31	14.5161	4.8157			
Relating to experience	Male	20	7.9500	2.7429	0.021	49	0.983
	female	31	7.9677	3.0603			
Assessing student needs	Male	20	7.1000	2.4688	0.199	49	0.843
	female	31	7.2581	2.9436			
Climate building	Male	20	8.8500	2.4554	0.468	49	0.642
	female	31	9.2258	2.9968			
Participation in the learning process	Male	20	7.6000	2.3709	0.530	49	0.598
	female	31	7.2903	1.7925			
Flexibility for personal development	Male	20	6.4000	2.3709	1.665	49	0.102
	female	31	7.6129	2.6417			
Total	Male	20	70.3500	17.8304	0.892	49	0.377
	female	31	75.0323	18.6037			

Table 8 shows that there exist no notable discrepancies between male and female instructors in their instruction methods. They have the teaching training workshops.

*** There is positive significant connection between instruction experience and instruction methods $r = 0.532$, $p < 0.01$. This affirmed that teaching experience playing an important role in teaching style. However, teaching experience is not the only factor that effect on teaching style but there are other factors that effect on teaching style such as personality traits, self-efficacy, syllabus, class climate, students' academic levels... etc.

7. Discussion

The inclusive goal of the current investigation has been to find out the discrepancies between native and foreign English speaking instructors' teaching styles and their Effect on their students' achievement and enjoyment of learning English registered in an extensive English language plan at the University of Taif. The present research revealed the importance of using native teachers teaching styles that help EFL Saudi students to learn the English language successfully. The findings revealed that there exist notable discrepancies between native and foreign English speaking instructors in the EFL Saudi students' achievement in favor of NESTs.

This outcome is to some extent in line with the research of Al-Nawrasy (2013) that indicated that there existed a notable correlation between being a native subject and accent in favor of the NESTs and a notable correlation between precision and being a native subject in favor of the NNESTs. Native and foreign English speaking instructors were considered to be various in their language instruction methods. Native English speaking instructors supposed to be much better in instructing advanced reading, speaking and listening courses. At the same time, they were considered to be much better in instructing more colloquial in instructing language or comprehension connected to the social understanding of the target language.

The reason may be because native English instructors are able to convey the significance and advantages of speaking a foreign language and delivering various tactics to enhance learners' acquisition. Such outcomes agree with lots of other outcomes that showed that NESTs were recommended to instruct speaking because of their precise eloquence and accent such as (Al-Omrani, 2008; Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Lee, 2004; Moussu, 2010; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999; Tang, 1997). Although it is not consistent with many of findings, which affirmed that instructors nativeness and former works have no notable influences on the EFL Saudi learners' acquisition processes (e.g., Alghofaili & Elyas, 2017). Nevertheless, Wardak (2014) obviously shows that NES and NNEST instructors are equally competent, and potent to instruct at more advanced levels.

Furthermore, the results declared that there exist discrepancies between the learners of native English speaking instructors and the learners of foreign English speaking instructors for the English learning enjoyment in favor of the students of native English speaking teachers. This could be explained in the light of that foreign English speaking instructors sometimes used some Arabic words, so the student does not feel that he achieve the main goal of learning English to talk in English all time. In addition to, native English speaking teachers use different teaching practices/strategies inside the classroom more non-native. Native English speaking teachers encourage the students to use English language practically. While non-native teachers encourage the students to memorize. Also because native teachers build different channels for communication with their student such as emails, Facebook, chat,... etc. This result agrees with the researches, e.g., Dewaele (1992) and Regan (1996) which found that active interaction with native speakers has the most significant effect and important effect on the acquisition of second language. However, On the contrary the present study Beckett & Stiefvater (2009) confirm that learners are pleased to learn from NNESTs in classes like presentation talents, math, engineering, and business, particularly from NNESTs that share their social background.

The most striking difference in these data was between men and women in learners in the enjoyment of learning the English language in favor of the males. The findings indicate significant gender discrepancies in the pleasure of acquiring the English language in favor of the males. Such result is consistent with other earlier studies (e.g., Carroll, 2001; Frenzel, Pekrun, & Goetz, 2007; Siebert, 2003) which reported that boys possessed more positive perceptions of enjoyment than girls. On the contrary, this finding does not get along with the studies of Al Shara (2015) and Gorard (2011) which affirm that girls experienced more enjoyment than boys and under 50% of female noted pleasing schools, in comparison with just above 40% of male.

Regarding the gender discrepancies between male and female teachers, this study sees no differences among them. Similarly this result agrees with the study of Starbuck (2003). However, this study is contradicted with many former studies that examined teaching styles and discovered that the methods of men and women faculty differed (Kuh, Nelson Laird, & Umbach, 2004; Lacey, Saleh, & Gorman, 1998; Statham, Richardson, & Cook, 1991).

Regards to the influence of instruction experience on teacher efficacy, this study affirmed that teaching experience playing an important role in teaching style. Such this finding agrees with the study of Hebert, Lee, & Williamson (1998) that found a discrepancy between novice and experienced instructors.

8. Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to analyze differences between native and foreign English speaking instructors' methods and styles and their Effect on their students' achievement and enjoyment of learning English. The outcomes of the present research supported the native English speaking instructors in their teaching styles and the students' achievement and enjoyment. The outcomes of the research also depicted that there exist gender discrepancies for the Enjoyment of acquisition. It means that men graded better than women for the pleasure of learning. This study can contribute to reducing gender difference regarding students' enjoyment toward learning English in Saudi Arabia by ensuring that all students are encouraged to motivate and participate in learning English. Paying more attention to the conditions of study in the university through building a suitable and enjoyable environment can help students to achieve more.

Although the outcomes of the current research may not be generalized to all native and foreign English subjects,

however they provide insights into the general view of native and foreign English subjects instruction styles and their effects on their students' achievement. The small size of the sample constitutes another limitation of the study. Using only thirty five native and non-native EFL teachers might not be representative enough to second language generalize the findings of the research to the entire native and non-native EFL teachers who might have other ways of teaching their classes that the study did not address.

Future studies could investigate teaching styles in secondary instruction so as to assess the efficacy of the styles suggested by this study for practicing teachers. In so doing, they could bring improvement in what did not work and share the findings with teachers from other places.

References

- Ainley, M., & John, A. (2011). Student engagement with science in early adolescence: The contribution of enjoyment to students' continuing interest in learning about science. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, Suppl. Students' Emotions and Academic Engagement*, 36(1), 4-12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2010.08.001>
- Alghofaili, N. M., & Elyas, T. (2017). Decoding the Myths of the Native and Non-Native English Speakers Teachers (NESTs & NNESTs) on Saudi EFL Tertiary Students. *English Language Teaching*, 10(6), 1-11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2010.08.001>
- Al-Nawrasy, O. (2013). The Effect of Native and Nonnative English Language Teachers on Secondary Students' Achievement in Speaking Skills. *Jordan Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9(2), 243-254.
- Al-Omrani, A. H. (2008). Perceptions and attitudes of Saudi ESL and EFL students toward native and nonnative English-speaking teachers. ProQuest.
- Al-Shara, I. (2015). Learning and Teaching between Enjoyment and Boredom as Realized by the Students: A Survey from the Educational Field. *European Scientific Journal*, 11(19), 146-168.
- Arva, V., & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and Non-native Teachers in the Classroom. *System*, 28(3), 355-372. <http://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014534451>
- Beckett, G. H., & Stiefvater, A. (2009). Change in ESL graduate students' perspectives on non-native English-speaker teachers. *TESL Canada Journal*, 27(1), 27-46. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v27i1.1028>
- Carroll, B. L. (2001). Children's perceived competence and enjoyment in physical education and physical activity outside school. *European Physical Education Review*, 7, 24-43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X010071005>
- Clements, D. (1995). Playing with computers, playing with ideas. *In Educational Psychology Review*, 7(2), 203-207. <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF02212494>
- Conti, G. (1989). Assessing teaching style in continuing education. In E. R. Hayes (Ed.), *Effective teaching styles* (pp. 87-91). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.36719894303>
- Davis, W. (1982). A causal theory of enjoyment. In *Proceedings of Mind 91*, XCI Press, 240-256. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mind/xci.362.240>
- Dewaele, J. M. (1992). L'omission du ne dans deux styles oraux d'interlangue française. *Interface: Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 3-17.
- Frenzel, A. C., Pekrun, R., & Goetz, T. (2007). Girls and mathematics—A “hopeless” issue? A control-value approach to gender differences in emotions towards mathematics. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 22, 497-514. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03173468>
- Gorard, S. S. (2011). How can we enhance enjoyment of secondary school? The student view. *British Educational Research Journal*, 37, 671-690. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.488718>
- Herbert, E., Lee, A., & Williamson, L. (1998). Teachers' and Teacher Education Students' Sense of Efficacy: Quantitative and Qualitative Comparisons. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 31(4), 214-225.
- Heidegger, M. (1990). *Being and Time*. (Q. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). Oxford: Blackwell,
- Knowles, M. S. (1970). *The modern practice of adult education: Andragogy versus pedagogy*. New York: Association Press.
- Kremer, J., Trew, K., & Ogle, S. (1997). *Young People's Involvement in Sport*. London: Routledge.

- Kuh, G. D., Nelson Laird, T. F., & Umbach, P. D. (2004). Aligning faculty and student behavior: Realizing the promise of Greater Expectations. *Liberal Education*, 90(4), 24-31.
- Kunter, M., Tsai, Y. M., Klusmann, U., Brunner, M., Krauss, S., & Baumert, J. (2008). Students' and mathematics teachers' perceptions of teacher enthusiasm and instruction. *Learning and Instruction*, 18, 468-482. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2008.06.008>
- Kuppens, P. (2008). Individual differences in the relationship between pleasure and arousal. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42, 1053-1059. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2007.10.007>
- Lacey, C. H., Saleh, A., & Gorman, R. (1998). *Teaching nine to five: A study of the teaching styles of male and female professors*. Paper presented at the Annual Women in Education Conference, Lincoln, Nebraska, October 11-12.
- Lee, I. (2004). Preparing nonnative English speakers for EFL teaching in Hong Kong. In Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and Teaching from Experience* (pp. 230-250). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Mahboob, A. (2004). Native or nonnative: What do students enrolled in an intensive English program think? In L. D. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience* (pp. 121-148). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Malone, T. W. (1980). What makes things fun to learn? Heuristics for designing instructional computer games. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM SIGMAEL Symposium and the First SIGPC Symposium on Small Systems*. Palo Alto, California, United States, SIGSMALL '80. ACM, New York, NY, 162-169. <https://doi.org/10.1145/800088.802839>
- Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher*. London: Macmillan. Walkinshaw, and Duong.
- Montessori, M. M. (1965). *Spontaneous Activity in Education: The Advanced Montessori Method*. New York: John Wiley.
- Moussu, L. (2010). Influence of teacher-contact time and other variables on ESL students' attitudes towards native- and non-native-English-speaking teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44, 746-768. <http://doi.org/10.2307/27896762>
- Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., & Derry, R. P. (2005). Achievement Emotions Questionnaire (AEQ), User's Manual. Department of Psychology, Munich University.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). ELT: The native speaker's burden? *ELT Journal*, 46(1), 12-18. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/46.1.12>
- Piaget, J. (1962). *Play, dreams and imitation in childhood*. New York: Norton.
- Prensky, M. F. (2001). Play and Games: What Makes Games Engaging. In *Digital game-based learning*. Comput. Entertain.
- Regan, V. (1996). Variation in French interlanguage: A longitudinal study of sociolinguistic competence. In R. Bayley & D. Preston (Eds.), *Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Variation* (pp. 177-201). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sibil.10.08reg>
- Resnick, M., Bruckman, A., & Martin, F. (1999). Constructional Design: Creating New Construction Kits for Kids. In A. Druin (Ed.), *The Design of Children's Technology*. San Francisco, USA: Morgan Kaufmann.
- Richards, J., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). *Language Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Harlow: Longman.
- Samimy, K. K., & Brutt-Griffler, J. (1999). To Be a Native Speaker: Perceptions of "Non-Native" Students in a Graduate TESOL Program. In G. Braine (Eds.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching*, 127-145. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Scherer, K. R. (1986). Vocal affect expression: A review and a model for future research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 99, 143-156. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.99.2.143>
- Siebert, L. L. (2003). Student and teacher beliefs about language learning. *The ORTESOL Journal*, 21, 7-39.
- Starbuck, G. H. (2003). College teaching styles by gender. Paper presented at the Western Social Science Association Annual Meeting, Las Vegas, NV, April 9-12.
- Statham, A., Richardson, L., & Cook, J. A. (1991). *Gender and university teaching: A negotiated difference*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Walkinshaw, I., & Oanh, D. H. (2014). *Native and non-native English language teachers: Student perceptions in Vietnam and Japan*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE publication. <http://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014534451>
- Wankel, L. M. (1993). The Importance of Enjoyment to Adherence and Psychological Benefits from Physical Activity. *Proceedings of International Journal of Sport Psychology 2A*, 151-169.
- Wardak, M. (2014). Native and Non-Native English Speaking Teachers' Advantages and Disadvantages. *Arab World English Journal*, 5(3), 124-141.

Appendix A.

Principles of Adult Learning Scale

Dear colleague,

The following survey contains several things that a teacher of University students might do in a classroom. You may personally find some of them desirable and find others undesirable. For each item please respond to the way you most frequently practice the action described in the item. Your choices are Always, Almost Always, Often, Seldom, Almost Never, and Never. If the item **does not apply** to you, select Never.

Thank you for taking the time to assist me in this research

Age _____ Gender _____

Place of Birth _____

Years of teaching experiences (How many) _____

PYP morning Group number _____

Highest Degree Held _____

No. items	Items	Always	Almost Always	Often	Seldom	Almost never	Never
	1. Learner centered activities						
1	I allow students to participate in developing the criteria for evaluating their performance in class.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2	I use disciplinary action when it is needed.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3	I allow my students more time to complete assignments when they need it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4	I encourage students to adopt middle-class values.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5	I help students diagnose the gaps between their goals and their present level of performance.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6	I provide knowledge rather than serve as a resource person.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	I stick to the instructional objectives that I write at the beginning of a program.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8	I participate in the informal counseling of students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9	I use lecturing as the best method for presenting my subject material to the students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10	I arrange the classroom so that it is easy for students to interact.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11	I determine the educational objectives for each of my students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12	I plan units which differ as widely as possible from my students' socio-economic backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5	6
	2. Personalizing instruction						
13	I get a student to motivate himself/ herself by confronting him/her in the presence of classmates during group discussions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14	I plan learning episodes to take into account my students' prior experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15	I allow students to participate in making decisions about the topics that will be covered in class.	1	2	3	4	5	6

16	I use one basic teaching method because I have found that most adults have a similar style of learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17	I use different techniques depending on the students being taught.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18	I encourage dialogue among my students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19	I use written tests to assess the degree of academic growth in learning rather than to indicate new directions for learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20	I utilize the many competencies that most students already possess to achieve educational objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21	I use what history has proven that students need to learn as my chief criteria for planning learning episodes.	1	2	3	4	5	6
	3. Relating to experience						
22	I accept errors as a natural part of the learning process.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23	I have individual conferences to help students identify their educational needs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24	I let each student work at his/her own rate regardless of the amount of time it takes him/her to learn a new concept.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25	I help my students develop short-range as well as long-range objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26	I maintain a well-disciplined classroom to reduce interferences to learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27	I avoid discussion of controversial subjects that involve value judgments.	1	2	3	4	5	6
	4. Assessing student needs						
28	I allow my students to take periodic breaks during the class.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29	I use methods that foster quiet, productive, deskwork.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30	I use tests as my chief method of evaluating students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31	I plan activities that will encourage each student's growth from dependence on others to greater independence.	1	2	3	4	5	6
	5. Climate building						
32	I gear my instructional objectives to match the individual abilities and needs of the students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33	I avoid issues that relate to the student's concept of himself/herself.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34	I encourage my students to ask questions about the nature of their society.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35	I allow a student's motives for participating in continuing education to be a major determinant in the planning of learning objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	6
	6. Participation in the learning process						
36	I have my students identify their own problems that need to be solved.	1	2	3	4	5	6
37	I give all students in my class the same assignment on a given topic.	1	2	3	4	5	6
38	I use materials that were originally designed for students in university.	1	2	3	4	5	6
39	I organize adult learning episodes according to the problems that my students encounter in everyday life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
	7. Flexibility for personal development						
40	I measure a student's long-term educational growth by comparing his/her total achievement in class to his/her expected performance as measured by national norms from standardized tests.	1	2	3	4	5	6
41	I encourage competition among my students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
42	I use different materials with different students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
43	I help students relate new learning to their prior experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	6
44	I teach units about problems of everyday living.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix B.

Learning English Enjoyment Questionnaire (LEEQ)

First version of Learning English Enjoyment questionnaire

No. items	Items	Strongly disagree	disagree	Agree to somewhat	Agree	Strongly agree
1	I look forward to studying English.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I enjoy the challenge of learning the English material.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I enjoy acquiring new knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I enjoy dealing with English course material.	1	2	3	4	5
5	Reflecting on my progress in my English coursework makes me happy.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I study more than required because I enjoy studying English very much.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I am very happy about the progress I have made, so I am motivated to continue studying English.	1	2	3	4	5
8	Certain English subjects are so enjoyable that I am motivated to do extra reading about them.	1	2	3	4	5
9	When my studies are going well, it gives me a “rush”.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I become physically excited when my studies are going well.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I enjoy being in the English class.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I enjoy doing English activities.	1	2	3	4	5
13	I enjoy learning English.	1	2	3	4	5
14	I enjoy listening to English.	1	2	3	4	5
15	I enjoy participating in the English class.	1	2	3	4	5
16	I enjoy talking English with the English native speakers.	1	2	3	4	5
17	I enjoy reading English short stories.	1	2	3	4	5
18	I enjoy my interaction with my teacher in English.	1	2	3	4	5
19	I enjoy benefiting from my teacher’s sharing of her unique information and experiences.	1	2	3	4	5
20	I enjoy participating in group work in English lectures.	1	2	3	4	5
21	I enjoy helping other students in the English course.	1	2	3	4	5
22	I enjoy preparing for the English lessons before attending the class.	1	2	3	4	5
23	I enjoy studying with my classmates for English exams.	1	2	3	4	5
24	I enjoy acquiring useful English expressions from my English teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
25	I enjoy making a note of useful English expressions.	1	2	3	4	5
26	When my teacher includes various forms of technology, I enjoy learning English more.	1	2	3	4	5

Learning English Enjoyment questionnaire

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Equamax with Kaiser Normalization. A Rotation converged in 14 iterations.

Table 1. Factor analyses: learning English enjoyment questionnaire

Factor	Description	Eigen value	% of variance	Cumulative %
1	Enjoying to acquire new knowledge in English	3.896	17.710	17.710
2	Motivational aspects/ affectional aspects	3.422	15.554	33.264
3	Enjoying participating/ group work in English	3.139	14.266	47.531
4	Enjoy doing English activities in the classroom.	3.135	14.251	61.781

Table 3. Dimension-total correlations between dimensions and total score for learning English enjoyment questionnaire subscales

Sub factors	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Correlations	0.810**	0.878**	0.744**	0.858**

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the $p < 0.01$.

Final version of learning English enjoyment questionnaire

No. items	Items	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Mean	Sd
	Enjoying to acquire new knowledge in English						
1	I look forward to studying English.	0.818				4.2857	.7420
2	I enjoy the challenge of learning the English material.	0.792				3.7857	.9509
3	I enjoy acquiring new knowledge about the English language/in English.	0.701				4.2857	.7420
5	Reflecting on my progress in my English coursework makes me happy.	0.357				4.4762	.8036
13	I enjoy learning English.	0.597				4.0952	.8782
14	I enjoy listening to English.	0.548				3.5238	1.0178
17	I enjoy reading English short stories.	0.398				3.3810	1.1252
	Motivational aspects/ affectional aspects						
6	I study more than required because I enjoy studying English very much.		0.367			3.0952	1.0075
7	I am very happy about the progress I have made, so I am motivated to continue studying English.		0.617			3.7857	.9762
8	Certain English subjects are so enjoyable that I am motivated to do extra reading about them.		0.422			3.4524	1.1306
25	I enjoy making a note of useful English expressions.		0.772			3.8810	1.1935
	Enjoying participation in English						
15	I enjoy participating in the English class.			0.585		3.5714	1.0393
20	I enjoy participating in group work in English lectures.			0.707		3.8810	1.0170
21	I enjoy helping other students in the English course.			.0874		4.1905	1.0415
23	I enjoy studying with my classmates for English exams.			0.461		3.5952	1.2699
26	When my teacher includes various forms of technology, I enjoy learning English more.			0.569		3.2381	1.1001
	Enjoy doing English activities in the classroom						
12	I enjoy doing English activities in the classroom.				0.369	3.2857	1.0190
16	I enjoy speaking in English with the English native teacher.				0.620	3.5714	1.1717
24	I enjoy acquiring useful English expressions from my English teacher.				0.369	3.5952	1.2699
22	I enjoy preparing for the English lessons before attending the class.				0.625	3.3810	1.3058

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).