ÇANAKKALE ONSEKİZ MART UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUGE TEACHING

AN INVESTIGATION INTO STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF NATIVE
ENGLISH SPEAKING TEACHERS' (NEST) AND NON-NATIVE ENGLISH
SPEAKING TEACHERS' (Non-NEST) PERFORMANCE AND
COMPETENCIES IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

MA THESIS

Submitted by
Kemal KÖKSAL

Supervisor
Asst. Prof. Dr.Hidayet TUNCAY

ÇANAKKALE, TURKEY - 2006

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü'ne

Kemal KÖKSAL' a ait

'An investigation into Students' Perceptions of NESTs' and Non-NESTs'

Performance and Competencies in Teaching English as a Foreign Language'

adlı çalışma, jürimiz tarafından Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngilizce
Öğretmenliği Programında
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Başkan ………………………………………….
Akedemik Ünvanı, Adı Soyadı

Üye …………………………………………...
Akedemik Ünvanı, Adı Soyadı (Danışman)

Üye …………………………………………...
Akedemik Ünvanı, Adı Soyadı

Üye …………………………………………...
Akademik Unvanı, Adı Soyadı

Üye …………………………………………...
Akedemik Ünvanı, Adı Soyadı

ABSTRACT

The increasing number of users of English and the need to speak English in the globalization process has made English universal, the most widely learned and the most internationally spoken language. So, learning of and teaching of English language has been gaining more and more importance. Consequently, various abilities and competencies of English teachers as Native or Non-Native English Speaking Teachers have become a significant matter of discussion.

The aim of this study is to investigate how Native English Speaking Teachers (NESTs) and Non-Native English Speaking Teachers (Non-NESTs) are perceived by Turkish students in respect of both groups of teachers' performance and competencies in various skills like pedagogy, motivation and communication.

216 students from three private high schools participated in the study. The data were collected by questionnaires, and for the analysis of the data, correlation and one-way ANOVA analyses (t and F tests) were applied.

The data obtained from the field indicated that the students' perceptions differentiated in regard to their NESTs' and Non-NESTs' performance, competencies, and pedagogical, motivational and communicational skills in a statistically significant level (p < 0,05). However, there was not observed any statistically significant difference between the students' demographic and educational characteristics and the two groups of the teachers.

The study puts forward that Non-NESTs facilitate learning of English and prevent learning difficulties faced by students as they benefit sharing the learners' mother tongue. If a general evaluation would be done from perspective of the students' perceptions, Non-NESTs who are fully equipped with professional knowledge and experience would therefore seem to be more effective and more appropriate in teaching English to Turkish students.

ÖZET

İngilizcenin artan kullanıcı sayısı ve küreselleşme sürecinde İngilizce konuşmaya duyulan ihtiyaç, İngilizceyi evrensel, en çok öğrenilen ve uluslararası en çok konuşulan dil haline getirmiştir. Böylece İngilizcenin öğrenilmesi ve öğretilmesi giderek daha fazla önem kazanır olmuştur. Dolayısıyla, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin, anadili İngilizce olan ve anadili İngilizce olmayan İngilizce öğretmenleri olarak çeşitli yetenek ve yeterlilikleri açısından incelenmesi gereken bir konu olmuştur.

Bu çalışmanın amacı, anadili İngilizce olan ve anadili İngilizce olmayan (Türk İngilizce Öğretmenleri) İngilizce öğretmenlerinin performans ve yeterliliklerini; pedagojik, motivasyon ve iletişim bakımından öğrenciler tarafından nasıl algılandığını tespit etmektir.

Çalışmaya, üç özel liseden 216 öğrenci katılmıştır. Veriler anket formları aracılığıyla toplanmış ve korelasyon, one-way ANOVA analizleri uygulanmıştır.

Elde edilen veriler, anadili İngilizce olan ve anadili İngilizce olmayan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin İngilizce öğretimindeki performans, yetenek, pedagojik, motivasyon ve iletişim yönleriyle her iki grup öğretmenin öğrencilerce anlamlı düzeyde ($p < 0,05$) farklı algılandığını ortaya koymuştur. Ancak, öğrencilerin demografik ve eğitimsel özellikleriyle öğretmenlerin genel performans seviyeleri arasında anlamlı bir farklılaşma olmadığı ortaya çıkmıştır.

Bu çalışma, anadili İngilizce olmayan (Türk İngilizce Öğretmenleri) İngilizce öğretmenlerinin öğrencilerle ortak dili konuşmalarından faydalanmaları, onların İngilizce öğrenmeyi kolaylaştırdıkları ve zorluklarını ortadan kaldırdıklarını ortaya çıkarmıştır. Öğrencilerin öğretmenlerini algılama perspektifinden bir değerlendirme yapılacak olursa, yeterli mesleki bilgiyle ve tecrübeyle donanmış anadili İngilizce olmayan (Türk İngilizce Öğretmenleri) İngilizce öğretmenlerinin, Türk öğrencilerin yabancı dil eğitiminde daha yararlı ve uygun olacağı düşünülmektedir

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS

CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSIONS and IMPLICATIONS

ABBREVIATIONS

ANOVA   Analysis of Variance

EFL   English as a Foreign Language

ELT   English Language Teaching

ESL   English as a Second Language

FLL   Foreign Language Learning

H   Hypothesis

L1   First Language

L2   Second Language

NEST   Native English Speaking Teachers

Non-NEST   Non-Native English Speaking Teachers

SPSS   Statistical Package for Social Sciences

TEFL   Teaching English as a Foreign Language

TESOL   Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1. INTRODUCTION

Since language proficiency occupies a fundamental place in the subject of English Language Teaching (ELT), the background of teachers, and their efficiency and sufficiency as Native or Non-Native English Speaking Teachers of the English language has become the main concern and needed to be studied in detail to evaluate their contribution to the teaching of English.

Some research findings have shown a distinction between Native and Non-Native English Speaking Teachers in their pedagogical perceptions by their students (Medgyes 1994; Lasagabaster 2002; Inbar 2000). But, these studies on Native (NESTs) or Non-Native English Speaking Teachers (Non-NESTs) have failed to examine the effect of additional personal and professional background variables on the teachers' perceptions by their students. Moreover, subjects in these studies are classified as Native or Non-Native English Speaker based on very limited definitions, disregarding the complex nature of the Native English Speaker Teachers.

The terms of Native and Non-Native English Speaking Teachers are much unworn, and the basic problem for most people can be considered as the difficulty in distinction between the terms NESTs and Non-NESTs. The relationship between NEST and Non-NEST has not been established or clarified adequately enough, and a controversy is still going on, according to the results obtained related studies on these issues.

The terms of NEST and Non-NEST (Kramch 1996:136) have created a professional distinction among the professionals in the ELT profession. Supporters of the terms believe that it is reasonable and compulsory to distinguish NEST and Non-

NEST, because of their differences, strengths, merits - demerits and their contribution to ELT.

As generally assumed, from both the students' and parents' points of view, it seems to be wonderful and relaxing to have a Native English Speaking Teacher in the class as every student dreams of practicing conversation with a native speaker. A native teacher may provide all the slang and vocabulary items. Furthermore, if the native teacher could also speak the students' mother tongue, he or she never has the fear of not knowing a mispronounced word. Instead the teacher can bridge the gap between the students' pronunciation and the correction of the target words.

The emerging problem is mainly that NESTs may not be "real" teachers but some of them are merely Native Speakers of the target language (Medgyes 1994). Many of them have little or no training experience in teaching; therefore, they might have problems in explaining some of the linguistic features of the English language. For example, the present perfect tense which has no equivalence in some languages, is one area of great difficulty faced. Furthermore, methodology chosen for teaching or pedagogic approach to students' expectation might be something completely different to them (Medgyes 1994).

To speak the language fluently and sufficiently may not mean that one can teach or transfer the knowledge to students in the same way as it is spoken. Although Medgyes (1994) states that NESTs are superior to Non-NESTs linguistically and culturally, there is no evidence supporting the notion that NESTs are more qualified English Teachers.

It appears from what has been discussed so far that there is no unanimously accepted definition of NESTs and Non-NESTs. However, in this study NESTs are considered those English speaking teachers whose mother tongue is English in born without regarding his or her nationality. And by Non-NESTs, it is meant Turkish English language teachers.

1.2. TOPIC OF THE STUDY

In this study, perceptions of the students regarding their Native and Non-Native English Speaking Teachers' performance and competencies in Teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) in the class circumstance are investigated.

The study deals with not only the performance and compatibilities of teachers in instructing the English language to their students but how these performance skills are perceived and evaluated by them as well.

NESTs obtaining a degree from any of his/her country's universities can work in teaching English language in other Non-English Speaking countries, even some have secondary or high school degrees. The degrees NESTs have can range from agriculture to psychology, in other words, anyone with any degree can travel to Non-English Speaking country, and has a chance of becoming an English Teacher, presumably without being questioned about their educational background and language teaching experience.

The problem is that unqualified NESTs often make language learning difficult for the students because of their lack of pedagogical knowledge, motivational and communicative skills (Medgyed 1994). It appears that there is a great need for qualified NESTs with a proper educational background and the ones who have cultural sensitivity in language teaching.

Employment of NESTs in educational and training institutions in Turkey is also another fact. What type of NEST they have or what qualifications those NESTs have are not adequately taken into consideration by students, parents or any educational authorities as there are not any studies, at least such studies directly related to the topics to pinpoint the problems met in the area. This study is focused on only one aspect of the issue, restricting to only the private schools which employ both Native and Non-Native English Speaking Teachers. It tries to discover how both groups of teachers' performances and competencies are perceived by their students.

1.3. AIM OF THE STUDY

Since NESTs and Non-NESTs come from different educational and cultural backgrounds, they are expected to differ in terms of their teaching performance and competencies. This study attempts to discover these differences between Native and Non-Native English Speaking Teachers from point of their students' perceptions.

In the study, how NESTs and Non-NESTs are perceived by their students in their teaching performance and competencies is measured, and the differentiations in their pedagogical, motivational and communicational skills are covered as well.

It is observed that some school administrators employ NESTs in their schools to teach English as they think and they might think that they may attract the parents and students. Besides, the idea behind this rationale is that NESTs teach better, so administrators prefer NESTs to Non-NESTs regardless of their teaching performance or qualifications. This tendency of school administrators helps unqualified NESTs to find jobs easily in Turkey.

There are a lot of prejudices put forward toward Native and Non-Native English Speaking Teachers without any proper knowledge and experience. Those prejudices put forward especially by parents and school administrators that Native English Speaking Teachers seem to be qualified enough and having more advantages in teaching English.

This study does not aim to indicate and determine who teaches English better or who is best at teaching skills. However, the study attempts to investigate how these groups of teachers', NESTs or Non-NESTs, performance and competencies differ in teaching English language from the point of students' perceptions. On the other hand, the study is an attempt to investigate students' views and evaluations regarding in what aspects NESTs and Non-NESTs are more sufficient, distinguished, or contributive in students' learning/acquisition of the English language.

1.4. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Since English has become a lingua franca, it has come to the most widely learned foreign language in the world. It is a fact that there are now at least four non-native speakers of English for every native speaker (Kachru 1986: 256). He (1986: 20) suggests that there are 300-400 million of Native Speakers of English against 340 million Non-Native Speakers of English.

As the number of Non-Native English language teaching graduates grows continuously and their presence in the professional circles increase noticeably, the need to understand and determine the role of English teachers in the education in a compound society has been more valuable than ever (Kachru 1997).

It appears from what has been said so far that there is a big gap in the scope of the study; since there is not almost any previous study in Turkey related to the main topic of this study. Therefore, it is planned to make a little contribution to the field through such investigation. The major significance of the study and what makes it peculiar is that there has not previously been any research or any thesis done under this title in this research area in Turkey.

The conclusion to be drawn from this study will present some clues and highlights the Ministry of National Education and other educational institutions to reconsider their decisions and show what roles these two groups of English Teachers may play in English Language Teaching and what perceptions of differences that Native and Non – Native English Speaking Teachers have and how they contribute to ELT in Turkey.

1.5. HYPOTHESES

The main and sub-hypotheses formulated for the study are as follow:

"There are differences in the perceptions of the students between their Non-NESTs and NESTs in their teaching performance and competencies" is the main hypothesis of the study.

And the sub-hypotheses are:

1. The differences in the perceptions of the students are also observed in that the Non-NESTs present better performance than NESTs in teaching EFL.

2. Non-NESTs and NESTs are perceived differently by the students in terms of effective EFL teaching and practicing pedagogical techniques.

3. There are differences in the perceptions of the students between the Non-NESTs and NESTs in terms of motivation while teaching them in the class.

4. There are differences perceived by the students between the Non-NESTs and NESTs in terms of their communication with them.

1.6. RESTRICTIONS OF THE STUDY

There were a lot of limitations in this study. The most important and restrained factor was to reach students who have exposed and observed both NESTs and Non– NESTs in their classes, and the number of those students who attend to both NESTs' and Non-NESTs' classes, and who can make some observations to make comparison between two groups of teachers was very limited. In fact, the study

had only such a chance to be implemented in the Private High Schools as there are no Native English Speaking Teachers employed in State Schools.

While conducting the survey in the field, some of the NESTs and the Non-NESTs did not seem to apply the questionnaires to the students in their classes, feeling anxiety of the result of the study might affect their employment status in case of the students' negative evaluations.

1.7. ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

This thesis is introduced in five chapters. The first chapter of the thesis introduces topic, aim and significance of the study, and also covers the restrictions and limitations to the study.

Chapter Two presents the literature review, Chapter Three presents the methodology implemented in the study, findings, analyses of the data and discussions are introduced in Fourth Chapter. In the Fifth Chapter, conclusion and implications of the study are presented and also some suggestions and implications about how a further proposed research could be implemented are described.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Definition of the terms NEST and Non-NESTs goes far back. Both linguists and philologists have been trying for years to define and determine these terms.

The terms NEST and Non-NEST were first coined and put forward by Medgyes (1992) as NEST (Native English Speaking Teachers) and Non-NEST (Non -Native English Speaking Teachers).

Medgyes first gives the lexical meaning 'nest', as it has meaning of shelter, home, family, love, something valuable, but he avoids defining the terms NEST and Non-NEST, stating that 'the native/non-native is controversial' and debatable issue (Medgyes 1992).

From the point of Davies (1991:167), NESTs come to mean not a being Non-Native speaker. Although he objected to define NEST, he defines Non-NEST negatively as someone who is not accepted by him.

Native language is defined by Tuncay (2003:151) as "the first language one learns to speak and understand" and the term Non-NEST is defined by him as "an acronym for teachers of English from Non-English speaking country whose native language is not English" (2003:154).

Nizegorodcew (1994:31) defines Non-NEST as natural, authentic, living, perfect, expert, best quality, most correct, proper, fresh, and current and best faultless.

Once the meaning of NEST and Non-NEST is clarified, Non-NEST is a person where s/he was born in a place or in a country related with by birth, while Native speaker can be identified as the person who has spoken a particular language by birth rather than learning it later. And Native is not an ordinary word that denotes the locality one is born or brought up in.

It appears that the exact meaning of the terms "Native Speaker and Non-Native Speaker" is a seriously discussed issue. The main discussion is that all attempts to define NESTs' competencies have so far been unsuccessful and inconclusive (Davies 1991; Stern 1983; Kachru 1997). But, they also reject the native and non- native distinction on the grounds that it is suggestive of separation and conflict. In the words of Kachru (1992:14), it is "us and them" dichotomy rather than "we – ness". A charge of a more practical nature is that birth is often set as hiring policies, which puts Non-NEST at a disadvantage.

The linguistic researchers and educators have explained the term of NEST analysis in more detailed and the competence in Chomsky's theory. Chomsky (1965: 3) defines native speaker of a language as an "ideal listener or speaker in a completely homogeneous speech community, who knows its language perfectly".

Some new concepts and terminologies are developed to introduce and re-define the terms NESTs and Non-NESTs. These terms are replaced with 'more or less accomplished' users of English (Edge 1988), and much the same to 'more or less proficient' users of English (Paikeday 1985). Rampton (1990) re-defines the terms NESTs and Non-NESTs as 'expert speakers and affiliation '.

Native English Speaking Teacher notion discussed by Philipson (1993:185) applied to the period when language teaching was synonymous with the teaching of culture. As recommended by him, the notion removed tape recorders and other equipment that can effectively replicate Native English Speaking Teacher in the

classroom. Philipson (1996) uses the phrase "the native speaker fallacy" to refer to unfair treatment of qualified Non-NESTs.

Medgyes (1999) sees English as a "universal commodity" and states that the Non-NESTs have more to say in its development rather than it being the privilege of so-called Native Speakers. So, the following questions need to be answered, "Who owns English, Who is best at teaching? NEST or Non-NEST"

There are few empirical studies that have attempted to investigate the difference between NEST and Non-NEST. And these studies mostly searched the teachers' opinions toward NESTs and Non-NESTs rather than students.

Medgyes(1994:33), in his surveys of NESTs and Non-NESTs, found that the areas of difficulty most frequently mentioned by Non-NESTs in their use of English, and in their efforts to learn more of it, included vocabulary, speaking and pronunciation. Far less frequently mentioned difficulty were reading and writing. Grammar was also mentioned as a difficulty relatively infrequently, and was labelled by Medgyes as the Non-NESTs' 'favourite hunting range'.

In paralel with the findings from earlier error gravity studies (Hughes & Lascaratou 1982), Medgyes' respondents also differentiated NESTs and Non-NESTs by their attitudes toward error correction, NESTs were evaluated as far less strict. Non-NESTs and NESTs were evaluated by Medgyes' teacher respondents as differing in their teaching behaviour, with NESTs reportedly using more 'real' language and it was also stated that the NESTs have more confidence in using English and they prove more cultural information. However, when asked which of two teacher-types was more successful, responses were evenly equal (25% and 26,4%), with 40% marking both options, thus indicating that they thought both teachers types were more successful. A few respondents remarked that NESTs were more successful only with advanced learners (Medgyes 1994:75), raising the possibility that NESTs and Non-NESTs are each more suitable at different stages of learning (Lasagabaster and Sierra 2002: 133).

The study which was conducted to TESOL graduate students (with teaching experience) by Samimy and Brutt-Griffler's (1999) also found that most (88%) of their teachers observed differences in the teaching of NESTs and Non-NESTs. Once again, NESTs were seen as more confident English users, but Non-NESTs were seen to have more awareness of students' need. As Philipson (1992) reported that the process of having acquired English as an L2 gives Non-NESTs some advantages. Samimy and Brutt-Griffler's respondents, like Medgyes', were split on the question of whether NESTs or Non-NESTs were more successful in their teaching and 58% chose 'both' option (Lasagabaster and Sierra 2002: 133).

Another survey conducted by Inbar (2000), Tel Aviv University, was set out to investigate the effect of the native versus non-native distinction on the pedagogical perceptions of teachers of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in Israil. The results show that NESTs identity is not necessarily preordained, but is also affected by social recognition and personal choice. Teachers' native or non-native background does not account for differences in most perception domains. Differences between NESTs and Non-NESTs were detected in only three perceptions: NESTs were found to agree more with the superiority of the NESTs and to espouse more confidence in using the English Language and teaching about the culture. Conversely, Non-NEST reported to having better relations with their students and feeling more confident in using the local language to facilitate teaching.

Kato (2001), Japanese lecturer, investigated the "the nature of classroom communication". Eight female language teachers were involved in the study. Four of them were Japanese Speaking English Teachers, the other four were NESTs. The teachers were interviewed and their Year 7 classes were observed. The analysis of the teachers' speech revealed some noticeable differences in the tendencies of communication styles between the two groups. It was concluded Non-NESTs play an important role for the culturally diverse classroom to whom they can present a positive model and the importance of culturally relevant pedagogy which applies to all teachers who are working with culturally diverse learning groups.

According to an investigation into perceptions of English Teachers toward NESTs and Non-NESTs, conducted on the web site of BBC and voted by 540 teachers, asking "NESTs make the best teacher", the obtained result was as, 15% totally agree, 29% agree somewhat, 28% disagree somewhat, 24% totally disagree and 4% do not have any idea. It appears that more than half of the respondents (52%) do not think that NESTs make the best teachers.

The studies mentioned so far focussed on the views of teachers. But the study conducted by Lasagabaster focused on the university students' perceptions of NESTs and Non-NESTs, which is similar to topic of our study. The sample of the study consisted of 76 undergraduates (16 males, 60 females; ages between 16 and 36), 38 were English studies, 38 were other Philologies, 52 had been taught by NESTs at some stages. They all completed the questionnaire containing 5 point Likert Scale asking about their preferences for NEST and Non-NEST at primary, secondary and university levels in relation to: language skills, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, learning strategies, culture and civilisation, attitudes and assessment.

The results of the study indicated that there was a preference for NESTs at all levels, but with a trend toward increased preference for NESTs as educational levels rise, this increased preference is more marked amongst the English Studies respondents. The respondents as a whole showed a preference for NESTs in the areas of pronunciation, speaking, vocabulary, culture and civilisation. With learning strategies and grammar the preference swung toward Non-NESTs.

The researcher emphasized that there were two intriguing additional aspects of these findings to consider in the study. The preference for NESTs at university level should be seen in the context of the very meagre percentages of NESTs currently working at university level in University of the Basque Country. The second aspect is that it was the English Studies students who were even more in favour of NESTs than the other Philologies students, and yet the English Studies students are the one most likely to be hoping to gain teaching jobs subsequently in

the university sector. Hence, for researcher, the results do not appear to have been influenced by the possibility of an increase in competition for employment.

2.2. GOOD LANGUAGE TEACHER

It is evident that the role of the language teacher today is not as simple as it once was. Everyday researchers are discovering new factors that may play apart in language learning. Today, knowledge of the linguistic structure of the language is only one of the requirements of a good language teacher. Teacher should also have broad background knowledge of the social environment that influences their students, different pedagogical techniques, social and cultural aspects of the language being taught (De Lopez 1989: 16).

This new increased responsibility for language learning does not fall entirely on the teacher. De Lopez (1989:16) states that the students must also assume more responsibility for the learning process. The students are not a positive receptacle into which the teacher pours knowledge. Students must participate actively in the learning process. It is the learner who must assimilate the language and allow it to become part of him. According to De Lopez (1989), teachers can only "facilitate" this process.

Apart from previous years, for Silberstein (1987:32), today's language teachers must manipulate much more information in several different areas of knowledge. The problem lies not only in the amount of information to be mastered, but in the organization and application of that knowledge to a practical situation.

One of the basic assumptions of humanistic education (Rogers 1990:305) is that learning is "facilitated" not so much through teaching skills but rather than through certain "attitudinal" qualities that exist in the personal relationship between the teacher and students. In support of this thought, there is some empirical evidence to indicate that these attitudinal qualities make a difference to learning (Appel 1995:

45). The most frequently mentioned of these attitudes are that distinguish a good teacher from the rests are as follows:

1. Empathetic Understanding: The teacher has the ability to understand the students reactions from the inside, has a sensitive awareness of the way the process of education and learning seem to the students.

2. Valuing: It is caring for the learner, but a non possessive caring. It is an acceptance of this other individual as a separate person, having worth in his own right. It is a basic trust, a belief that this other person is somehow fundamentally trustworthy.

3. Realness: The teacher can be a real person in her relationship with his students. He can be enthusiastic, can be bored, can be interested in students, can be angry, can be sensitive and sympathetic. He accepts these feelings on his own; he has no need to impose them on his students. Thus he is a person to his students, not a faceless embodiment of a curricular requirement nor a sterile tube through which knowledge is passed from one generation to the next.

4. Autonomy: One important consequence that follows from understanding and valuing students is that they are trusted at least to some extent to know what they need understanding and respecting therefore means, respecting their autonomy and leaving important decisions about the learning process to them.

These attitudes may exist in the countless interpersonal interactions between the teacher and the students (Rogers 1990: 305).

A good language teacher is the person trained to guide student, help him select appropriate learning materials and create a positive classroom environment. In order to perform these tasks, the language teacher should have access to three main types of information about his/her students (Karl 1994: 16).

1. Psychological Factors
2. Social Factors,
3. Personal Factors

A good and succefull language teacher can be identified as one who is aware of these and other feelings her/his students may have, since in some cases a change in attitude may lead to much more learning than hours of exercises.

Tsujimoto (2001) states that a good English teacher must possess five common passions: love of language, love of teaching, love of learning, love of witnessing growth in their students, and love of showing their passions through their voice and manner through their personal. She desires to remind her fellow teachers of their first love is their passion for language which drew trachers into the discipline in the first place. This love becomes a great part of who teachers are, defining teachers, and whether students know it or not, they crave to hear and see and know this love.

For Hassett (2000), good teachers must have a sense of purpose, have expectations of success for all students, tolerate ambiguity, demonstrate a willingness to adapt and change to meet student needs, are comfortable with not knowing, reflect on their work, learn from a variety of models, enjoy their work and their students.

Palmer (1999) indicates that good teaching is not about technique. According to him, good teachers are "people who have some sort of connective capacity, who connect themselves to their students, their students to each other, and everyone to the subject being studied".

2.2.1. THE ROLES OF A GOOD LANGUAGE TEACHER

A good teacher finds many roles to play while teaching his/her subject matters to the students. Some of these roles are as follows:

In another survey research designed to discover students' views of good and bad language teacher, on the basis of perceptions of the students, some of the roles required of the good language teachers were defined.

The Roles of a Good Teacher

Activity	Role
The teacher gives instructions for students to get into groups	Manager
The teacher asks students to repeat a sentence after her for pronunciation practice.	Model
The teacher goes around listening to pairs practising a dialogue.	Monitor
The teacher advises students how best to approach a task.	Counsellor
The teacher explains when we use the present perfect for recently completed actions.	Informant
The teacher provides material and guidance to enable students to work on their own.	Facilitator
The teacher stays behind after class and discusses one of the student's personal problems which is affecting his/her work	Social Worker
The teacher chats with students over coffee or arranges a cinema visits with	Friend

(Prodromou 1991:24)

In the research, the students were also asked to recall their favourite and least favourite teachers and to say why they thought some teachers were more successful than others.

Below is a summary of what they said about the good and the bad language teacher (Prodromou 1991:19).

	GOOD LANGUAGE TEACHER	BAD LANGUAGE TEACHER
1	Friendly	Very strict
2	Explains things	Does not let us speak
3	Gives good notes	Gives marks all the time
4	We do the lesson together	Fixed in chair
5	Talks about her life	Shouts
6	Plays games	Gives lots of tests
7	Tells jokes	Does not discuss the other problems
8	One of us	Does not smile
9	Does not push weak learners	Very nervous
10	Asks students opinions	Talks and talks
11	Funny	Speak flat
12	Close to students	Distance from us
13	Very experienced	Like machine
14	Makes grammar clear	Not prepared
15	Gives advice	Treats us like objects
16	More like an comedian	Rigid
17	Not strict	Sarcastic and ironic
18	Makes sure everyone understands	We cannot laugh
19	Talks about other objects	Makes us feel anxious
20	Group work	No communication

It was found that it would not only difficult but counterproductive to generalise from the diverse and often contradictory comments made by students about good and bad teachers.

In fact, the diversity of opinions as to what constitutes effective teaching confirms an assumption: that there is no formula for good teaching, that very different people make good teachers for very different reasons (Prodromou 1991), observing teachers at work for many years suggests that both introverts and extroverts, soft-spoken and outspoken people, theatrical and non-theatrical types can all hold the attention of a class and make learning enjoyable and effective.

Again, according to another study "What makes a good teacher" conducted by Harmer (1999:1-3) with secondary school students studying at Cambridge Comprehensive School, the following features of a good teacher bring up:

- A good teacher should make his lessons interesting so you do not fall asleep in them.
- A teacher must love his job. If he really enjoys his job that will make the lessons more interesting.
- The students like the teacher who has his own personality and does not hide it from the students so that he is not only a teacher but a person as well and it comes through the lessons.
- The students like a teacher who has lots of knowledge, not only of his subject, but the other subjects.
- It is important that you can talk to the teacher when you have problems and you do not get along with the subject.
- A good teacher somebody who has an affinity with the students whom they are teaching.
- A good teacher should try and draw out the quiet ones and control the talkative ones.
- He should be able to correct people without offending them.

Students often think of English teachers mainly as people who know everything about English and explain it all to students. This view of English teacher is not entirely wrong. The main reason is that learning English does not just involve gaining knowledge.

An equally important part of learning English is developing skills, and skills can only be developed by practise. Just a coach cannot make someone a good runner just explaining how to run; an English Teacher cannot make students good speakers of English to them. Instead, like a coach, a teacher can help students learn how to practise effectively, and also encourage them to practise a lot even when the teacher is not around.

A good teacher is also one who knows the subject, is willing to share the knowledge, loves the job, is always ready for the unexpected, and has plenty of patience. It depends on individually as a good teacher is someone who can make the teaching lively and interesting. A well trained, well educated teacher will always be best (Appel 1995).

The distinguishing features of the Non-NESTs and the NESTs appear from what has been mentioned so far. These features are used as indicators in our study in order to measure the perceptions of the students about their teachers' performance and competencies

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1. UNIVERSE OF THE STUDY

The universe of the study contains all the students who have attended or are still attending both NESTs' and Non-NESTs' classes in private high schools in Turkey.

It was learnt from an authority from the General Directory of the Private Education Institutions, Ministry of National Education that there are 577 private schools in Turkey; but it was not known the perfect number of the private schools which employ NESTs due to a great number of complex procedures of employing a foreign nationality teacher in Turkey.

The participants were chosen from high school students, since they are at the appropriate age of evaluating their teachers' teaching performance and competencies in a better way.

3.2. SAMPLE OF THE STUDY

At the beginning of the study it was applied to many private high schools for the permission of implementing of the questionnaires, but the authorities did not seen to give permission due to some reasons.

Therefore, the study was conducted at Private Kültür High School – Istanbul, TEV İnanç Türkeş High School – Kocaeli, and Private American College – İzmir, where a great number of students were mainly consisted of preparatory classes and 9th grade students. Limited number of the students from 10th and 11th grades was able to participate in the study because of their limited time due to their preparation of university entrance examination.

In these schools there were total 965 students to whom the questionnaire could be applied.

The sample drawn from the above mentioned schools was as follows:

60 respondents from İnanç Türkeş High School,
41 respondents from Izmir American College,
115 respondents from Istanbul Kültür High School

Totally 216 students participated in the study.

3.3. SAMPLING OF THE STUDY

As previously mentioned, in the application of the questionnaires to the students some school administrators and English teachers felt uneasy. So, those schools which gave permission were chosen to conduct the study.

In these schools, 216 students were chosen through systematic random sampling technique. The questionnaires were delivered to the students in their guidance lesson.

3.4. TOOLS OF DATA COLLECTION

Since the study, in essence, relied on survey findings, as a tool of data collection, a questionnaire which was consisted of 35 items was used. Five questions were related to individual properties of the students, such as gender, class, etc., and 30 items were related to the measurement of the students' perceptions in regard to Non-NESTs' and NESTs' performance and competencies.

To measure the perceptions of the students, a five-dimensioned scale was used. The scale used in the study graded as;

5: Totally Agree
4: Agree
3: No comment
2: Disagree
1: Totally Disagree

The questionnaire items were first written both in English and Turkish in case respondents may fail to understand the items perfectly. For the pre-test of the questionnaire, 45 students were selected from among the third class students of Kandıra Anatolian High School. After the pre-test of the questionnaire, it was observed that some of the items in the questionnaire were unclear. Then they were clarified, so the final draft was comprehensible enough for them to understand the English version of questionnaire perfectly.

After the collection of the data, the responses of the participants were put into the computer, and analysed by means of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Correlation, ANOVA and Chi-square test were applied for the test of the hypotheses of the study, at $p < 0,05$ significance.

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

4.1. INTRODUCTION

The survey questionnaire of the study is consisted of 35 items; 5 questions are related to the individual and educational characteristics of the students, and 30 statements assess the general performance of both groups of teachers.

The 30 statements in the questionnaire are divided into two groups; the first group is consisted of 14 statements (S6, S7, S9, S16, S17, S18, S21, S22, S23, S24, S27, S28, S29, S30) that are about evaluating the general performance of NESTs, and the second group is consisted of 16 statements (S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14, S15, S19, S20, S25, S26) that are about evaluating the general performance of the Non-NESTs.

4.2. THE STUDENTS' INDIVIDUAL and EDUCATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Five demographic questions are placed in the questionnaire as students' individual and educational characteristics such as sex, class, duration of studying may play role in their perceptional evaluation of their Non-NESTs and NESTs. These characteristics are presented in Tables 1-5 below.

4.2.1. GENDER OF THE STUDENTS

The gender of the students is illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1
Gender of the Students

Gender	Frequency	Valid Percent
Male	122	56,5
Female	94	43,5
Total	216	100,0

Table 1 shows that total 216 students participated in the study. Out of 216 is 122 (%56, 5) male and 94 (%43, 5) female.

4.2.2 CLASSES OF THE STUDENTS

The classes of the students are illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2

Classes of the Students

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Prep. Class	113	52,3
9th Class	61	28,2
10th Class	24	11,1
11th Class	18	8,3
Total	216	100,0

As seen in Table 2, 52,3 percent of the students is from the preparatory classes, 28,2 percent is from 9th grades, 11,1 percent is from the 10th grades, and 8,3 percent is 11th grades.

The reason why the preparatory class students form more than half of the students is that other students were preparing to the university entrance exam, and they were reluctant to participate in the study.

4.2.3 DURATION OF THE STUDENTS' LEARNING ENGLISH

Duration of the Students' learning English may cause different perceptions of their Non-NESTs' and NESTs' performance and competence in teaching EFL.

That students have been learning English since long period of time would give them a better opportunity to observe and evaluate their Non-NESTs' and NESTs' teaching performances and competencies. How long they have been learning English is presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Duration of the Students' Learning English

Duration	Frequency	Valid Percent
0-6 Months	5	2,3
1 Year	5	2,3
2 Years	4	1,9
3 Years	13	6,0
4 Years - over	189	87,5
Total	216	100,0

Table 3 illustrates that overwhelming majority (% 87, 5) of the students have been learning EFL for 4 years and over. 6, 0 percent of them have been learning English for 3 years, and only 6, 5 percent of them have been learning for 2 years and less period of time.

It is understood from Table 3 that since overwhelming majority of the students have been learning EFL from Non-NESTs and NESTs for a long period of time, they must have enough experience to express their perceptions in regard to their teachers.

4.2.4. PERIODS OF THE NESTs and THE NON-NESTs ATTENDING THE STUDENTS CLASSROOMS

The periods that NESTs (Table 4) and Non-NESTs (Table 5) attended students' classes are illustrated in tables given below.

Table 4
NESTs

Duration	Frequency	Valid Percent
0-6 Months	69	31,9
1 Year	20	9,3
2 Years	26	12,0
3 Years	23	10,6
4 Years - over	78	36,1
Total	216	100,0

As shown in Table 4, 31, 9 percent of the students have attended NESTs' classes for 6 and less months, 9, 3% of them for a year, 12% of them for 2 years 10,6% of them have attended 3 and over years.

The periods that the Non-NESTs attended students' classes are illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5
Non-NESTs

Duration	Frequency	Valid Percent
0-6 Months	14	6,5
1 Year	8	3,7
2 Years	14	6,5
3 Years	17	7,9
4 Years - over	163	75,5
Total	216	100,0

Duration of Non-NESTs attended students' classes are as follows; 22 of the students attended 1 year and less duration, 14 of them for 2 years, 17 of them for 3 years and majority of the students (163) have attended Non-NESTs classes for 4 years and over.

All of the respondents have had lessons in Native English Speaking Teachers' classes. In this sense, answers of the students to this questionnaire will give us reasonable sights and clues for each question. Almost most of the students participated in this research have attended in Non-Native English Speaking Teachers' classes more than 4 years and over.

According to questions 4 and 5, all of the students have attended in both teachers' classes. As assumed, the results and data to be obtained from this study could help to increase the validity and reliability of the research.

4.3. PERCEPTIONAL FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

4.3.1. PERCEPTION

Perception is defined by Theodorson (1969) as a process and a pattern of response to stimuli. It is a function of the situational field, that is, of the total configuration of stimuli, as well as of previous social and cultural conditioning. It is the selection, organization and interpretation by an individual of specific stimuli in a situation, according to prior learning, activities, interests, experiences.

Some of the perceptions are selective and selective perception is the tendency of individuals to perceive those elements of a situation which support previous expectations. All perception is selective, in this sense that all individual learn to select relevant stimuli and organize them in standard ways, both for understanding and for communication with others (Theodorson 1969).

In the study, perceptions of the students are considered and examined in terms of both NESTs' and Non-NESTs' performance, competency, pedagogy, motivation and communication in their class circumstance.

4.3.2. PERFORMANCE RELATED PERCEPTIONAL FINDINGS

Performance is usually contrasted with competence which is the knowledge which underlines one's ability to use language. Performance is subject to variations due to inattention or fatigue whereas competence, at least for the mature native speaker, is more stable (Lightbown & Spada: 178).

For Brown (1987:24), performance is the clearly observable and concrete manifestation or realization of competence. It is the actual doing of something: walking, singing, dancing and speaking.

In order to measure the level of performance of the NESTs and the Non-NESTs perceived by the students, four statements (S1, S2, S3 and S4) were asked. The answers given to the concerned statements were presented in Table 6.

Table 6
Evaluation of Performance of the Non-NESTs and NESTs Perceived by the Students

Categories / Statements	Totally Agree		Agree		No Comment		Disagree		Totally Disagree		Mean	Std. D.
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	X	%
1. Non-NESTs supply learners with more information about English Language and its English Culture.	83	38,4	77	35,6	16	7,4	25	11,6	15	6,9	3,87	1,24
2. Non-NESTs go into details while teaching.	38	17,6	76	35,2	31	14,4	54	25,0	17	7,9	3,30	1,24
3. Non-NESTs teach English better.	85	39,4	49	22,7	29	13,4	42	19,4	11	5,1	3,72	1,30
4. That Non-NESTs make comparison between English and Turkish while teaching affects students English learning in a positive way.	41	19,0	82	38,0	41	19,0	27	12,5	25	11,6	3,40	1,25

As seen in Table 6, all students answered the questions concerning performance of the Non-NESTs and NESTs. Table 6 shows that most of the students agree with the statements concerning the performance of the two groups of teachers. However, they differ in the evaluation of their teachers' performances to some extent.

While 38.4 percent of the students totally agree with the statement 1 and 35,6 percent agree, and 39,4 percent totally agree with the statement 3 and 22,7 percent of them agree, and 35,2 percent agree, 2 and 17,6 totally agree, and 38 percent agree with the statement 4 and 19,0 totally agree, 11,6 percent totally disagree with the statement 1 and 6,9 percent disagree, and 25,0 percent totally disagree with the statement 2 and 7,9 disagree, and 19,4 percent totally disagree with the statement 3 and 5,1 percent disagree, and 12,5 percent totally disagree with the statement 4 and 11,6 percent disagree. It reveals that the students' evaluations in regard to their

teachers' teaching performances in terms of S1, S2, S3 and S4 are not equal. "Non-NESTs supply learners with more information about English Language and its English Culture" is the most agreed statement (X= 3,87); 74,0 percent of the students agree with the statement 1 to a certain extent, and "Non-NESTs go into details while teaching" is the relatively least agreed statement (52,8%) (X= 3, 30) among the statements measuring the performances of the Non-NESTs and the NESTs.

It is understood from the overall evaluation of the Table 6 that there seem to be some differences in the students' perceptions between Non-NESTs and NESTs in teaching performance of EFL. The students evaluated the performance of their Non-NESTs and the NESTs differently; more than half of them perceived their Non-NESTs' performances in terms of S1, S2, S3 and S4 in a more positive way as compared to NESTs. But these perceptional differences are not correlated except with the two statements (S2 and S3 r = 164) in statistically significant level p<0, 05.

It is inferred from the evaluation of performance related statements that the Non-NESTs supply learners more information about English Language and Culture. This might be of that the Non-NESTs could be viewed as a facilitator of target and first language as they have the experience of both languages.

According to a study done by Medgyes (1994), also upholds this results in that during the Non-NESTs' own learning process, the Non-NESTs have experienced both language' procedures and approaches that Non-NESTs are believed to be the better informants. Also, both teachers are expected to follow a certain curriculum and a syllabus and carry out the pre-determined goals in the lessons in Turkish Education System. As the Non-NESTs know more about the rules and expectations in society, they do their best to furnish the students with necessary information, as hoping that the students may use that knowledge in their future lives.

English Teachers have to process the subjects and the themes in the given period as well. And, presumably grammar may considered to be the most important skill by most Non-NESTs in Turkey. Some think that grammar learning and

acquisition of rules are more crucial than acquiring other performative skills. So in their presentation of the lesson, particularly grammar holds much time contrary to public opinions held in the field. Non-NESTs and NESTs both have the equal chance of success in teaching; the fragmental use of mother tongue randomly by Non-NESTs might make English more teachable, learnable and understandable. Regardingly, all these outcomes may help to improve their "learnacy".

Students are contend with the comparison of mother and target language in a non-target country. As may be inferred, Non-NESTs are the experienced teachers with the knowledge of both English and students' mother tongue; they make comparisons to help students overcome unexpected difficulties, specifically while teaching grammar and colloquial expressions.

It might be concluded from a general evaluation of Table 6 that the performance of the Non-NESTs present affect the teaching and learning in a positive way, and this might increase the level of students' learning and attention to the lesson presented.

4.3.3. COMPETENCE RELATED PERCEPTIONAL FINDINGS

Scientists and philosophers have operated with the basic distinction between competence and performance. Competence refers to one's underlying knowledge of system, event, or fact (Llightbown & Spada 2003). It is the non observable, idealized ability to do something, to perform something. In western society, it is used the competence and performance distinction in all walks of life. In the schools, for example, it has assumed that children possess certain competence in given areas and that this competence can be measured and assessed by means of the observation of elicited samples of performance called "tests" and "examination" (Brown 1987).

Competencies acquired from birth by a native foreign language teacher can be easily put into practice, and that provides the teacher with superiority. Teaching

style, reading ability, methods and techniques used by a NEST may be related to his birth-achieved abilities. During the instruction of a lecture all affect the teacher's interaction with the students, and may make him distinguished in teaching foreign language. The responses given to the concerned statements are presented in Table 7.

In this study, in order to measure the differentiations of the competences of the NESTs and the Non-NESTs perceived by the students, six statements (S5, S6, S7, S8, S9 and S10) were directed. Three statements were designed to discover the Non-NESTs' superior features concerning their competencies and three statements were given to discover NESTs' superior features.

Table 7
Competencies of the Non-NESTs and NESTs

Categories / Statements	Totally Agree		Agree		No Comment		Disagree		Totally Disagree		Mean	Std. D.
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	X	%
5. The teaching style of NEST ensures the students enjoy the lesson more.	40	18,5	77	35,6	43	19,9	46	21,3	10	4,6	3,42	1,37
6. The questions in NESTs' examinations are based on reading ability	52	24,1	89	41,2	41	19,0	24	11,1	10	4,6	3,69	1,10
7. NESTs generally teach students daily English	40	18,5	86	39,8	31	14,4	42	19,4	17	7,9	3,42	1,22
8. Non - NESTs have high teaching ability in using different techniques and methods.	40	18,5	88	40,7	31	14,4	45	20,8	12	5,6	3,46	1,17
9. Non-NESTs mostly teach grammar based lesson.	52	24,1	86	39,8	28	13,0	40	18,5	10	4,6	3,60	1,17
10. Non-NESTs apply textbooks more than NESTs do.	55	25,5	71	32,9	35	16,2	32	14,8	23	10,6	3,48	1,30

As seen in Table 7, the students' evaluations differ about their teachers' abilities and competences like teaching and reading ability, application of textbooks, and so forth.

One of the most agreed statement by the students is" The teaching style of NESTs ensures the students enjoy the lesson more". 35, 6 percent of the students agree with the statement and 18, 5 percent totally agree with it. If the students enjoy the NESTs' teaching style, they like the lesson and participate in the class interaction, and this makes the performance high.

Since the teaching style of the NESTs is closely related to their abilities achieved from birth, this feature reflects itself in the questions asked by the NESTs. So the questions they ask in the examinations are based on improving the students' reading abilities. As seen in Table 7, 41,2 percent of the students agree with the statement "The questions in NESTs' examinations are based on reading ability" and 24,1 percent totally agree with it.

The NESTs may be preferred by the educational institutions due to their competencies of fluent English speaking. The same preferential situation can be with the students, too. In order to learn the case, the statement "NESTs generally teach students daily English" was directed to the students. 39, 8 percent of the students agreed with the statement and 18, 5 percent of them totally agreed. It clearly appears that the NESTs speak their mother language fluently, and they can easily also use daily English in the class without feeling any difficulty in pronunciation of the words and remembering the rarely used and ambiguous words and expressions.

If an overall evaluation and interpretation of the statements related to the NESTs' competencies are considered, it appears that the NESTs indicate very effectively their birth-achieved abilities in their EFL teaching. When looked at the relation between the concerned statements there seems to be a very significant correlation. The pairs of the statements that are significantly correlated are "The questions in NESTs' examinations are based on reading ability" and NESTs generally teach students daily English" ($r = 254$; $p = 0,000$); "The teaching style of NESTs ensures the students enjoy the lesson more" and NESTs generally teach students daily English" ($r = 239$; $p = 0,000$). These statistically very significant correlations indicate, at the same time, very success of the NESTs in teaching EFL.

As for the Non-NESTs, they cover their gaps in teaching EFL by giving importance to the grammar of the language, applying text books more, and using different teaching techniques and methods unique to themselves. A clear proof of what has been said is that 40,7 percent of the students agree with the statement *"Non - NESTs have high teaching ability in using different techniques and methods"* and 18,5 totally agree, and 39,8 percent agree with the statement 5 and 24,1 totally agree, and 32,9 percent agree with the statement 9 and 25,5 totally agree. These three statements indicate distinguished features of the Non-NESTs; they have high teaching ability in using different techniques and methods while teaching English and to some extent their teaching seems to be mostly grammar based in English lesson, and apply textbooks more than NEST do.

The high level of significance between the statements "Non-NESTs mostly teach grammar based lesson" and "Non-NESTs apply textbooks more than NESTs do" ($r = 252$; $p = 0,000$) that are concerned with the measurement of the Non-NESTs' abilities in EFL indicates their distinguishing and differentiating features perceived by the students. And the other significant correlation appears between *"Non-NESTs have high teaching ability in using different techniques and methods"* and "Non-NESTs mostly teach grammar based lesson*"* ($r= 150$; $p = 0,027$).

The different features in teaching EFL between the NESTs and Non-NESTs, as seen so far, are perceived by the students to a great extent. What the students have perceived affects their success and interest in learning foreign language; either causing them to be encouraged or making them reluctant in participating in the class actively. However, the students seem to perceive and evaluate their teachers' competencies in a positive way.

On the other hand, teachers' competencies and abilities in different skills determine their teaching and assessment techniques. According to the appearing educational skills of the teachers, participation of the students in the class discussions leads them to incline more heavily in the classes of either the Non-NESTs' classes or the NESTs' classes. As a result, it can be claimed that the Non-NESTs' classes are

teacher-centred and the NESTs' classes are student-centred. Therefore the NESTs consider students' insufficiency in communicative skills and where they lack in English, they direct the students to use verbal English more, and the Non-NESTs show their efforts more to teach grammar based lessons.

Both NESTs and Non-NESTs differ in terms of declarative and procedural knowledge. Nunan (1999:3) defines 'declarative knowledge' as all the things we know and what we can articulate, this can be the rules of target language or about the target culture. 'Procedural knowledge' (Bailey 2002:5) is defined as the ability to do things knowing how, versus about knowing about. These things can be; knowing how to teach or how to behave in target language.

That Non-NESTs have stronger declarative knowledge about target language, and they have a better insight to the structure and way of teaching English. The Non-NESTs have not strong sufficiency and efficiency in using English in communicative ways, they apply more written English, like in writing and grammar skills and it is easier for the Non-NESTs to explain grammar as they have consciously had to learn it for themselves first. Better intuition, ability to communicate fluently with full competence and the capacity of using them properly might lead NESTs to give more knowledge than structure of English. That is to say, some have tendency to teach about the language, not the language itself.

The Non-NESTs have the competence of teaching structure and declarative knowledge; so, they always apply course books when they lack and feel the incompetence. However, the NESTs have a natural advantage of using English, and they may fill the gaps better (especially when confusion occurs) by using their communicative competencies. And as NESTs are more confident in their knowledge of their native language, they put less work in lesson planning and using course books. While 63,9 percent of the students agree with the statement *"Non-NESTs mostly teach grammar based lesson"* 25, 4 disagree.

It is understood from Table 7 that perceptions of the students differ statistically at significant level about their Non-NESTs and NESTs in their various features concerning the competence. It can be inferred that the use of conversational English by the NESTs in the class and their use of authentic, fluent English, and students' feeling less fear and anxiety in NESTs' lessons help students enjoy the lesson more. Also most NESTs', due to their communicative competencies, aim to make students speak and participate in lessons, and their using different techniques or strategies might make lessons more appealing.

4.3.4. PEDAGOGICAL RELATED PERCEPTIONAL FINDINGS

Pedagogy is the principles and methods used in teaching something, normally used in connection with teaching school subjects (Lindgren 1973). Two commonly ideal type pedagogies are the traditional and progressive, the former giving priority to formal academic teaching, competition, hierarchy and punishment, the latter to informal, egalitarian, non-repressive methods of teaching and to reward.

In order to measure the pedagogical perceptions of students toward the NESTs and Non-NESTs, ten statements (S11, S12, S13, S14, S15, S16, S17, S18, S19 and S20) were asked. The answers given to the concerned questions are presented in Table 8.

Since a good teaching either English or other subjects basically relies on some pedagogical principles and methods, it is important to take into consideration perceptional differentiations of the students while their teachers follow.

In order to measure the level of differentiations in the perceptions of the students as regard to pedagogical performances of the Non-NESTs and NESTs, the following statements listed in Table 8 were directed to them.

As seen in Table 8, the students have different perceptions about their teachers' pedagogical performances during teaching. Except for the statement "Non-NESTs punish the students in mark", more than half of the responses given to all the statements are in positive direction.

Table 8 Pedagogical Evaluation														
Categories / **Statements**	Totally Agree		Agree		No Comment		Disagree		Totally Disagree		Total		Mean	St. Dv.
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
11. Non-NESTs are more likely to be understanding when students make mistake.	50	23,1	60	27,8	23	10,6	62	28,7	21	9,7	216	100,0	3,26	1,35
12. The exam questions that Non-NESTs ask are more difficult than NESTs do.	43	19,9	51	23,6	35	16,2	68	31,5	19	8,8	216	100,0	3,14	1,30
13. Non-NESTs mostly ask grammar based questions in the examinations.	57	26,4	76	35,2	25	11,6	49	22,7	9	4,2	216	100,0	3,57	1,22
14. Non-NESTs manage the class better.	56	25,9	67	31,0	26	12,0	55	25,5	12	5,6	216	100,0	3,46	1,27
15.Non-NESTs encourage the students more in learning English	38	17,6	31	14,4	49	22,7	50	23,1	48	22,2	216	100,0	3,27	1,24
16. Non-NESTs punish the students in mark.	28	13,0	33	15,3	25	11,6	66	30,6	64	29,6	216	100,0	2,51	1,39
17. Non-NESTs mark more severely in assessing students' marks in comparison with NESTs	49	22,7	48	22,2	38	17,6	50	23,1	31	14,4	216	100,0	3,16	1,39
18. NESTs are equal to students (unbaised) in comparison with Non-NESTs .	36	16,7	50	23,1	48	22,2	56	25,9	26	12,0	216	100,0	3,06	1,28
19. Students do not have any anxiety of making mistakes in NESTs' classes	31	14,4	70	32,4	40	18,5	59	27,3	16	7,4	216	100,0	3,19	1,20
20. The attitudes NESTs represent affect the students' English learning in a positive way	43	19,9	105	48,6	38	17,6	20	9,3	10	4,6	216	100,0	3,70	1,04

As seen in table 8, the most agreed statement "The attitudes NESTs represent affect the students' English learning in a positive way". 48, 6 percent of the students agree with the statement and 19, 9 percent of them totally agree. Total 68, 1

percent of the students agree to some extent with the attitudes that NESTs show in the class affects the students' English learning positively.

Another point in the measurement of the students' perceptions is concerned with what type of questions the teachers ask in the exams. Since the exams are the central interest as well as mean the students' fear and anxiety. As shown in Table 8, 31,5 percent of the students disagree and 8,8 is totally disagree with the statement *"The exam questions that Non-NESTs ask are more difficult than NESTs do"*, 23,6 percent just agree and 19,9 totally agree. Almost a number of the students who gave responses to the statements either positive or negative are near to each other. Views of the students cannot be inclined heavily on either side.

A second statement regarding questions occurring in the exams is *"Non-NESTs mostly ask grammar based questions in the examinations"*. 35, 2 percent of the students agree and 26, 4 totally agree with the statement.

It appears that while the students are not heavily inclined into either side, and therefore they are not differentiated as to their Non-NESTs ask more difficult questions. But they are much differentiated as to their Non-NESTs ask grammar-based questions in the exams in the direction of positive perception. There is also statistically very significant correlation between the two statements (r =251; p= 0,000).

It is expected that the Non-NESTs have more empathy since they might have made same mistake during their educational years. So, they disregard the students' mistake and encourage them to overcome whet they lack. A little more than half of the students (50.9 percent) who participated in the study agree to some extent with the statement *"Non-NESTs are more likely to be understanding when students make mistake"*. Contrary to the above findings, 32,4 percent of the students do not have any anxiety of making mistakes in NESTs' classes, at all, and 19,9 percent do not have any anxiety (agree with the statement). The students can learn more easily a

foreign language better with the implementation of a method that adopts fear and anxiety, free educational principles.

Assessment of marks is very sensitive issue for both students' and teachers' educational life. If the marks assessed by the teacher are evaluated by their students severely or extravagantly, they are affected in both cases thinking that they are punished or rewarded by the teacher. For these obvious reasons, measurement of the students' perceptions in regard to how they evaluate their teachers' assessment of their marks is very crucial issue.

In order to measure the students' perceptions in connection with how they evaluate their teachers' mark assessments, two statements were asked respectively: "Non-NESTs punish the students in mark" and "Non-NESTs mark more severely in assessing students' marks in comparison with NESTs". Totally 60,2 percent of the students disagreed with the statement; 29,6 percent totally disagree and 30,6 percent disagree. Total 28,3 percent of the students agree with the statement; 15,3 percent agree and 13,0 totally agree. But it is immediately mentioned that 28,3 percent of the students who did not agree should not be considered a small number which can easily be ignored. The Non-NESTs must take preventive measures so that their students should not consider any mark they get is a punishment, or means of punishment. Otherwise, this situation would affect the interrelation between the teachers and the students in an undesirable way. Likewise to a certain extent, 44,9 percent (22,7 totally agree and 22,2 agree) of the students agree with that Non-NESTs mark more severely in comparison to the NESTs. And very significant correlation found between the two statements also indicate the parallel perceptions of the students about the matter ($r = 233$; $p = 0,001$).

The pedagogical strategy or method followed either by the Non-NESTs or the NESTs in teaching EFL would make them more successful in the eyes of their students. One of the indicators reflecting the success of the teachers is related to how they manage the class. According to more than half of the students (56, 9 percent),

who participated in the study agree to some extend with the statement "Non-NESTs manage the class better", and 31,1 percent disagree with the idea respectively.

In class management, the Non-NESTs benefit from sharing the students' mother tongue and same culture. The cultural similarity is very important for a better teaching atmosphere. What is more, their anticipation about the students present condition is quiet significant and they know about Turkish students' expectations both from teacher and the lesson. The Non-NESTs are more aware of the conduct of behaviour of their students.

It can be concluded from Table 8 that the students' perceptions are quite differentiated as regard to their Non-NESTs' and NESTs' teaching principles and methods (which is called pedagogy). While Non-NESTs are evaluated by the students to be more successful in the management of the class, possessing empathy of their students' mistakes during the class interactions, the NESTs are seen to be representing more positive attitudes that affect the students' learning English, and consequently in the NESTs' classes the students do not have anxiety of making mistakes.

In some points the students are indifferent; they do not make any distinctions about the NESTs' and Non-NESTs' equal attitude (unbiased) to them, and about that Non-NESTs encourage the students more in learning English.

To evaluate Table, Non-NESTs are to make empathy to encourage and make students motivated while teaching because they probably made the similar mistakes at one time or another while they were learning English. So, they are more empathic with students' needs and problems as Non-NEST is the first hand experience. They understand and appreciate their problems and experienced identical situations by students because most likely have undergone the same learning difficulties and experienced various situations in their educational life.

The students sometimes may cause the teachers to be patient not only in the lessons presented but also for the misbehaviour they display. The reactions NESTs show may be slighter toward students' failure due to fact that they do not know the students' mother tongue, and it will be quiet difficult for them to express their thoughts out; so, they may try to keep quiet or use body language in order to show their reactions.

Also, exams are the main concern for students during their education and they always pose problems for students. So, when the exams (questions in exams) are considered by students, it holds a place as one of the most important part in their learning. What might be inferred is that difficulty of exams depends on lessons. This may also be inferred that NESTs may see the students as if they were native students and NESTs think they can perceive every item on the exam paper, so they prepare the questions under such assumptions. Yet, the students fail to understand even if they were easy questions.

Another assumption may be that Non-NEST designs grammar-based questions for their examinations so that Non-NESTs focus grammar more than other skills as they feel competent enough about teaching grammar, and they might feel themselves associated with accuracy rather than fluency. Also, in Turkey, most of the examinations which are hold as national level measure and test the written and structural skills so those reasons presumably lead teachers to focus on grammar and vocabulary.

The NESTs' lack of cultural awareness and having less cognizant about Turkish Educational system might put them in a disadvantageous place in managing the class. The main concern is to determine who encourages the students more in learning English, which is very crucial. As a whole, encouraging the students is the responsibility of both teachers, NESTs and Non-NESTs, it should be both teachers' main duty for a better teaching and education. As mentioned in previous question, NESTs speak the language fluently with a comfortable mode, with full of

expressions, and this might encourage the students and might force them to study in order to speak or use English as NESTs do.

As can be claimed, the NESTs speak the language in the way how they feel most of the time and they speak English as if students were native. Students miss the words and expressions, and they fail to understand the NESTs, so students are demoralized and accordingly their attention decreases.

Anxiety and fear in FLL influence the learning negatively and they mostly happen due to lack of confidence, excommunication and fear of making mistakes. As mentioned above, Non-NESTs are felt to be associated with accuracy rather than fluency, also students are to communicate with NESTs, so mistakes may be disregarded in NEST's class to motivate students' communicative skills.

Most Non-NESTs sometimes use the mark as a threat to discipline the class and control the students; nevertheless, marking is also used as a tool by Non-NESTs to raise the students' attention to the lessons and to regulate students' behaviour. Students' feeling and their expectation from teacher should be taken into account. The reason of fully agreement might be of again their comfortable mode and their fluent English speaking. Also added to this result that Non-NESTs' feeling of teaching everything to students in a short time puts them in a rush, so students are forced to learn more than they are to able to.

As can be concluded from table 8, the language teacher must have a good attitude toward teaching and knowledge about methodology and pedagogy. Non-NESTs have advantage in that they can understand why students are having problem at understanding certain aspects of the language and they can decide on which areas are more problematic and which are less so they can have better explanation of relevant difficulties and provide more useful information about the target language. On the other hand, the NESTs can have difficulties in explaining certain mistakes. The important thing is for the both teachers to know how to be effective in rising students' attention and keeping them engaged with lesson.

4.3.5. MOTIVATION RELATED PERCEPTIONAL FINDINGS

Motivation is also one of the point of measuring the perceptional differentiations of the students about NESTs' and Non-NESTs' aspects. In the study, motivation is defined operationally by means of attraction, goal seeking, hesitation and anxiety.

Table 9 Motivational Differentiations														
Categories / **Statements**	Totally Agree		Agree		No Comment		Disagree		Totally Disagree		Total		Mean	St. dv.
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
21. NESTs attract the students more than Non-NESTs	63	29,2	71	32,9	24	11,1	42	19,4	16	7,4	216	100,0	3,57	1,29
22. Students study to learn rather than take high mark in NESTs' classes.	29	13,4	64	29,6	54	25,0	52	24,1	17	7,9	216	100,0	3,17	1,17
23. Students do not hesitate to discuss the opinions with NESTs.	30	13,9	83	38,4	42	19,4	40	18,5	21	9,7	216	100,0	3,28	1,20
24. Students have less examination stress in NESTs' classes	23	10,6	49	22,7	31	14,4	81	37,5	32	14,8	216	100,0	2,77	1,25
25. Students have anxiety of mark in Non-NESTs' class.	59	27,3	55	25,5	33	15,3	47	21,8	21	9,7	216	100,0	3,44	1,56

As illustrated in Table 9, in order to evaluate the motivational perceptions of students toward NESTs and Non-NESTs, five questions (S21, S22, S23, S24 and S25) were asked. The answers given to the questions at issue are presented in Table 9.

Table 9 shows that 32, 9 percent of the students agree and 29,2 percent totally agree with that the NESTs attract the students' attentions during the teaching sessions in the class more than the Non-NESTs do. The fact that the NESTs attract intentions of the students into the lesson leads them to understand the topic better, and consequently they get self-confidence and do not hesitate to discuss the opinions

with the NESTs. 38, 4 percent of the students agree not to hesitate to discuss the opinions with the NESTs, and 13, 9 percent agree with it as well. There is also significant correlation between the two statements (r = 178; p = 0,009).

To be able to discuss with the teachers without any hesitation in a formal class circumstance is a good indicator of the proper interaction between students-teachers. As the students do not hesitate to participate in class-discussions, their goal becomes solely learning rather than obtaining high marks. 29,6 percent of the students stated that they agree with the idea that they study to learn rather than take high mark in the NESTs' classes, 13,4 percent totally agree. But 25,0 percent indecisive in this regard. The situation that the students do not hesitate in class discussions may lead them, at some points to get rid of their feeling of examination stress. Total 33,3 percent (22,7 percent agree and 10,6 totally agree) of the students stated that they agree with that they feel less examination stress in the NESTs' classes.

It is also inferred from Table 9 that while the students do not have any hesitation to discuss their opinion in the NESTs' classes, they cannot easily express their opinions in the Non-NESTs' classes due to their fear of mark. 27,3 percent of the students state that they have anxiety of mark in the Non-NESTs' classes, and 25,5 of them agree with the proposed idea. The most significant correlation exists between the two statements; students do not hesitate to discuss the opinions with NESTs and "Students have less examination stress in NESTs' classes" (r = 303; p = 0,000).

That many significant correlations exist between the concerned statements refers the motivational differentiation of the students in connection with their Non-NESTs and NESTs.

From the students' point of view, it might be a good opportunity for them to have a Native English Speaking Teacher as every learner dreams of practicing conversation with a native speaker. In this item, majority of the students agree with

the idea as it was presumed that NESTs attract the students owing to the fact that NESTs' feeling for nuances, having comfortable natural expression and speaking the language fluently.

The fact that the students' desirousness to communicate with the NESTs without any problem forces and leads them to learn the language properly. In Turkish culture, Turkish people always show interest in foreign people, and they always have the tendency of establishing close relationship with foreign people. So students feel the same to NESTs and they comfort the students as they are from different culture, society and personal identities.

Non-NESTs might be seen as somebody who always criticize and make judgements about students' attitudes and toward students' knowledge about English. As Non-NESTs know the students' background and expectations of society, they would perform as an advisor and someone who knows everything about students.

Examinations should not be considered as either the matter of personality or ELT background. Whether s/he is NEST or Non-NEST, students could not be kept away from the fear, stress and anxiety of examinations. This also is added to the result, NESTs might be more tolerant or indifferent in examinations and Non-NESTs are said to be stricter as they have the awareness of what exams really mean for parents and how important place exams have in teaching and assessing in professional life.

An assumption might be the difficulties and types of questions and parents' expectations of the children to receive high marks might force them to focus on marks rather than the evaluation of the items taught. Additionally, as mentioned in previous questions, most Non-NESTs may have tendency to use the marking as a tool for a better class management and in most cases as a motivation factor.

4.3.6 COMMUNICATION RELATED PERCEPTIONAL FINDINGS

The term communication is widely used and has been applied to situations ranging from information processing within the individual to large-scale socio cultural systems, mass communication and influence (Deaux & Wrightsman 1984:108). Communication is a process that enables person to send and receive messages carrying information and thus to attempt to exercise some control over his environment (Lindgren 1973: 302).

This study focuses on the interpersonal communication that takes place between the teachers and the students.

For a good education, proper communication is essential. Students can learn better what are taught by the teachers when they are more comfortable. The teachers either the NESTs or the Non-NESTs have an important role in establishing a good relationship between students and themselves. So an interaction between teacher and students relies on a healthy communication.

It is expected that the students, due to some lacks; may have insufficient knowledge of English or for some other reasons, cannot establish a good communication with their environment. As a result of this, they express their dissatisfaction by means of other channels. Such a situation reflects itself as an over excitement, fear and anxiety in the examinations, or some type of aggressive behaviour or pessimist attitudes.

Therefore, teachers' sense of humour, cheerfulness and so on all are the good indicators of the teachers' communication. In order to measure the communicational differentiations of students toward NESTs and Non-NESTs, five questions (S26, S27, S28, S29, and S30) were asked. The answers given to the concerned statements are presented in Table 10.

Categories / Statements	Totally Agree		Agree		No Comment		Disagree		Totally Disagree		Total		Mean	St. dv.
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
26. Students can express their thoughts to Non-NEST better	57	26,4	66	30,6	25	11,6	52	24,1	16	7,4	216	100,0	3,44	1,31
27. Students often fall in desperate situation because they do not understand what their NESTs say. (as he/she speaks English)	42	19,4	51	23,6	30	13,9	59	27,3	34	15,7	216	100,0	3,04	1,39
28. That NESTs have different sense of humor ensure them to establish good relationship with students	58	26,9	73	33,8	43	19,9	28	13,0	14	6,5	216	100,0	3,62	1,20
29. Students do not establish a good communication with NESTs as their English is limited	49	22,7	63	29,2	23	10,6	53	24,5	28	13,0	216	100,0	3,24	1,38
30. NESTs are more cheerful than Non-NESTs	34	15,7	50	23,1	49	22,7	48	22,2	35	16,2	216	100,0	3,00	1,32

Table 10
Communicational Differentiations

Table 10 shows that 30,6 percent of the students agree with that they can express their thoughts to the Non-NESTs better, and 26,4 percent agree with the same idea. It appears from Table 10 that most of the students have a better communication in terms of manifesting their thoughts to the Non-NESTs. The reason of why the students better express their thoughts to the Non-NESTs is because of their insufficiency in verbal communication with the NESTs. As shown in Table 8, in regard to pedagogical evaluations of the students about their feeling anxiety of making mistakes in the NESTs' classes, in sum 34,7 percent had feeling of anxiety, and 18,5 percent of them was indecisive. This situation also puts forward that the Non-NESTs communicate better than the NESTs do. In addition to this, totally 43,0 percent of the students accept that they often fall in desperate situation because they do not understand what their NESTs say while speaking in the class. The existence of very significant correlation between the statements "Students can express their thoughts to Non-NEST better" and "Students often fall in desperate situation because

they do not understand what their NESTs say" also indicates that those students who agree with both statements are to think in parallel way. (r = 332; p = 0,000).

In contrast, those students who had the view that the NESTs have different sense of humour ensure them to establish good relationship with students do not think in the parallel line with those students who had the view that they can express to the Non-NESTs better. This is understood from the existence of statistically negative correlation between the two statements (r = - 150, p = 0,023). 33,8 percent of the students agree with the view that those NESTs who have different sense of humour ensure them to establish good relationship with them, and 26,9 percent agree with the statement as well.

The existence of very high level of the significant correlation between the statements "Students do not estblish a good communication with NESTs as their English are limited" and "Students often fall in desperate situation because they do not understand what their NESTs say" also shows that the communication, in other words, the interaction between the NESTs and their students is not at a desired level by a great number of students (r = 550; p = 0,000). The fact is that totally 51,9 percent of the students agree with the view that they do not establish good communication with their NESTs since their English is limited puts forth the lacking side of the NESTs. Both groups of teachers differ in respect to communication skills in the class.

If the students cannot adequately communicate as expected this situation reflects in the teachers' cheerfulness. Being cheerful is a good indicator of a healthy communication. When looked at the responses as presented in Table 10, it appears that the students did not incline one side of the response categories about the statement "NESTs are more cheerful than Non-NESTs". To some extent, 38,4 percent of the students disagree with the statement, and totally 38,8 percent of them agree with the statement, and 22,7 percent mentioned that they did not have any idea about the matter.

It can be concluded from the data in Table 10 that, the students evaluate their teachers' communication skills differently; however, majority of them is in the view that the Non-NESTs are better in communication compared to the NESTs since their English is not sufficient to communicate properly with their NESTs.

As the NESTs are from different culture and society and differences in personalities and the teaching background might conclude us to obtain these results. Students may feel more comfortable when they speak to them as they are very sure that they are not judged or tested as the way some Non-NESTs are apt to do so. Students feel that their limited English causes communication problems and misunderstandings between NESTs and students. Even though NESTs and students have a good relationship, students' unassured inabilities to communicate in English always affect their relation negatively and will create obstacles in sharing.

It is a fact that beginner learners may feel the confusions if they cannot perceive the meaning or expression of teachers. Consequently when the students miss a lot from the lesson, their fear and anxiety might increase and this may reduce students' motivation and will lead them to be reluctant to the lesson.

Psychological mode of students differing from teacher to teacher and student to student might be assumed to be the cause. In this sense, both NEST and Non-NEST, while speaking the target language, should reduce the students' anxiety and fear and should keep control of using English and hence, the words should be chosen due to student's perception.

As a result, the students perceive and evaluate their Non-NESTs' and NESTs' communicative skills differently. The Non-NESTs make use of the students' mother tongue, and besides Non-NESTs might be considered as someone familiar to them

4.4. TESTING OVERALL (GENERAL) PERFORMANCE OF THE STUDENTS

4.4.1. COMPARISON OF PERCEIVED OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE NESTS AND THE NON-NESTS

Out of the 30 statements, 14 of them (**S6, S7, S9, S16, S17, S18, S21, S22, S23, S24, S27, S28, S29, S30**) are about evaluating the performance of the NESTs and 16 of them (**S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S8, S10, S11, S12, S13, S14, S15, S19, S20, S25, S26**) are about the general performance of the Non-NESTs.

The students indicated their level of agreement to these statements on a 5 point Likert Scale (5=Totally Agree to 1=Totally Disagree).

7 of the statements (S9, S12, S13, S16, S25, S27 and S29) contained negative assessments. Answers to these statements were transposed and recoded before running the tests.

It was first computed the overall mean scores of the answers to the statements, separately for the NESTs and the Non-NESTs. The higher overall mean score meant the higher level of perceived performance. Then, T test was run in order to compare and to see whether there is significant differences between the mean scores (perceived performance) of the NESTs and the Non-NESTs. All the tests were done in 0, 05 significance level.

Table 11
Mean Scores for Perceived Overall Performance (Descriptive)

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Overall Performance of NEST	3,0463	216	0,4951	0,03369
Overall Performance of Non-NEST	3,3028	216	0,48136	0,03275

Table 12
Paired Samples T Test

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
NEST-Non-NEST	-0,25653	0,72166	0,0491	-0,35331	-0,15974	-5,22	215	0,0000

As seen in Table 11, the overall performance mean score of NEST is 3,0463, while it is 3,3028 for Non-NESTs. According to the result of paired samples T test, this difference is statistically significant at 0,0000 confidence interval (Table.12). Mean scores for perceived overall performance of the NESTs are lower than those of Non-NESTs. In this case, the mean hypothesis of the study (H_1): "There are differences in the perceptions of students between the Non-NESTs and the NESTs in their teaching performance and competencies" is accepted.

4.4.2. PERCEIVED OVERALL PERFORMANCE AND STUDENTS DEMOGRAPHICS

Further analysis of variance was done (ANOVA) in order to check if the perceived overall performances mean scores significantly vary according to the respondent demographics.

4.4.3. PERCEIVED OVERALL PERFORMANCE AND GENDER OF STUDENTS

As seen in Table13, the male students gave 3,077 overall performance mean score for the NESTs, while female students gave 3, 0064 mean points to NESTs.

Male students gave 3, 25 mean points to the Non-NESTs while female students gave 3, 36 mean points to the Non-NESTs.

Table 13
Overall Performance vs Gender Descriptive Statistics

Gender	Overall Performance of NEST			Overall Performance of Non-NEST		
	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Male	3,077	122	0,47698	3,2514	122	0,4936
Female	3,0064	94	0,51751	3,3695	94	0,45904
Total	3,0463	216	0,4951	3,3028	216	0,48136

Analysis of variance was run to see whether these minor differences in mean scores are statistically significant. According to the ANOVA results, there was no significant difference on perceived overall performance in terms of students' gender (Table 14).

Table 14
Overall Performance vs Gender ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
NESTs Overall Performance vs. Gender	Between Groups	0,265	1	0,265	1,082	0,299
	Within Groups	52,436	214	0,245		
	Total	52,701	215			
Non-NESTs Overall Performance vs. Gender	Between Groups	0,74	1	0,74	3,227	0,074
	Within Groups	49,077	214	0,229		
	Total	49,817	215			

4.4.4. PERCEIVED OVERALL PERFORMANCE AND EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF STUDENTS

As seen in Table 15, according to the educational level of students, there are minor differences in terms of overall performance mean scores. But these differences are not statistically significant according to the results of ANOVA (Table 16).

Table15
Overall Performance vs Level Of Respondent (Class) Descriptive Statistics

Class	Overall Performance of NEST			Overall Performance of Non-NEST		
	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Prep. Class	3,069	113	0,52417	3,2544	113	0,49057
9th Class	3,0426	61	0,44038	3,4197	61	0,4831
10th Class	3,0306	24	0,54052	3,3139	24	0,38897
11th Class	2,937	18	0,44013	3,1963	18	0,48962
Total	3,0463	216	0,4951	3,3028	216	0,48136

Table 16
Overall Performance vs Educational Level ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
NESTs Overall Performance vs. Class	Between Groups	0,28	3	0,093	0,377	0,769
	Within Groups	52,421	212	0,247		
	Total	52,701	215			
Non-NESTs Overall Performance vs. Class	Between Groups	1,305	3	0,435	1,902	0,13
	Within Groups	48,512	212	0,229		
	Total	49,817	215			

4.4.5. PERCEIVED OVERALL PERFORMANCE AND STUDENTS' DURATION OF LEARNING ENGLISH

As seen in Table 17 below, according to the students' duration of learning English, there are minor differences in terms of overall performance mean scores. But these differences are not statistically significant according to the results of ANOVA (Table 18).

Table 17
Overall Performance vs Learning Duration of Respondent Descriptive Statistics

How long have you been learning English?	Overall Performance of NEST			Overall Performance of Non-NEST		
	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
0-6 Months	2,8933	5	0,52196	3,1467	5	0,7723
1 Year	3	5	0,43461	3,5333	5	0,37712
2 Years	3,1333	4	0,60858	3,3	4	0,29059
3 Years	2,8462	13	0,48334	3,3077	13	0,37569
4 Years – over	3,0635	189	0,49576	3,3006	189	0,48667
Total	3,0463	216	0,4951	3,3028	216	0,48136

Table 18
Overall Performance vs. Learning Duration of Respondent ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
NESTs Overall Performance vs. Duration Of Learning English	Between Groups	0,735	4	0,184	0,746	0,562
	Within Groups	51,967	211	0,246		
	Total	52,701	215			
Non-NESTs Overall Performance vs. Duration of Learning English	Between Groups	0,389	4	0,097	0,415	0,798
	Within Groups	49,429	211	0,234		
	Total	49,817	215			

4.5. FURTHER OBSERVATION

When the questionnaire was prepared, apart from the items in the questionnaires, students were asked to write their additional comments on the Non-NESTs and the NESTs in order to share their thoughts and feelings which they could not reflect through questionnaire items.

4.5.1. STUDENTS' COMMENTS

Some students were uneasy to fill in such a questionnaire about their teachers, as thinking that the NESTs might lose their jobs and there is no need to make

distinction between the two groups of teachers. Some suggest that speaking and listening lessons can be taught better by NEST while grammar and writing by Non-NEST. Students were in the view of that the NESTs are quiet natural and sincere. A significant number of students think most of the NESTs force them to speak English as they are supposed not to know any words of Turkish. One of the concerns students indicate is the fear of assessment claiming that the Non-NESTs evaluate their success according to the marks they receive from examination, but on the contrary NESTs evaluate them according to their attitudes shown in the class sessions. Hence, they have no examination fear in NESTs' lessons and they enjoy those sessions more than those of Non-NESTs'.

4.6. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The responses and the comments arrived from students indicate that the differences between the NESTs and the Non-NESTs lay not only in their proficiency in English but in their way of teaching. The students characterized Native English Speaking Teachers as informal and confident whereas Non-Native English Speaking Teachers were characterized as sensitive to the students' needs, sufficient but dependent on course books.

The observed differentiations do not necessarily mean that either the NESTs or the Non-NESTs are superior to each other, since the topic of the study is restricted to discover of the differences between the two groups of the teachers from the students' point of view. The only outstanding observation may said to be the way they teach and how their performances and competences are perceived by students during the teaching sessions.

The substantial responses and comments also emphasise that the Non-NESTs are to make empathy for the purpose of encouraging and making the students motivated while teaching. To a certain extent, the Non-NESTs probably made similar

mistakes during their learning the English language. As the Non-NESTs are considered to be the first hand experience, such a priority makes the teachers more empathetic to the needs and problems of the students.

That the NESTs really attract the students through using communicative skills more effectively than Non-NESTs is another important point and encourages the students to practice the language and puts them in further steps in teaching English as well. That NESTs are from different societies and cultures and their different sense of humour might also attract the students. However, those peculiarities do not suggest that the NESTs are better teachers in teaching English. In this sense, there should be a collaborative assessment.

From the aspect of their competence in English language teaching, the Native English Speaking Teachers were perceived by the students to be more successful and superior in the English language teaching profession than the Non-NESTs; however, the Non-NESTs also have some superior features. And the findings outlined in the study are parallel to the study conducted by Medgyes (1994:103) which puts forward that Non-Native English Speaking Teachers can provide a good learning model for imitation, teach language learning strategies more effectively, supply learners with more information about the English language, better anticipate and prevent language difficulties, be more empathetic to the needs and problems of the learners and Non-NESTs make use of the learners of mother tongue.

To a certain extent the NESTs are considered to be the proficient users of English. They can act as perfect language models, but they may not be good learner models as they have not been the learners of English as a foreign language in the sense that the Non-NESTs are. The Non-NESTs can adopt language learning strategies during their own learning process. The Non-NESTs are stepped in that their places fill the gaps between misunderstandings and the English language. When students complain, such as "English is very difficult, we do not understand it" are considered the teacher who is a Non-NEST may assure his/her students of these

difficulties can be overcome easily. Because the Non-NESTs might have felt similar feelings and can explain the problems as they have the knowledge and experience in both language and culture.

The Non-NESTs can be far more likely to be patient and understanding when students make mistakes because, in the past, they have probably made similar mistakes at one time or another. By contrast, no matter how patient and understanding the NESTs are, it is hard for them to shake off their fears and target culture-based misunderstanding and problems.

The Non-NESTs have advantages in some fields over the NESTs as far as teaching EFL is concerned. Because of the fact that Non-NESTs themselves have learned English as a foreign language, they understand the students' needs and expectations better. As foreign language learners themselves, they have probably spent a great deal of time and effort trying to master the foreign language skills. How they learned the grammar, how they attempted to expand their vocabulary and how they overcome the problems they encountered during learning are all valuable experiences that they can share with their students. Their determination to succeed and the fact that they did succeed provide an excellent example for students. Non-NESTs might present good models for students as learners of a foreign language.

On the other hand, the NESTs also have advantages, especially if s/he is an experienced teacher of English with a broad knowledge of both English language and the student's mother tongue; s/he can make comparisons between the grammar of English and the grammar of the native language to help students overcome difficulties in understanding and practising new structures. However, Non-NESTs have a few drawbacks in some English language teaching areas, for instance, in pronunciation of certain words. According to Medgyes (1994:103), translation is another problem in EFL teaching. The Non-NEST might comfortably rely on word - by - word translation, perhaps more than necessary. The NESTs might struggle to explain some concepts which could easily be taught with the help of the student's mother tongue. Bennett (1994) states that learners most of the time make many

efforts to express untranslatable sentences or words of the native culture and language which are important for them. While Non-NESTs recognize these and anticipate and focus on them, NESTs are more likely to dismiss them as Non – English and therefore they are not worth attention.

Native and Non-Native English Speaking Teachers have different strengths. According to the results obtained from the study, it is observed that Non-NESTs manage the class better. This may be due to the fact that the Non-NESTs benefit from sharing the students' mother tongue and the same culture. What Shaw (1979) pointed out is parallel with our findings. He says that a NEST may partially or even completely lack the kind of insight necessary for English language teachers to prepare and execute his classes. He also observed that the Non-NESTs are typically better controlling the complexity of their speech and behaviour in the class.

Myint's findings also support our study results. He believes that Non-NESTs have more advantages and they offer benefits to EFL students and puts forward five advantages to be highlighted as follows;

> A- First hand experience,
>
> B- Patience and understanding,
>
> C- A living model,
>
> D- Multicultural understanding,
>
> E- Ease of identification through similar experience (2002:10).

Medgyes(1992) claims that Non-NESTs can never acquire a NEST's ability and adequacy. The two groups remain clearly distinguishable. The main reason why Non-Native English Speaking Teachers cannot turn into NESTs lies in the fact that they are, by their very nature, norm-dependent. Their use of English is but an imitation of some form of native use. Non - native speakers can never be as creative and original as those whom they have learnt to copy. He addressed an interesting and challenging issue and argued that Non-NESTs should have the chance of reaching level of language competency that NESTs already have. He (1992) suggests that

Non-NESTs could serve as imitable models of successful language learners, provide learners with more information about language and learning strategies, anticipate the difficulties learners would encounter more easily and perhaps be able to assist them better through sharing their mother tongue.

According to Braine (1999), Non-NEST and NEST have some distinguishing characteristics as follow;

Native English Speaking Teachers	Non - Native English Speaking Teachers
1- Informal, fluent, accurate	1- Rely on textbooks, materials
2- Use different techniques, methods and approaches	2- Apply the differences between L1 and L2
3- Flexible	3- Use L1 as a medium
4- Use conversational English	4- Aware of negative transfer
5- Know subtleties of the language	5- Sensitive to the needs of students
6- Use Authentic English, provide positive feedback	6- More efficient
7- Communication not exam preparation	7- Know student's background
	8- Exam preparation

(Braine 1999:136)

It is understood from findings that the Non-NEST creates an easy rapport with students and leads them to a better understanding and stronger motivation to learn English. This results support our findings, too.

The fact that the teacher is seen as "one of us "and not as someone different to the students, makes a big difference in the way students view the lesson, and presumably it helps them to overcome anxiety and distress. The Non-NESTs serve as living models of what the students can achieve if they are willing to work hard and save time to study English. The presence of Non-NESTs in the class is enough to remind students that if they are willing to work hard, the world is within their reach (Rampton 1990)

Non-NESTs have better insights into the language formally than untrained NESTs who may have little or no explicit structural knowledge of their first language. Murphy O'Dwyer (1996) noted that Non-NESTs have distinct advantage over monolingual NESTs in that they already have a successful language learning experience behind them, which they can draw on to, inform their teaching.

4.7. SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter presented the data obtained from analysis of the study. The findings were discussed and supported with the results of some researchers' studies. The following chapter contains the conclusion and implications of the study.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1. CONCLUSION

The study examines the perceptions of the students regarding their NESTs and Non-NESTs' performance and competencies, pedagogical, motivational and communicational skills in English teaching. Since NESTs and Non-NESTs come from different educational and cultural backgrounds, they are expected to differ in terms of their teaching abilities and skills. In the study, it is measured how NESTs and Non-NESTs are perceived by their students in their teaching performance and competencies, and is investigated which group of the teachers have better performance and competencies in teaching English from the point of their students' perceptions.

Since the NESTs are employed only in the Private High Schools in Turkey, and the number of the students who attend both NESTs' and Non-NESTs classes, and can make some observations so as to compare between the teachers is very limited, the study is restricted with the private high schools in which both NESTs and Non-NESTs work, and with the students who have taken English lessons from both groups of the teachers.

The study was conducted in the three different private high schools by taking 216 students as the sample of the study, meanly of preparatory classes and 9th grade students, chosen through systematic random sampling technique. Out of 216 respondents is 122 (%56, 5) male and 94 (%43, 5).

To measure the perceptions of the students 30 statements were asked using a five-dimensioned scale –totally agree to totally disagree. In the analysis of the data, correlation and ANOVA (t, F tests) were applied for the testing of the hypotheses of the study, at $p < 0,05$ significance.

It was found that the Non-NESTs supply learners more information about English language and culture. This might be because of the fact that the Non-NESTs could be viewed as a facilitator of the first language as they have the experience of both languages. The Non-NESTs are the experienced teachers with the knowledge of both English and students' mother tongue; so, they make comparisons to help students overcome unexpected difficulties, specifically while teaching grammar. As a result, the students evaluate the performance of their Non-NESTs and NESTs differently; more than half of them perceived their Non-NESTs' performances in a more positive way as compared to their NESTs. But these perceptional differences are not correlated except with the two statements (S21 and S28 r = 164) at statistically significant level p= 0, 05. Therefore, it can be concluded that the performances of the two groups of teachers differ up to a certain level.

One of the most agreed statement by the students is "The teaching style of NESTs ensures the students enjoy the lesson more". More than half of the students agree with such a statement. If the students enjoy the NESTs' teaching style, they like the lesson and participate in the class, and this makes their performance higher.

Since the teaching style of the NESTs closely related to their competencies achieved from birth, this feature reflects itself in the questions asked by the NESTs. Therefore, the students expressed their views in favor of the NESTs in regard to the questions asked by the NESTs in the examinations. They are based on improving the students' reading abilities and daily English speaking skill. Since the NESTs speak English language fluently, they can attract the students' attentions more. As a result, it appears from the study that the students' evaluations differ about their teachers' abilities and competences like teaching style and reading ability, application of textbooks, and so forth. The NESTs use their birth-achieved abilities successfully in their EFL teaching. So the correlation between the concerned statements seems to be very significant.

On the other hand, the Non-NESTs cover their lacking skills in teaching EFL by concentrating more on the grammar, applying text books more, and using

different teaching techniques and methods unique to themselves. The concerned statements indicate the distinguished features of the Non-NESTs; they have high teaching ability in using different techniques and methods, and they mostly teach grammar in English lesson, and apply textbooks more than the NEST do.

The use of conversational, fluent English in the class by the NESTs causes students do not have fear and anxiety in the NESTs' lessons; this situation helps them enjoy the lesson more. Consequently, they perceived and evaluated their teachers' competencies in a positive way. The differentiation in the perceptions of the students about their Non-NESTs and NESTs in their various features concerning the competence is at statistically significant level.

The students' perceptions are quite differentiated in regard to their Non-NESTs' and NESTs' teaching principles and methods. While the Non-NESTs are evaluated by the students more successful in the management of the class, possessing empathy of their students' mistakes during the lecture, the NESTs are seen representing more positive attitudes that affect the students' learning English, and in the NESTs' classes the students do not have anxiety of making mistakes, and being punished.

The most differentiated perception of the students is about the attitudes that the NESTs show in the class. 68, 1 percent of the students are in the view that the NESTs' attitudes affect the students' English learning in a positive way.

It appears from the study that the students do not make any distinctions about the NESTs' and Non-NESTs' equally (unbiased) behaving them. The Non-NESTs are to make empathy to encourage and make students motivated while teaching. They are more empathetic to students' needs and problems as they might previously face the same similar difficult situations.

The perceptions of the students also differ in some aspects to the NESTs' lack of cultural awareness. This may be because of their lack of knowledge about Turkish

Culture and Turkish Educational system, and it puts them in a disadvantageous place in managing the class.

Since the NESTs speak English fluently with a comfortable mode they seem to be perceived encouraging the students more. But it appears that students fail to understand NESTs perfectly, consequently they are demoralized and accordingly their attention decreases.

Most of the Non-NESTs sometimes use the mark as a threat to discipline the class and control the students; nevertheless, marking is also used as a tool by Non-NESTs to raise the students' attention to the lessons and to regulate students' behaviour.

It was found that the NESTs attract the students' attentions during the lesson in the class more than the Non-NESTs do. The fact that the NESTs attract intentions of the students into the lesson leads them to understand the lesson better, and consequently they get self-confidence and do not hesitate to discuss the opinions with the NESTs. Therefore, most of the students were in the opinion of not hesitating to discuss the opinions with the NESTs. And significant correlation between the two related statements (r = 178; p = 0,009) also prove the result.

To be able to discuss with the teachers without any hesitation in a formal class circumstance is a good indicator of the proper interaction between the students-teachers. As the students do not hesitate to participate in class-discussions, their goal becomes solely learning rather than obtaining high marks. The situation that the students do not hesitate in class discussions may lead them at the same time to decrease their feeling examination stress. Total 33,3 percent of the students agree with that they feel less examination stress in the NESTs' classes.

In the study, it was uncovered that while the students do not feel hesitation to discuss their opinion in the NESTs' classes, a significant number of them stated that they could not easily express their opinions in the Non-NESTs' classes due to their

fear of mark. 52, 8 percent of the students agree with that they have anxiety of mark in the Non-NESTs' classes. That many significant correlations exist between the concerned statements refers to the motivational differentiation of the students in connection with their Non-NESTs and NESTs.

It appears from the study that most of the students have a better communication in terms of manifesting their thoughts to the Non-NESTs. The reason of why the students better express their thoughts to the Non-NESTs is because of their insufficiency in verbal communication with the NESTs. In addition, the fact that 43,0 percent of the students accept that they often fall in desperate situation because they do not understand what their NESTs say while speaking in the class also support this result. The existence of very significant correlation between the relevant statements also indicates differentiations of the students' thoughts (r = 332; p = 0,000).

The students who had the view that the NESTs have different sense of humour ensure them to establish good relationship with students do not think in the parallel line with those students who had the view that they can express to the Non-NESTs better. This is understood from the existence of statistically negative correlation between the two statements (r = - 150, p = 0,023).

The existence of very high level of the significant correlation between the statements "Students do not establish a good communication with NESTs as their English are limited" and "Students often fall in desperate situation because they do not understand what their NESTs say" also shows that the communication between the NESTs and their students is not at a desired level by the great number of students (r = 550; p = 0,000). 51,9 percent of the students was in the view that they do not establish good communication with their NESTs since their English is limited puts forth the lacking side of the NESTs. As a result, both groups of teachers differ in respect to communication skills in the class.

The students evaluate their teachers' communication skills differently, however majority of them is in the view that the Non-NESTs are better in communication as compare to the NESTs since their English is not sufficient to communicate properly with their NESTs.

The overall performance mean score of NESTs was 3,0463, while it was 3,3028 for Non-NESTs. According to the result of paired samples t test, the students' perceptions differentiate statistically significant at 0,0000 confidence interval. Mean scores for perceived overall performance of the NESTs lower than those of Non-NESTs. In this case, the mean hypothesis of the study (H_1): "There are differences in the perceptions of students between Non-NESTs and NESTs in their teaching performance and competencies" is accepted.

The male students gave 3,077 overall performance mean score for NESTs, while Female students gave 3, 0064 mean points to NESTs. Male students gave 3, 25 mean points to the Non-NESTs while female students gave 3, 36 mean points to Non-NESTs. Analysis of variance was run to see whether these minor differences in mean scores are statistically significant. According to the ANOVA results, there was no significant difference on perceived overall performance in terms of the students' gender, level of education and duration of learning English.

It can be concluded that the students' perceptions differentiate in regard to their NESTs' and Non-NESTs' teaching performance and competence, and motivational, pedagogical, motivational and communicational skills. But in the perceptional differentiations the students' demographic or educational features does not play any significant role.

Both NESTs and Non-NESTs have some advantageous aspects in teaching EFL that were perceived and evaluated by the students, but the Non-NESTs in general were more positively evaluated as compare to the NESTs.

5.2. IMPLICATIONS

Even though it may be impossible to generalize the results of this study, there may be some suggestions given according to data obtained from the results drawn out to a certain extent.

The evidence suggests that Non-NESTs are more effective in most of the teaching fields and they will always be beneficial to Turkish learners' learning English language.

It may be assumed quiet far for Non-NESTs to reach Native English Speaking Teachers' sufficiency in implementing the English language skills in a few areas; Non-NESTs are superior to NESTs in some cases. Such a study, for the sake of results to be arrived, is to be impartial. But if Native English Speaking Teachers are well equipped, upgraded with pedagogical and educational formation and also with the broad knowledge of Turkish Society and Culture, they may have rooms in ELT in Turkey.

It can also be suggested that as the NESTs are, as assumed, superior to Non-NESTs in speaking, pronunciation and listening, NESTs may be hired to help students practice English and more effective in their daily lives.

Native and Non-Native English Speaking Teachers may serve equally useful purposes in their own terms. In the educational field, there can be good balance of NEST and Non-NEST, and they complement each other in their strengths and weaknesses. A favourable combination, various forms of collaboration are possible both in and outside classroom, using each other as language consultant or teaching in tandem.

It is inevitable that NESTs lack, as common with students, most of the time, they fail to understand them because of their limited English, but NESTs may be

more effective in advanced classes as students may have the sufficient English to communicate with NESTs.

Qualified and trained Non-NESTs can contribute in meaningful ways to the field of English Language Teaching by virtue of their own experience as English language learners and their training and experience as teachers.

When the Non-NESTs prove high language proficiency, good qualifications, and good teaching experience, Non-NESTs have to struggle to maintain credibility. Ultimately, the Non-NEST's professional confidence and survival depend on his/her ability to establish professional credibility and authority, to balance power relationship in the classroom and to resolve personal identity issues that arise from previously mentioned struggles.

If Non-NESTs are trained fair enough to teach English in all skills, when they reach Native English Speaking Teachers' competency in some skills, there may be no need to hire NESTs and more importantly, the students will learn the language from first hand.

5.3. FURTHER RESEARCH

In terms of research, much could be done. But, due to the title of this study, there were a lot of limitations and scopes that prevented the detailed research. This might also be considered as one of the preliminary studies in this field done so far.

Further research may deal with the success of Native and Non-Native English Speaking Teachers in language teaching to test who teaches English better or who is most suitable for teaching a foreign language.

This study was focused only on the perceptional differences perceived by the students about their Non-NESTs and NESTs. But a further study can be conducted

on who teaches English better, or who is a better English teacher. In a substantial study, while measuring the good educational aspects of the teachers, a longitudinal method can be used. The measurement can be done from the teachers' point of view the teachers as well as their students.

After definition of the relevant concepts operationally and determination of the indicators, a measurement of the teaching abilities and performances of the teachers can be done in T1, and after a certain period of the time a second measurement can be done in T2. Thus, it can be brought up the successful or superior aspects of the teachers; that is, the difference in the achievement of the students, for instance, can be considered in favour of a group of the teachers who have met the requirements of the better teaching and for or compensate the lacking areas as well.

REFERENCES

APPEL, J
    1995   **Diary of a Language Teacher**.
                         Oxford: Heinemann. The Bath Press

BAILEY, M. K
    2002   NNEST Newsletter. Vol.4, No:2
                         (On-line). Available:
                         www.unh.edu/nnest

BENNETT, K
    1994   "Going Native". Practical English Teaching International
                         Journal of Intercultural Relation.10, 179.

BRAINE, G
    1999   **Non-Native Educators in ELT.**
                         New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc. Inc.

BROWN, H.D
    1987   **Principles of Language Learning and Teaching.**
                         New Jersey: Prentice-Hall

CHOMSKY, N
    1965   **Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.**
                         Cambridge: MIT Press.

DAVIES, A
    1991   **The Native Speaker in Applied Linguistics.**
                         Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

DE LOPEZ, C.C. L
    1994   "The Roles of the English Teacher in Today' Language
                         Classroom". In T. Kral. **Teacher Development Making the
                         Right Moves.**
                         Washington: U.S. Information Agency

DEAUX, K & S. W. LAWRENCE
    1984   **Social Psychology in the 80s**.
                         California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

EDGE, J
    1988   "Natives, Speakers and Models".
                    ELT Journal, 9, 3:153.

HARMER, J
    1999   **How to Teach English. ' An introduction to the Practise of English Language Teaching'**
                    Malasia: Longman

KACHRU, B.B
    1986   **The Alchemy of English: the Spread, Functions and Models of Non-English Teachers.**
                    Oxford: Pergamon Press.

KACHRU, B.B
    1992   **Teaching World Englishes. The Other Tongue: English Cross Cultures.**
                    Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

KACHRU, B.B
    1997   **Paradigms of Marginality. World Englishes.**
                    Cambridge: CUP

KRAMSCH, C
    1996   **The Privilege of the Non-Native Speakers.**
                    Oxford: OUP

LIGHTBOWN, P.M & N. SPADA
    2003   **How Languages are Learned.**
                    Oxford: OUP

LINGDREN, H.C
    1973   **An Introduction to Social Psychology.**
                    New Delhi: Wiley Eastern Limited.

MEDGYES, P
    1992   "Native or Non-Native: Who is worth more?"
                    ELT Journal, 46 :340-349

MEDGYES, P
    1994   **The Non-Native Teachers.**
                    London: MacMillian Publishers.

MEDGYES, P
    1999   "Native or Non-Native. Who is worth more?" In T. Hedge
                & N.Whitney. **Power, Pedagogy & Practise**.
                Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MYINT, M.K
    2002   NNEST Newsletter. Vol. 4, No:2
                (On-line). Available:
                www.unh.edu/nnest

NIZEGORODCEW, A
    1994   **The Polish Teachers Trainers.**
                London: MacMillian

NUNAN, D
    1999   "So You think that Language Teaching is a Profession?"
                TESOL Matters. 9, 4: 3.

PAIKEDAY, T.M
    1984   **Native Speaker is Dead.**
                Toronto: Paikeday Publishing.

PHILIPSON, R   "The Native Speakers' Burden."
    1993   **ELT Journal**, 46:12-19

PHILIPSON, R
    1996   "The Native Speakers' Burden." In T. Hedge & N. Whitney
                Power, Pedagogy &Practise.
                Oxford: OUP

PRODROMOU, L   "The Good Language Teacher" In T. Kral. **Teacher**
    1994   **Development Making the Right Moves.**
                Washington: U.S. Information Agency

RAMPTON, M.B.H
    1990   "Displacing the 'Native Speaker': Expertise, Affiliation
                and Inheritance"
                ELT Journal, 44 : 97-101

ROGERS, C
    1990
"A Different Angle: Humanisms." In J. Appel. **Diary of a Language Teacher**. Part Two.
Oxford: Heinemann. The Bath Press

SHAW, P. A
    1979
Teacher Training of Modern English Teacher.
London: Modern English Publication.

SILBERSTEIN, S
    1987
"Lets Take Another Look at Reading: Twenty-Five Years of Reading Instruction". **English Teaching Forum**, 25: 4

STERN, H.H
    1983
Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching
Oxford: OUP

THEODORSON, G.H & A.G THEODORSON
    1969
A Modern Dictionary of Sociology.
Toronto: Fitzhenry &Whiteside Limited.

TUNCAY, H
    2003
ELT Dictionary.
Istanbul. Literatür Yayıncılık.

ON-LINE RESOURCES

LASAGABASTAR, D & J.M. SIERRA
    2002
"University Students' Perceptions of Native and Non- Native Speaker Teachers of English". Retrieved February 5, 2006, from www.multilingual-matters.net/la/011/0132/la0110132.pdf

INBAR, O
    2000
"Native or Non-Native English Teachers: Investigation of the Construct and Perceptions". Retrieved August 23, 2005, from www.ac.il/education/toar3/etakzir2001-4

Kato, K
    2001
"Identify as a Teacher". Retrieved February 5, 2006 from www.uq.edu.au/news/?article

B.B.C
"Native Speakers Teachers". Retrieved February 7, 2006, from www.bbc.co.uk/teachingenglish/vote

TSUJIMOTO,J

    2001   "To be a Good English Teacher" Retrieved February 10, 2006,
                         from www.bambooridge.com/feature.asp

HASSETT, M & T. PALMER

    2000   "Reflective Teaching". Retrieved February 10, 2006,
                         from www.fltrp.com/newspic/download/dyjlm0508.ppt

APPENDIX

Dear Students.

     The data collected from the following questionnaire will be used as a basis for a thesis entitled "An investigation into Students' Perceptions of NESTs' and Non-NESTs' Performance and Competencies in Teaching English as a Foreign Language". Please mark the appropriate slot which satisfies you. Each item requires one choice only.

Thanks indeed for your invaluable contribution

Kemal KÖKSAL
English Teacher

			Totally Agree	Agree	No Comment	Disagree	Totally Disagree

		Please start from here to mark the Questionnaire.
		1- Male ( ) Female ( )
		2- Class ....
		3- How long have you been learning English?
		   0-6 Months ( ) 1 Year ( ) 2 Years ( ) 3 Years ( ) 4 Years-over ( )
		4- Duration of NEST(s)' attending your class?
		   0-6 Months ( ) 1 Year ( ) 2 Years ( ) 3 Years ( ) 4 Years-over ( )
		5- Duration of Non-NEST(s)' attending your class?
		   0-6 Months ( ) 1 Year ( ) 2 Years ( ) 3 Years ( ) 4 Years-over ( )					

1	Non-NESTs supply learners with more information about English Language and its Culture.					
2	Non-NESTs go into details while teaching.					
3	Non-NESTs teach English better.					
4	That Non-NESTs make comparison between English and Turkish while teaching affects students English learning in a positive way.					
5	The teaching style of NEST ensures students enjoy the lesson more.					
6	The questions in NESTs' examinations are based on reading ability					
7	NESTs generally teach students daily English.					
8	Non - NESTs have high teaching ability in using different techniques and methods.					
9	Non-NESTs mostly teach grammar based lesson.					
10	Non-NESTs apply textbooks more than NEST do.					
11	Non-NESTs are more likely to be understanding when students make mistake.					
12	The exam questions that Non-NESTs ask are more difficult than NESTs do.					
13	Non-NESTs mostly ask grammar based questions in the examinations.					
14	Non-NESTs manage the class better.					
15	Non-NESTs encourage the students more in learning English.					
16	Non-NESTs punish the students in mark					
17	Non-NESTs mark more severely in assessing students' marks in comparison with NESTs					
18	NESTs are equal to students (unbiased) in comparison with Non-NESTs .					
19	Students do not have any anxiety of making mistakes in NESTs' classes.					
20	The attitudes NESTs represent affect the students' English learning in a positive way					
21	NESTs attract the students more than Non-NESTs.					
22	Students study to learn rather than take high mark in NESTs' classes.					
23	Students do not hesitate to discuss the opinions with NESTs.					
24	Students have less examination stress in NESTs' classes					
25	Students have anxiety of mark in Non-NESTs' class.					
26	Students can express their thoughts to Non-NEST better.					
27	Students often fall in desperate situation because they do not understand what their NESTs say (as he/she speaks English).					
28	That NESTs have different sense of humour ensure them to establish good relationship with students.					
29	Students do not establish a good communications with NESTs as their English are limited.					
30	NESTs are more cheerful than Non-NESTs					
Please write (if any) your additional comments on the competencies and performance of Native and Non – Native English Speaking Teachers.							