



A Tale of Two Foreign Languages: A Comparison of the Methods Used by Arabic and English Teachers' Used in High School Classes

Arezoo Qolinejad Kamarposhti ^{1*}

Education Department, Chalous, Iran¹

Correspondence e-mail *: golinejad1359@gmail.com

Abstract: Both Arabic and English as foreign languages are compulsory in Iranian high schools and have been taught for decades. The textbooks and teaching methods which have been used in Arabic and English classes in high schools have undergone so many changes in the past decades in Iran. Unlike teaching Arabic as a foreign language, in Iran, teaching English as a foreign language has been in the cannon of attention in terms of the volume of research done on both the language and teaching methodologies. This implies that teaching these two languages has been dealt with different out of the class. This research aims at tracing such a difference within a single class through a case study method. Qualitative case study research using classroom observation and retrospective interview was utilized to see two teachers, one teaching Arabic and the other teaching English adopt different teaching methods within a single class. The analysis of field notes from eight hours of observation and the data from the semi-structured interviews showed that the teachers adopted quite different methods in the class. While the English teacher was linguistically oriented focusing on morphosyntactic rules, the Arabic teacher focused on translation and every-day use of language relying on community related examples, some of which were created by the students themselves. Moreover, the English teacher bolded the use of technological aids for teaching, especially, use of multimedia. The pedagogical implications of the findings were discussed, according to the findings of the study.

Keyword: Arabic, English, Foreign Language, High School Class, Teaching Methods

Article info: Submitted : 2025-06-07 | Accepted : 2025-06-29 | Published : 2025-07-07

Copyright © 2025, Author.

This is an open-access article under the [CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)



How to Cite :

Introduction

Both Arabic and English have been present in high school foreign language curriculum in the past decades considering the roles they played with regard to national affairs, regional importance and cultural significance. The role of English as a lingua franca has made it a must-learn language in Iran, especially, with reference to its role in scientific give-and-take. Arabic has also been emphasized by Iranian educational policy makers considering the fact that the majority of the countries in the Middle East house Arab-speaking citizens. In addition, Arabic is religiously important since it is a language of Qur'an and is a communication bond among Islamic countries. Accordingly, both languages have been taught in high schools parallel to one another

and the Iranian high school students spend almost the same amount of time learning them and taking their tests yearly.

However, and particularly in the Iranian context, the teaching of a second language is eclipsed by English as a foreign language. This happens since this language is taught widely out of high schools with wide coverage in the private sector, although without the expected effect of achieving bilingualism in the Iranian population (Shademan, Baykan & Gorji, 2016). Another point which has to be considered is that in contrast to teaching Arabic as a second language, the English language has been extensively researched, both in its internal structure and social use, as well as in its teaching methodologies, in Iran. However, as Kumaravadivelu (2013) pointed, this is common to many contexts where English is taught as a second or a foreign language, in part, because this language allows access to millions of speakers around the world, study or work possibilities, cultural exchange, scientific development, etc. These factors make it an attractive language for students; however, Arabic has encountered some resistance in the Iranian context, either due to ideological positions towards the language or simply due to infrastructure problems in educational centers, number of specialized teachers, socioeconomic level of students, foreign language teaching methodologies, among others (Tavakolimohammadi, Siyami & Farzane, 2022).

This leads to different perceptions of these two languages, mostly negative towards Arabic and positive towards English, which impacts on the motivation to learn them. Thus, it is pertinent to study how these languages are taught in intercultural contexts and particularly to young learners in Iran in order to gain a better understanding of how to improve their preservation or teaching. In particular, this study seeks to contribute to a little-explored area, such as the comparison of methodologies for teaching a global language and a local one with the specific objectives of identifying, characterizing, and comparing the teaching discourses and their methodological practices used in high schools.

Conceptual Background

1. Bilingualism in High Schools

In the first place, the modern approaches to teaching a second or a foreign language is viewed as an intercultural phenomenon, because it assumes a respectful relationship between peoples. However, Álvarez (2008) argues that this type of intercultural education evades the social and political context, since it is necessary to understand the culture and interpret its manifestations according to its own terms, but often the educational criteria emanate from the dominant culture.

Secondly, and in terms of bilingualism, students must have significant contact with the language, taking into account the little linguistic stimulus that exists in the environment in which the speakers of the language operate. For example, Hamers and Blanc (2000) argue that additive bilingualism is the state of community members who

have language skills in two languages and in which there is a positive appreciation of the languages used through constant use of both codes. However, in Iranian high schools where Arabic and English are taught, not only are the teaching hours short for students to be bilingual, but also Persian or students first language is the dominant language, which decreases dramatically the level of exposure to the foreign language.

In addition, another problem with intercultural programs has been the absence of teachers with communication and didactic skills to teach foreign languages. Moreover, despite the fact that the textbooks currently taught in Iranian high schools are claimed to be communicative, little specific knowledge has been developed to be used in the teaching a foreign language using this method among teachers (Jafari, Shokrpour & Guetterman, 2015).

2. The Role of English in Iran

Undoubtedly, English is currently an international language (Crystal, 2003) and a lingua franca (Kumaravadivelu, 2013). In particular, the process of influence of English has been due to historical and sociocultural reasons under British influence and then under the power of the United States since the second half of the 20th century. It is a very important tool in business, scientific research, education, tourism, international relations, among others (Graddol, 2006) and it is estimated that it is spoken by 1.5 billion people, either as their mother tongue, second or foreign (British Council, 2018), which is equivalent to a quarter of the world's population. In this way, English has become an essential language in the globalized world. Consequently, this language is one of the fundamental skills that Iranian students must master in order to make the challenges of the continent even more visible and help achieve the economic development of the countries (Glass, 2013).

Iran has historically had several challenges in improving educational success when teaching English as a foreign language. First, there is no immediate need to use English on a daily basis in the region, since it is made up of Arabic-speaking countries, one Turkish-speaking country, and Pashtu-speaking population among other language minorities, which partly explains the low motivation of students with respect to learning the English language nation-wide. Other factors have also been considered of great importance, such as access to technology in the classroom (and also at home), the location/geography of schools, systems for measuring second language proficiency, the percentage public/private spending, infrastructure development, as well as teacher training (see Atai & Mazlum, 2013; Behroozi & Amoozegar, 2014; Khany & Darabi, 2014; Narafshan & Yamini, 2011; Zarrabi & Brown, 2017).

Despite the implementation of different educational policies for several decades and teaching English as a compulsory subject in the high school curriculum, the expected Persian-English bilingualism has not yet been achieved. The situation is quite different in the private sector, where institutes are free to tailor their curricula

according to their institutional objectives. Along these lines, many educational institutions have increased the weekly hours of English as a foreign language, since these schools have more resources to invest in bilingual education.

3. Teaching and Learning Foreign Languages

Traditionally, it has been considered that pedagogical instruction consists of three processes: curriculum, evaluation and teaching methodology; this division is somewhat academic, since these three elements are mixed in the teaching exercise. First, curriculum has to do with planning the teaching process, in terms of what is expected of the students, the content to be covered (including its sequencing) and the educational policies that order the pedagogical process (Richards, 2001). Second, evaluation has to do with measuring the achievement of the proposed objectives and how students provide evidence of what they have learned in the teaching-learning process (Hughes, 2003). Finally, the teaching methodology has to do with the practices that teachers have in the classroom, not only in teaching an area of knowledge, but also in the logistical aspects of teaching, such as managing the classroom, the delivery of materials, among others (Ur, 1999). This study is located precisely in this area (language teaching method), particularly in the comparative description of the methods that Arabic and English teachers use in the classroom at high schools.

Regarding the linguistic aspects of a second or foreign language, language teaching method has traditionally been based on what has emerged from research in applied linguistics, and, in particular, in the area of second language acquisition. For example, in the 1970s the process of learning a second language had been understood mainly from the transfer processes (positive or negative) that the mother tongue caused in the language being learned. In this context, interlanguage is considered an intermediate process between L1 and L2, in which learners make mistakes that can cause fossilization or that can positively develop the interlanguage process if they are considered as learning opportunities (Corder, 1967; Selinker, 1972). In this line, we go from a punitive approach to error to a more pedagogical one in which learners can use communication strategies to avoid linguistic constructions.

There are also other factors in learning that can influence the process of achieving proficiency in the L2. A relevant element in the context of this project is the role of age, since there is a general belief that learning is more successful if instruction begins earlier in school (Curtain & Dahlberg, 2010). This belief is based on the ease of children to acquire a (almost) native pronunciation, especially if there is systematic exposure before the start of the critical period. However, there is evidence that adolescents and adults have advantages in other areas, such as better memory, abstract thinking ability, more previous experiences, etc.; and some studies have shown that it is also possible to achieve advanced competence after the critical period process (Marinova-Todd, Marshall & Snow, 2000). Other factors that partially explain the

success of the learning process are motivation, aptitude/intelligence, personality, socioeconomic level, among others (Dörnyei, 2009, 2012). Lastly, and in terms of instruction, the following are also important: input/output and interaction to generate practice opportunities in the language to be learned; the type of feedback and correction based on the language samples produced by the learner; and the implicit or explicit teaching of the skills and components of the new language (Cook, 2016).

Method

This study used a qualitative approach to describe the teaching method in language classes (Arabic and English), which is not focused on measuring aspects of reality from a positivist perspective, but rather on explaining experiences that cannot be measured numerically (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). In this sense, the understanding of an educational phenomenon is sought to understand and interpret it, and in particular in this research, from a post-structuralist ontology, whose objective is to explore a truth constructed by the participants. Hatoss (2013) emphasizes that the methodological approach (qualitative) and the research perspective (etic/emic) are important when epistemologically positioning an investigation of a discursive nature. In this way, the focus is not to discover a quantifiable and generalizable objective reality (etic perspective), but rather to explore a subjective reality in relation to how the actors in the process behave in the classroom and, then, how they perceive and evaluate their pedagogical processes (emic perspective).

The researchers observed the Arabic class and the English. It should be noted that the researchers had made previous informal observations in both classes, which served to confirm the methodological trends observed during the investigation.

This is the case of this study, where the discursive samples are framed within the genre of «pedagogical discourse» (Bernstein & Díaz, 1985, p. 14) and in which the disciplines of linguistics and education converge. In the theory of pedagogical discourse, it is explained that teachers build and exercise power relations by concentrating speaking turns, selecting the topic and the mode of delivery of the message, directing interactions, among other actions. This entails power structures that are also influenced by the official curriculum of the school and the curriculum as institutions that legitimize and reproduce certain discursive practices (Foucault, 1989), which has an influence on methodological practices in the classroom.

Design

This research project is a case study, since it seeks to understand a phenomenon in a particular reality in order to understand it in depth and does not seek generalizations (Robert, 2013). In addition, the design of this study is non-experimental and descriptive, since there is no intervention of reality, but rather a characterization of the phenomenon is sought, being also cross-sectional, since data collection occurs in

a single moment and does not seek to understand the evolution over time of the problem to be investigated.

Participants

Regarding the participants, an Arabic teacher and an English teacher were observed and interviewed at intervals of one month (8 hours each) and voluntarily, which included signing an informed consent for the purposes of this study. Both teachers belong to the same school and teach the same group of students, although there is no interdisciplinary work between the two subjects. Regarding their academic training, the first participant is a BA holder English teacher and the second is a BA holder Arabic teacher (both with 13 and 15 years of experience, respectively). It is also important to highlight that the same group of students was observed when they took Arabic and English classes, which included 29 students majoring in 10th grade. Accordingly, the sampling is of an intentional non-probabilistic type with cases selected based on convenience sampling to investigate in depth a specific reality.

Instruments

Regarding the instruments, field notes were made in the classes of both subjects and then retrospective semi-structured focused interviews were carried out with the English and Arabic teachers to help understand the pedagogical moves observed in the observation stage. According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007), field notes are documents that collect the observations in the form of diaries or entries to record the behavior of the individuals investigated and that are usually made while the observation takes place and that can later be complemented at the end of the observed event (p. 405). This makes field notes a flexible sampling tool, particularly when there are two or more researchers who can then compare their observations, as is the case in this study.

It is necessary to clarify that, although it is true that these instruments have ethnographic characteristics, the immersion in the investigated reality is limited in time. Furthermore, the observation through field notes does not have the specificity in the linguistic transcription (for example, in the analysis of the conversation), but rather a more generic description of what happens in the classroom, which is enough for the purpose of this study. In the words of Copland (2018):

Focusing observations on the research questions, therefore, can reduce the feeling of being overwhelmed by information and details...so researchers always have the focus on the research questions that guide the study. If these are kept in mind, especially in the initial stages of the fieldwork, they can help the researcher in the search for information. However, the investigator should also be open to pointing out what seems interesting at the research site as new foci may emerge as the study develops (p. 256).

Lastly, and according to Fontana and Frey (2005) , interviews are useful for capturing the perceptions of the participants' experiences; and according to Gray (2004) , the semi-structured interview format has the advantage of granting greater flexibility in taking samples in order to obtain information that could be relevant and that emerges at the moment of the interaction. Therefore, they allow the generation of a conversation in which the participants can contribute information that contributes to achieving the purpose of the study.

Data Analysis

The data collected from the field notes and the interviews were analyzed through discourse analysis techniques. According to Bhatia, Flowerdew and Jones (2008, p. 1), discourse analysis is a set of methods to analyze oral, written or multimodal texts for the meanings constructed by the investigated participants. In this way, the focus of analysis is the statements in context to discover linguistic patterns and thus be able to understand the worldviews that the participants showed in their use of the language.

In particular, the texts were explored through the principles of critical discourse analysis. This method examines language as a social practice with an emphasis on exploring sociopolitical domination in terms of ideologies, abuse, identity, issues, among others, that can produce/reproduce unequal power relations through the way they are represented (Fairclough, 1989; Wodak, 1996; Van Dijk, 1998). From this perspective, and in methodological terms, critical discourse analysis analyzes not only the macro context where discursive events are produced, but also linguistic microelements, with the aim of exploring the construction of certain messages. It is important to clarify that the most relevant criticism of this method is the bias, since the analyst normally takes a position to analyze the data. However, supporters of critical discourse analysis claim that all human beings are biased in some way. In addition, the objective of the study has social implications, which requires taking a certain position, especially in favor of the most marginalized. In the specific analysis of the samples, the Gee's (1996) approach was used. It is framed in five units of analysis: (1) prosody, (2) cohesion, (3) organization of discourse, (4) contextualization signals and (5) thematic organization.

Results

The results of the study are presented in two sections; the first section provides the results extracted from the field notes taken in classroom observation phase. The second section is dedicated to the results of the analysis of the interview data.

Results of the Observation Phase

Three categories emerged after comparing the field notes between the researchers, which are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1.
Categories of Analysis from the Observation with Field Notes

Code	Category
TS	Teaching strategies
TCA	Types of content and activities
DR	Didactic resources

1. Teaching Strategies

Regarding the first category (TS), the use of three main strategies can be observed: use of the mother tongue (UMT), translation (T) and the speaking turn (ST). In both subjects, practically the entire class is conducted in the students' mother tongue (Persian), and there is little exposure to Arabic and English. Also, the translation from L1 to L2 or vice versa is used, and each teacher concentrates on the speaking turns during the class. The interactions are generally teacher-initiated through the question initiated by each teacher, either in the English class or in the Arabic class or when the students respond to the activities that are included in the textbooks with interactions initiated by the teachers in each class. Here are some examples of this category in Table 2.

Table 2.
Extracts from Field Notes (Teaching Strategies)

Category	Extracts
Field note 1	The teacher explains (in Persian) about the topic
Field note 4	The teacher reads the text, translating it into Persian.
Field note 3	The teacher asks in Persian and some students answer.

2. Types of Content and Activities

Regarding the types of content and activities (TCA), the teachers differ in the content taught. In the case of Arabic, there is a strong approach to the content through culture and, in the case of English, this is more linguistic, which is evidenced in the objectives written on the blackboard at the beginning of the lessons. Some examples of this category are shown below in Table 3.

Table 3.
Extracts from Field Notes (Types of Content and Activities)

Category	Extracts
Field Notes 3 and 7 (contents)	Arabic (objective) 5 basic: understand texts that address stories about the daily affairs Arabic (objective) 6 basic: know different types of word formation.
Field Notes 4 and 5 (contents)	English (objective) 5 basic: recognize grammatical endings of plural nouns. English (objective) 6 basic: identify the verb conjugation in sentences.

In addition, although it is true that there are incipient elements of communicative models through readings, there is no emphasis on the development of communicative skills, but rather on understanding through cultural similarities or the language system (translation), and the decontextualized vocabulary presentation in both classes. This is also reflected in the organization of the room, since the educational spaces does not have educational aids such as posters or images related to the content, as well as vocabulary. In both classes, there is the traditional distribution of desks in rows, in which the teachers control the pedagogical discourse. Some examples of this category are shown in Table 4.

Table 4.
Extracts from Field Notes (Types of Content and Activities)

Category	Extracts
Field Notes 7 (activities)	Arabic teacher resumes the class talking about the content of the through wh-questions from the text she reads
Field Notes 8 (activities)	English The teacher asks what are the possessive pronouns in the text and some students give answers. She then comments that an "s" is added to a noun to show possessive relationship

3. Didactic Resources

With regard to the didactic resources (DR), the use of teacher's guides with the support of the whiteboard and the projector predominates (in the case of the English class. Both classes rely on technological and educational aids very limitedly. That is, both teachers rely on traditional aids, mainly whiteboard. Little attention is paid to what students can bring in as classroom projects or group work products.

Table 5.
Extracts from Field Notes (Teaching Resources)

Category	Extracts
Field Notes 10 (DR)	The Arabic teacher provides a list of new words on the whiteboard and uses different colors for verbs and noun to elaborate on their word formation process later.
Field Notes 12 (DR)	The English teacher provides examples of using possessive pronouns and possessive s on the board using different colors for the morpho-syntactic elements showing possessions.

Findings from the Interview

The following section presents the results of the retrospective interviews with the teachers on the teaching of Arabic or English, which does not make sense to generalize methodological aspects, but rather to corroborate the information collected in class observations to facilitate their comparison. The themes of this interview are presented below, together with extracts of what the teachers shared in their responses.

Question I: How do you usually teach the Arabic/English language in your class? Why?

The English teacher mentions the use of technology in the classroom and elements of the grammar-translation method in her classes. However, the Arabic teacher emphasizes code-switching, the oral nature of the language, and the cultural perspective in teaching. Table 6 contains excerpts from the interview to illustrate this point.

Table 6.
Extracts from Interviews (Declared Methodological Elements)

Language	Interview Excerpt
English	How do I teach in my class, right? A part with videos or PPT on screen in order to meet the needs in the classroom... I have had to accomplish the objectives through translation so that the students can follow the class.
Arabic	We use a mixture of Arabic and Persian, and we focus more on the issue of orality, using cultural issues to be able to make the meaning of the content clearer.

Has the use of these forms of teaching been effective? Why (not)?

In the second question, the teachers' perspectives differ on the effectiveness of the method; it seems that the English teacher is more satisfied than the Arabic teacher. Table 7 contains excerpts from the interview to illustrate this point.

Table 7.
Extracts From Interviews (Effectiveness Of Teaching)

Language	Interview Excerpt
English	I think it is favorable that they have been able to have a set of meaningful examples in which they can identify issues as basic as possessive pronouns, or [that] they can put together nouns to form a possessive combination.
Arabic	Although few examples are not enough for learning word formation processes, more examples which I provide through go-home activities will do the trick.

To what extent do you connect the importance of learning L2 with the interests of students?

Once again, technology and code-switching appear as important elements in the English class and the discussion of the Arabic content in the other class. Table 8 contains excerpts from the interview to illustrate this point.

Table 8.
Extracts from Interviews (Student Interests)

Language	Interview Excerpt
English	The colorful and real-life examples interest them and motivates them to repeat the expressions or learn them. In addition, translation activities from Persian to English seem to be good activities to teach the language.
Arabic	There are students who are interested in what is going on in their communities. Focusing on every-day issues and relating content to their every-day community life I can make the course more interesting to them.

What elements facilitate the way in which you teach the language? Why?

With regard to this question, the English teacher once again emphasized the motivating aspect of language teaching in which technology is at the service of teaching. On the contrary, the Arabic teacher focused on how the class helps students to use their knowledge of community life. Table 9 contains excerpts from the interview to illustrate this point.

Table 9.
Extracts from Interviews (Elements Facilitating Teaching)

Language	Interview Excerpt
English	I think using multimedia presentation is at the heart of my practice. Even a simple PowerPoint presentation may be enough. I try to engage students in making contents, giving examples and participate in creating new sentences or content. This facilitates teaching-learning process.

What elements hinder the way you teach the language?

An external element is emphasized in the English class, while in Arabic class there is again a cultural discourse. Table 10 contains excerpts from the interview to illustrate this point.

Table 10.
Extracts from Interviews (Obstructing Elements Of Teaching)

Language	Interview Excerpt
English	The unwillingness to participate in classroom discussion. It's just that the students may not have the rudimentary level that corresponds to presenting the material included in their textbook. For example, some [students] who are in this grade year can't read the sentences in their books properly.
Arabic	The issue of time perhaps because imagine that we could make a much more effective connection and a much more meaningful learning if we had the opportunity to practice more meaningful content in the classroom.

What resources and strategies are better received by students when using your teaching methodology?

As evidenced in previous questions, the English teacher attributes positive characteristics to technology as a tool for grammar-translation practice, while the Arabic teacher again returns to the meaningful examples as the key to a more practical teaching method. Table 11 contains excerpts from the interview to illustrate this point.

Table 11.
Extracts from Interviews (Resources And Strategies)

Language	Interview Excerpt
English	I emphasize the fact that the use of multimedia and playing the listening audio and explaining them to the students may best motivate them either to repeat the content, learn it or translate it. In reading comprehension, for example, I use multimedia presentation to highlight target vocabulary, single words, that they need to underline. They learn the words through translating the the words that are presented in sentences from Persian to English or from English to Persian.
Arabic	Relating every aspect of language to their everyday life or issues may work very well. I hardly use computers; however, I rely on their creativity and the content they create in the class.

Discussion

1. The Method Used

Regarding the language teaching methodology, the teaching methods in Iran historically focused on structural and morpho-syntactic aspects of language. In the first place, and under the influence of structuralism, the perspective of understanding the structure of the language was emphasized, and was implemented, as in many parts of the world, through the grammar-translation method. This method accentuated the notion of grammatical knowledge in the target language with the consequent effect of generating knowledge in the student to translate texts from the mother tongue to L2 and vice versa. Then, and as a reaction to the more structuralist models, the communicative approach emerged in the eighties with the idea that it was not enough to know the structure of the language. In this, the understanding and production of meanings should be highlighted, so that students could communicate in real and meaningful contexts.

However, under the premise that the perfect method does not exist, a new era has been established in foreign language teaching methodology, considering that different elements of each method can be useful and that it is necessary to be sensitive to the context in order to satisfy the needs and interests of students (Prabhu, 1990). Following this «eclectic approach» (Brown, 2001, p. 40), the postmethod era began with the idea that the search for the best method was finally over. However, the current scenario in the teaching of English is much more related to the principles of communicative method than to the perspective of structuralism and, in this aspect, communicative strategies have become a relevant element in developing competence.

The grammar-translation method (mostly observed in the English as a foreign language class) follows a structuralist view of language, in which morphosyntactic

analysis is at the center of the discussion. Language, according to this approach, is learned by transferring information from the mother tongue to the target language in such a way that structural analysis of language helps students to master L2. However, “the efficacy of direct grammar instruction only showed that grammar teaching has a peripheral effect” (Krashen, 2003, p. 30). In fact, applied linguists are increasingly moving away from the study of language learning through isolated linguistic stimuli, and understand language as a form of interaction and dynamic activity that serves social purposes in meaningful contexts (Emmitt, Komesaroff & Pollock, 2006). Furthermore, empirical evidence supports the idea that young learners (children) are still developing abstract thinking (Zhao & Morgan, 2004; Cook, 2016), which is necessary to understand grammatical explanations, so the emphasis should be directed to orality through significant experiences and not to grammatical instruction (Marinova-Todd, Marshall & Snow, 2000; Curtain & Dahlberg, 2010).

In the particular case of Arabic teaching in this study, the methodological orientations of the foreign language explicitly distance themselves from what is stipulated in more traditional methodologies for teaching a second language, partly due to the grammatical differences between L1 and L2.

In order to promote these skills, it is proposed to avoid the "literal" translation and comparison between the L2 and Persian, especially if the language taught has a different grammatical order, since the confusion between two codes can affect comprehension and linguistic expression in one of the two languages in different ways, which in turn affects the low self-esteem of the students.

Undoubtedly, with the rise of language teaching under a communicative model, language skills have emerged as the center of the teaching-learning process, that is, the development of reading comprehension, listening comprehension, written production, and oral production (Nunan, 2015). In this sense, these skills must be developed with contextualized practices to deal with vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation guided by the teacher (Krashen, 1989; Webb, 2005; Sripada, 2015). In this way, a communicative model promotes the development of the four skills through the use of meaningful interaction in the classroom, so that students can communicate in situations that imitate real life, with the use of knowledge of the structure of the target language as a support for communicative practice and not as its end.

Finally, it is important to highlight that, although it is true that an incipient use of information and communication technologies is observed (especially, in the English class), the classes observed show that this use only replaces the function of the blackboard or that of the teacher by delivering linguistic stimulus (Steel & Levy, 2013). In this sense, it can be argued that this is the most basic use of technology in language learning and in which the student is considered as a passive subject who must receive the information transmitted. On the contrary, technology can be used to create products, simulate various scenarios, solve problems, etc., which contributes to the

conception of an active learner in which the student is the protagonist of their learning process and has been developed and studied through using computer-assisted language teaching.

2. Meaningful Language Teaching

It is evident that, contrary to what happens in the English class, the Arabic class deals strongly with the cultural element, which is not only motivating for the class itself (Dörnyei, 2012), it also makes the experience meaningful, since it prepares the student for his future life in the target community, if it happened. Specifically, everyday life issues are not used as an end in itself, but as a means through which the educational process is practiced, in which the texts mediated by the teacher are examples of narrations of meaningful events in the culture. The Arabic class centers on teaching and learning L2 based on its semantic characteristics, understanding that the construction of a language is directly related to meanings. So, it is necessary not only to learn to speak the Arabic to know the linguistics elements, but also, fundamentally, to approach the meanings of what is spoken.

Although it is true that focusing on meaning is especially important in the teaching of foreign languages; It is not a new element, especially in the context of a globalized world. For example, the Council of Europe (2002) emphasizes "cultural sensitivity and the ability to identify and use a variety of strategies to establish contact with people from other cultures" in order to develop "the ability to overcome stereotyped relationships" (p. 102). However, while it is important to achieve a greater understanding and respect for diversity, it is also important to develop one's own culture; in this sense, Merino, Becerra and Fina (2016) express the need to grant spaces to develop culture.

Finally, second language teachers need to understand how teaching methodologies shape educational processes and, at the same time, how individuals experience learning processes according to their cultural differences (Pennycook, 1994). Therefore, it is necessary for teachers to understand not only the philosophy of language and the methodological framework that underlies their teaching practices, but also the culture of origin of the students, as well as the culture of the target language in order to be effective mediators. between the student and the language to be learned.

Conclusion

In relation to the objectives of the study, it is possible to affirm that the methodologies for teaching Arabic and English are clearly different, since the first deals mainly with the oral teaching of lexicon through elements of culture and the second deals with structural elements of the language, emphasizing the communicative elements. Arabic teaching places the emphasis on the teaching of

cultural aspects, which includes traditions, historical moments, worldview, among others; however, there is no treatment of the cultural aspect in the class of English as a foreign language. Along the same lines, the Arabic class does not emphasize understanding the structure of the language as it is emphasized in the English class, but rather the methodology is based mainly on teaching vocabulary through texts and examples. These differences are also accentuated through other methodological elements, such as the organization of the classroom, the use of the Whiteboards or the use of audiovisual material, among others.

In addition, based on class observations and interviews with the teachers, it is possible to show that the use of every-day culture is motivating. This is because language learning has a real connection to the community in which students participate, and is not just some distant, abstract notion. Especially, in the Arabic class, it is evident that students can work on higher thinking skills, since they must not only understand language communicatively, but must also interpret them from the current moment of culture. In contrast, in the English classroom, learning is understood as a mechanical model in which information is transferred from one language to another, particularly with grammatical accuracy. So, the teacher's role is mostly that of mediator (in Arabic class) and expert (in English class), and that of the student as active (in Arabic class) and passive (in English class). Therefore, the teacher is positioned as the key element in the selection of the teaching methodology of a foreign language.

Regarding the pedagogical implications of this study, it is important to highlight that the methodologies show elements of different language philosophies and learning theories. In this sense, it is important to emphasize that young learners are not cognitively prepared to work with grammatical elements or translation, but instead, the relying on every-day culture and technology can be motivating for the instruction of a foreign language. In addition, these results can serve as models for initial teacher training, especially to create knowledge about the teaching of foreign languages.

Finally, it is possible to identify some limitations. More research possibilities on the comparative teaching of these two languages is needed. It can be expected that the observation time could have been longer, and larger sample of teachers could be included. Furthermore, an experimental study could be implemented to measure the effect of different methodologies in the teaching of both languages.

References

- Alvarez, P. (2008). The insertion of the Mapuche language in the curriculum of schools with intercultural education: a more than methodological problem, *Alpha*, 26, 9-28.
- Atai, M. R., & Mazlum, F. (2013). English language teaching curriculum in Iran: Planning and practice. *The Curriculum Journal*, 24(3), 389-411.

- Behroozi, M., & Amoozegar, A. (2014). Challenges to English language teachers of secondary schools in Iran. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 136, 203-207.
- Bernstein, B., & Diaz, M. (1985). Towards a theory of pedagogical discourse. *Colombian Journal of Education*, 15, 1-41.
- Bhatia, V. K., Flowerdew, J., & Jones, R. (2008). *Advances in discourse studies* London: Routledge.
- British Council. (2018). *The future demand for English in Europe: 2025 and beyond*. London: Trajectory Partnership.
- Brown, H. (2001). *Teaching by principles*. Boston: Pearson.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Cook, V. (2016). *Second Language learning and Language Teaching*. New York: Routledge.
- Copland, F. (2018). Observation and fieldnotes. In A. Phakiti, P. De Costa, L. Plonsky & S. Starfield (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Applied Linguistics Research Methodology* (pp. 249-268). United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan Limited.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The Significance of Learners' Errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5, 161-170.
- Council of Europe. (2002). *The Common European Framework of Reference for languages: learning, teaching, evaluation*. Madrid: Anaya-CVC.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Curtain, H., & Dahlberg, C. (2010). *Languages and children: Making the match*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. California: Sage Publishing.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). *The psychology of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2012). *Motivation in language learning*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Emmitt, M., Komesaroff, L., & Pollock, J. (2006). *Language and Learning: An Introduction to Teaching*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. (2005). *The interview: From neutral stance to political involvement*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishing.
- Foucault, M. (1989). *The archeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. London: Routledge.
- Gee, J. (1996). *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Glass, K. (2013). *Teaching English in Chile: A study of teacher perceptions of their professional identity, student motivation and pertinent learning contents*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English next*. The United Kingdom: British Council.

- Gray, D. (2004). *Doing Research in the Real World*. London: Sage Publishing.
- Grenoble, L. A., & Whaley, L. J. (2006). *Saving Languages: An introduction to language revitalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hamers, J., & Blanc, M. (2000). *Bilingualism and Bilinguality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hatoss, A. (2013). *Displacement, language maintenance and identity: Sudanese refugees in Australia*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jafari, S. M., Shokrpour, N., & Guetterman, T. (2015). A mixed methods study of teachers. Perceptions of communicative language teaching in Iranian high schools. *Theory and practice in language studies*, 5(4), 707.
- Khany, R., & Darabi, R. (2014). ELT in Iran: Reflection of the principles-based and post-method pedagogy in language teaching. *Procedia-social and behavioral sciences*, 98, 908-916.
- Krashen, S. (1989). We Acquire Vocabulary and Spelling by Reading: Additional Evidence for the Input Hypothesis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 24, 237-270.
- Krashen, S. (2003). *Explorations in Language Acquisition and Use*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2013). Rethinking global perspectives and local initiatives in language teaching. In S. Ben Said & L. J. Zhang (eds.), *Language Teachers and Teaching: Global Perspectives and Local Initiatives*. (pp. 317-323). New York: Routledge.
- Marinova-Todd S. F., Marshall D. B., & Snow C. (2000). Three misconceptions about age and 12 learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(1), 9-31.
- Merino, M. E., Becerra, S., & Fina, A. (2016). Narrative discourse in the construction of Mapuche ethnic identity in context of displacement. *Discourse & Society*, 28(1), 60-80.
- Narafshan, M. H., & Yamini, M. (2011). Policy and English language teaching (ELT) in Iran. *Iranian EFL journal*, 7(5), 179-189.
- Nunan, D. (2015). *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages: An introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. New York: Longman.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1990). There is no one best method-Why? *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(2), 161-176.
- Richards, J. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Robert, K. Y. (2013). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. London: Sage Publishing.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 209-231.

- Shademan, K., Baykan, A., & Gorji, R. (2016). Bilingualism in Iranian educational system. *Journal of Pouyesh in Education and Consultation (JPEC)*, 1395(3), 81-104.
- Sripada, P. N. (2015). Towards Better Vocabulary Proficiency: Research Trends in the Area of Vocabulary Teaching. *Journal of English Studies*, 10, 56-69.
- Steel, C. H., & Levy, M. (2013). Language students and their technologies: Charting the evolution 2006-2011. *RECALL*, 3, 306-320.
- Tavakolimohammadi, M., Siyami, M., & Farzane, M. (2022). A look at the effectiveness of new Arabic language teaching strategies in Iran. *Arabic Language and Literature Education*, 3(4), 171-186.
- Ur, P. (1999). *A Course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Dijk, T. (1998). *Ideology*. London: Sage.
- Webb, S. (2005). Receptive and Productive Vocabulary Learning: The Effects of Reading and Writing on Word Knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 33-52.
- Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Zarrabi, F., & Brown, J. R. (2017). English language teaching and learning analysis in Iran. *International Journal of Educational and Pedagogical Sciences*, 9(10), 3485-3493.
- Zhao, A., & Morgan, C. (2004). Consideration of Age in 12 Attainment-Children, Adolescents and Adults. *Asian EFL Journal*, 6(4), 1-13.