

**MALTEPE UNIVERSITY**

**INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION**

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING**

**TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES ON**

**NON-NATIVE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS**

**MASTER OF ARTS THESIS**

**ESRA BARLAK**

**101113204**

**Supervisor**

**Assist. Prof. Dr. M. ONUR CESUR**

**Istanbul, September 2013**

T.C. Maltepe Üniversitesi  
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü'ne,

09.10.2013 tarihinde tezinin savunmasını yapan Esra BARLAK'a ait "Teachers and Students Perspectives on Non-native Foreign Language Teachers" başlıklı çalışma, Jürimiz Tarafından Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programında Yüksek Lisans Tezi Olarak Kabul Edilmiştir.



Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hakan DILMAN  
(Başkan)



Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ümit SÖYLEMEZ  
(Üye)



Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mustafa Onur CESUR  
(Üye)  
(Danışman)

## **ABSTRACT**

This study investigated the perceptions of the students and teachers about non-native English teachers in private and state high schools in Turkey. The focus of the study was on the perceived advantages and disadvantages of non-native English teachers by students and teachers and the differences between the two groups. 112 English language teachers and 105 foreign language students at different high schools in Turkey participated in this study as subjects. They were given a questionnaire titled as 'Teachers' and Students' Perspectives on Non-native Foreign Language Teachers'. It comprised 30 items. The data was gathered during the spring of the 2012 – 13 academic year.

The data analysis showed that students and teachers state that both native and non-native teachers have strengths and weak points. The aspects NNEST were found to be strong are: presenting the lesson better, class management, using students' cultural background to facilitate their learning, understanding students' language problems, communication with students, and being a precious guide and model to show the way to learn the target language. Different from teachers' perceptions, students believe more that non-native teachers ensure their students understand the lesson more.

Since these findings in this study are limited to these kinds of problems at high schools in Turkey, it may not be completely true to generalize the results of this research. However, it may give a general idea about the subjects' beliefs and some common problems experienced in non-native classes in private and state high schools.

### **Key Words**

Non-native English Teachers

ELT

English Teachers

## ÖZET

Bu çalışma, hem özel hem de devlet lise okullarındaki öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin ana dili İngilizce olmayan İngilizce öğretmenleri hakkında görüşlerini ve algılarını araştırmak amacı ile yapılmıştır. Çalışmanın odak noktası, öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin bu öğretmenler hakkında avantaj veya dezavantaj olarak gördüğü noktalar ve öğretmen öğrenci algıları arasındaki farkları göstermektir. Çalışmaya Türkiye’de bulunan farklı lise okullarından yüzoniki İngilizce öğretmeni katılmıştır. Katılımcılara bir anket verilmiştir. Sözü edilen veri 2012–2013 öğretim yılının ikinci döneminde toplanmıştır.

Çalışma öğrenci ve öğretmenler hem ana dili İngilizce olan hem de olmayan öğretmenlerin kuvvetli ve zayıf yönlerinin olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Ana dili İngilizce olmayan yabancı dil öğretmenlerinin, öğrencilerin dili öğrenirken çektikleri sıkıntıları anlama, sınıf yönetimi, öğrencilerin kültürel altyapısını yabancı dili öğrenmelerinde yol gösterici olarak kullanabilmesi gibi noktalarda kuvvetli yanları belirtilmiştir.

Çalışmadaki bu bulgular; Türkiye’deki liselerle sınırlı olduğundan bu araştırmanın sonuçlarını genellemek tam anlamıyla uygun olmayabilir. Bununla birlikte; öğretmenlerin hem özel hem de devlet liselerindeki ana dili İngilizce olmayan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin sınıflarında karşılaşılan bazı yaygın problemler ve öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin bu problemler hakkındaki düşünceleri üzerine genel bir fikir verebilir.

### Anahtar Sözcükler

Ana dili İngilizce olmayan İngilizce öğretmenleri

ELT

İngilizce öğretmenleri

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Assistant Prof. Dr. M. Onur CESUR, my thesis advisor, for his valuable guidance and support throughout this thesis.

I would also like to thank to all the participants who supported and encouraged me willingly in this study, especially my husband Uğur DİLKİ and my best friends Esmâ SARI, Nida ÖZDEMİR and Müge ESER for their contributions, moral support and patient.

Esra BARLAK

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| <b>ABSTRACT</b> .....   | <b>i</b>    |
| <b>ÖZET</b> .....   | <b>ii</b>   |
| <b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....   | <b>iii</b>  |
| <b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....  | <b>iv</b>   |
| <b>LIST OF ABBREVIATION</b> .....   | <b>viii</b> |
| <b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....   | <b>ix</b>   |
| <b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</b> .....  | <b>1</b>    |
| 1.1. Background of the Study.....   | 1           |
| 1.2. Who is Native Speaker? .....   | 6           |
| 1.3 Characteristics of Native and Non-native Speaking Language Teachers ..... | 12          |
| 1.4 Characteristics of Good Foreign / Second Language Teachers.....           | 14          |
| 1.5 Advantages and Disadvantages of Being NEST and NNEST .....                | 17          |
| 1.6 The Relation between Language Competence and Teacher Efficacy.....        | 23          |
| 1.4. Literature Review.....   | 32          |
| 1.4.1 Studies on Self Perceptions of Non-native Teachers .....                | 33          |
| 1.4.2 Studies on Students' Perceptions of Non-native Teachers .....           | 37          |
| 1.4.3 Studies in Turkey .....   | 42          |
| 1.5. Statement of the Problem .....   | 46          |
| 1.6 Aim of the Study .....  | 47          |
| 1.7 Hypothesis .....  | 48          |
| <b>CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY</b> .....   | <b>49</b>   |
| 2.1. Research Questions.....  | 49          |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| 2.2. Participants.....  | 49        |
| 2.3. Instrument.....  | 53        |
| 2.4. Reliability of the Questionnaire.....  | 55        |
| 2.5. Data Collection Procedure.....   | 56        |
| 2.6. Data Analysis.....   | 56        |
| <b>CHAPTER 3: RESULTS.....</b>  | <b>57</b> |
| 3.1. Analysis of the Variables .....  | 57        |
| 3.1.1 Language Competence and Teaching Ability.....   | 58        |
| 3.1.2. Content of the Lesson .....  | 62        |
| 3.1.3. Method of Teaching .....   | 67        |
| 3.1.4. Classroom Management .....   | 68        |
| 3.1.5. Body Language .....  | 70        |
| 3.1.6. Communication with Students .....  | 72        |
| 3.1.7. Motivating Students .....  | 76        |
| 3.1.8. Student Anxiety in Classroom .....   | 79        |
| 3.1.9 Serving as a Good Model .....   | 83        |
| 3.1.10. Understanding Students .....  | 87        |
| 3.1.11. Providing More Information .....  | 90        |
| 3.1.12. From Students' and Teachers' Perspectives in Which Aspects Are NNEST<br>Inferior or Superior to NEST? ..... | 94        |
| 3.1.13. Is There a Relation between Language Competence and Teaching<br>Ability?.....                               | 102       |
| 3.1.14. What Are the Effects of Being Taught by NNEST?.....   | 104       |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 3.1.15. Is There a Correlation between Teachers' and Students' Perceptions on NNEST?..... | 108 |
|---|-----|

**CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....116**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 4.1 Discussion and Evaluation of the Research Questions..... | 116 |
|--|-----|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 4.1.1 From Students' and Teachers' Perspectives in Which Aspects Are NNEST Inferior or Superior to NEST?..... | 116 |
|---|-----|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 4.1.1.1 Language Competence and Teaching Ability..... | 117 |
|---|-----|

|                                     |     |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| 4.1.1.2 Content of the Lesson ..... | 120 |
|-------------------------------------|-----|

|                                 |     |
|---------------------------------|-----|
| 4.1.1.3 Method of Teaching..... | 121 |
|---------------------------------|-----|

|                                   |     |
|-----------------------------------|-----|
| 4.1.1.4 Classroom Management..... | 122 |
|-----------------------------------|-----|

|                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| 4.1.1.5 Body Language..... | 123 |
|----------------------------|-----|

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 4.1.1.6 Communication with Students..... | 123 |
|--|-----|

|                                  |     |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| 4.1.1.7 Motivating Students..... | 124 |
|----------------------------------|-----|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 4.1.1.8 Student Anxiety in the Classroom..... | 124 |
|---|-----|

|                                      |     |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| 4.1.1.9 Serving as a Good Model..... | 125 |
|--------------------------------------|-----|

|                                      |     |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| 4.1.1.10 Understanding Students..... | 126 |
|--------------------------------------|-----|

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 4.1.1.11 Providing Students with More Information..... | 127 |
|--|-----|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 4.1.2. Is There a Relation between Language Competence and Teaching Ability?..... | 128 |
|---|-----|

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 4.1.3. What Are the Effects of Being Taught by NNEST?..... | 129 |
|--|-----|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 4.1.4. Is There a Correlation between Teachers' and Students' Perceptions on NNEST... | 132 |
|---|-----|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 4.1.5. From Students' and Teachers' Perspectives, Who Is Better Overall in Teaching English and Why?..... | 133 |
|---|-----|

|                     |     |
|---------------------|-----|
| 4.2 Conclusion..... | 134 |
|---------------------|-----|



|  |            |
|--|------------|
| 4.3 Limitations of the Study.....                                      | 141        |
| 4.5 Suggestions for Further Study.....                                 | 142        |
| <b>REFERENCES.....</b>   | <b>144</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE.....</b>                                  | <b>155</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX B: PERMISSION FROM MINISTRY OF NATIONAL EDUCATION.....</b> | <b>159</b> |
| <b>CURRICULUM VITAE.....</b>   | <b>160</b> |

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

NEST : Native English Speaking Language Teachers

NNEST : Non-native English Speaking Language Teachers

NS : Native Speakers

NNS : Non-native Speakers

EFL : English as a Foreign Language

ESL : English as a Second Language

TESOL : Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

ELT : English Language Teaching

## LIST OF TABLES

|            |   |    |
|------------|---|----|
| Table 2.1  | Distribution of teachers.....                         | 50 |
| Table 2.2  | Distribution of the students.....                     | 52 |
| Table 2.3  | Construction of the questionnaire .....               | 54 |
| Table 2.4  | Reliability Statistics.....                           | 55 |
| Table 3.1  | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 1.....  | 58 |
| Table 3.2  | Distribution of the students' replies to item 1.....  | 59 |
| Table 3.3  | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 6.....  | 59 |
| Table 3.4  | Distribution of the students' replies to item 6.....  | 60 |
| Table 3.5  | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 29..... | 60 |
| Table 3.6  | Distribution of the students' replies to item 29..... | 61 |
| Table 3.7  | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 30..... | 61 |
| Table 3.8  | Distribution of the students' replies to item 30..... | 62 |
| Table 3.9  | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 2.....  | 63 |
| Table 3.10 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 2.....  | 64 |
| Table 3.11 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 7.....  | 64 |
| Table 3.12 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 7.....  | 65 |

|            |   |    |
|------------|---|----|
| Table 3.13 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 8.....  | 65 |
| Table 3.14 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 8.....  | 66 |
| Table 3.15 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 9.....  | 66 |
| Table 3.16 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 9.....  | 67 |
| Table 3.17 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 21..... | 67 |
| Table 3.18 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 21..... | 68 |
| Table 3.19 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 20..... | 69 |
| Table 3.20 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 20..... | 69 |
| Table 3.21 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 22..... | 70 |
| Table 3.22 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 22..... | 71 |
| Table 3.23 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 23..... | 71 |
| Table 3.24 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 23..... | 72 |
| Table 3.25 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 16..... | 73 |
| Table 3.26 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 16..... | 73 |
| Table 3.27 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 17..... | 74 |
| Table 3.28 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 17..... | 74 |
| Table 3.29 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 18..... | 75 |
| Table 3.30 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 18..... | 75 |

|            |   |    |
|------------|---|----|
| Table 3.31 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 5.....  | 76 |
| Table 3.32 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 5.....  | 77 |
| Table 3.33 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 12..... | 77 |
| Table 3.34 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 12..... | 78 |
| Table 3.35 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 13..... | 78 |
| Table 3.36 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 13..... | 79 |
| Table 3.37 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 14..... | 80 |
| Table 3.38 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 14..... | 80 |
| Table 3.39 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 15..... | 81 |
| Table 3.40 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 15..... | 81 |
| Table 3.41 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 26..... | 82 |
| Table 3.42 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 26..... | 82 |
| Table 3.43 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 11..... | 83 |
| Table 3.44 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 11..... | 84 |
| Table 3.45 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 19..... | 84 |
| Table 3.46 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 19..... | 85 |
| Table 3.47 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 25..... | 86 |
| Table 3.48 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 25..... | 86 |

|            |   |     |
|------------|---|-----|
| Table 3.49 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 4.....  | 87  |
| Table 3.50 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 4.....  | 88  |
| Table 3.51 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 10.....                                       | 88  |
| Table 3.52 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 10.....                                       | 89  |
| Table 3.53 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 24.....                                       | 89  |
| Table 3.54 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 24.....                                       | 90  |
| Table 3.55 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 3.....  | 91  |
| Table 3.56 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 3.....  | 92  |
| Table 3.57 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 27.....                                       | 92  |
| Table 3.58 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 27.....                                       | 93  |
| Table 3.59 | Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 28.....                                       | 93  |
| Table 3.60 | Distribution of the students' replies to item 28.....                                       | 94  |
| Table 3.61 | Descriptive Statistics of Advantages Perceived by Teachers.....                             | 95  |
| Table 3.62 | Descriptive Statistics of Advantages Perceived by Students.....                             | 97  |
| Table 3.63 | Descriptive Statistics of Disadvantages Perceived by Teachers.....                          | 99  |
| Table 3.64 | Descriptive Statistics of Disadvantages Perceived by Students.....                          | 101 |
| Table 3.65 | Correlations between Language Competence and Teaching Ability According<br>to Teachers..... | 103 |

|            |  |     |
|------------|--|-----|
| Table 3.66 | Correlations between Language Competence and Teaching Ability According to<br>Students.....              | 103 |
| Table 3.67 | Descriptive Statistics on students' perception on being provided with more<br>information.....           | 104 |
| Table 3.68 | Descriptive Statistics on being more motivated.....  | 105 |
| Table 3.69 | Descriptive Statistics on feeling more relaxed.....  | 106 |
| Table 3.70 | Descriptive Statistics on having a good model.....   | 106 |
| Table 3.71 | Descriptive Statistics on being understood.....  | 107 |
| Table 3.72 | Correlations of students' and teachers' perspectives on language competence and<br>teaching ability..... | 108 |
| Table 3.73 | Correlations of students' and teachers' perspectives on content of the lesson.....                       | 109 |
| Table 3.74 | Correlations of students' and teachers' perspectives on methods of teaching.....                         | 110 |
| Table 3.75 | Correlations of students' and teachers' perspectives on classroom management.....                        | 111 |
| Table 3.76 | Correlations of students' and teachers' perspectives on body language of NNEST.....                      | 111 |
| Table 3.77 | Correlations of students' and teachers' perspectives on communication with<br>students.....              | 112 |
| Table 3.78 | Correlations of students' and teachers' perspectives on motivating students.....                         | 112 |
| Table 3.79 | Correlations of students' and teachers' perspectives on student anxiety in<br>classroom.....             | 113 |
| Table 3.80 | Correlations of students' and teachers' perspectives on serving as a good<br>model.....                  | 113 |

|            |   |     |
|------------|---|-----|
| Table 3.81 | Correlations of students' and teachers' perspectives on understanding students.....     | 114 |
| Table 3.82 | Correlations of students' and teachers' perspectives on providing more information..... | 114 |



## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1. Background of the Study**

The English language is approximately spoken by two billion people in varying degrees of proficiencies around the world (Graddol, 2006). Whether we appreciate it or not, it has become the primary language of international communication, in other words: the lingua franca of the world. Crystal (2003) states that there has never been a language so widely spread or spoken by so many people as English. And it has ‘touched the lives of so many people, in so many cultures and continents, in so many functional roles, and with so much prestige’ (Kachru, 1992).

English is the primary tool for international communication today. In a world where global integration is the norm, such a tool is necessary than ever before. This ongoing increase of need for communication in globalizing world has made English and English language teaching a major issue in many parts of the world. Students mostly experience a long process of learning to achieve their goals about learning the target language. There is no doubt that the language teacher plays an important role in this learning process.

However, language teaching has a unique characteristic that makes it different and a little more complicated than teaching other subjects. Language and culture are the inseparable parts of a society and language cannot be taught without teaching the other one. Therefore, language teaching also involves teaching the cultural and social knowledge of the society that language belongs to. Native English teachers are endowed with natural English speaking environment and cultural background of the society. Here the question, whether speaking a language naturally corresponds to the ability to teach a language with its social and cultural background arise. In other words, whether native English speaking teachers (NEST) or non-native English speaking teachers (NNEST) can provide the students with a better or more effective knowledge is a great matter of discussion.

The majority of English language teachers in the world -approximately 80%- are non-native speakers of English (Matsuda & Matsuda, 2001; Prodromou 2003). Therefore, non-native English-speaking teachers have a significant role in the field of English language teaching. Although they contribute to the profession with such a great proportion, the strengths and weaknesses of NNEST have been debated since it began to be taught internationally (Medgyes, 1994).

Despite the vast number of non-native teachers of English in the world, numerous discrimination against non-native English-speaking teachers have been reported, especially in employment (e.g. Braine, 1999; Jenkins, 2000; Kirkpatrick, 2007; Shin, 2008). Many people around the world including instructors and students have a stereotype that native teachers are the best to teach English, based on the simple thought that English is their mother tongue. They are

seen as the ideal teachers of English because of their language competence in English. This assumption confers status and power on a select group throughout the world. The language institutions, schools choose their teachers based on the stereotype that NEST are inherently better English teachers. Phillipson (1992) denies, to some extent, the stereotype in a concept of “linguistic imperialism”. He introduced the term ‘native speaker fallacy’ which rejects the stereotype.

Some excuses for the discrimination are put forward by the institutions. A commonly used excuse for the discrimination against NNEST is that students prefer to be taught by native speakers (Braine, 1999). However, it is doubtful whether students do show a preference for NEST. Mahboob (2003) studied the hiring practices of directors and administrators within 118 adult ESL program in the US. He found that the number of NNEST teaching ESL in the United States is low and disproportionate to the high number of NEST enrolled in MA TESOL programs. He also found that 59.8% of the program administrators who responded to his survey used the “native speaker” criterion as their major decisive factor in hiring ESL teachers. A reason for this discrimination was that administrators believed only NEST could be proficient in English and qualified teachers. Ironically, other researches (Cheung, 2007; Mahboob, 2004; Moussu, 2002) show that ESL students might not share this point of view.

Whatever the excuse is, the discrimination has negative impacts on NNEST, their identities as ELT professionals, and their evaluations of their proficiency and pronunciation of English (Burns, 2005).

As in most other countries, where English language teaching has been expanding in popularity and significance on a daily basis, in Turkey, too, the majority of people (including administrators and educators) seem to view English language teaching as the sole domain of native speakers and assume that the ideal EFL/ESL teacher is necessarily a native speaker (Çelik, 2006). Turkish government also has a plan to embark on a project to hire 40.000 native English-speaking teachers to collaborate with the local non-native English teachers in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes in Turkey within the scope of 'Foreign Language Education Project' (Kırkgöz, 2008).

Turkish government plans have its substantial place among the other European Union countries by teaching students at least one foreign language. However, although several investments were made to improve the level of English in Turkey, many researchers defend that the desired level of English proficiency cannot be achieved in Turkey In spite of all the investments and efforts. (Aydemir, 2007; Çelebi, 2006; Işık, 2008; Kırkgöz, 2008; Soner, 2007; Tosun, 2006). According to EF English proficiency index 2012 Turkey seems to be the thirty-second country with a low level of English proficiency in the world and NEST are thought to be more effective in improving the level of English students than NNEST in Turkey.

Above mentioned project hasn't been put into practice by the government in public schools yet, however, while searching the internet you can encounter a great amount of adverts of private educational institutions looking for only NEST.

When the institutions are asked why they prefer NEST for language teaching although they are generally more costly than NNEST, they state that learning by exposure is important for especially young learners and they think NEST are better models for students in terms of language use. They also stated that especially for young learners, NEST are a better choice for the institutions. However, as the students grow they feel more free to teach their students by NNEST.

These assumptions of the institutions and also parents of students aren't based on a real research. There is no research that provides genuine evidence that mother tongue of the foreign/second language teacher is the primary indicator of his/her ability to teach (Al-Omrani, 2008). He reminds that: "...language teaching is an art, a science and a skill that requires complex pedagogical preparation and practice". Rampton (1996) calls for shifting the emphasis from 'who you are' to 'what you know'.

Although there are some researches about this issue in international context, there aren't many samples to show us the self perceptions of NNEST, or the way they are perceived by their students in Turkey. So, it is worthwhile to investigate the issue from the students' and teachers' perspectives in order to understand whether students do show a preference for native English-speaking teachers, and to understand how teachers feel in terms of being non-native teachers of English in Turkey.

## 1.2 Who is Native Speaker?

In the past decades, linguists had some attempts to find out who is native and who is not. In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, Bloomfield (1933) studied the acquisition of language and asserted that “The first language a human being learns to speak is his native language; he is native speaker of this language”. He defined native language as the particular language an individual learned from his/her mother in childhood. He implies that only the language an individual was exposed to in childhood would be considered his/her native language and every human being is the native speaker of one language but not any language learned at a later stage in life. This definition of Bloomfield was a pioneering but narrow one because there are some circumstances where children are exposed to more than one language simultaneously during childhood.

At this point, Ballmer (1981) states that: “...native speakers learn the knowledge and ability of language in the process of primary socialization”. To guarantee the purist linguistic inputs that were not contaminated by other languages, he highlights the importance of living in a monolingual environment. According to him, the monolingual environment indicates the reliability of native speakers’ performance which linguists try to establish a grammatical system of the language on. Ballmer’s definition asserted that native speakers only exist in the monolingual context. However, this was also a narrow perspective which ignores the primary socializations involved more than one language and the worldwide bilingual speakers who are the native speakers of each language. Moreover, according to both assertions, second language learners have no possibility to claim nativeness over the target language.

Richards, J.C., Platt, J., and Platt, H. defined native language as the language that a person acquired in early childhood. This is usually the first language introduced to the child (1992). However, they admitted that, in addition to the first learned language, language introduced by other older family members or babysitters can also be considered a “native language”. They didn’t limit native language to the language learned in a strictly defined context and expanded others’ definition by claiming individuals can be native speakers of more than one language.

Moreover, both Bloomfield (1933) and Richards et al. (1992) emphasized the importance of native speakers’ intuition in constructing the rules of grammar. In this sense, native speakers were depicted as arbitrators of grammar and had the ultimate and unquestionable authority of what was right and wrong in using this language. However they can be criticized as they seem to be ignoring the fact that every native speaker isn’t really aware of the rules of the language and not very competent in using the language properly.

Phillipson (1992) describes native speakers as the model of standard grammar and vocabulary. He pointed out their capability of “demonstrating fluent, idiomatically appropriate language, in appreciating the cultural connotations of the language”. In addition to the linguistic superiority and the authority of native speakers, native speakers’ extensive cultural knowledge and creative cultural application in communication according to different contexts were also underlined in Phillipson’s description. He stated that: “Native speakers not only have the knowledge of language, but they also have sufficient knowledge of culture embedded within the

language that enables them to speak “natively.” Their linguistic and cultural knowledge, as well as the “native” pronunciation play a significant role in language teaching. ”

Chomsky (1965) didn't directly define the term “nativeness”. Instead of that, he connected it with generating linguistic theories and grammar. He believed that linguistic theories primarily explained the actual performance of an ideal native speaker who knew his language perfectly. In other words, native speakers are the primary subjects under investigation and are resources based on which linguistic theories are developed. He explains grammar of a language as “... a description of the ideal speaker-hearer's intrinsic competence”. In other words, he states that grammar itself is made by native speaker.

At the same time, Chomsky (1965) laid an emphasis on native/non-native distinction by explaining the difference between competence and performance. Competence is the speaker's knowledge of the language, whereas performance is the usage of language in real-life situations. He believed that competence of a native speaker was perfect, and it operated as a latent system that could only be discovered through the observation of actual performances. Differing from competence, performance may show some errors or incomplete sentence structures. However, Chomsky believed that there is a perfect linguistic knowledge of the language exists in the head of native speakers.

Davies (2003) examined the native speakers in the aspects of psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic or communicative competences in his book: “The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality”. The results of his examination showed native speakers' intuitive capacity to write “...literatures at all level from jokes to epics, metaphor to novels”. They also had the ability to



translate and interpret the native language into a foreign language or vice versa while they also spoke another language. However, it doesn't mean that all native speakers are able to write great literary works. Because it is obvious that apart from being a native speaker, writing literature also needs an intrinsic language skill and cultural knowledge. Native speakers, in this regard, have a better chance than non-native speakers as they are more exposed to both culture and language.

About all these trials to explain nativeness, Davies (2003) considers native / non-native definitions as circular and not constant. He criticized the importance of socialization in early childhood about the communicative competence of native speakers that commonly existed in the definitions above. He claimed that through training and practice, "... the second language learner has a difficult but not an impossible task to become a native speaker of a target language..." He defines the only characteristic that second language learners cannot have is childhood acquisition that is "bio-developmentally".

Although he admitted that the impact from early childhood acquisition was so great that it was unlikely for many second language learners to achieve the native speaker proficiency at the post-puberty period, different from the others Davies (2003) proposes the social acceptance as a criterion to nativeness. He claims that:

"Being a native speaker means being a speaker who is accepted and identified as "us" by speakers of the target-speaking community. It all depends on the acceptance and the confidence from the native-speaking community toward

whoever is under the judgment that constitutes a lot of personal preference and opinions.”

Without acquiring this language in early childhood, second language learners can still be identified as native speakers of the target language through their level of language proficiency. Second language learners who have superior language proficiency can still communicate as effectively and appropriately as native speakers. In this sense, he does not join the majority of educationists who claim the “bio-developmental” characteristic as critical and makes the distinction between native and non-native. (Davies,2003)

Also, Brutt-Griffler and Samimy suggest that ‘nativeness’ constitutes a socially constructed identity rather than a linguistic category. They claim that: “Whether international speakers of English are considered as ‘native’ or ‘non-native speaker’ depends upon various social parameters, such as the preconceived notions of what native speakers should look like or sound like.” (2001).

Although some educationists and researchers tried to define ‘native speaker’, there were a number of researchers who claimed in the book ‘The Native Speaker Is Dead!’ that there is no such creature as the native or non-native speaker (Paikeday, 1985). Ferguson formulated this approach as: “The whole mystique of the native speaker and the mother tongue should probably be quietly dropped from the linguists’ set of professional myths about language” (1983). He thought that native/non-native dichotomy was useless. So these terms should have been replaced by new ones like ‘more or less accomplished and proficient users of English’ (Edge, 1988),

'expert/novice speakers' (Rampton, 1990), 'bilingual speakers' for the people who are fluent in another language. Kachru (1992) also introduced a new concept as 'English-using speech fellowships' to stress 'we-ness' instead of the rigid 'us and them' division.

Many educationists contend that the native/non-native label is too simplistic and that it fails to capture the rich complexities associated with being a user of a language (J. Liu 1999; Lazaraton 2003). Rampton encourages the use of other labels and terms to describe the knowledge and language proficiency of a skilled language user; for example, he proposes to use the term 'language expertise' rather than 'native' or 'non-native'. He argues that, 'the notion of expert shifts the emphasis from "who you are" to "what you know" (1990). Cook suggests that language teaching would benefit by paying attention to the second language user rather than concentrating primarily on the native speaker. He argues that skilled, second language users should be viewed as 'successful multicompetent speakers, not failed native speakers' (1999).

Arguments about how to define the term 'native speaker' is still being discussed by researchers. Braine (1999), Kelch & Santana-Williamson (2002), Mahboob (2004) agree that a precise definition haven't been found for the term yet. Ellis (2002) adds that it is not possible to empirically define who a native speaker is. Despite these arguments about what nativeness is, today this way or that way the term still takes place in empirical and academic researches and books generally in the meaning of mother tongue. And the term 'native' will be used to refer English teachers who acquire English as a first language and speak it as a mother tongue and the term 'non-native' to refer the teachers of English who speak or acquire it as a second/foreign language.

### **1.3 Characteristics of Native and Non-native Speaking Language Teachers**

Linguists have tried to define 'nativeness' but agreement was not reached on this issue. Even so, the differences between native and non-native speaking language teachers were well examined and documented in the field of English language teaching.

Medgyes (1992) explains the differences between native and non-native, referring to their language competence. He argues that 'non-native speakers can never achieve a native speaker's competence' (1992). He believes that a non-native speaker's competence is limited, because, they are by nature norm-dependent. He admits that only a reduced group can reach near-native speaker's competence such as Jozef Teodor Konrad Korzeniowski, alias Joseph Conrad but he asserts "sooner or later they are halted by a glass wall".

Based on the concept of nativeness, Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (1999) define two major approaches to NNEST. The dominance approach and the difference approach. The dominance approach is proposed on the paradigm that NNEST are viewed as 'linguistically handicapped' in relation to NEST (Quirk, 1990). The difference approach to the NNEST, on the other hand, emphasizes the strengths of NNEST. According to the approach, regardless of their different backgrounds, both NNEST and NEST are equally capable of being good language teachers.

Although there is no difference between NEST and NNEST in terms of being a good teacher, there are some differences in the ways they teach the language. Participants in Samimy

and Brutt-Griffler's study reported that native-speaking teachers used authentic English in interacting with students, adopted different techniques and methods, and emphasized communication rather than exam preparation. Nonnative speaking teachers reported to be aware of psychological perspectives of learning, more efficient in teaching, but emphasizing exam preparation more. (1999)

Reves & Medgyes found also some other differences between native and non-native teachers (1994). In their study, they reported different teaching behaviors in three areas: "use of English", "general teaching approach" and "specific language teaching approach." With superior command in English language, native English-speaking teachers in their study tended to give fewer tests and homework and preferred free activities, such as work in groups or pairs, and more flexible approaches that had a variety of materials. In contrast, their non-native colleagues preferred more controlled activities, such as a translation exercise or drills, and adopted a more guided approach that required a textbook and more homework.

Native teachers were believed to be less committed to the teaching and less empathic to students' learning, whereas non-native teachers were more cautious and stricter in teaching and had more realistic expectations of students' learning. In terms of linguistic foci in teaching, native teachers tended to emphasize such elements as fluency, oral skills or colloquial registers, whereas non-native teachers focused more on accuracy, grammar rules or formal registers. (Arva & Medgyes, 2000)

#### **1.4 Characteristics of Good Foreign / Second Language Teachers**

Language teaching requires some special characteristics compared to the other subjects. Borg examined the distinction between language teachers and those of other fields. According to this study, in terms of content, language teaching was regarded to be more complex and varied than other subjects. It was also found that English language teaching methodology was more progressive than that of other subjects, and consequently, English language teachers needed to be more up-to-date to cope with advanced and progressive nature of language teaching methodology. English language teachers were also supposed to have closer, more relaxed, and generally more positive relationships with learners in comparison to other teachers. (Borg, 2006)

According to Borg, the judgment of a good language teacher shouldn't be based on one perspective. Five kinds of criteria should be considered in identifying the characteristics of good language teachers: personal qualities, pedagogical skills, classroom practices, subject matter and psychological constructs such as knowledge and attitudes. (2006)

In most studies being native or non-native hasn't been identified as a distinctive characteristic of the good English teacher (Al-Omrani, 2008). Girard (1977) stated that a good language teacher is the one who speaks good English, makes the students participate, makes his/her course interesting and clear explanations, shows the same interest in all the students and shows great patience. Another study carried by Prodromou (1991) revealed that interacting with

students in a friendly way, giving good notes, playing games, telling jokes, not pushing weak students were among the many features of a good language teacher. He stated: 'Being a good language teacher is somehow like being a comedian ( Prodromou, 1991).

Brosh (1996) identified a set of distinctive features for effective language teachers. He listed these four distinctive characteristics as having knowledge and command of the target language: 1. Being able to organize, explain. 2. Clarify, arouse and sustain interest and motivation among students 3. Being fair to students by showing them neither favoritism nor prejudice. 4. Being available to students. Pettis (1997) added some characteristics for being a professionally competent teacher. These were being principled, skillful and personally committed to his/her professional development.

According to a research conducted on the development of standards in Foreign Language Teacher Preparation in Croatia (Kalebic, 2005), having fourteen competences was reported to be highly valuable and needed. Those characteristics were: 1. Linguistic and communicative competence. 2. Ability to motivate learners for learning. 3. Communication and presentation skills. 4. Ability to choose appropriate teaching strategies. 5. Ability to deal with unpredictable situations and to maintain discipline. 6. Ability to plan the lesson. 7. Ability to organize learning activities. 8. Ability of pedagogical action. 9. Ability to create friendly atmosphere in the classroom. 10. Ability to respond to learner abilities and needs (flexibility). 11. Knowledge about teaching strategies. 12. Knowledge about the culture and literature in of the target language. 13. Ability to assess learner language knowledge/competence.

14. Knowledge of methods and theoretical concepts in English language teaching (Kalebic, 2005).

Park and Lee (2006) investigated the characteristics of effective English teachers as perceived by teachers and students in high schools in Korea, consisting of three categories: English proficiency, pedagogical knowledge, and socio-affective skills. Their findings showed that teacher's perceptions of characteristics important for an English language teacher differed significantly from those of the students in all three categories. The teachers ranked English proficiency the highest and the students ranked pedagogical knowledge.

And finally, according to post method pedagogy (Kumaravadivelu 2005), there is no one best method of teaching. A good teacher should decide which method works better for her/his students. According to him, a good language teacher is the one who keeps in mind the needs of her/his students and tries to make them meet their own needs. And a post method teacher (Kumaravadivelu 2005), does not wait for researchers to provide theories and has to understand the culture of his/her students.

None of the studies mentioned above refers to native/non-native distinction in terms of being a good foreign/second language teacher which means speaking English as a mother tongue does not necessarily mean being a better teacher of that language. In this regard Al-Omrani (2008) states that it would be appropriate to introduce an alternative term: 'Standard English'.



He suggests replacing the term 'native' by the term 'standard'. Therefore, a good foreign/second language teacher would be the one who speaks Standard English regardless of her/his mother tongue language.

### **1.5 Advantages and Disadvantages of Being NEST and NNEST**

The first reflections regarding the differences between native and non-native speakers started to come in the eighties: Coppieters, (1987); Kachru, (1982); Kresovich, (1988); Nickel, (1985); Pride, (1981) Edge (1988). One of the issues recently being discussed by researchers is whether being a NEST/ NNEST makes any advantage on the other one. In contrast to what many institutions' and learners' beliefs about the incompetency of NNEST, many researches revealed that they actually enjoy many advantages of being a non-native. In his book, Llurda suggests that non-native teachers of English have been reported to have several advantages over NEST, especially over the ones who are monolinguals (2004).

Edge (1988), emphasized the importance and the advantage of giving "real" models (NNEST) to the EFL students. These "real" models have learned to speak language of the students natively and have learned to speak English well, just like students are expected to do. However, "foreign" models (NEST), do not share the cultural, social, and emotional experience of the students. This idea was later supported by McKay (2003).

In this regard, Cook (1999) states that "students may feel overwhelmed by native speaker teacher who achieves a perfection that students cannot reach". So, he adds "students

may prefer the fallible non-native speaker teacher who presents more achievable model". Also Milambiling (2000) argues that the NNEST can be a good example of skilled foreign/second language user and share his/her experiences with the students.

However, in the early nineties Medgyes wrote the first article (1992), and then a book (1994) that discussed non-native speakers of English. Medgyes states that: 1. The ideal NEST is the one who has achieved a high degree of proficiency in the learners' mother tongue; 2. The ideal NNEST is the one who "has achieved near-native proficiency" in English.

This theory seems reliable in an EFL setting where all the students will speak the same language. In an ESL setting, however, it could hardly be required of all teachers to know all their students' different languages. Canagarajah (1999), for example, claims that NEST will be better teachers in EFL contexts, because of their unique cultural knowledge, whereas NNEST will be better teachers in ESL context, because of their multicultural experience. Interestingly, this claim is not supported at all by TESOL practicum supervisors, who seem to believe that NNEST would be better teachers in their own countries (Llurda, 2005).

Coppieters (1987) seems to be more flexible in terms of native / non-native distinction. She states: "There are many people whose L2 has become their L1. Generally with the exception of the accent, native speakers cannot distinguish them from themselves". She calculates that these speakers are at about 90% to 95% in their acquisition along the interlanguage continuum. Her study showed that there are differences in both groups' intuitions even when some of the near-native speakers did not have a foreign accent. Coppieters (1987) observed that native and near-

native speakers have the same proficiency and are equal in their level of language use. She discovered that native speakers and near-native speakers develop a different grammar (or a different perception of grammar) and proposed that a language does not impose a specific underlying grammar on its speakers.

Medgyes (1992) recognizes the language deficiencies of NNEST however, according to him, all these deficiencies of non-nativism do not mean NNEST to be less efficient teachers in classroom. He admits that NNEST possess a number of distinctive strengths and advantages over NEST. For example, NNEST can serve as imitable models of the successful learners of English; they can teach learning strategies more effectively; they can be more empathetic to the needs and problems of their students; they can provide learners with more information about the English language; they are more able to anticipate language difficulties; and they can benefit from sharing the learners' mother tongue.

Medgyes (1994) states six positive characteristics of NNEST in his discussion about the advantages of NNEST'. They 1) provide a good learner model to their students, 2) can teach language strategies very effectively, 3) are able to provide more information about the language to their students, 4) understand the difficulties and needs of the students, 5) are able to anticipate and predict language difficulties, and 6) can (in EFL settings) use the students' native language to their advantage. Medgyes then explains that if the language deficiencies of NNEST are remedied, NEST and NNEST have equal chance to achieve professional success. Consequently, according to Medgyes: "the more proficient in English, the more efficient in the classroom".

This argument contradicts Giauque (1984), who states that NNEST are not the only teachers who can become better teachers with better training. Giauque (1984) explains that even though it is essential for NNEST to acquire a good knowledge of the language, it is equally essential that NEST gain a good knowledge of contrastive linguistics before being qualified to teach their own language. Rampton (1990) supports this argument by asking, "Does 'native speaker' automatically mean one speaks one's first language well and has a comprehensive grasp of it?" His answer is not positive: "being born into a language does not mean that one inherently speaks it well." And Seidlhofer (1999) adds that: "native speakers know the destination, but not the terrain that has to be crossed to get there; they themselves have not traveled the same route."

In addition to all these advantages, of course NNEST have some disadvantages in terms of their teaching or language profession. At this point, Kachru (1985) states that: "There is no doubt that non-native speakers can acquire native-like proficiency in English as an additional language, whether they belong to the 'outer circle' (ESL) or the 'expanding circle' (EFL)". However he and Nelson point out that, although acquiring native-like proficiency, NNEST have a linguistic insecurity that provokes a prescriptive and intolerant attitude (Kachru, 1985).

Medgyes (1992) also states that NNEST usually feel unsafe using the language they have to teach. Because of this fear, they tend to adopt two kinds of attitudes: pessimistic or aggressive. He adds that the latter is typical of the worst kind of teachers. He states that, fortunately, the pessimistic type is the most common one. This kind is obsessed with grammar and pays little attention to pronunciation and vocabulary, and almost none to linguistic appropriateness. They

seem to have in mind Widdowson's belief that no one can learn a language without learning its grammar (1994).

The aggressive type of teacher, on the other hand, operate on mistaken beliefs and prejudices about how language works. These false assumptions will turn into errors of all kinds: phonological, structural and semantic. Medgyes (1994) has observed that aggressive NNEST tend to be grammar-centered. They believe that knowing grammar means knowing a language. However, sometimes they are ignorant of a rule or mislearned it when they were students. Then they commit errors which are afterwards transmitted to their students. Medgyes states that:

“They avoid using alternative sources to teach pronunciation such as radio, video, cassette recorder, etc. The reason is that they try to hide their deficiencies, such as their foreign accent, from their students. It is a way to save face in the classroom. According to him, pronunciation is not their only Achilles' heel: NNEST's lexicon is another burden. The English language is estimated to have over 400,000 words. It is something that cannot be completely mastered (neither by native speakers nor by non-native speakers). However, native speakers have a Sprachgefühl that can often help them to know if a word used by a student is right or not. The only way out for aggressive teachers is to play it safe: they use the words that are known to them. Many times these words have hidden connotations or are out-of-date or slang.”

Medgyes states that: “By being both teacher and learner at the same time, NNEST are driven into a constant state of schizophrenia” (1983). He claims that sooner or later NNEST tend

to regret having chosen this career because as one day he is going live a breakdown. And he believes that one of the options is total resignation, and another is restricting the language to those rules which he or she has learned or mislearned. Medgyes argues that NNEST should openly acknowledge that they are students of English as well. This would be the best way to take a more confident stance in the classroom (Medgyes, 2001)

Cultural context is another issue that NNEST have deficiencies in. Medgyes points out that members of different cultures view the world in different ways. So it is really challenging for a NNEST to teach a topic that he or she may be ignorant or unaware about. According to Medgyes, the choice of language has to match the social situation of the interaction and depends on the context. The relation between the linguistic form and objects or events in the outside world can be defined as referential appropriateness. It is very common for non-native speakers to use structures that native speakers would not use in the same situations. This is a cultural aspect that cannot be separated from language and often leads to pragmatic failures (Medgyes, 2001)

In addition to what researchers and educationists report, according to a study by Reves & Medgyes (1994), non-native English teachers also stated the lack of fluency and accuracy in their oral proficiency and admitted that they have to struggle with the appropriate use of English. In this study, non-native teachers reported to have deeper insights into English language than native English teachers. However, nonnative English teachers had limited knowledge of context and tended to teach an unfamiliar language in context-poor environments or in isolation. In

contrast, native teachers taught language in more creative and authentic contexts, while using more effective and innovative teaching techniques.

It is obvious that NNEST generally are fallible in the choice of language although that have a more planned system of language teaching. However, in some cases NEST can also be fallible. Smith pointed out that "Native speakers need as much help as non-native speakers when using English [or any other language] to interact internationally. There is no room for linguistic chauvinism"

#### **1.6 The Relation between Language Competence and Teacher Efficacy**

As discussed above, there are some differences in the competence of language between native speakers and non-native speakers. This is why NEST are considered to be better language teachers. But, is language competence really the dominating factor in teaching ability? Reves and Medgyes (1994) conducted a survey named: *"The non-native English speaking EFL/ESL teacher's self-image: An international survey."* about the issue and claimed that there is a great relation between competence and teaching behavior. They put forward three hypotheses: (1) "NEST and NNEST differ in their teaching behavior", (2) "These differences in teaching behavior are largely due to divergent levels of language proficiency", and (3) "The awareness of differences in language proficiency influences the NNEST self-perception and teaching attitudes".

Medgyes (2001), like most researchers or educationists and the participants of his study, admits that language competence is the point where NNEST are inevitably handicapped in some ways. In his study, he found that every NNEST has his/her own problems about using English; however, fluency and vocabulary, followed by speaking, pronunciation, and listening comprehension are the most frequent areas of difficulty NNEST suffer from. Grammar, writing, idiomatic expressions, appropriacy, intonation, and prepositions were at the bottom of the list which means they are not really problematic to NNEST.

Reves and Medgyes' analyze the different areas of difficulty for NNEST as:

(1) *Vocabulary*: The problem is because many words have different meanings according to the context, idioms, synonyms, etc. In short, vocabulary resists mastery.

(2) *Fluency*: Oral fluency requires many qualities, such as readiness to speak, speech rate, etc, in which NNEST are in a disadvantage. NNEST's speech tends to be redundant and clumsy due to the difficulty in finding the right structures and expressions at the right time.

(3) *Pronunciation*: It is obvious that NNEST are marked by a foreign accent that in the worst cases interferes with other people's understanding.

(4) *Grammar*: Grammar is the favorite field for NNEST. Participant of the study remark it as more concrete and more learnable than vocabulary.

Related to their three hypothesis, Reves and Medgyes (1994) assert two questions: 1) "Is it true that, having a better command of English, NEST perform better in the classroom?" and, 2)



"Is it true that the more deficient the teacher is in English, the less efficient he or she is bound to be?"

In a study, Reves and Medgyes (1994) asked 325 EFL/ESL teachers from 11 countries about their perceptions of difference in English competence. Most of these NNEST (74%) considered their English to be 'good' or 'average'. Ten per cent considered their command to be 'excellent', and only one percent admitted having a 'poor' command. However, the authors state that the higher the grade of sophistication non-native achieves the more self-critical and self-conscious s/he becomes. So, according to Reves and Medgyes these results show that about eighty-four per cent are not very highly sophisticated. Many of them may think that they know English, but they do not.

Medgyes (1994) points out that, thanks to their superiority in the ability to use language spontaneously, NEST (with or without a teaching degree) would always be better than NNEST if language competence was the only variable for a good teaching skill. However, this is not the case in real life. There are additional variables to be considered in teaching. These are: experience, age, sex, aptitude, charisma, motivation, training, etc. Medgyes states that in his own experience, "native and non-natives stand an equal chance of achieving professional success".

Keeping in mind that language competence is not the overriding factor, the teaching differences variable between NEST and NNEST is taken into account. Reves and Medgyes found

that two-thirds of their subjects saw differences in teaching behavior between NEST and NNEST. A quarter of their respondents thought that NEST were more successful teachers, conversely another quarter considered NNEST to be more successful. Half of the respondents did not see any difference.

Palfreyman (1993) points out that these two groups have different approaches to talking and thinking about language. He found that there is a different kind of language-related awareness between them. NEST are more aware of the correct use, but NNEST are more aware of structural patterns and of language-learning processes. This makes the NNEST more rigid and more knowledgeable at the same time. He conducted an experiment with two NEST and two NNEST designing a lesson plan. He discovered that there were two approaches in the way that the language system was represented: *analytic* (NEST) and *synthetic* (NNEST) (1993). NEST tried to establish distinctions, on the basis of context-free principles such as generalized semantic definitions and word-forms. It is the way native speakers bring order to their unconscious linguistic knowledge into the classroom. The latter approach, aimed to integrate language into a situational or linguistic context. This developed from having to cope with English-speaking situations.

According to these two approaches, the perceptions teachers have about their students' linguistic knowledge are different. Making their students consciously aware is the matter of fact that NEST tend to see. On the other hand, NNEST are concerned not with language, but with the ability to mean. (Palfreyman, 1993)

However, Reves and Medgyes state that NEST are more natural and real with language (that is to say, communication is more important than form), whereas NNEST are more concerned with accuracy and formal features of English. The latter inevitably isolate language from context, because they are afraid of losing control of the teaching material. Also, according to Garcia Merino, NNEST usually follow a standard variety, whereas NEST often speak a non-standard variety. And based on his experiences with many language teachers and professors from four different universities in three different countries, NNEST are much more strict with grammatical and spelling errors made by their students (non-native speakers) than NEST, who are more concerned with fluency and communication (1997).

Lederer (1981) agrees the idea that NNEST tend to consider morphological mistakes more serious, whereas NEST place emphasis on pronunciation and syntax. The reason is that word order is a structural pattern that NEST acquire subconsciously; they take it for granted. However, even highly educated native speakers, who were not educated in linguistics, would not know how to explain word order in English. For instance, Lederer states that they know that the sentence: 'He came home drunk yesterday' is fine, and that the sentence: 'He came drunk yesterday home' is not. Lederer states, "Our brain, because it is not programmed to accept this syntactic arrangement, sends back signals saying 'This sequence does not compute'".

The other question Reves and Medgyes tried to answer is whether NNEST's defective in English hampers their teaching. Less than a quarter answered that it did not. The majority said that it interferes 'a little' and 'quite a bit'. Only four per cent admitted that it interfered 'very much' or in an extreme' way. They showed that NNEST prepare their classes more carefully. On the other hand, NEST tend to improvise more and not to follow the textbook as closely. They found that the better trained teachers were more self-confident, assessed their students' learning capacities more accurately, were more generous with their value judgements, and were employed in the best schools. After this analysis, we still cannot answer the question about who is more successful. This question is based on subjective perceptions. Reves and Medgyes found that the respondents' answer to that question was balanced.

Above, the deficiencies of NNEST are mentioned, however, it is not possible to generalize that all NNEST are deficient users of English. They may have some gaps as NEST have gaps in their L1. Medgyes points out that NEST are only potentially superior and that in some cases non-natives do better in certain areas of language use. Harmer also (1991) claims, "average native speakers...do not consciously know any grammar and cannot produce any rules of grammar without study and thought, but they do have a language competence which is subconscious and allows them to generate grammatically correct sentences" (p. 13). Cook (1999) explains the situation with an example and refers to native speakers as good bike riders, who cannot explain how they ride a bicycle.

Moreover, Medgyes enumerates five points where a NNEST is better than a NEST although being potentially handicapped:

(a) "*NNEST can teach learning strategies more effectively*" (346). As the NNEST is a teacher and a learner at the same time, he or she has developed learning strategies that can be useful to his or her students. On the other hand, NEST may lack these strategies.

(b) "*NNEST can provide learners with more information about the English language*" (347). NNEST have learned about how the English language works during their own learning process. This makes them better informants than their native teachers. Reves and Medgyes point out that NEST may not be aware of the internal mechanisms operating in the acquisition of a second language, since NEST language acquisition was unconscious.

(c) "*NNEST are more able to anticipate language difficulties*" (347). According to the *Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH)* by contrasting two languages, phonological, morphological/lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic errors can be predicted. (Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991) Errors occur because where two languages are similar, positive transfer would occur, whereas where they were different, negative transfer, or interference, would result. Larsen-Freeman and Long have estimated that between 23% and 51% of the errors occur due to the transfer from L1.

(d) "*NNEST can be more empathetic to the needs and problems of their learners*" (347). As NNEST are learners, they are still struggling with English and this makes them more sensitive and understanding with their students.

(e) "*Only NNEST can benefit from sharing the learner's mother tongue*" (347). In a monolingual setting, for instance that of Spanish speakers teaching English in Spain, their mother tongue can be used as a vehicle of communication. It can help in the learning process in many ways. It would be easier to use the students' language to translate the terms. Much time can be saved by just translating the words into the students' L1. (Medgyes,1991)

Medgyes (1991) concludes that these advantages tend to balance the NNEST' language competence deficiencies. Therefore, he states, "*The more proficient in English, the more efficient in the classroom is a false statement*" (347).

Lederer (1981) points out that if all language teachers are native speakers the students would reach the conclusion that one has to be born in an English speaking country to learn to speak English. Medgyes points out that NNEST have been, and still are, learners of English. They are successful learners and they can become models for their students. The teachers use their learning experience in a reflective way in their teaching. Widdowson makes a distinction between the *role of the instructor* and the *role of the informant*. He considers that a native speaker may have the edge as an informant, i.e., he or she can be a perfect language model; but the instructor's role is a different matter. The NEST cannot be a learner model because he or she did not have to learn English as a second language (1994).

Medgyes makes a non-native/non-native comparison too and he agrees that if all the other variables are equal, the NNEST with higher proficiency in English would be the better one. Therefore, he points out that the most important professional duty for NNEST is to improve their command of English as much as possible. There are two major problems that make this goal difficult to achieve: lack of time and fossilization. According to Merino (1997), the best way to avoid fossilization and acquire a high proficiency in English is to live in the target language country for a long time.

When the comparison is between two natives Medgyes believes that the assertion: "The more proficient, the more efficient" is absurd for this dimension. Although there are differences in performance among native speakers, there are no differences in L1 competence. In their case, NEST have to try to minimize the deficiencies mentioned above. Medgyes believes that if a NEST is at the same time a learner of a foreign language, the drawbacks can be counterbalanced. This is particularly important in the monolingual setting. For instance, if a NEST is teaching in Spain, it would be most helpful for him or her to learn Spanish. Because of this fact, Medgyes states that: "The more proficient in the learners' mother tongue, the more efficient in the classroom". This is important in both ways. It not only helps in using the students' L1, but also helps teachers be more self-confident.

Reves and Medgyes's (1994) study also revealed the self-image and attitude to teaching perceived by nonnative speaking teachers. The results showed that the level of English, especially oral, proficiency differentiated the self-image of those nonnative ESL/EFL teachers. Teachers who reported poor self-image were found teaching in an environment where the opportunities to use English was limited. In contrast, teachers with a stronger self-image appeared to have more experience living in English-speaking countries and to have higher teaching quality. The effect of English proficiency was also observed in other studies (Chacon, 2002; Shin, 2001). Both studies revealed the effect of language proficiency on both teacher efficacy and teaching methodology. Language teachers who reported a higher level of language

proficiency would choose to have more interactive and communication-orientated activities in classrooms.

Widdowson (1994) suggests that teaching English is not a biological quality but a craft, a skill that has to be learned and mastered. He states that when the emphasis is moved from the contexts of use to contexts of learning, the advantage that native speaker teachers have disappears.

## **1.7 Literature Review**

” The study of NNEST English teachers is a global phenomenon. Despite the pioneering work of Medgyes in the early 1990s, studies on these issues began to be published in the United States only a decade later. And issues relating to NNEST English teachers have now become a legitimate area of research.” (Braine, 2005)

The issues about non-native English speaking teachers have recently attracted attention by researchers such as Arva and Medgyes (2000), Braine (1999; 2005), Llurda (2004), Mahboob (2004) and Medgyes (1994; 2001). According to Mahboob (2003), the interest to the issue has increased by the establishment of Non-native English Speakers in TESOL Caucus. He states that the number of the papers discussed at TESOL Conventions in 2001 and 2002 was 13; however in 2003 the number reached 48 and it is still increasing.



#### **1.4.1 Studies on Self Perceptions of Non-native Teachers**

There are several studies on self-perceptions of Non-native English teachers throughout the world. According to Kamhi-Stein (2004) phases have been identified as research areas about NNEST issues. The first one focused on the self-perceptions of NNEST. The second one investigated the credibility of NNEST. And the third has dealt with two topics: a) the meaning of label 'non-native English speaking teacher' and b) others' (students and administrators) perceptions of NNEST.

Medgyes, who is a non-native speaker, was the first to have brought the issues about NNEST to the open. He wrote two pioneering articles in the *ELT Journal* titled 'The schizophrenic teacher' (1983) and 'Native or non-native: who's worth more?' (1992). Later on, he wrote his book '*The Non-native Teacher*' (1994), in which he revealed the results of his research with his own experience as a NNEST English teacher and observations of other NNEST.

In his book he discussed the topics: 'natives and non-natives in opposite trenches,' 'the dark side of being a non-native', 'and who's worth more: the native or the non-native'. He presents four hypotheses based on his assumption that NEST and NNEST are 'two different species'. The hypotheses were that the NEST and NNEST differ in terms of (1) language proficiency, and (2) teaching practice (behavior), that (3) most of the differences in teaching practice can be attributed to the discrepancy in language proficiency, and that (4) both types of teachers can be equally good teachers on their own terms.

Studies of teachers' self-perceptions of their self efficacy in the ESL field have different results. An international survey of 216 NEST and NNEST from 10 countries (Brazil, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Israel, Mexico, Nigeria, Russia, Sweden, Yugoslavia, and Zimbabwe) was conducted (Reves&Medgyes, 1994). 68% of the subjects perceived differences in the teaching practices of NEST and NNEST. Eighty-four percent of NNEST admitted having various language difficulties. Vocabulary and fluency were the most common areas which were followed by speaking, pronunciation, and listening comprehension. Only 25% of the subjects stated that their language difficulties had no adverse effect on their teaching. In view of these findings, Reves & Medgyes (1994) suggest that: "...frequent exposure to authentic native language environments and proficiency-oriented in-service training activities' might improve the language difficulties of NNEST". Further, in order to enhance the self-perception of these teachers, they recommend making them aware of their advantageous condition as language teachers.

Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) surveyed and interviewed non-native speaking TESOL graduate assistants (from Korea, Japan, Turkey, Surinam, China, Togo, Burkina Faso, and Russia) who were either pursuing a MA or Ph.D. in TESOL at a university in the United States. Similar to Reves and Medgyes (1994), more than 2/3 thought that their own language difficulties affected their teaching and 90% perceived a difference between NEST and NNEST. However, while they perceived that both NEST and NNEST have strengths and weaknesses, they did not consider the NEST to be superior teachers. They identified the NEST as being informal, fluent, accurate, using different techniques, methods, and approaches, being flexible, using conversational English, knowing subtleties of the language, using authentic English,

providing positive feedback to students, and having communication (not exam preparation) as the goals of their teaching. NNEST were perceived as relying on textbooks, applying differences between the first and second languages, using the first language as a medium of instruction, being aware of negative transfer and psychological aspects of learning, being sensitive to the needs of students, being more efficient, knowing the students' background, and having exam preparation as the goal of their teaching. In their research, Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) did not find a negative self-image of NNEST in the U.S., nor did Mahboob, Uhrig, Newman, & Hartford (2002).

Whereas Reves & Medgyes (1994) focus on the differing levels of language proficiency and their effects on teaching practices, the differing teaching practices identified by Samimy & Brutt-Griffler (1999) may be attributed to cross-cultural differences.

Drawing on an empirical study of the self-perception of a group of Austrian teachers, Seidlhofer (1999) found that a majority of the teachers felt insecure rather than confident being non-native teachers of English. While they see the main advantage of being non-native speakers is that they share their students' L1, their confidence based on the shared language and culture with their students is coupled with a lack of confidence they have about themselves as speakers of English. Despite the feeling of insecurity, other factors such as experience and education are found to help teachers gain self-assurance. As non-native teachers have to learn the language they teach themselves, they are distanced from it, which gives them confidence in explaining certain aspects of the language and other concepts. Indeed, Seidlhofer argues that an important strength of non-native teachers is that they show a high degree of conscious, or declarative

knowledge of the internal organization of the English language because of their own language learning experience. Hence, they can 'get into the skin of the foreign learner' (1999). In short, non-native teachers are at the same time familiar with the target and distanced from it, enabling them to be effective teachers of English. Indeed, non-native teachers are what Seidlhofer calls 'double agents' in the sense that they mediate between the different languages and cultures through appropriate pedagogy so as to make informed choices that benefit learners (1999).

The other study of the self-perceptions of NNEST English teachers was conducted by Ofra Inbar-Lourie at Tel Aviv University in Israel. Titled 'Native and nonnative English teachers: investigation of the construct and perceptions', it was one of the first studies at doctoral-level on NNEST issues (2001). Results of the study indicated that there are differences between NEST and NNEST only in some categories, mainly the superiority of the NEST (as espoused by the NEST themselves), the degree of confidence in teaching specific language areas, and in student-teacher relations. No differences were found in perception categories relating to teaching and assessment practices, defining students' knowledge of English, the status of the English language, and goals of teaching English. The interesting result is that perception differences in these areas arose not from the teachers' status as NS or NNEST but from personal and professional variables such as country of birth, length of residence in the country, school level, and perceived type of school. NNEST reported having better relations with students and feeling more confident in using the L1 to facilitate teaching (2001).

In a more recent study, Llurda & Huguet (2003) investigated the self awareness of 101 non-native English teachers in primary and secondary schools in a Spanish city. As for the

language skills, they found that the secondary teachers showed more confidence than primary teachers, especially in general proficiency, grammar, knowledge, and reading comprehension. Although primary teachers admitted that they did experience certain difficulties in teaching English, they did not attribute these difficulties to their proficiency in English. As for language improvement over time, the primary teachers displayed a greater awareness of their language improvement and believed that this improvement came through conscious study of the language. In the case of teaching goals, almost all the primary teachers (97.2%) preferred communicative strategies, while only two-thirds of the secondary teachers did so.

In the NEST or NNEST debate, the primary school teachers appeared to be more influenced by the native speaker fallacy, half of them stating that they would hire more NEST than NNEST for a language school, although the other primary school teachers did state that they would hire equal numbers of NEST and NNEST. As for secondary school teachers, nearly two thirds chose the balanced option of hiring teachers from both groups. In fact, most of the secondary school teachers (65.6%) believed that being a NNEST was an advantage. As for the need for cultural knowledge, the teachers clearly preferred British culture, with situations involving the English language being closely associated with British NEST. (Mahboob, 2004)

#### **1.4.2 Studies on Students' Perceptions of NNEST**

The research described so far has focused on the self-perceptions of NNEST. Research on students' perceptions of non-native teachers which is in fact as crucial as the self-perceptions has a more recent history. In terms of students' perceptions, there is a widely accepted

assumption that, in language teaching students prefer native instructors, and most administrators' hiring practices have been influenced by this assumption to some degree (Cook, 2000; Mahboob, Uhrig, Newman, & Hartford, 2001; Medgyes, 1992).

Kristy Liang's Master's research (2002) at California State University, Los Angeles, also investigated students' attitudes towards NNEST. The results showed that, although the students rated pronunciation/accent as very important, pronunciation/accent did not affect the students' attitudes towards their NNEST. Further, personal and professional features as derived from the teachers' speech, such as 'being interesting', 'being prepared', 'being qualified', and 'being professional', played a role in the students' preference for teachers (Liang 2002).

Cheung (2007) conducted a study by examining both student and teacher views in Hong Kong. In his study, both groups saw NEST and NNEST as possessing different strengths. NEST's strengths included: high proficiency in English, ability to use English functionally and awareness of the cultures of English-speaking countries. NNEST's perceived strengths included: ability to empathize with students as fellow second language learners, shared cultural background and ability to teach grammar.

Ahmar Mahboob (2003) conducted a research about the issue under the title 'Status of non-native English teachers as ESL teachers in the USA'. The analysis of the students' comments showed that both NEST and NNEST received positive and negative comments. In the

case of NEST, the majority of positive comments related to oral skills, with vocabulary and culture also being viewed positively. Negative comments on NEST related to grammar, experience as an ESL learner, ability to answer questions, and methodology. In the case of NNEST, experience as an ESL learner earned the most number of positive comments, followed by grammar, affect, oral skills, methodology, hard work, vocabulary, culture, ability to answer questions, and literacy skills. NNEST received negative comments with regard to oral skills and culture.

Torres (2004) also conducted a study named 'Speaking up! Adult ESL students' perceptions of native and non-native English speaking teachers'. Results indicated that adult ESL students have a general preference for NEST over NNEST, but have stronger preferences for NEST in teaching specific skill areas such as pronunciation and writing. There was not a significant difference between immigrants' and refugees' general preferences for NEST over NNEST based on immigration status.

Liaw (2004) conducted a survey on the differences between native and non-native teachers of English and the perception of nativeness. The data shows a positive connection between teachers' self-perceived ability in teaching the target language and level of efficacy. The influence of teaching experience, such as years of teaching and level of students' language proficiency on teachers' sense of efficacy observed in this study. Moreover, native and nonnative language teachers from different language departments were also found different in such areas as teaching methods in the classroom, levels of instructional strategic efficacy or nativeness issues.

Lasagabaster and Sierra's (2005) study explored students' views on the pros and cons of having NEST and NNEST as their English teachers. The results suggest that more than half of the respondents (60.6%) show a preference for NEST and 35.5% do not have a clear preference. However, when they were given the possibility of having both NEST and NNEST, the percentage increased to 71.6%. Lasagabaster and Sierra also found that the university students preferred NEST in the areas of pronunciation, culture and civilization, listening, vocabulary and speaking, while they showed a preference for NNEST in the areas of grammar and strategies. However, the students did not show any preference for NEST or NNEST in the other areas, namely reading, assessment, attitudes towards English speaking countries and attitudes towards the learning of English. Another interesting finding is that whereas the students preferred NEST at university level in most areas, this was not true for primary education. In the open questionnaire, most of the respondents recognized the strengths of NNEST. In particular, they valued the NNEST as a resource of learning strategies, and saw NNEST as imitable models. Lasagabaster and Sierra's study is important in that it looks at students' perceptions towards NEST and NNEST with respect to different aspects of language teaching and in relation to different levels of education. Hence, their study goes deeper than the question of students' preference for NS or NNEST in general.

Moussu and Braine (2006) attempted to examine ESL students' attitude change after being taught by NNEST. Two questionnaires were administered to almost 100 students in a university in the US. Moussu and Braine found that students held positive attitudes towards NNEST at the beginning of the semester. Most students indicated that they could learn English just as well as from NNEST and they respected and admired their NNEST. On the whole, the



students' responses showed a high degree of support for their NNEST. In Moussu and Braine's study, the most important finding is that the students' attitudes towards their NNEST increased positively over time, despite a lack of significant change over time. A possible reason is that the students already had positive opinions of their NNEST at the beginning of the semester. In particular, 76% of respondents recommended their NNEST to a friend by the end of the semester, compared to only 57% at the beginning of the semester.

Butler's (2004) study examined students' attitudes towards teachers with American-accented English and Korean-accented English. The study found significant differences in the students' attitudes towards the teachers with American-accented English and Korean-accented English with regard to their 'goodness of pronunciation', 'confidence in their use of English', 'focus on fluency versus accuracy, and 'the use of Korean in the classroom', but not regarding 'general teaching strategies'. More specifically, the Korean students thought that the American-accented English guise had better pronunciation, was relatively more confident in her use of English, would focus more on fluency than on accuracy, and would use less Korean in the English. In other words, certain qualifications are more important to NEST while a different set of qualities are more important for NNEST. Yet, other qualities may be regarded as important regardless of NEST or NNEST status. In addition, the students generally showed a preference for the American-accented English teachers as their English teacher. Butler's study contributes to the attitudinal studies on NS and NNS by employing a matched-guised technique in probing into students' attitudes. However, her study did not look at students' actual experience with NS and NNEST, but relied on the use of different accents in eliciting students' attitudes towards NS and NNEST.

Cheung and Braine (2007) investigated the attitudes of students towards their NNEST in the context of Hong Kong. The results of the study indicate that on the whole, the students showed a favorable attitude towards their NNEST. They stated that NNEST could employ effective strategies in teaching English, understood the difficulties encountered by the students, and were capable of designing teaching materials according to the needs and learning styles of the students. However, the respondents also cited several NNEST's shortcomings, including their examination-oriented teaching approach, their limited use of English in class, and the tendency to over-correct students' work. Cheung and Braine also found that final-year students indicated a more positive attitude than first- and second-year students, implying that the students' positive attitude towards NNEST tended to increase with longer stay at the university.

### **1.4.3 Studies in Turkey**

One of the first studies in Turkey was titled: *Native English Speaking Teachers and Non-native English Speaking Teachers in İstanbul: A Perception Analysis* conducted by Ebru Ezberci (2005). The purpose of this study was to investigate the differences between the career perceptions of NEST and NNEST working at universities in İstanbul, and the two groups' perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of NEST and NNEST. This study was conducted with 172 participants working in 10 different institutions in İstanbul. Data was collected through a questionnaire consisting of four parts. In addition, 15 participants were interviewed. The results reveal that a great majority of the respondents view English language teaching (ELT) as a

career or profession. When the two groups were compared, the percentage of the NNEST who view ELT as a career or profession is higher than that of NEST. While indicating similar viewpoints between NEST and NNEST regarding their views of ELT, the study found differences in the perceptions of the important qualifications of teachers, and the strengths and weaknesses of NEST and NNEST. Overall, the findings suggest that the 'native speaker fallacy' may still have validity even though both groups of participants refrained from publicly accepting it.

In his article named '*A concise examination of the artificial battle between native and non-native speaker teachers of English in Turkey*', Çelik (2006) states that qualifications such as ESL/EFL pedagogy, a profound understanding of the English language, comprehension of the second/foreign language acquisition process, an enthusiasm and thriving practice of teaching English should be the basic criteria to evaluate the effectiveness of a language teacher. Accordingly, non-native speaker teachers should stop comparing themselves unfavorably with native speaker teachers and should take the responsibility to educate people by presenting them the benefits non-native English-speaking teachers may bring to the classroom. If they act with confidence to show they are well-trained and exceptional teachers, others will have no opportunity, but to accept that it does not matter where they come from or where they are teaching.

Bayyurt (2006), who interviewed 12 Turkish NNEST about their beliefs regarding the teaching of culture in the EFL classroom, additionally showed that NNEST were aware that EFL students regarded them as good language learning models and guides. This study examines the

importance of raising non-native English language teachers' awareness of different dimensions of culture in the teaching of English as an international language. The author believes that the more critical English language teachers become about the involvement of culture in their English language teaching, the more they equip their students with the necessary linguistic and cultural resources to be able to communicate with people from other cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The study comprises the development and implementation of a semi-structured interview. The study shows that there is a general consensus among the participants of the study on the practice of referring to an 'international culture' with special emphasis on English-speaking Anglo-American cultures, as well as the learners' local culture in the English as a Foreign Language classroom. Moreover, the results also reveal the participant teachers' belief that being a non-native English-speaking teacher is an advantage as far as cultural and linguistic issues in the English language classroom are concerned.

In her study named: '*University students' perceptions of native and non-native teachers*' Evrim Üstünlüoğlu tried to identify university students' perceptions of native and non-native teachers of English as well as to identify deficiencies and needs in the teaching process so that some suggestions can be made. A data pool of 311 university students participated in this study and evaluated 38 native and non-native teachers of English. A questionnaire was used as the instrument and it consisted of 30 items related to in-class teaching roles, in-class management roles, in-class communication roles, and individual features. The results indicate that there is a meaningful difference between native and non-native teachers of English from the students' perspective. The results suggest that non-native teachers fulfill in-class teaching and in-class

management roles better than native teachers do while native teachers fulfill in-class communication skills and present more favorable qualities (2007).

Dogancay-Aktuna (2008) asked 21 non-native English-speaking teacher educators about their status as non-native speakers of English, professional identities, and self-perceived skills. Most of these participants rated their language skills and competences in English as high, overall, although some noted a need to improve their knowledge of idiomatic expressions and conversational English. At the same time, slightly more than half of the participants had experienced prejudice because of their non-native status and many felt that this status was disadvantageous to their professional careers and teaching experience. They agreed, however, that being NNS in an EFL context allowed them to understand the issues related to this context better than if they were NS of English.

In their study named '*Challenges of being a non-native English Teacher*' Öztürk & Atay (2010) conducted a study on three Turkish teachers of English and investigated their opinions on the native speaker/non-native speaker dichotomy over an eighteen month period. Results of the study have shown that "I'm-not-a-nativespeaker" syndrome is prevalent among NNEST and this has negative effects on their morale as they feel inferior and inadequate when they compare themselves to their L1 colleagues (Suarez, 2000). Moreover, the conflict between the educational principle of equality between NNS and NEST and commercial benefits seems to be going on as well. Institutions offering English language programs often promote themselves as employing NEST and advertisements for teaching positions often require that applicants are native speakers implying that NEST are preferable in some way. The reason for the commercial

preference for NEST appears to be that despite the academic arguments and evidence there is still a broad social acceptance of the native as a speaker model (Pacek, 2005; Thornburry, 2006).

In his study named: *'Native Speakers as Teachers in Turkey: Non-native Pre-service English Teachers' Reactions to a Nation-wide Project'* Abdullah Coşkun tried to reveal the preliminary reactions of pre-service NNEST about this project through data obtained from open-ended surveys. The content analysis of the data showed that even before the project was initiated, most of the participants objected to it. Although some of the participants favored the project as they believed that the NEST might be more helpful for students to improve speaking skills and to increase their cultural awareness, the majority of the participants held negative attitudes towards the project mainly because of employment and pedagogical concerns (2013).

### **1.5 Statement of the Problem**

Language teachers, without any doubt, play an important role in language learning process. A good teacher can make a great contribution to his/her students' learning the language effectively. Because the majority of English language teachers in the world (approximately 80%) are non native speakers of English. (Matsuda & Matsuda, 2001)

However, without any genuine evidence that native teachers are better teachers of English, administrators at language centers, parents, politicians and most people believe that the mother tongue is the primary indicator of ability to teach a language effectively. However, most

people didn't have the chance to compare the two teachers in a real learning atmosphere. So, this belief may be due to a wrong perception of inferiority complex because of the simple thought that they know English better than us. This belief also affects the motivation of teachers and students in a bad way which is well-known to be very important in learning atmosphere.

The advantages and disadvantages of nonnative teachers in the field of ELT were thoroughly analyzed and documented in several studies (e.g., Medgyes, 1999 ; Matsuda and Matsuda, 2001; Lasagabaster & Sierra,2002; Jin, 2005; Laborda, 2006; Clark & Paran, 2007; Liu & Zhang, 2007; Chen, 2008; Todd & Pojanapunya, 2009; McDonald & McRae, 2010), In Turkey, not much research has been carried out in this issue. The existing researches do not investigate the issue in terms of both teachers' and students' perceptions. This study intends to investigate both students' and teachers' perceptions of nonnative EFL teachers in Turkey.

## **1.6 Aim of the Study**

Students' understanding of teachers' instructions in English and teachers' self perceptions are very important variables throughout the teaching and learning process. These perceptions may be a vehicle for facilitating language learning or a hindrance. This study is significant in providing data about teachers' preferences and students' expectations about language learning. The findings of the study may encourage language teachers to increase their awareness of considering students' expectations. Finally, the study will shed

a light on the legitimacy of the trials of government or private schools in terms of employing NEST.

This study aims to fill a gap by finding out the perceptions of the students' and self efficacy of the teachers'; raising awareness between the two groups.

### **1.7 Hypothesis**

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

Students find NNEST as efficient as native teachers. However, NNEST find it challenging to be a NNEST and they feel the need to improve their level of English.

And the sub-hypotheses are:

1. Language competence is important but not an over-riding factor in teaching a language better.
2. NNEST and NEST are perceived differently by the students and teachers in terms of effective EFL teaching and practicing pedagogical techniques.
3. Students and teachers perceive NNEST efficiency in different ways.



## **CHAPTER 2**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **2.1 Research Questions**

It is aimed to find out the perceptions of teachers and students on English language teachers in this study. The answers to the following research questions will be found.

1. From students' and teachers' perspectives, in which aspects are NNEST superior or inferior to NEST?
2. Is there a relationship between language competence and teaching ability?
3. What are the effects of being taught by NNEST?
4. What are the correlations between the teachers' and students' perceptions on NNEST?
5. From students' and teachers' perspectives, who is better overall in teaching English and why?

#### **2.2 Participants**

The first target group of the study included 112 non-native teachers of English who teaches in different cities and high schools in Turkey.

**Table 2.1.** Distribution of teachers.

| <b>Category</b>                            |                                  | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
|--|----------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>Gender</b>                              | Male                             | 75               | 67.0           |
|  | Female                           | 37               | 33.0           |
| <b>Academic Degree</b>                     | University                       | 74               | 66.1           |
|  | Master                           | 38               | 33.9           |
| <b>Comment on University<br/>Education</b> | Not satisfied                    | 11               | 9.8            |
|  | Nearly satisfied                 | 7                | 6.2            |
|  | Satisfied                        | 57               | 50.9           |
|  | Completely<br>Satisfied          | 37               | 33.0           |
| <b>Frequency of Speaking English</b>       | In-class only                    | 64               | 57.1           |
|  | In-class and one<br>more setting | 42               | 37.5           |
|  | In all parts of life             | 6                | 5.4            |
| <b>Teaching Experience</b>                 | 1-5 years                        | 44               | 39.3           |
|  | 6-10 years                       | 21               | 18.8           |
|  | 11-15years                       | 31               | 27.7           |
|  | 16-20years                       | 10               | 8.9            |
|  | 21- more                         | 6                | 5.3            |
| <b>Going Abroad</b>                        | Yes                              | 72               | 64.3           |
|  | No                               | 40               | 35.7           |

As seen in Table 2.1., 67 % of the teachers are male, 33 % of them are female. 66,1 % of teachers are graduates of university while 33,9 % of them have a master degree in their field. Also, 33 % of the teachers are completely satisfied with their university education, 50,9 % of them are just satisfied, 6,2 % of them are nearly satisfied, however, 9,8 % of them are not satisfied with their education. As for the teaching experience, 39,3 % of them have 1-5 year-experience, 18,8 % of them have 6-10-year-experience, 27,7 % of them have 11-15-year-experience and 8,9 % of them have 16-20 years, 5,3 % of them have experience of more than 21 years. 57,1 % of the teachers use English in-class only, 37,5 % have a chance to speak the language in one more setting but only 5,4 % use it in all parts of his/her life. 64,3 % have been abroad at least once, 35,7 % have never been abroad before. 3,6 % of the teachers think he/she can only teach beginner level effectively, 7,1% of them feel themselves sure to teach elementary level, too. 25,9 % feel sure that they can teach levels up to intermediate, 63,4 % of them think that they can teach levels including advanced level effectively.

**Table 2.2.** Distribution of the students.

| <b>Category</b>                                 |              | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
|---|--------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>Gender</b>                                   | Male         | 51               | 48.6           |
|   | Female       | 54               | 51.4           |
| <b>Class</b>                                    | 9            | 58               | 55.2           |
|   | 10           | 30               | 28.6           |
|   | 11           | 17               | 16.2           |
| <b>Length of Studying English</b>               | 5-10 years   | 93               | 88.5           |
|   | 11-15 years  | 12               | 11.4           |
| <b>Length of Being Taught by Native Teacher</b> | 1-2 years    | 23               | 21.9           |
|   | 3-4 years    | 18               | 17.1           |
|   | 5 and over   | 64               | 61.0           |
| <b>Level of English</b>                         | elementary   | 27               | 25.7           |
|   | intermediate | 73               | 69.5           |
|   | advanced     | 5                | 4.8            |

The second group included 105 students who continue the private high schools (Darüşşafaka Lisesi, Ted Koleji, Doğa Koleji) and have the chance to make a comparison between native/non-native teachers as they learn English by both. 48,6 % of the students are male and 51,4 % are female. 55,2% of the students attended 9<sup>th</sup>, 28,6 % of them 10<sup>th</sup>, 16,2 % of them attended 11<sup>th</sup> degree. 88,5 % of these students have been learning English for between 5-10

years and 11,4 % of the students have been learning for 11-15 years. 21,9 % of them have been taught by native speaker for 1-2 years, 17,1 % have been taught for 3-4 years. 61,0 % have been taught for 5 years and over. As for the level of English, 69,5 % of the students are intermediate, 25,7 % are elementary and 4,8 % are advanced students.

### **2.3 Instrument**

In this study, a questionnaire with two parts was comprised to obtain data about the ideas and perceptions of teachers and students about non-native teachers. The first part is about the personal background of the respondents and the second one is about the perceptions including 30 questions.

At the beginning of the study the questionnaire was comprised of 33 questions. A pilot study was done in order to find out if the questionnaire would serve its purpose. After the pilot study 3 questions were excluded and the main questionnaire was formed with 30 questions.

During the preparation of the questionnaire, different questionnaires of different surveys have been examined. The first of these studies is 'Speaking Up! Adult ESL Students' Perceptions of Native and Non-native Teachers' by Julie West Torres (2004); and the second one is the study titled ' How are They Different: A Comparative Study of Native and Nonnative Foreign Language Teaching Assistants' by En-Chong Liaw (2004). However an original questionnaire has been prepared.

The questionnaire comprises 11 factors. Classroom management, motivating students, communication with students, understanding students, serving as a good model, content of the lesson, methods of teaching, language competence and teaching ability, providing more information, body language, student anxiety in the classroom are the factors inquired in those questions. By this way, most of the aspects have been repeated in the questionnaire in order to make the questionnaire more reliable. In the following table, these factors are presented.

**Table 2.3:** Construction of the questionnaire.

| <b>FACTOR NAME</b>                       | <b>QUESTIONS</b> |
|--|------------------|
| Language competence and teaching ability | 1, 6, 29, 30     |
| Content of the lesson                    | 2, 7,8,9         |
| Method of teaching                       | 21               |
| Classroom management                     | 20               |
| Body language                            | 22, 23           |
| Communication with students              | 16, 17, 18       |
| Motivating students                      | 5, 12, 13        |
| Student anxiety in classroom             | 14, 15, 26       |
| Serving as a good model                  | 11,19, 25        |
| Understanding students                   | 4, 10, 24        |
| Providing more information               | 3, 27, 28        |

Teachers answer the questions on a four-point Likert scale: 4 (strongly agree) 3 (agree) 2 (disagree) 1 (strongly disagree). Before the questionnaires were handed out to the participants, a cover sheet which explains the purpose of the study and assures that their responses would be confidential was added. Moreover an open-ended question was added to the questionnaire asking respondents to write their own ideas about non-native teachers of English.

#### **2.4. Reliability of the Questionnaire**

In order to comprise a valid study, the first drafts of the questionnaire were given to the experts from Maltepe University. Experts evaluated the questionnaire in terms of content validity, face validity and clarity of items. Then, the questionnaire was revised and some necessary changes were made. After that process, the questionnaire was piloted to a small group of 20 students. According to their comments and answers, 3 of the questions have been omitted.

**Table: 2.4** Reliability Statistics.

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| 0.84             | 30         |

In addition, to test the reliability of the present questionnaire Cronbach-alpha values were calculated. Cronbach-alpha has been found to be 0,84. Cronbach-alpha value of the questionnaire is in high level of reliability.

## **2.5 Data Collection Procedure**

After having official permission by Ministry of Education in İstanbul, the questionnaires were sent to different high schools during the 2013 spring. Before administering the study, the participants were informed about the questionnaire and the purpose of the study. They were guaranteed that their answers to the questionnaires would be confidential, would contribute to a master's degree study and would not be used for other aims. The teachers were not asked to write their names on the questionnaires but their school names. The teachers were given a week to fill in the questionnaires. At the end of the week, the questionnaires were collected by the researcher from the teachers.

## **2.6 Data Analysis**

The data gathered via questionnaires were analyzed by the SPSS 16.0 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). Strongly disagree was coded as '1', disagree as '2', agree as '3', strongly agree as '4'. Afterwards, the descriptive analysis was used to investigate the demographic characteristics and background information of the subjects.

The aim of the study is to learn about the views of the students and EFL teachers about non-native teachers in private and state schools.



## **CHAPTER 3**

### **RESULTS**

In this chapter, the results related to teachers' and students' perceptions about non-native teachers will be presented and discussed item by item. The findings related to research questions will be given. Analysis of the variables for the perceptions will be presented in the tables. In the second part of the results section, the results of the survey the relation between the teachers' and students' perceptions will be discussed in data analysis part.

#### **3.1 Analysis of the Variables**

The perceptions of teachers and students will be analyzed under eleven factors. These are classroom management, motivating students, communication with students, understanding students, serving as a good model, content of the lesson, methods of teaching, language competence and teaching ability, providing more information, body language, student anxiety in the classroom.

### 3.1.1 Language Competence and Teaching Ability

Language competence and teaching ability comprises four variables. Item 1, 6, 29 and 30 express the perceptions on the language competence and teaching ability of non-native teachers. Table 3.1-3.8 present the frequencies of teachers' and students' answers to the items. Item 1 aims to investigate whether NEST provide learners with more information about language and culture. Item 6 aims to investigate if the teaching of NNEST ensures students understand the lesson more. Item 29 aims to investigate whether NNEST teach productive skills (speaking, writing) better and item 30 investigates if students' achievement in language learning is directly related to their teachers' effectiveness in language teaching.

**Table 3.1:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 1.

| NEST provide learners with more information about language and culture. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| strongly disagree   | 0         | 0       | 0             | 0                  |
| disagree  | 11        | 9.8     | 9.8           | 9.8                |
| agree   | 55        | 49.1    | 49.1          | 58.9               |
| strongly agree  | 46        | 41.1    | 41.1          | 100.0              |
| Total   | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As given in the table when participants were asked if NEST provide students more information about language and the culture, 41,1 % of the teachers marked *strongly agree* choice. 49,1 % of the participants marked agree and 9,8 % of them didn't agree with the idea that NEST provide more information. None of the participants marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.2:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 1.

| NEST provide learners with more information about language and culture. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree   | 0         | 0       | 0             | 0                  |
| disagree  | 3         | 2.9     | 2.9           | 2.9                |
| agree   | 69        | 65.7    | 65.7          | 68.6               |
| strongly agree  | 33        | 31.4    | 31.4          | 100.0              |
| Total   | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

It is seen in the table that just like the teachers none of the students marked strongly disagree choice. 2,9 % of the students disagreed with the position, 65,7 % agree with the idea and 31,4 % of them marked strongly agree choice.

**Table 3.3:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 6.

| The teaching of NNEST ensures students understand the lesson more. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree  | 4         | 3.6     | 3.6           | 3.6                |
| disagree   | 48        | 42.9    | 42.9          | 46.4               |
| agree  | 56        | 50.0    | 50.0          | 96.4               |
| strongly agree   | 4         | 3.6     | 3.6           | 100.0              |
| Total  | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table, 3,6 % of the teachers marked strongly disagree choice about the claim that NNEST ensure students understand the lesson more. 42,9 % of the teachers marked disagree choice and 50,0 % of them marked agree and 3,6 % of them marked strongly agree choice.

**Table 3.4:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 6.

| The teaching of NNEST ensures students understand the lesson more. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid disagree   | 13        | 12.4    | 12.4          | 12.4               |
| agree  | 47        | 44.8    | 44.8          | 57.1               |
| strongly agree   | 45        | 42.9    | 42.9          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As for the students' answers, 12,4 % of the students disagreed the claim. While 44,8 % agreed the claim 42,9 % of them strongly agreed with the idea.

**Table 3.5:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 29.

| NNEST teach productive skills (speaking, writing) better. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions                                     | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree                                   | 8         | 7.1     | 7.1           | 7.1                |
| disagree  | 57        | 50.9    | 50.9          | 58.0               |
| agree   | 26        | 23.2    | 23.2          | 81.2               |
| strongly agree  | 21        | 18.8    | 18.8          | 100.0              |
| Total   | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table teachers' answers to item 29, which claims that NNEST teach productive skills better, distribute in this way: 7,1 % strongly disagree and 50,9 % disagreed. However 23,2 % of them agreed the idea and 18,8 % strongly agreed it.

**Table 3.6:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 29.

| NNEST teach productive skills (speaking, writing) better. |                   |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions                                     |                   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid   | strongly disagree | 9         | 8.6     | 8.6           | 8.6                |
|   | disagree          | 31        | 29.5    | 29.5          | 38.1               |
|   | agree             | 30        | 28.6    | 28.6          | 66.7               |
|   | strongly agree    | 35        | 33.3    | 33.3          | 100.0              |
|   | Total             | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.6, 8,6 % of the students strongly disagree and 29,5 % disagree with the position. 28,6 of the students agreed with the idea while 33,3 of them marked strongly agree choice.

**Table 3.7:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 30.

| Students' achievement in language learning is directly related to their teacher's effectiveness in language teaching. |                   |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions   |                   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid   | strongly disagree | 4         | 3.6     | 3.6           | 3.6                |
|   | disagree          | 20        | 17.9    | 17.9          | 21.4               |
|   | agree             | 42        | 37.5    | 37.5          | 58.9               |
|   | strongly agree    | 46        | 41.1    | 41.1          | 100.0              |
|   | Total             | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table, item 30 claims that students' achievement in language is directly related to their teachers' effectiveness. 3,6 % of the teachers marked strongly disagree choice and 17,9 % of them marked disagree choice. 37,5 of the teachers marked agree choice while 41,1 % marked strongly agree.

**Table 3.8:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 30.

| Students' achievement in language learning is directly related to their teachers' effectiveness in language teaching. |                |           |         |               |                    |
|---|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions   |                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid   | disagree       | 10        | 9.5     | 9.5           | 9.5                |
|   | agree          | 44        | 41.9    | 41.9          | 51.4               |
|   | strongly agree | 51        | 48.6    | 48.6          | 100.0              |
|   | Total          | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.8, none of the students marked strongly disagree choice. 9,5 % of the students disagreed with the idea that students' achievement is directly related to teacher effectiveness and 41,9 % of them marked agree choice. 48,6 % of them marked strongly agree choice.

### 3.1.2. Content of the Lesson

Content of the lesson comprises four variables. Item 2, 7, 8 and 9 express the perceptions of participants on the lesson content of non-native teachers. Table 3.9-3.16 present

the frequencies of teachers' answers and students' answers to the questions. Item 2 aims to investigate whether NNEST go into unnecessary details while teaching. Item 7 aims to investigate if NEST lessons and examinations are mostly based on reading ability. Item 8 and 9 aim to investigate if NNEST mostly teach grammar based lessons and prepare grammar based examinations and if NNEST generally teach formal English while NEST teach daily English.

**Table 3.9:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 2.

| NNEST go into unnecessary details while teaching. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions                             | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree                           | 14        | 12.5    | 12.5          | 12.5               |
| disagree  | 69        | 61.6    | 61.6          | 74.1               |
| agree   | 29        | 25.9    | 25.9          | 100.0              |
| Total   | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.9 25.9 % of the teachers agree with the idea that NNEST go into unnecessary details throughout the teaching process. 61.6 % of the teachers disagree and 12.5 % strongly disagree with the claim. None of the participants marked strongly agree choice.

**Table 3.10:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 2.

| NNEST go into unnecessary details while teaching. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions                             | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree                           | 33        | 31.4    | 31.4          | 31.4               |
| disagree  | 51        | 48.6    | 48.6          | 80.0               |
| agree   | 17        | 16.2    | 16.2          | 96.2               |
| strongly agree                                    | 4         | 3.8     | 3.8           | 100.0              |
| Total   | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table, 3.8 % of the students strongly agreed and 16,2 % of them agreed with the claim that NNEST go into unnecessary details and 48,6 % of them marked disagree, 31,4 % marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.11:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 7.

| NEST lessons and examinations are mostly based on reading ability. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree  | 14        | 12.5    | 12.5          | 12.5               |
| disagree   | 54        | 48.2    | 48.2          | 60.7               |
| agree  | 36        | 32.1    | 32.1          | 92.9               |
| strongly agree   | 8         | 7.1     | 7.1           | 100.0              |
| Total  | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.11 7,1 % of the teachers strongly agree and 32,1 % agree with the claim that NEST lessons and examinations are mostly based on reading ability. However, 48,2 % of the teachers disagree with the idea and 12,5 % marked strongly disagree choice.



**Table 3.12:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 7.

| NEST lessons and examinations are mostly based on reading ability. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree  | 2         | 1.9     | 1.9           | 1.9                |
| disagree   | 28        | 26.7    | 26.7          | 28.6               |
| agree  | 54        | 51.4    | 51.4          | 80.0               |
| strongly agree   | 21        | 20.0    | 20.0          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.12, 20 % of the students strongly agree and 51,4 % of them agree with the claim that NEST lessons and exams are mostly based on reading ability. However, 26,7 % disagree and 1,9 % strongly disagree with the idea.

**Table 3.13:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 8.

| NNEST mostly teach grammar based lessons and prepare grammar based examinations. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid disagree   | 27        | 24.1    | 24.1          | 24.1               |
| agree  | 66        | 58.9    | 58.9          | 83.0               |
| strongly agree   | 19        | 17.0    | 17.0          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table, item 8 claims that NNEST mostly teach grammar based lessons and prepare grammar based examinations. None of the participants marked strongly disagree and 24,1 % marked disagree choice. However 58,9 % of them marked agree and 17 % marked strongly agree choice. None of the participants marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.14:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 8.

| NNEST mostly teach grammar based lessons and prepare grammar based examinations. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid disagree   | 10        | 9.5     | 9.5           | 9.5                |
| agree  | 66        | 62.9    | 62.9          | 72.4               |
| strongly agree   | 29        | 27.6    | 27.6          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As for the students' answers to item 8, 27,6 of the students strongly agree and 62,9 % agree that NNEST mostly teach grammar based lessons and prepare grammar based examinations. 9,5 % of the students disagree the claim. None of the students marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.15:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 9.

| NNEST generally teach formal English while NEST teach daily English. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree  | 11        | 9.8     | 9.8           | 9.8                |
| disagree   | 10        | 8.9     | 8.9           | 18.8               |
| agree  | 57        | 50.9    | 50.9          | 69.6               |
| strongly agree   | 34        | 30.4    | 30.4          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

According to item 9 NNEST generally teach formal English while NEST teach daily English. 30,4 % of the teachers marked strongly agree and 50,9 % marked agree choice. However, 8,9 % marked disagree choice while 9,8 % of them marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.16:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 9.

| NNEST generally teach formal English while NEST teach daily English. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree  | 5         | 4.8     | 4.8           | 4.8                |
| disagree   | 16        | 15.2    | 15.2          | 20.0               |
| agree  | 44        | 41.9    | 41.9          | 61.9               |
| strongly agree   | 40        | 38.1    | 38.1          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.15, 38,1 % of the students strongly agree, 41,9 % agree with the position stated in item 9. 15,2 % disagree and 4,8 % strongly disagree with the idea.

### 3.1.3. Method of Teaching

Method of teaching comprises one variable. Item 21 express the perceptions of participants on the teaching methods of non-native teachers. Table 3.17 and 3.18 present the frequencies of teachers' answers and students' answers to the item.

**Table 3.17:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 21.

| NNEST follow textbooks more than NEST do. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions                     | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid disagree                            | 30        | 26.8    | 26.8          | 26.8               |
| agree                                     | 51        | 45.5    | 45.5          | 72.3               |
| strongly agree                            | 31        | 27.7    | 27.7          | 100.0              |
| Total                                     | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table, item 21 is about the NNEST's using of textbooks. 27,7 % of the teachers strongly agree and 45,5 % agree with the idea that NNEST follow textbooks more than NEST do. However, 26,8 % of the teachers disagree with the claim. None of the teachers marked strongly disagree with the claim.

**Table 3.18:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 21.

| NNEST follow textbooks more than NEST do. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions                     | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree                   | 7         | 6.7     | 6.7           | 6.7                |
| disagree                                  | 21        | 20.0    | 20.0          | 26.7               |
| agree                                     | 45        | 42.9    | 42.9          | 69.5               |
| strongly agree                            | 32        | 30.5    | 30.5          | 100.0              |
| Total                                     | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As for the students, 30,5 % of the the participants strongly agree and 42,9 % agree with the statement. But 20 % of the participants marked disagree and 6,7 % marked strongly disagree choice.

#### **3.1.4. Classroom Management**

Classroom management comprises one variable. Item 20 aims to investigate the perceptions of participants on classroom management of non-native teachers. Table 3.19 and 3.20 present the frequencies of teachers' answers and students' answers to the questions.

**Table 3.19:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 20.

| NNEST manage the class better. |           |         |               |                    |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions          | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree        | 14        | 12.5    | 12.5          | 12.5               |
| disagree                       | 42        | 37.5    | 37.5          | 50.0               |
| agree                          | 42        | 37.5    | 37.5          | 87.5               |
| strongly agree                 | 14        | 12.5    | 12.5          | 100.0              |
| Total                          | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Item 20 propose that NNEST manage the class better. 12,5 % of the teachers strongly agree and 37,5 % agree with the claim. However, 37,5 % of the participants disagree and 12,5 % strongly disagree with the claim.

**Table 3.20:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 20.

| NNEST manage the class better. |           |         |               |                    |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions          | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree        | 18        | 17.1    | 17.1          | 17.1               |
| disagree                       | 23        | 21.9    | 21.9          | 39.0               |
| agree                          | 28        | 26.7    | 26.7          | 65.7               |
| strongly agree                 | 36        | 34.3    | 34.3          | 100.0              |
| Total                          | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.20, 34,3 % of the students strongly agree and 26,7 % agree with the claim that NNEST manage the class better. However, 21,9 % marked disagree and 17,1 % marked strongly disagree choice.

### 3.1.5. Body Language

Body language comprises two variables. Items 22, 23 aim to investigate the perceptions of participants on body language of non-native teachers. Table 3.21-3.24 present the frequencies of teachers' and students' answers to the questions. Item 22 aims to investigate whether NEST tend to use their body language more so that students can understand better what they say. And item 23 aims to investigate if NNEST tend to use body language more sparingly compared to NEST.

**Table 3.21:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 22.

| NEST tend to use their body language more so that students can understand better what they say. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree   | 4         | 3.6     | 3.6           | 3.6                |
| disagree  | 30        | 26.8    | 26.8          | 30.4               |
| agree   | 54        | 48.2    | 48.2          | 78.6               |
| strongly agree  | 24        | 21.4    | 21.4          | 100.0              |
| Total   | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table, 21,4 % of the teachers strongly agree and 48,2 % agree with that NEST tend to use their body language more so that students can understand better what they say. But 26,8 % of the participants disagree and 3,6 % strongly disagree with the claim.

**Table 3.22:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 22.

| NEST tend to use their body language more so that students can understand better what they say. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid disagree  | 23        | 21.9    | 21.9          | 21.9               |
| agree   | 49        | 46.7    | 46.7          | 68.6               |
| strongly agree  | 33        | 31.4    | 31.4          | 100.0              |
| Total   | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As for the students' perception about the body language of non-native teachers, 31,4 % of them marked strongly agree 46,7 % marked agree choice. 21,9 % of the participants marked disagree choice while none of them marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.23:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 23.

| NNEST tend to use body language more sparingly compared to NEST. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree  | 8         | 7.1     | 7.1           | 7.1                |
| disagree   | 43        | 38.4    | 38.4          | 45.5               |
| agree  | 47        | 42.0    | 42.0          | 87.5               |
| strongly agree   | 14        | 12.5    | 12.5          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in table 3.23, 12,5 % of the teachers strongly agree and 42 % agree with the claim that NNEST tend to use body language more sparingly compared to NEST. 38,4 % of the participants disagree and 7,1 % strongly disagree with the claim.

**Table 3.24:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 23.

| NNEST tend to use body language more sparingly compared to NEST. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree  | 10        | 9.5     | 9.5           | 9.5                |
| disagree   | 28        | 26.7    | 26.7          | 36.2               |
| agree  | 39        | 37.1    | 37.1          | 73.3               |
| strongly agree   | 28        | 26.7    | 26.7          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.24, 26,7 % of the students strongly agree and 37,1 agree with the claim that NNEST tend to use body language more sparingly compared to NEST. 26,7 % disagree and 9,5 % strongly disagree with the term.

### 3.1.6. Communication with Students

Communication with students comprises three variables. Items 16, 17, 18 aim to investigate the perceptions of participants on communication of non-native teachers with the students. Table 3.25-3.30 present the frequencies of teachers' and students' answers to the questions. Item 16 aims to investigate whether students can express their thoughts to NNEST better. Item 17 aims to investigate if students often fall in desperate situations because they do not understand what their NEST say as he/she speaks English. And item 18 aims to investigate if students cannot establish a good communication with NEST as their English is limited.



**Table 3.25:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 16.

| Students can express their thoughts to NNEST better. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions                                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree                              | 4         | 3.6     | 3.6           | 3.6                |
| disagree   | 36        | 32.1    | 32.1          | 35.7               |
| agree  | 62        | 55.4    | 55.4          | 91.1               |
| strongly agree                                       | 10        | 8.9     | 8.9           | 100.0              |
| Total  | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.25, 8,9 % of the teachers strongly agree and 55,4 % agree with the claim that students can express their thoughts to NNEST better. 32,1 % of the participants marked disagree choice and 3,6 % marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.26:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 16.

| Students can express their thoughts to NNEST better. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions                                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree                              | 8         | 7.6     | 7.6           | 7.6                |
| disagree   | 36        | 34.3    | 34.3          | 41.9               |
| agree  | 28        | 26.7    | 26.7          | 68.6               |
| strongly agree                                       | 33        | 31.4    | 31.4          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As for the students, 31,4 % of the students strongly agree and 26,7 % of them agree with the claim. However, 34,3 % of them marked disagree and 7,6 % marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.27:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 17.

| Students often fall in desperate situation because they do not understand what their NEST say as he/she speaks English. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree   | 15        | 13.4    | 13.4          | 13.4               |
| disagree  | 37        | 33.0    | 33.0          | 46.4               |
| agree   | 49        | 43.8    | 43.8          | 90.2               |
| strongly agree  | 11        | 9.8     | 9.8           | 100.0              |
| Total   | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.27 9,8 % of the teachers strongly agree and 43,8 % agree with the term that students often fall in desperate situation because they do not understand what their NEST say as he/she speaks English. 33 % of them marked disagree and 13,4 % marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.28:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 17.

| Students often fall in desperate situation because they do not understand what their NEST say as he/she speaks English. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree   | 24        | 22.9    | 22.9          | 22.9               |
| disagree  | 54        | 51.4    | 51.4          | 74.3               |
| agree   | 16        | 15.2    | 15.2          | 89.5               |
| strongly agree  | 11        | 10.5    | 10.5          | 100.0              |
| Total   | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.28, 10,5 % of the students strongly agree and 15,2 % agree with the term. 51,4 % of the participants disagree and 22,9 % strongly disagree with the term.

**Table 3.29:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 18.

| Students cannot establish a good communication with NEST as their English is limited. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree   | 6         | 5.4     | 5.4           | 5.4                |
| disagree  | 58        | 51.8    | 51.8          | 57.1               |
| agree   | 44        | 39.3    | 39.3          | 96.4               |
| strongly agree  | 4         | 3.6     | 3.6           | 100.0              |
| Total   | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.29, 3,6 % of the teachers strongly agree and 39,3 % agree with the claim that students cannot establish a good communication with NEST as their English is limited. 51,8 % of the teachers disagree and 5,4 % strongly disagree with the term.

**Table 3.30:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 18.

| Students cannot establish a good communication with NEST as their English is limited. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree   | 28        | 26.7    | 26.7          | 26.7               |
| disagree  | 40        | 38.1    | 38.1          | 64.8               |
| agree   | 29        | 27.6    | 27.6          | 92.4               |
| strongly agree  | 8         | 7.6     | 7.6           | 100.0              |
| Total   | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.30, 7,6 % of the students strongly disagree and 27,6 % agree with the claim. However, 38,1 % and 26,7 % of them strongly disagree with the term.

### 3.1.7. Motivating Students

Motivating students comprises three variables. Items 5, 12, 13 aim to investigate the perceptions of participants on non-native teachers' motivating role. Table 3.31-3.36 present the frequencies of teachers' and students' answers to the questions. Item 5 aims to investigate whether the teaching of NEST ensures students enjoy the lesson more. Item 12 aims to investigate if NEST motivate the students to learn English more than NNEST. And item 13 aims to investigate if students study to learn rather than take high mark in NEST' classes.

**Table 3.31:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 5.

| The teaching of NEST ensures students enjoy the lesson more. |                   |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions  |                   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid  | strongly disagree | 4         | 3.6     | 3.6           | 3.6                |
|  | disagree          | 54        | 48.2    | 48.2          | 51.8               |
|  | agree             | 39        | 34.8    | 34.8          | 86.6               |
|  | strongly agree    | 15        | 13.4    | 13.4          | 100.0              |
|  | Total             | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.31, 13,4 % of the teachers strongly agree and 34,8 % agree with the position that the teaching of NEST ensures students enjoy the lesson more. 48,2 % disagree and 3,6 % strongly disagree with the term.

**Table 3.32:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 5.

| The teaching of NEST ensures students enjoy the lesson more. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree                                      | 2         | 1.9     | 1.9           | 1.9                |
| disagree   | 32        | 30.5    | 30.5          | 32.4               |
| agree  | 52        | 49.5    | 49.5          | 81.9               |
| strongly agree   | 19        | 18.1    | 18.1          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As for the students, as seen in the table 3.32, 18,1 % strongly agree and 49,5 % agree with the claim. However, 30,5 % disagree and 1,9 % strongly disagree with the term.

**Table 3.33:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 12.

| NEST motivate the students to learn English more than NNEST. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid disagree   | 51        | 45.5    | 45.5          | 45.5               |
| agree  | 44        | 39.3    | 39.3          | 84.8               |
| strongly agree   | 17        | 15.2    | 15.2          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.33, 15,2 % of the teacher participants strongly agree and 39.3 % agree with the claim that NEST motivate the students to learn English more than NNEST. 45,5 % of the participants disagree and none of the teachers marked strongly disagree the choice.

**Table 3.34:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 12.

| NEST motivate the students to learn English more than NNEST. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree                                      | 2         | 1.9     | 1.9           | 1.9                |
| disagree   | 25        | 23.8    | 23.8          | 25.7               |
| agree  | 46        | 43.8    | 43.8          | 69.5               |
| strongly agree   | 32        | 30.5    | 30.5          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As for the students, 30,5 % of the students strongly agree and 43,8 % agree with the claim. 23,8 % of the students disagree and 1,9 % strongly disagree with the term.

**Table 3.35:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 13.

| Students study to learn rather than take high mark in NEST classes. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid disagree  | 41        | 36.6    | 36.6          | 36.6               |
| agree   | 51        | 45.5    | 45.5          | 82.1               |
| strongly agree  | 20        | 17.9    | 17.9          | 100.0              |
| Total   | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in table 3.35, 17,9 % of the teachers strongly agree and 45,5 % agree with the claim that students study to learn rather than take high mark in NEST' classes. 36,6 % marked disagree choice and none of the teachers marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.36:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 13.

| Students study to learn rather than take high mark in NEST classes. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree   | 2         | 1.9     | 1.9           | 1.9                |
| disagree  | 25        | 23.8    | 23.8          | 25.7               |
| agree   | 52        | 49.5    | 49.5          | 75.2               |
| strongly agree  | 26        | 24.8    | 24.8          | 100.0              |
| Total   | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.36, 24,8 of the students marked strongly agree and 49,5 % marked agree choice. However, 23,8 % of the participants marked disagree and 1,9 % marked strongly disagree choice.

### 3.1.8. Student Anxiety in Classroom

Student anxiety in the classroom comprises three variables. Items 14, 15, 26 aim to investigate the perceptions of participants on student anxiety in non-native teachers' class. Table 3.37-3.42 present the frequencies of teachers' and students' answers to the questions. Item 14 aims to investigate whether students have anxiety of mark in NNESTs class. Item 15 aims to investigate if students have any anxiety of making mistakes in NNESTs classes. And item 26 aims to investigate if NEST present a cheerful and relaxed atmosphere related to NNEST.

**Table 3.37:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 14.

| Students have anxiety of mark in NNEST class. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions                         | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree                       | 4         | 3.6     | 3.6           | 3.6                |
| disagree                                      | 23        | 20.5    | 20.5          | 24.1               |
| agree   | 57        | 50.9    | 50.9          | 75.0               |
| strongly agree                                | 28        | 25.0    | 25.0          | 100.0              |
| Total   | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.37, 25 % of the students strongly agree and 50,9 % agree with the claim that students have anxiety of mark in NNEST class. But, 20,5 % of the teachers disagree and 3,6 % strongly disagree with the term.

**Table 3.38:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 14.

| Students have anxiety of mark in NNESTs class. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions                          | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree                        | 14        | 13.3    | 13.3          | 13.3               |
| disagree                                       | 36        | 34.3    | 34.3          | 47.6               |
| agree  | 29        | 27.6    | 27.6          | 75.2               |
| strongly agree                                 | 26        | 24.8    | 24.8          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.38, 24,8 % of the students marked strongly agree and 27,6 % marked agree choice. 34,3 % of them disagree and 13,3 % strongly disagree with the term.



**Table 3.39:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 15.

| Students do not have any anxiety of making mistakes in NNESTs classes. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree  | 7         | 6.2     | 6.2           | 6.2                |
| disagree   | 62        | 55.4    | 55.4          | 61.6               |
| agree  | 32        | 28.6    | 28.6          | 90.2               |
| strongly agree   | 11        | 9.8     | 9.8           | 100.0              |
| Total  | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.39, 9,8 % of the teachers marked strongly agree and 28,6 % marked agree choice to the item students do not have any anxiety of making mistakes in NNEST classes. However, 55,4 % of the participants marked disagree and 6,2 % marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.40:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 15.

| Students do not have any anxiety of making mistakes in NNESTs classes. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree  | 17        | 16.2    | 16.2          | 16.2               |
| disagree   | 34        | 32.4    | 32.4          | 48.6               |
| agree  | 32        | 30.5    | 30.5          | 79.0               |
| strongly agree   | 22        | 21.0    | 21.0          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table, item 15 claims that students do not have any anxiety of making mistakes in NNESTs classes. 16,2 % of the participants marked strongly disagree and 32,4 %

marked disagree choice. However 30,5 % of them marked agree and 21 % marked strongly agree choice.

**Table 3.41:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 26.

| NEST present a cheerful and relaxed atmosphere related to NNEST. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree  | 3         | 2.7     | 2.7           | 2.7                |
| disagree   | 45        | 40.2    | 40.2          | 42.9               |
| agree  | 48        | 42.9    | 42.9          | 85.7               |
| strongly agree   | 16        | 14.3    | 14.3          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.41, 14,3 % of the teachers strongly agree and 42,9 % agree with the term that NEST present a cheerful and relaxed atmosphere related to NNEST. 40,2 % of them marked disagree and 2,7 % marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.42:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 26.

| NEST present a cheerful and relaxed atmosphere related to NNEST. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree  | 5         | 4.8     | 4.8           | 4.8                |
| disagree   | 18        | 17.1    | 17.1          | 21.9               |
| agree  | 43        | 41.0    | 41.0          | 62.9               |
| strongly agree   | 39        | 37.1    | 37.1          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As for the students' answers to item 26, 37,1 % of the students strongly agree and 41 % agree that NEST present a cheerful and relaxed atmosphere related to NNEST. 17,1 % of the students disagree the claim. 4,8 % of the students marked strongly disagree choice.

### 3.1.9 Serving as a Good Model

Serving as a good model comprises three items. Items 11, 19, 25 aim to investigate the perceptions of participants on non-native teachers' serving as a good model in class. Table 3.43-3.48 present the frequencies of teachers' and students' answers to the questions. Item 11 aims to investigate whether a NNEST is a good example of how to learn English. Item 19 aims to investigate if NNEST can be a good guide for foreign language learners of English. And item 25 aims to investigate if NEST are better role models for their students than NNEST.

**Table 3.43:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 11.

| A NNEST is a good example of how to learn English. |                |           |         |               |                    |
|--|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions                              |                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid  | disagree       | 14        | 12.5    | 12.5          | 12.5               |
|  | agree          | 74        | 66.1    | 66.1          | 78.6               |
|  | strongly agree | 24        | 21.4    | 21.4          | 100.0              |
|  | Total          | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table, item 11 claims that a NNEST is a good example of how to learn English. None of the participants marked strongly disagree and 12,5 % marked disagree choice. However 66,1 % of them marked agree and 21,4 % marked strongly agree choice.

**Table 3.44:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 11.

| A NNEST is a good example of how to learn English. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions                              | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree                            | 2         | 1.9     | 1.9           | 1.9                |
| disagree   | 13        | 12.4    | 12.4          | 14.3               |
| agree  | 40        | 38.1    | 38.1          | 52.4               |
| strongly agree                                     | 50        | 47.6    | 47.6          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As for the students' answers to item 11, 47,6 % of the students strongly agree and 38,1% agree that a NNEST is a good example of how to learn English.12,4 % of the students disagree the claim. 1,9 % of the students marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.45:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 19.

| NNEST can be a good guide for students as a learner of English as a foreign language. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid disagree  | 22        | 19.6    | 19.6          | 19.6               |
| agree   | 71        | 63.4    | 63.4          | 83.0               |
| strongly agree  | 19        | 17.0    | 17.0          | 100.0              |
| Total   | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table, item 19 claims that NNEST can be a good guide for students as a learner of English as a foreign language. None of the participants marked strongly disagree and 19,6 % marked disagree choice. However 63,4 % of them marked agree and 17 % marked strongly agree choice.

**Table 3.46:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 19.

| NNEST can be a good guide for students as a learner of English as a foreign language. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree   | 2         | 1.9     | 1.9           | 1.9                |
| disagree  | 6         | 5.7     | 5.7           | 7.6                |
| agree   | 52        | 49.5    | 49.5          | 57.1               |
| strongly agree  | 45        | 42.9    | 42.9          | 100.0              |
| Total   | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.46, 42,9 % of the students marked strongly agree and 49,5 % marked agree choice. However, 5,7 % of the students marked disagree and 1,9 % marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.47:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 25.

| NEST are better role models for their students than NNEST. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions                                      | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree                                    | 3         | 2.7     | 2.7           | 2.7                |
| disagree   | 51        | 45.5    | 45.5          | 48.2               |
| agree  | 36        | 32.1    | 32.1          | 80.4               |
| strongly agree   | 22        | 19.6    | 19.6          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.47, 19,6 % marked strongly agree and 32,1 % marked agree choice while 45,5 % marked disagree and 2,7 % marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.48:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 25.

| NEST are better role models for their students than NNEST. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions                                      | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree                                    | 2         | 1.9     | 1.9           | 1.9                |
| disagree   | 23        | 21.9    | 21.9          | 23.8               |
| agree  | 45        | 42.9    | 42.9          | 66.7               |
| strongly agree   | 35        | 33.3    | 33.3          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As for the students' thoughts in table 3.48, 33,3 % of the students marked strongly agree and 42,9 % marked agree choice. 21,9 % of the participants marked disagree and 1,9 % marked strongly disagree choice.

### 3.1.10. Understanding Students

Understanding students comprises three variables. Items 4, 10, 24 aim to investigate the perceptions of participants on non-native teachers' understanding students. Table 3.49-3.54 present the frequencies of teachers' and students' answers to the questions. Item 4 aims to investigate whether NEST don't have the chance to make comparison between two languages and they can't understand students' problems about language. Item 10 aims to investigate if NNEST are more likely to be understanding when students make mistake. And item 24 aims to investigate if NNEST can be more understanding of the needs of their learners than NEST.

**Table 3.49:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 4.

| NEST don't have the chance to make comparison between two languages and they can't understand students' problems about language. |                   |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions  |                   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid  | strongly disagree | 3         | 2.7     | 2.7           | 2.7                |
|  | disagree          | 41        | 36.6    | 36.6          | 39.3               |
|  | agree             | 42        | 37.5    | 37.5          | 76.8               |
|  | strongly agree    | 26        | 23.2    | 23.2          | 100.0              |
|  | Total             | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table, item 4 claims that NEST don't have the chance to make comparison between two languages and they can't understand students' problems about language. 2,7 % of the participants marked strongly disagree and 36,6 % marked disagree choice. However 37,5 % of them marked agree and 23,2 % marked strongly agree choice.

**Table 3.50:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 4.

| NEST don't have the chance to make comparison between two languages and they can't understand students' problems about language. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree  | 14        | 13.3    | 13.3          | 13.3               |
| disagree   | 47        | 44.8    | 44.8          | 58.1               |
| agree  | 35        | 33.3    | 33.3          | 91.4               |
| strongly agree   | 9         | 8.6     | 8.6           | 100.0              |
| Total  | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As for the students' thoughts in table 3.50, 8,6 % of the students marked strongly agree and 33,3 % marked agree choice. 44,8 % of the participants marked disagree and 13,3 % marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.51:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 10.

| NNEST are more likely to be understanding when students make mistake. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree   | 6         | 5.4     | 5.4           | 5.4                |
| disagree  | 11        | 9.8     | 9.8           | 15.2               |
| agree   | 56        | 50.0    | 50.0          | 65.2               |
| strongly agree  | 39        | 34.8    | 34.8          | 100.0              |
| Total   | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table, item 10 claims that NNEST are more likely to be understanding when students make mistake. 5,4 % of the participants marked strongly disagree and 9,8 %



marked disagree choice. However 50 % of them marked agree and 34,8 % marked strongly agree choice.

**Table 3.52:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 10.

| NNEST are more likely to be understanding when students make mistake. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree   | 4         | 3.8     | 3.8           | 3.8                |
| disagree  | 19        | 18.1    | 18.1          | 21.9               |
| agree   | 39        | 37.1    | 37.1          | 59.0               |
| strongly agree  | 43        | 41.0    | 41.0          | 100.0              |
| Total   | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.52, 41 % of the students marked strongly agree and 37,1 % marked agree while 21,9 % marked disagree and 3,8 % marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.53:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 24.

| NNEST can be more understanding of the needs of their learners than NEST. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree   | 3         | 2.7     | 2.7           | 2.7                |
| disagree  | 26        | 23.2    | 23.2          | 25.9               |
| agree   | 64        | 57.1    | 57.1          | 83.0               |
| strongly agree  | 19        | 17.0    | 17.0          | 100.0              |
| Total   | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table, item 24 claims that NNEST can be more understanding of the needs of their learners than NEST. 2,7 % of the participants marked strongly disagree and 23,2 %

marked disagree choice. However 57,1 % of them marked agree and 17 % marked strongly agree choice.

**Table 3.54:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 24.

| NNEST can be more understanding of the needs of their learners than NEST. |           |         |               |                    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree   | 6         | 5.7     | 5.7           | 5.7                |
| disagree  | 16        | 15.2    | 15.2          | 21.0               |
| agree   | 45        | 42.9    | 42.9          | 63.8               |
| strongly agree  | 38        | 36.2    | 36.2          | 100.0              |
| Total   | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.54, 36,2 % of the students marked strongly agree and 42,9 % marked agree while 15,2 % marked disagree and 5,7 % marked strongly disagree choice.

### 3.1.11. Providing More Information

Providing students with more information comprises three variables. Items 3, 27, 28 aim to investigate the perceptions of participants on non-native teachers' serving as a good model in class. Table 3.55-3.60 present the frequencies of teachers' and students' answers to the questions. Item 3 aims to investigate whether NNEST present the lesson better as they make comparison between English and Turkish which has a positive effect. Item 27 aims to investigate if it is difficult for NNEST to explain to students how and why certain expressions are used in

certain contexts. And item 28 aims to investigate if NNEST can use students' own cultural background to facilitate their understanding of culture, people and society of the target language.

**Table 3.55:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 3.

| NNEST present the lesson better as they make comparison between English and Turkish which has a positive effect. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree  | 3         | 2.7     | 2.7           | 2.7                |
| disagree   | 25        | 22.3    | 22.3          | 25.0               |
| agree  | 51        | 45.5    | 45.5          | 70.5               |
| strongly agree   | 33        | 29.5    | 29.5          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table, item 3 claims that NNEST present the lesson better as they make comparison between English and Turkish which has a positive effect. 2,7 % of the participants marked strongly disagree and 22,3 % marked disagree choice. However 45,5 % of them marked agree and 29,5 % marked strongly agree choice.

**Table 3.56:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 3.

| NNEST present the lesson better as they make comparison between English and Turkish which has a positive effect. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid disagree   | 19        | 18.1    | 18.1          | 18.1               |
| agree  | 52        | 49.5    | 49.5          | 67.6               |
| strongly agree   | 34        | 32.4    | 32.4          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3.56, 32,4 % of the students marked strongly agree and 49,5 % marked agree while 18,1 % marked disagree. None of the students marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.57:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 27.

| It is difficult for NNEST to explain to students how and why certain expressions are used in certain contexts. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid disagree   | 19        | 17.0    | 17.0          | 17.0               |
| agree  | 86        | 76.8    | 76.8          | 93.8               |
| strongly agree   | 7         | 6.2     | 6.2           | 100.0              |
| Total  | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table, item 3 claims that NNEST present the lesson better as they make comparison between English and Turkish which has a positive effect. 2,7 % of the participants marked strongly disagree and 22,3 % marked disagree choice. However 45,5 % of them marked agree and 29,5 % marked strongly agree choice.

**Table 3.58:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 27.

| It is difficult for NNEST to explain to students how and why certain expressions are used in certain contexts. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree  | 20        | 19.0    | 19.0          | 19.0               |
| disagree   | 34        | 32.4    | 32.4          | 51.4               |
| agree  | 23        | 21.9    | 21.9          | 73.3               |
| strongly agree   | 28        | 26.7    | 26.7          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As for the students' answers to item 27, 26,7 % of the students marked strongly agree, 21,9 % marked agree while 32,4 % marked disagree and 19 % marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.59:** Distribution of the teachers' replies to item 28.

| NNEST can use students' own cultural background to facilitate their understanding of culture, people and society of the target language. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teachers' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid disagree   | 15        | 13.4    | 13.4          | 13.4               |
| agree  | 80        | 71.4    | 71.4          | 84.8               |
| strongly agree   | 17        | 15.2    | 15.2          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 112       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table, item 28 claims that NNEST can use students' own cultural background to facilitate their understanding of culture, people and society of the target language. 13,4 % of the participants marked strongly disagree and 71,4 % marked agree choice. 15,2 % of them marked strongly agree. None of the students marked strongly disagree choice.

**Table 3.60:** Distribution of the students' replies to item 28.

| NNEST can use students' own cultural background to facilitate their understanding of culture, people and society of the target language. |           |         |               |                    |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Students' perceptions  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid strongly disagree  | 7         | 6.7     | 6.7           | 6.7                |
| disagree   | 10        | 9.5     | 9.5           | 16.2               |
| agree  | 55        | 52.4    | 52.4          | 68.6               |
| strongly agree   | 33        | 31.4    | 31.4          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 105       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

As seen in the table 3,60, 31,4 % of the students strongly agree and 52,4 % agree that NNEST can use students' own cultural background to facilitate their understanding of culture, people and society of the target language. 9,5 % of them disagree and 6,7 % strongly disagree.

### **3.1.12 From Students' and Teachers' Perspectives in Which Aspects Are NNEST Inferior or Superior to NEST?**

Students and teachers have different perceptions on the efficacy of English teachers. Table 3.61-3.64 present the means of teachers' and students' answers to the items related to superior and inferior aspects of NNEST. Item 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 28 aim to investigate the superior aspects of NNEST. Item 1, 2, 5, 12, 14, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29 aim to investigate inferior aspects of NNEST compared to NEST.

**Table 3.61:** Descriptive Statistics of Advantages Perceived by Teachers

| Advantages |     |         |         |      |                |
|------------|-----|---------|---------|------|----------------|
| Teachers   | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| item3      | 112 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.01 | 0.79           |
| item4      | 112 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.81 | 0.82           |
| item6      | 112 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.53 | 0.62           |
| item10     | 112 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.14 | 0.80           |
| item11     | 112 | 2.00    | 4.00    | 3.08 | 0.57           |
| item15     | 112 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.41 | 0.75           |
| item16     | 112 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.69 | 0.68           |
| item17     | 112 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.50 | 0.84           |
| item18     | 112 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.41 | 0.65           |
| item19     | 112 | 2.00    | 4.00    | 2.97 | 0.60           |
| item20     | 112 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.50 | 0.86           |
| item24     | 112 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.88 | 0.70           |
| item28     | 112 | 2.00    | 4.00    | 3.01 | 0.53           |

As seen in the table 3.61, teachers' means of the responses about the advantages of non-native teachers range between 2.41 and 3.14 which means they have a positive perceptions on the aspects NNEST are superior to NEST.

The aspects teachers believe that NNEST are superior and the mean values are listed above: NNEST present the lesson better as they make comparison between English and Turkish which has a positive effect (3.01). NNEST have the chance to make comparison between two languages and they can't understand students' problems about language (2.81). The teaching of NNEST ensures students understand the lesson more (2.53). NNEST are more likely to be understanding when students make mistake (3.14). A NNEST is a good example of how to learn English (3.08). Students do not have any anxiety of making mistakes in NNESTs classes (2.41). Students can express their thoughts to NNEST better (2.69). Students often fall in desperate situation because they do not understand what their NEST say as he/she speaks English (2.50). Students cannot establish a good communication with NEST as their English is limited (2.41). NNEST can be a good guide for students as a learner of English as a foreign language (2.97). NNEST manage the class better (2.50). NNEST can be more understanding of the needs of their learners than NEST (2.88). NNEST can use students' own cultural background to facilitate their understanding of culture, people and society of the target language (3.01).



**Table 3.62:** Descriptive Statistics of Advantages Perceived by Students.

| Advantages |     |         |         |      |                |
|------------|-----|---------|---------|------|----------------|
| Students   | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| item3      | 105 | 2.00    | 4.00    | 3.14 | 0.69           |
| item4      | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.37 | 0.82           |
| item6      | 105 | 2.00    | 4.00    | 3.30 | 0.68           |
| item10     | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.15 | 0.85           |
| item11     | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.31 | 0.76           |
| item15     | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.56 | 0.99           |
| item16     | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.81 | 0.96           |
| item17     | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.13 | 0.88           |
| item18     | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.16 | 0.91           |
| item19     | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.33 | 0.67           |
| item20     | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.78 | 1.13           |
| item24     | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.09 | 0.82           |
| item28     | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.08 | 0.82           |

As seen in the table 3.62, the aspects students believe that NNEST are superior are: NNEST present the lesson better as they make comparison between English and Turkish which has a positive effect (3.14). NNEST have the chance to make comparison between two

languages and they can't understand students' problems about language (2.37). The teaching of NNEST ensures students understand the lesson more (3.30). NNEST are more likely to be understanding when students make mistake (3.15). A NNEST is a good example of how to learn English (3.31). Students do not have any anxiety of making mistakes in NNESTs classes (2.56). Students can express their thoughts to NNEST better (2.81). Students often fall in desperate situation because they do not understand what their NEST say as he/she speaks English (2.13). Students cannot establish a good communication with NEST as their English is limited (2.16). NNEST can be a good guide for students as a learner of English as a foreign language (3.33). NNEST manage the class better (2.78). NNEST can be more understanding of the needs of their learners than NEST (3.09). NNEST can use students' own cultural background to facilitate their understanding of culture, people and society of the target language (3.08).

**Table 3.63:** Descriptive Statistics of Disadvantages Perceived by Teachers.

| Disadvantages      |     |         |         |      |                |
|--------------------|-----|---------|---------|------|----------------|
| Teachers           | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| item1              | 112 | 2.00    | 4.00    | 3.31 | 0.64           |
| item2              | 112 | 1.00    | 3.00    | 2.13 | 0.60           |
| item5              | 112 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.58 | 0.76           |
| item12             | 112 | 2.00    | 4.00    | 2.69 | 0.72           |
| item14             | 112 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.97 | 0.77           |
| item22             | 112 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.87 | 0.78           |
| item23             | 112 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.59 | 0.79           |
| item25             | 112 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.68 | 0.81           |
| item26             | 112 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.68 | 0.74           |
| item27             | 112 | 2.00    | 4.00    | 2.89 | 0.47           |
| item29             | 112 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.53 | 0.87           |
| Valid N (listwise) | 112 |         |         |      |                |

Teachers agree that NNEST also have some disadvantages compared to NEST. Those aspects will be listed with the means values of the teachers' responses to related items:

According to table 3.63, NEST supply learners with more information about language and culture (3.31). NNEST go into unnecessary details while teaching (2.13). The teaching of

NEST ensures students enjoy the lesson more (2.58). NEST motivate the students to learn English more than NNEST (2.69). Students have anxiety of mark in NNESTs class (2.97). NEST tend to use their body language more so that students can understand better what they say (2.87). NNEST tend to use body language more sparingly compared to NEST (2.59). NEST are better role models for their students than NNEST (2.68). NEST present a cheerful and relaxed atmosphere related to NNEST (2.68). It is difficult for NNEST to explain to students how and why certain expressions are used in certain contexts (2.89). NNEST teach productive skills (speaking, writing) better (2.53).

**Table 3.64:** Descriptive Statistics of Disadvantages Perceived by Students.

| Disadvantages      |     |         |         |        |                |
|--------------------|-----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Student            | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Std. Deviation |
| item1              | 105 | 2.00    | 4.00    | 3.2857 | .51355         |
| item2              | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 1.9238 | .79294         |
| item5              | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.8381 | .73542         |
| item12             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.0286 | .79005         |
| item14             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.6381 | 1.00119        |
| item22             | 105 | 2.00    | 4.00    | 3.0952 | .72753         |
| item23             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.8095 | .94151         |
| item25             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.0762 | .79294         |
| item26             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.1048 | .85399         |
| item27             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.5619 | 1.08241        |
| item29             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.8667 | .98123         |
| Valid N (listwise) | 105 |         |         |        |                |

In the table 3.64, students' perceptions on the features that non-native teachers are inferior to native teachers can be seen. According to the table, students agree that NEST supply learners with more information about language and culture (3.28). The teaching of NEST ensures students enjoy the lesson more (2.83). NEST motivate the students to learn English more than NNEST (3.02). Students have anxiety of mark in NNESTs class (2.63). NEST tend to use

their body language more so that students can understand better what they say (3.09). NNEST tend to use body language more sparingly compared to NEST (2.80). NEST are better role models for their students than NNEST (3.07). NEST present a cheerful and relaxed atmosphere related to NNEST (3.10). It is difficult for NNEST to explain to students how and why certain expressions are used in certain contexts (2.56). NNEST teach productive skills (speaking, writing) better (2.86). Students do not agree that NNEST go into unnecessary details while teaching (1.92).

### **3.1.13 Is There a Relation between Language Competence and Teaching Ability?**

The correlation between language competence and teaching ability according to the respondents of the study will be stated in this part. In tables 3.65-3.66 the teachers' and students' perceptions on the relation between language competence and teaching ability will be presented.

**Table 3.65:** Correlations between Language Competence and Teaching Ability According to Teachers.

| Teachers' responses |                     | lang.competence | teaching.ability |
|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| lang.competence     | Pearson Correlation | 1               | 0.65             |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     |                 | 0.00             |
|                     | N                   | 112             | 112              |
| teaching.ability    | Pearson Correlation | 0.65            | 1                |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 0.00            |                  |
|                     | N                   | 112             | 112              |

As seen in the table, the pearson correlation is 0.65 which means there is a positive high correlation between language competence and teaching ability according to the teacher respondents.

**Table 3.66:** Correlations between Language Competence and Teaching Ability According to Students.

| Students' responses |                     | lang.competence | teaching.ability |
|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| lang.competence     | Pearson Correlation | 1               | 0.45             |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     |                 | 0.00             |
|                     | N                   | 105             | 105              |
| teaching.ability    | Pearson Correlation | 0.45            | 1                |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 0.00            |                  |
|                     | N                   | 105             | 105              |

As seen in the table, the Pearson correlation is 0.45 which means there is a positive moderate correlation between language competence and teaching ability according to the student respondents.

### 3.1.14 What Are the Effects of Being Taught by NNEST?

This part of the study is directly related to students. The effects of being taught by NNEST will be analyzed by the responses of the students under the titles of factors. Table 3.67-3.71 present the students' negative or positive comments on being provided with more information, being more motivated, feeling more relaxed, being understood, having a good model aspects.

**Table 3.67:** Descriptive Statistics on students' perception on being provided with more information.

|                    | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------|-----|---------|---------|------|----------------|
| item3              | 105 | 2.00    | 4.00    | 3.14 | 0.69           |
| item27             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.56 | 1.08           |
| item28             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.08 | 0.82           |
| Valid N (listwise) | 105 |         |         |      |                |



As seen in the table 3.67, the mean of the students' thoughts on the term NNEST present the lesson better as they make comparison between English and Turkish which has a positive effect is 3.14 which means they strongly agree with the term. The mean of item 2.7, it is difficult for NNEST to explain to students how and why certain expressions are used in certain contexts, is 2.5 which means they accept the term. The mean value of item 28, NNEST can use students' own cultural background to facilitate their understanding of culture, people and society of the target language, is 3.08.

**Table 3.68:** Descriptive Statistics on being more motivated.

|                    | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------|-----|---------|---------|------|----------------|
| item5              | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.83 | 0.73           |
| item12             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.02 | 0.79           |
| item13             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.97 | 0.75           |
| Valid N (listwise) | 105 |         |         |      |                |

As seen in the table 3.68, the mean of the students' thoughts on the term the teaching of NEST ensures students enjoy the lesson more is 2.83 which means they agree with the term. The mean of item 12, NEST motivate the students to learn English more than NNEST, is 3.02 which means they agree with the term. The mean value of item 13, students study to learn rather than take high marks in NEST's classes, is 2.97.

**Table 3.69:** Descriptive Statistics on feeling more relaxed.

|                    | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------|-----|---------|---------|------|----------------|
| item14             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.63 | 1.00           |
| item15             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.56 | 0.99           |
| item26             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.10 | 0.85           |
| Valid N (listwise) | 105 |         |         |      |                |

As seen in the table 3.69, the mean of the students' thoughts on the term students have anxiety of mark in NNESTs class is 2.63 which means they agree with the term. The mean of item 15, students do not have any anxiety of making mistakes in NNESTs classes, is 2.56 which means they agree with the term. The mean value of item 26, NEST present a cheerful and relaxed atmosphere related to NNEST, is 3.10.

**Table 3.70:** Descriptive Statistics on having a good model.

|                    | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------|-----|---------|---------|------|----------------|
| item11             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.31 | 0.76           |
| item19             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.33 | 0.67           |
| item25             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.07 | 0.79           |
| Valid N (listwise) | 105 |         |         |      |                |

As seen in the table 3.70, the mean of the students' thoughts on the term a NNEST is a good example of how to learn English is 3.31 which means they strongly agree with the term. The mean of item 19, NNEST can be a good guide for students as a learner of English as a foreign language, is 3.33 which means they strongly agree with the term. The mean value of item 25, NEST are better role models for their students than NNEST, is 3.07.

**Table 3.71:** Descriptive Statistics on being understood.

|                    | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------|-----|---------|---------|------|----------------|
| item4              | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 2.37 | 0.82           |
| item10             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.15 | 0.85           |
| item24             | 105 | 1.00    | 4.00    | 3.09 | 0.86           |
| Valid N (listwise) | 105 |         |         |      |                |

As seen in the table 3.71, the mean of the students' thoughts on the term NEST don't have the chance to make comparison between two languages and they can't understand students' problems about language is 2.37 which means they agree with the term. The mean of item 10, NNEST are more likely to be understanding when students make mistake, is 3.15 which means they strongly agree with the term. The mean value of item 24, NNEST can be more understanding of the needs of their learners than NEST, is 3.09.

### 3.1.15. Is There a Correlation between Teachers' and Students' Perceptions on NNEST?

The correlation between the students' and teachers' responses will be analyzed under the titles of related factors in this part. Tables 3.72-3.82 present the Pearson correlation values between the two groups' responses item by item.

**Table 3.72:** Correlation of students' and teachers' perspectives on language competence and teaching ability.

|         | Pearson correlation | Sig. (2 tailed) |
|---------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Item1   | 0.06                | 0.50            |
| Item 6  | 0.13                | 0.18            |
| Item 29 | 0.14                | 0.15            |
| Item 30 | 0.19                | 0.04            |

As seen in the table 3.72, the correlation between students' and teachers' responses on item 1 is 0.06, item 6 is 0.13, item 29 is 0.14 which means there no correlation. As for the item 30, the correlation is 0.19 which mean positive low correlation.

**Table 3.73:** Correlation of students' and teachers' perspectives on content of the lesson.

|        | Pearson correlation | Sig. (2 tailed) |
|--------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Item 2 | -0.01               | 0.86            |
| Item 7 | -0.05               | 0.57            |
| Item 8 | 0.06                | 0.51            |
| Item 9 | -0.16               | 0.09            |

As seen in the table 3.73, the correlation between students' and teachers' responses on item 2 is -0.01, item 7 is -0.05 , item 8 is 0.06 , item 9 is -0.16 which means there is no correlation.

**Table 3.74:** Correlation of students' and teachers' perspectives on methods of teaching.

|                |                     | teacher.item21 | student.item21 |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|
| teacher.item21 | Pearson Correlation | 1              | -0.10          |
|                | Sig. (2-tailed)     |                | 0.30           |
|                | N                   | 112            | 105            |
| student.item21 | Pearson Correlation | -0.10          | 1              |
|                | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 0.30           |                |
|                | N                   | 105            | 105            |

As seen in the table 3.74, the correlation between students' and teachers' responses on item 21 is -0.10 which means there is no correlation.

**Table 3.75:** Correlation of students' and teachers' perspectives on classroom management.

|                |                     | teacher.item20 | student.item20 |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|
| teacher.item20 | Pearson Correlation | 1              | -0.04          |
|                | Sig. (2-tailed)     |                | 0.63           |
|                | N                   | 112            | 105            |
| student.item20 | Pearson Correlation | -0.04          | 1              |
|                | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 0.63           |                |
|                | N                   | 105            | 105            |

As seen in the table 3.75, the correlation between students' and teachers' responses on item 20 is -0.04 which means there is no correlation.

**Table 3.76:** Correlation of students' and teachers' perspectives on body language of NNEST.

|         | Pearson correlation | Sig. (2 tailed) |
|---------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Item 22 | 0.07                | 0.47            |
| Item 23 | 0.08                | 0.40            |

As seen in the table 3.76, the correlation between students' and teachers' responses on item 22 is 0.07 which means there is no correlation. The correlation between students' and teachers' responses on item 23 is -0.08 which means there is no correlation.

**Table 3.77:** Correlations of students' and teachers' perspectives on communication with students.

|         | Pearson correlation | Sig. (2 tailed) |
|---------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Item 16 | 0.03                | 0.74            |
| Item 17 | 0.04                | 0.68            |
| Item 18 | -0.06               | 0.52            |

As seen in the table 3.77, the correlation between students' and teachers' responses on item 16 is 0.03, item 17 is -0.04, item 18 is -0.06 which means there no correlation.

**Table 3.78:** Correlations of students' and teachers' perspectives on motivating students.

|         | Pearson correlation | Sig. (2 tailed) |
|---------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Item 5  | -0.09               | 0.34            |
| Item 12 | -0.13               | 0.16            |
| Item 13 | -0.04               | 0.63            |



As seen in the table 3.78, the correlation between students' and teachers' responses on item 5 is -0.09, item 12 is -0.13 and item 13 is -0.04 which means there is no correlation.

**Table 3.79:** Correlations of students' and teachers' perspectives on student anxiety in classroom.

|         | Pearson correlation | Sig. (2 tailed) |
|---------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Item 14 | 0.00                | 0.94            |
| Item 15 | 0.11                | 0.23            |
| Item 26 | 0.02                | 0.81            |

As seen in the table 3.79, the correlation between students' and teachers' responses on item 14 is 0.00, item 15 is 0.11 and item 26 is 0.02 which means there is no correlation.

**Table 3.80:** Correlations of students' and teachers' perspectives on serving as a good model.

|         | Pearson correlation | Sig. (2 tailed) |
|---------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Item 11 | 0.00                | 0.96            |
| Item 19 | 0.13                | 0.16            |
| Item 25 | -0.15               | 0.12            |

As seen in the table 3.80, the correlation between students' and teachers' responses on item 11 is 0.00, item 19 is 0.13 and item 25 is -0.15 which means there is no correlation.

**Table 3.81:** Correlations of students' and teachers' perspectives on understanding students.

|         | Pearson correlation | Sig. (2 tailed) |
|---------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Item 4  | -0.04               | 0.67            |
| Item 10 | 0.00                | 0.99            |
| Item 24 | 0.21                | 0.03            |

As seen in the table 3.81, the correlation between students' and teachers' responses on item 4 is -0.04, item 10 is 0.00 and item 24 is 0.21 which means there is no correlation.

**Table 3.82:** Correlations of students' and teachers' perspectives on providing more information.

|         | Pearson correlation | Sig. (2 tailed) |
|---------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Item 3  | -0.14               | 0.15            |
| Item 27 | 0.0                 | 0.46            |
| Item 28 | -0.07               | 0.46            |

As seen in the table 3.82, the correlation between students' and teachers' responses on item 3 is -0.14, item 27 is 0.07 and item 28 is -0.07 which means there is no correlation.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

The results for each item in the questionnaire were presented in Chapter 3. In this chapter, these results will be analyzed according to research questions. Evaluation of the results on research questions will be compared with the studies stated in the literature review. Suggestions for further studies and limitations of the study will be presented.

#### **4.1 Discussion and Evaluation of the Research Questions**

In the methodology part research questions of this study were presented. In the following part the results will be discussed in relation to each research question.

##### **4.1.1 From Students' and Teachers' Perspectives in Which Aspects Are NNEST Inferior or Superior to NEST?**

The study examines the perceptions of the students and teachers regarding their NEST's and NNEST's performance and competencies, pedagogical, motivational and communicational skills in English teaching. Since NEST and NNEST come from different educational and cultural backgrounds, they are expected to differ in terms of their teaching abilities and other skills. In

the study, it is measured in which aspects are NNEST perceived to be superior or inferior to NEST. The responses of the attendants related those superiority and inferiority will be discusses in this part.

#### **4.1.1.1 Language Competence and Teaching Ability**

Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) surveyed and interviewed non-native speaking TESOL graduate assistants and similar to Reves and Medgyes (1994), more than 2/3 thought that their own language difficulties affected their teaching and 90% perceived a difference between NEST and NNEST. However, while they perceived that both NEST and NNEST have strengths and weaknesses, they did not consider the NEST to be superior teachers. Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) identified the NEST as being informal, fluent, accurate and NNEST as being more efficient, applying differences between the first and second languages, using the first language as a medium of instruction, being aware of negative transfer and psychological aspects of learning,

Similar to the study mentioned according to current study, the respondents perceive differences between NEST and NNEST but teachers do not have a negative self perception. The mean value of aspects NNEST feel themselves superior is a little higher (2.76) than the mean value of teachers' self criticism (2.72). This slight difference doesn't mean that they find themselves superior however, it is obvious that they also do not feel inferior.

Similar to teachers' responses, the mean value of aspect students feel NNEST superior is a little higher (2.86) than the mean value of teachers' inferior sights (2.83). Students have more positive perceptions about NNEST to be superior than NNEST feel themselves.

Seidlhofer (1999) found that a majority of the teachers felt insecure rather than confident being non-native teachers of English. While they see the main advantage of being non-native speakers is that they share their students' L1, their confidence based on the shared language and culture with their students is coupled with a lack of confidence they have about themselves as speakers of English.

According to her study named: '*University students' perceptions of native and non-native teachers*' Evrim Üstünlüoğlu found that non-native teachers fulfill in-class teaching roles better than native teachers do while native teachers fulfill in-class communication skills and present more favorable qualities (2007).

However according to results of the current study most teachers and students believe that NNEST can make a comparison between the two languages which gives the opportunity to present the lesson better. Most of the teacher attendants believe that this opportunity gives the NNEST a chance to create a better teaching atmosphere.

Most of the respondents of the questionnaire believe that the teaching of NNEST ensures students understand the lesson more. However there is a great difference between the teachers and students' responses. While nearly 65 % of the teachers agree with the term 80 % of the students agree that they understand the lesson more with NNEST.

According to study conducted by Cheung (2007), both student and teacher groups saw NEST and NNEST as possessing different strengths. NEST's strengths included: high proficiency in English, ability to use English functionally and awareness of the cultures of English-speaking countries. They stated that NNEST could employ effective strategies in teaching English, understood the difficulties encountered by the students, and were capable of designing teaching materials according to the needs and learning styles of the students. NNEST's perceived strengths included ability to teach grammar.

Lasagabaster and Sierra (2005) also found that the university students preferred NEST in the areas of pronunciation, culture and civilization, listening, vocabulary and speaking, while they showed a preference for NNEST in the areas of grammar and strategies. However, the students did not show any preference for NEST or NNEST in the other areas, namely reading, assessment, attitudes towards English speaking countries and attitudes towards the learning of English.

However, according to the current study grammar is not perceived as the only skill that NNEST teach efficiently. 61 % of the attendants think that NNEST teach productive skills (speaking, writing) better.

Students and teachers have different perceptions on the efficacy of English teachers. Teachers' means of the responses about the advantages of non-native teachers range between 2.41 and 3.14 and the students' responses range between 3.37 and 2.13 which means both groups have positive perceptions on the advantageous aspects of NNEST that they are superior to NEST. The general mean of the teachers' responses is 2.76 and general mean of the students' responses is 2.76 which means students find NNEST more advantageous than teachers do.

Moreover, 88.5 % of the respondents believe that students' achievement in language learning is directly related to their teacher's effectiveness in language teaching.

#### **4.1.1.2 Content of the Lesson**

According to the findings of the study of Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) NEST use conversational English



According to the current study, both teachers and students agree that NNEST give necessary details throughout the lesson and 75 % of the teacher respondents; 89 % of the students respondents state that NNEST mostly teach grammar based lessons and prepare grammar based examinations.

Another finding is that nearly 80 % of the student and teacher respondents state that NNEST generally teach formal English while NEST teach daily English.

#### **4.1.1.3 Method of Teaching**

In their research, Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) reached the result that NNEST were perceived as relying on textbooks, and having exam preparation as the goal of their teaching. They identified the NEST as being informal, fluent, accurate, using different techniques, methods, and approaches, being flexible, using conversational English, and having communication (not exam preparation) as the goals of their teaching.

In a more recent study, Llorca & Huguet (2003) found almost all the primary non-native teachers (97.2%) preferred communicative strategies, while only two-thirds of the secondary teachers did so.

Ahmar Mahboob (2003) conducted a research about the issue under the title 'Status of non-native English teachers as ESL teachers in the USA'. According to his study, the more experience students as an ESL learner earned the most number of positive comments they make about NNEST. Grammar, affect, oral skills, methodology, hard work, vocabulary, culture, ability to answer questions, and literacy skills were the positive comments of students about NNEST teachers. NNEST received negative comments with regard to oral skills and culture.

Similar to the findings of Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) according to the current study, nearly 73 % of the teachers and students state that NNEST carry out textbook oriented lessons.

#### **4.1.1.4 Classroom Management**

According to her study Evrim Üstünlüoğlu found that non-native teachers fulfill in-class management role better than native teachers do (2007).

Similar to her findings, according to the current study, students think that NNEST manage the class better. However, the classroom management is one of the issues NNEST underestimate themselves or feel incompetent about. Although 61 % of the students state that

NNEST can manage the class better, only 49 % of the teachers find NNEST efficient in classroom management.

#### **4.1.1.5 Body Language**

In literature there is no study found about body language of NEST and NNEST. According to respondents of this study, 70 % of the teachers and 80 % of the students think that NEST use their body language more so that students can understand better what they say.

#### **4.1.1.6 Communication with Students**

According to a study of the self-perceptions of NNEST English teachers conducted by Ofra Inbar-Lourie (2001), results of the study indicated that there are differences between NEST and NNEST only in some categories, mainly the superiority of the NEST (as espoused by the NEST themselves), the degree of confidence in teaching specific language areas, and in student-teacher relations.

Not similar to the results stated above, according to the current study, students can express their thoughts to NNEST better. Students often fall in desperate situation because they

do not understand what their NEST say as he/she speaks English. Moreover, respondents state that, students cannot establish a good communication with NEST as their English is limited.

#### **4.1.1.7 Motivating Students**

Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) identified the NEST as providing positive feedback to students which motivates students in a good way.

According to the current study, teachers' do not find NEST classes more enjoyable, only 47 % of the respondents think NEST ensures the students enjoy the lesson more. However, nearly 58 % of the students think that NEST classes are more enjoyable. In terms of motivating students teachers do not show a clear preference for NEST or NNEST but students find NEST more motivating. Moreover 73 % of the students express that the source of motivation is not exam or taking high marks. They express that the motivation is the intention to learn the language in NEST classes.

#### **4.1.1.8 Student Anxiety in the Classroom**

According to the current study, both teachers and students agree that students do not have any anxiety of making mistakes in NNEST classes. However, they state that they have the

anxiety to take high marks in NNEST classes. 78 % of the students think that NEST present a more cheerful atmosphere compared to NNEST. Teachers do not exactly agree with students. Only 56 % state that NEST present a more cheerful atmosphere.

#### **4.1.1.9 Serving as a Good Model**

Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) did not find a negative self-image of NNEST in the U.S., nor did Mahboob, Uhrig, Newman, & Hartford (2002). However according to the results of this study NNEST have a more negative self image than students express about them. They find themselves inferior to the NEST in some certain aspects such as being a good example for the students and being an efficient guide for the students.

However, according to the current study, both teachers and students have a positive perception on NNEST can be a good guide for students as a learner of English as a foreign language. 80 % of the teachers and 91 % of the students state that NNEST can be a good guide for students as a learner of English as a foreign language.

The other aspect about serving a good model is NNEST's being good guide as a learner of English as a foreign language. 80 % of the teachers and 91 % of the students favor the term.

Moreover, the other aspect both teachers and students agree is that a NNEST is a good example of how to learn English. Although nearly 60 % of the teachers agree with the term, nearly 82,5 % of the students believe that NNEST are better examples to follow behind.

#### **4.1.1.10 Understanding Students**

According to the study of Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) the NNEST were perceived as being sensitive to the needs of students NNEST can be more understanding of the needs of their learners than NEST.

Cheung and Braine (2007) investigated the attitudes of students towards their NNEST. The respondents stated that understood the difficulties encountered by the students.

According to the current study, teachers and students agree that NNEST are more likely to be understanding the reason when students make mistake. Moreover, respondents state that NEST don't have the chance to make comparison between two languages and they can't understand students' problems about language. And NNEST can use students' own cultural background to facilitate their understanding of culture, people and society of the target language.

Teachers' and students' responses indicate that NNEST seem to be superior in terms of making comparison between the two languages and understanding students' language problems better so that they can provide solutions to overcome those problems. However students agree less than the teachers that this is an advantageous situation. Although 57,5 % of the students agree with the term 70 % of the teachers agree that this is an advantageous situation for NNEST.

#### **4.1.1.11 Providing Students with More Information**

Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) identified the NEST as knowing subtleties of the language, using authentic English,

Most teachers and students believe that NNEST can make a comparison between the two languages which gives the opportunity to present the lesson better. Most of the attendants believe that this opportunity gives the NNEST a chance to create a better teaching atmosphere.

However, attendants accept that it is difficult for NNEST to explain to students how and why certain expressions are used in certain contexts. 82 % of the teachers and 47 % of the students agree with the term. The difference between teachers' and students' responses again reveal that students have a more positive perception on their NNEST. This means students understand better when NNEST explain the expressions.

#### **4.1.2 Is There a Relation between Language Competence and Teaching Ability?**

Non-native teachers of English are thought to be deficient in terms of language competence all over the world. Inevitably they are thought to be deficient in language teaching. In his book Medgyes discussed the topics: 'natives and non-natives in opposite trenches,' 'the dark side of being a non-native', 'and who's worth more: the native or the non-native'. He presents four hypotheses based on his assumption that NEST and NNEST are 'two different species'. The hypotheses were that the NEST and NNEST differ in terms of (1) language proficiency, and (2) teaching practice (behavior), that (3) most of the differences in teaching practice can be attributed to the discrepancy in language proficiency, and that (4) both types of teachers can be equally good teachers on their own terms.

According to an international survey of 216 NEST and NNEST from 10 countries was conducted and 68% of the subjects perceived differences in the teaching practices of NEST and NNEST. 84 % of NNEST admitted having various language difficulties. Vocabulary and fluency were the most common areas which were followed by speaking, pronunciation, and listening comprehension. Only 25% of the subjects stated that their language difficulties had no adverse effect on their teaching. (Reves&Medgyes, 1994)

Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) also surveyed and interviewed non-native speaking TESOL graduate assistants. Similar to Reves and Medgyes (1994), more than 2/3 thought that their own language difficulties affected their teaching and 90% perceived a difference between NEST and NNEST.



Similar to the results of two mentioned studies, there is a positive high correlation between language competence and teaching ability according to the teacher respondents in this study. 75 % of respondents in their study stated that they have difficulties because of language competence. Respondents in this study also reveal a meaningful relevance between language competence and their teaching ability which means teaching ability will be better as language competence increases.

According to students, there is a lower relationship between language competence and teaching ability. The difference of correlation value between students' and teachers' responses reveal that teachers perceive more relationship between the language competence and teaching ability although students do not express such an importance between the two variables. The reason of students' perceptions is the reality that they are not aware of the competency level of the teachers.

#### **4.1.3. What Are the Effects of Being Taught by NNEST?**

According to Ahmar Mahboob's study (2003) NNEST provide students with their achievement in grammar, affect, oral skills, methodology, hard work, vocabulary, culture, ability to answer questions, and literacy skills. The disadvantages students experience during NNEST classes are related to oral skills and culture.

According to Torres (2004) results indicated that adult ESL students have a general preference for NEST over NNEST, but have stronger preferences for NEST in teaching specific

skill areas such as pronunciation and writing. However respondents of this study do not show any preference for NEST for writing skill.

However, similar to the findings of the study conducted by Cheung (2007) that students enjoy NNEST ability to empathize with students as fellow second language learners, shared cultural background and ability to teach grammar, in terms of being provided with more information, the results of this study show that students think that they learn better with a NNEST as NNEST can make comparison between the two languages. And they strongly agree with the term that NNEST can use students' own cultural background to facilitate their understanding of culture, people and society of the target language. However, they agree with the term that NNEST have some difficulties in explaining the use of some certain expressions.

Lasagabaster and Sierra's (2005) study explored students' views on the pros and cons of having NEST and NNEST as their English teachers. The results suggest that more than half of the respondents (60.6%) show a preference for NEST and 35.5% do not have a clear preference. However, when they were given the possibility of having both NEST and NNEST, the percentage increased to 71.6%.

In contrast to Lasagabaster and Sierra's (2005) study, the results show that students do not show a special preference on NEST teachers. Their perceptions reveal that both teachers have different contributions to their language learning.

Lasagabaster and Sierra also found that NEST provide more the university students in the areas of pronunciation, culture and civilization, listening, vocabulary and speaking, while NNEST are more efficient in the areas of grammar and strategies. However, the students do not show any preference for NEST or NNEST in the other areas, namely reading, assessment as they can learn these areas both with NEST and NNEST. Students valued the NNEST as a resource of learning strategies, and as imitable models.

Similar to these results, students and teachers perceive NNEST as imitable models, guides and a good example of how language learning could be achieved.

As for being more motivated, students' responses reveal that nearly 70 % of the students enjoy NEST lessons which means most of them find NNEST classes more boring than NEST's. Moreover, they openly state that they find NEST more motivating to learn English. Most students stated that they just study to learn English rather than taking high marks in NEST classes which means NEST provide students an intrinsic motivation to learn the language.

Students think that NEST do not have the chance to make comparison between two languages and they can't understand students' problems about language. They also state that NNEST are more likely to be understanding when they make mistakes. With a high proportion they state that NNEST can be more understanding of the needs of their learners than NEST.

As stated in the study, maybe the most important effect of being taught by NNEST and NEST is that students overcome their prejudices that NNEST are inferior to NEST. More positive perceptions of students about NNEST in this study refer this reality.

#### **4.1.4. Is There a Correlation between Teachers' and Students' Perceptions on NNEST?**

The correlation statistics have been presented in chapter 3. However, no meaningful correlation between the students' and teachers' responses could be identified.

There is not a meaningful correlation between the two groups' responses because students and teachers belong to different age groups and their perceptions of education differ in many aspects. Teachers have a professional awareness stage of language education which provides them a professional viewpoint about how a good teacher should be. However, students do not have a qualified perspective and the different non-native teachers they come across affect their perceptions in different ways.

Moreover, there are differences between students' and teachers' perspectives on language and learning a foreign language.

#### **4.1.5. From Students' and Teachers' Perspectives, Who Is Better Overall in Teaching English and Why?**

Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) surveyed and interviewed non-native speaking TESOL graduate assistants. According to study, 90% perceived a difference between NEST and NNEST. However, while they perceived that both NEST and NNEST have strengths and weaknesses, they did not consider the NEST to be superior teachers.

Moussu and Braine (2006) examined ESL students' attitude change after being taught by NNEST. Two questionnaires were administered to almost 100 students in a university in the US. Moussu and Braine found that students held positive attitudes towards NNEST at the beginning of the semester. Most students indicated that they could learn English just as well as from NNEST and they respected and admired their NNEST. On the whole, the students' responses showed a high degree of support for their NNEST. In Moussu and Braine's study, the most important finding is that the students' attitudes towards their NNEST increased positively over time, despite a lack of significant change over time. A possible reason is that the students already had positive opinions of their NNEST at the beginning of the semester. In particular, 76% of respondents recommended their NNEST to a friend by the end of the semester, compared to only 57% at the beginning of the semester.

Despite the stated vast number of surveys revealing NEST preference throughout the world, neither students nor teachers stated that NNEST or NEST is better overall. They state that both teachers have different pros and cons. The means of the attendants' responses to those pros and cons of the teachers were moderate. Even the means of responses to the superior aspects of NNEST were slightly higher. However, this slight difference cannot be interpreted as a general preference.

#### **4.2. Conclusion**

This study aimed to examine the perceptions of teachers and students on non-native teachers of English in Turkey. The results of the study have been presented in the previous chapters. In this chapter the implication of the present study will be addressed. In addition, recommendations for future research on non-native teachers of English will be mentioned.

As it has been presented in the results chapter, it was found that students and teachers state that both native and non-native teachers have strong and weak points. The aspects NNEST were found to be strong are: presenting the lesson better, classroom management, using students' cultural background to facilitate their learning, understanding students' language problems, communication with students, and being a guide and model to show the way to learn the target language.

The statements of the students and teachers about NNEST's positive sides are:

- NNEST present the lesson better as they make comparison between English and Turkish which has a positive effect.
- NNEST have the chance to make comparison between two languages and they can understand students' problems about language.
- The teaching of NNEST ensures students understand the lesson more.
- NNEST are more likely to be understanding when students make mistake.
- A NNEST is a good example of how to learn English.
- Students do not have any anxiety of making mistakes in NNESTs classes.
- Students can express their thoughts to NNEST better.
- Students often fall in desperate situation because they do not understand what their NEST say as he/she speaks English.
- Students cannot establish a good communication with NEST as their English is limited.
- NNEST can be a good guide for students as a learner of English as a foreign language.
- NNEST manage the class better.
- NNEST can be more understanding of the needs of their learners than NEST.
- NNEST can use students' own cultural background to facilitate their understanding of culture, people and society of the target language.

The perceived weak points of non-native teachers compared to NEST are: being able to supply learners with more information about the target language, motivating students, using body language effectively and a relaxed classroom atmosphere. Unlike students, teachers believe that non-native teachers go into unnecessary details throughout the lesson.

The statements of the students and teachers about NNEST's negative sides are:

- NEST supply learners with more information about language and culture.
- The teaching of NEST ensures students enjoy the lesson more.
- NEST motivate the students to learn English more than NNEST.
- Students have anxiety of mark in NNEST classes.
- NEST tend to use their body language more so that students can understand better what they say.
- NNEST tend to use body language more sparingly compared to NEST.
- NEST are better role models for their students than NNEST.
- NEST present a cheerful and relaxed atmosphere related to NNEST.
- It is difficult for NNEST to explain to students how and why certain expressions are used in certain contexts.
- NNEST teach productive skills (speaking, writing) better.

In language teaching, there is a widely accepted assumption that, students prefer native instructors, and most administrators' hiring practices have been influenced by this assumption to some degree. Relevant to this assumption, private schools in Turkey welcome average people to



teach English ‘just because they are native speakers of English’. Most of the practicing native speaker teachers of English in Turkey do not have formal training in teaching, nor do they have a degree in ELT/TESOL or in a related field. However, they are allowed for the construction of an environment where its own people with degrees and skills in English language teaching are doomed and discriminated against, although not permitted by the law and is not performed overtly. The reason may be either language competency level of NNEST or the significant contribution they make to the prestige of the school or institution. The number of native teachers assigned at a school is a great point to be advertised in Turkey.

Nevertheless, the results of this study also reveal that neither students nor teachers show a meaningful preference for NEST. Students find it a little advantageous to have non-native teachers. Especially younger students feel the need to communicate easier with their teachers and to be understood by their teachers. Because NNEST understand them more they show a little more preference for NNEST. Yet, this is not the case for older students. The reason may be their language competency since their level of English improves enough to have a good communication with NEST day by day.

Students do not find language competence and teaching ability as relevant as teachers think of. This may be because they are unaware of their teachers’ general competency level. However, teachers are aware of their competency level and they can make comparison between the level of a NEST and their own one.

In the NEST vs. NNEST debate, students overall have a better perception about NNEST in mind than teachers have. The teachers appear to be more influenced by ‘native speaker fallacy’ than the students. They are more merciless than the students in criticizing themselves in some aspects. The biggest differences between teacher and student perceptions are about these issues: More students think that NNEST ensure the students to understand the lesson better. More of them think that NNEST are good examples of how to learn English and they can be good guides for students as foreign language learners.

There are some other aspects that both students and teachers agree, but teachers find themselves more inferior to NEST than students think of. These aspects are: NEST motivates the students to learn English more than NNEST. NEST ensures students to enjoy the lesson more. NEST tend to use body language so that students can understand the lesson more. It is difficult for NNEST to explain how and why some certain expressions are used in certain contexts.

The reason why NNEST underestimate their teaching may be the foretold general assumption about the NEST’s being better teachers. Moreover, the lack of confidence about their own level of English leads NNEST to this perception. In addition, they forget about the importance of their pedagogical knowledge which enables them to present better constructed lessons making learning easier than estimated. Having competence on an issue does not always guarantee the ability to teach it better. The reason overall may be due to a feeling of inferiority that has been imposed by native speakers of the language for decades.

If the survey was conducted in state schools where students do not have the chance to attend native teachers' classes and make a comparison between the two groups, most probably the results would be different. They could show a preference because of 'native speaker fallacy'. Being taught by NNEST has several effects on students of course. However, one of the most important effects of being taught by both NEST and NNEST is that students overcome their prejudices that NNEST are inferior to NEST. This study shows that students have more positive perceptions about NNEST and teachers have a little more negative perceptions about themselves.

The aspects NNEST are mistaken about the NEST are about the communication between the students and NEST. Both students and teachers agree the idea; however, more teachers think that NEST do not have the chance to make a comparison between the mother tongue of the students and English which enables NEST to understand language problems of students. Moreover, more teachers believe that students fall in desperate situations because they have difficulty in understanding NEST. This misconception may be caused by the idea that NEST don't know the mother tongue of the students. But during their professional life as a teacher in Turkey, NEST are exposed to mother tongue of the students intensely and they have the chance to learn Turkish quickly.

Most of these negative perceptions by teachers are caused by the language deficiencies that NNEST suffer all over the world. If the language deficiencies of NNEST are remedied, NEST and NNEST, at least, have equal chance to achieve professional success. According to the results of the study, if NNEST can reach a desired, maybe native-like, level of

English, they will even be more advantageous than NEST because of the reasons stated above. They will still share the same cultural background with students and understand students' language problems better than NEST. Therefore, NNEST have the chance to be better teachers than NEST as long as they can achieve a high level of language competence.

The plans of Turkish government to hire 40.000 native English-speaking teachers to collaborate with the local non-native English teachers in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes can be revised within the scope of this study. Instead of hiring native teachers at high prices, the government can provide its own people with opportunities to study abroad for a specific time or times before or during the teaching process. So that the non-native teachers can acquire the desired level of competency and overcome their lack of confidence.

Moreover, during the university education, candidate teachers can be exposed to native speakers to make them gain native-like competency. International ex-change education programs can be arranged for every student, not for a limited group. In addition, some precautions can be applied for a more efficient apprenticeship process such as spending more time in-class with efficient teachers.

The results show that students do not show a special preference on NEST teachers. Their perceptions reveal that both teachers have different contributions to their language learning. However, if NNEST teachers are provided with more opportunities to increase their language proficiency level and practicing it more in a natural target language

environment with native speakers, these opportunities will contribute to the NNEST in reaching the desired level of competency and teaching ability. In-service training courses, especially abroad, will contribute to the aim in the best way.

### **4.3 Limitations of the Study**

There were several limitations in this study. These limitations are presented in the following.

The most important and restrained factor was to reach students who have been exposed and observed both NEST and NNEST in their classes, and the number of those students who attend to both NEST's and NNEST's 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 NEST and the NNEST did not want 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.

#### **4.4 Suggestions for Further Study**

This study identifies the perceptions of students and teacher on NNEST. Some research questions for further studies and researchers are as follows;

The ways how NNEST can achieve better language competence and what can be done to compensate the language competency gap of NNEST can be a beneficial topic to study on.

Whether English teachers are satisfied with the university education as they still feel a language competence problem even after the graduation can be the other topic. This study may be beneficial to redesign the education programs of ELT departments of universities so that students may have a more dynamic schedule between the target language countries and Turkey.

The needs of English language teachers to improve their pedagogical skills and the reasons why teachers have negative perceptions about themselves compared to NEST can also be a matter of survey.

## REFERENCES

- Al-Omrani, A.H. (2008) Perceptions and Attitudes of Saudi ESL and EFL Students Toward Native and Nonnative English-speaking Teachers, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, ISBN 9780549496861: <http://books.google.com.tr/books?id=vJJXyLj9dvwC>
- Arva, V. & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System* 28, 355-372.
- Aydemir, Ö. (2007). İlköğretim II. kademe öğrencilerinin İngilizce dersinde kullandıkları başarı başarısızlık yüklemeleri ve öğrenme stratejileri. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Trakya Üniversitesi, Türkiye.
- Bayyurt, Y. (2006). Non-native English language teachers' perspective on culture in English as a Foreign Language classrooms. *Teacher Development*, 10/2, 233-247.
- Borg, S. (2006) The distinctive characteristics of foreign language teachers *Language Teaching Research*, 10,(1), 3-31.
- Ballmer, T.T. (1981). A typology of native speakers. In Florian Coulmas (Eds.), *A Festschrift for native speaker*, 51-67, New York : Mouton Publishers.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. (1933). *Language*. New York: H. Holt and company.
- Braine, G. (1999). Nonnative educators in English language teaching. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. Braine, G. (1999b). N\NNS and invisible barriers in ELT. *TESOL Matters*,

- 2(2), 14. Braine, G. (Ed.). (2005). *Teaching English to the world. History, curriculum, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates. Briggs, S., & Hofer, B. (1991). Undergraduate perceptions of ITA effectiveness. In J.
- Braine, G. (Ed.) (2005). *Teaching English to the World: History, Curriculum, and Practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Brosh, H. (1996), Perceived Characteristics of the Effective Language Teacher. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29: 125–136.
- Brutt-Griffler, J, & Samimy K. K. (1999). Revisiting the colonial in the postcolonial: Critical praxis for nonnative English-speaking teachers in a TESOL program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 413-432.
- Brutt-Griffler, J. and K. K. Samimy (2001) Transcending the nativeness paradigm. *World Englishes*, 20, (1), 99-106.
- Burns, A. (2005). *Teaching English from a global perspective. Case studies in TESOL series*. Alexandria: TESOL.
- Butler, G. Y. (2004). What level of English proficiency do elementary school teachers need to attain to teach EFL? Case Studies from Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(2), 245-278.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). Interrogating the “native speaker fallacy”: Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Nonnative educators in English language teaching*. (pp. 145-158). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.



- Chacon T. C. (2002). Teacher Efficacy and Selected Characteristics of Selected English as a Foreign Language Venezuelan Middle School Teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Ohio.
- Chen, X. (2008): A Survey : Chinese College Students' Perceptions of Non—Native English Teachers. *CELEA Journal* (Bimonthly) , Vol . 31 No. 3, 75-82.
- Cheung, Y.L., & Braine, G. (2007). The attitudes of university students towards non-native speakers English teachers in Hong Kong. *RELC Journal*, 38(3), 257-277.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspect of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Clark E. & Paran A. (2007). The employability of non-native-speaker teachers of EFL: a UK survey. *System*, 35(4), 407-430.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185-210.
- Cook, V. (2000). Comments on Vivian Cook's "Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching." The author responds. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 329-332.
- Coşkun A. (2013). Native Speakers as Teachers in Turkey: Non-native Pre-service English Teachers' Reactions to a Nation-wide Project. The Qualitative Report 2013 Volume 18, Article 57, 1-21 <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR18/coskun57.pdf>
- Coppieters, R. (1987) Competence differences between native and near-native speakers. *Language* , 544-573.

- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. (2nd ed. First ed., 1997), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, ISBN Hb 0 521 82347 1, Pb 0 521 53032 6.
- Çelebi, M. D. (2006). Türkiye’de anadili eğitimi ve yabancı dil öğretimi, *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2(21), 285-307.
- Çelik, S. (2006). A concise examination of the artificial battle between native and nonnative speaker teachers of English in Turkey. *Journal of Kastamonu Education Faculty*, 14, 371-376.
- Davies, A. (2003). *The native speaker: Myth and reality*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Dogancay-Aktuna, S. (2008). Non-Native English Speaking TESOL Teacher Educators: A Profile from Turkey. In S. Dogancay-Aktuna & Hardman (eds.). *Global English Teaching and Teacher Education: Praxis and Possibility*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL Publications.
- Edge, J. (1988). Natives, speakers, and models. *JALT Journal*, 9(2), 153-157.
- Ellis, L. (2002). Teaching from experience: a new perspective on the non-native teacher in adult ESL Australian. *Review of Applied Linguistics* 25, (1) pp. 71 - 107.
- Ezberci, E. (2005). *Native English Speaking Teachers and Non-native English Speaking Teachers in Istanbul: A Perception Analysis*. The Degree of Master of Arts in The Department of Teaching English. Bilkent University: Ankara
- Ferguson, C. (1983). 'Language planning and language change'. In Cobarrubias, H. & Fishman, J. (Eds.). *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives*. (pp. 29-40). Berlin: Mouton.

- Giaque, G. (1984). Purism versus pragmatism in foreign language teaching and acquisition. Unpublished manuscript, University of Northern Arizona. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 247 747).
- Girard, D. (1977). Motivation: the responsibility of the teacher. *ELT Journal* 31: 97–102.
- Graddol, D. (2006). English next, from <http://www.britishcouncil.de/pdf/english-next-2006.pdf>
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The practice of English teaching*. Harlow: Longman.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The Phonology of English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jin J. (2005). Which is better in China, a local or a native English-speaking teacher? *English Today* 83, 21(3), 39-45.
- Kalebic, S. C. (2005). *Towards the Development of Standards in Foreign Language Teacher Preparation*, University of Split, Croatia.
- Kamhi-Stein, L. D. (Ed.). (2004). Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on Nonnative English-speaking professionals. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Kelch, K., & Santana-Williamson, E. (2002). ESL students' attitudes toward native- and nonnative-speaking instructors' accents. *The CATESOL Journal*, 14(1), 57-72.
- Kachru, B. (1982). Models for non-native Englishes. In B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 31-57). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1985) Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk and H.G. Widdowson (Eds), *English in the world: Teaching*

- and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. (Ed.). (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2008). Globalization and English language policy in Turkey. *Educational Policy*, 23(5), 663-684.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kresovich, B. M. (1988). *Error gravity: Perceptions of native-speaking and non-native speaking faculty in EFL*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 311732).
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2005). In Defense of Postmethod. *ILI Language Teaching Journal*, (1)1:15-19.
- Laborda, G. (2006). Native or non-native: Can we still wonder who is better? *TESLEJ*. Vol. 10, No. 1, 23-28.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, H. M. (1991). *An introduction to Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Lasagabaster, D & Sierra, J. (2002): University Students' Perceptions of Native and Non-native Speaker Teachers of English. *Language Awareness* Vol. 11, No. 2, 132-138.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2005). What do students think about the pros and cons of having native speaker teacher? In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers:*

*Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (pp. 217-241). New York, NY: Springer.

Lazaraton, A. (2003). Incidental displays of cultural knowledge in the nonnative-English-speaking teacher's classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 37(2), 213-245.

Lederer, Herbert. "The 'native speaker' issue: Problem or pretext?" *ADFL Bulletin* 12.4 (1981): 1-4.

Liang, K. (2002). English as a second language (ESL) students' attitudes towards non-native English-speaking teachers' accentedness. Unpublished M.A. thesis. California State University, Los Angeles, CA.

Liaw, E. C. (2004). "How are they different?" A comparative study of native and nonnative foreign language teaching assistants regarding selected characteristics: Teacher efficacy, approach to language teaching/learning, teaching strategies and perception of nativenesship. Unpublished Dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus.

Liu, J. (1999). Nonnative-English-speaking-professionals. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(1), 85-102.

Liu, M. and Zhang, L. (2007): Student Perceptions of Native & Non-native English Teachers' Attitudes, Teaching Skills Assessment and Performance. *Asian EFL Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 4: Conference Proceedings, 157-166

Llurda, E. & A. Huguet (2003) Self-awareness in NNS EFL primary and secondary school teachers. *Language Awareness*, 12, 220-235.

Llurda, E. (2004) Non-native-speaker teachers and English as an International Language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14, (3), 314-323.

- Llurda, E. (Ed.) (2005). *Non-native Language Teachers. Perceptions, Challenges, and Contributions to the Profession*. New York: Springer.
- Işık, A. (2008). Yabancı dil eğitimimizdeki yanlışlıklar nereden kaynaklanıyor? *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 4(2), 15-26.
- Inbar, O. (2001). *Native and non-native English teachers: Investigation of the construct and perceptions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Tel Aviv University, Israel.
- Mahboob, A. (2003). *Status of nonnative English speakers as ESL teachers in the United States*. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Mahboob, A. (2004). Demystifying the Native Speaker in TESOL. *SPELT Quarterly* 19(4),1-14.
- Mahboob, A., Uhrig, K., Newman, K.L., & Hartford, B. S. (2002). Perceptions of non-native speaking teachers. Paper presented at the April 2002 36<sup>th</sup> annual meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages; Salt Lake City, UT.
- Matsuda, P. K., & Matsuda, A. (2001). Autonomy and collaboration in teacher education: Journal sharing among native and nonnative English-speaking teachers. *CATESOL Journal*, 13(1), 109-121.
- McDonald, C. & McRae, S. (2010). A pre-trial collection and investigation of what perceptions and attitudes of Konglish exist amongst foreign and Korean English language teachers in terms of English education in Korea. *Asian EFL Journal*, Vol. 12 (1), pp.134-164
- McKay, S. L. (2003). Towards an appropriate EIL pedagogy. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 1-22.

- Medgyes, P. 1983. 'The schizophrenic teacher'. *ELT Journal*: 37/1. 2-6.
- Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or nonnative: Who's worth more? *ELT Journal*, 46(4), 340-349.
- Medgyes, P. (1994). *The Non-Native Teacher*. London: Macmillan Publishers. (1999) 2nd edition. Ismaning: Max Hueber Verlag.
- Medgyes, P. (2001). When the teacher is a non-native speaker. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, 5, 429-442.
- Merino, I. G. (1997), *Native English-Speaking Teachers versus Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers*, University of Northern Iowa
- Milambiling, J. (2000). Comments on Vivian Cook's "Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching." How nonnative speakers as teachers fit into the equation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 324-328.
- Moussu, L. (2002). *English as a Second Language Students' Reactions to Nonnative English-speaking Teachers*. Unpublished master's thesis. Brigham Young University at Provo, UT. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 468 879).
- Moussu, L., & Braine, G. (2006). The Attitudes of ESL Students Towards Nonnative English Language Teachers. *TESL Reporter* 39, 33-47.
- Nickel, G. (1985). How 'native' can (or should) a non-native speaker be? *ITL, Review of Applied Linguistics* (67-68), 141-160.

- Ozturk, U. and Atay, D. (2010). Challenges of being a non-native English teacher. *Educational Research*, Vol. 1(5):135-139, June 2010.
- Pacek, D. (2005). Personality Not Nationality: Foreign Students' Perceptions of a Non-Native Speaker Lecturer of English at a British University in Llundain (ed). *NonNative Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession*. (NY: Springer), pp. 243-262.
- Paikeday, T. (1985). *The Native Speaker is Dead!* Toronto: Paikeday Publishing.
- Palfreyman, D. (1993). "How I Got It in My Head": Conceptual Models of Language and Learning in Native and Non-Native Trainee EFL Teachers. *Language Awareness*. 2 (4).
- Park, G. P. & Lee, H. W. (2006). The characteristics of effective English teachers as perceived by high school teachers and students in Korea. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 7(2), 236-248.
- Pettis, Joanne (1997), Developing our Professional Competence: Some Reflections. *TESL Canada Journal/Revue TESL Du Canada* Vol. 14, NO.2, Spring 1997
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pride, J. (1981). Native competence and the bilingual/multilingual speaker. *English World-Wide*, 2(2), 141-153.
- Prodromou, L. (1991). The good language teacher. *English Teaching Forum* 29: 2-7.
- Prodromou, K. (2003). In search of the successful users of English; How a corpus of non-native speaker language could impact on EFL teaching. *Modern English Teacher*, 12(2), 5-14.
- Quirk, R. (1990). Language varieties and standard language. *English Today*, 21, 3-10.



- Rampton, B. (1990) Displacing the 'native speaker': expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. *ELT Journal*, 44, 97-101.
- Rampton, M. B. H. (1996). Displacing the "native speaker": Expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. In T. Hedge & N. Whitney (Eds.), *Power pedagogy & practice* (pp. 9-22). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reves, T., & Medgyes, P. (1994). The non-native English speaking ESL/EFL teacher's self-image: An international survey. *System*, 22(3), 353-367.
- Richards, J.C., Platt, J., and Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Samimy, Keiko K. & Brutt-Griffler, Janina. (1999). To Be a Native Speaker: Perceptions of "Non-Native" Students in a Graduate TESOL Program. In George Braine (Eds.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* 127-145, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Seidlhofer, B. (1999) Double standards: Teacher education in the expanding circle. *World Englishes*, 18,(2), 233-245.
- Shin, Jaewoo. (2001). The efficacy beliefs of Korean teachers of English as a foreign language. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Ohio.
- Shin, S. (2008). Preparing non-native English-speaking ESL teachers. *Teacher Development* Vol. 12, No. 1, 57–65.
- Soner, O. (2007). Türkiye'de yabancı dil eğitimin dünü bugünü. *Öneri*, 7(28), 397-404.

- Suarez J (2000). Native and non-native: Not only a question of terminology. *Humanizing Language Teaching*, 2(6): Available at: <http://www.hltmag.co.uk/nov09/mart.htm>
- Thornbury S (2006). *An A-Z of ELT*. Macmillan: Oxford.
- Todd, R. & Pojanapunya, P. (2009). Implicit attitudes towards native and non-native speaker teachers. *System*, Volume 37, Issue 1, Pages 23-33.
- Torres, J. W. (2004). Speaking up! Adult ESL students' perceptions of native and non-native English speaking teachers. Master of Arts (English as a Second Language), December 2004, 89 pp., 2 tables, 2 figures, references, 38 titles.
- Tosun, C. (2006). *Yabancı dille eğitim sorunu*. [Problem of education in a foreign language]. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, (2)1, 22-42.
- Üstünlüoğlu, E. (2009). "University students' perceptions of native and non-native teachers." *Teachers & Teaching* 13.1 (2007): 63-79. *Academic Search Premier*. EBSCO. Web. 28 Oct. 2009.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 377-389.

## APPENDIX A

### Teachers' and Students' Perspectives on Non-native Foreign Language Teachers

The data collected from the following questionnaire will be used as a basis for a thesis entitled "Teachers' and Students' Perspectives on Non-native Foreign Language Teachers". Please mark one of the appropriate choice which describes you best. For each item please mark only one choice. Thanks indeed for your invaluable contribution.

**Please start from here to mark the questionnaire.**

1- Male ( ) Female ( )

2- Class you are teaching .....

3- How long have you been teaching English?

( ) 1-5 Years ( ) 6-10 Years ( ) 11-15 Years ( ) 16-20 Years ( ) 21 Years-over

4- Your highest academic degree ( ) University ( ) MA ( ) PhD

5- Which university did you graduate from?

---

6- What do you think of your university education? Are you satisfied with the education you have had?

---

7- In terms of teaching English, what do you think would be more helpful? (Going abroad, in-service teacher training courses?)

---

8- Do you participate in any form of in-service training? If yes, can you please state name?

---

9- Where do you speak English?(Only in-class, etc.)

---

10- Have you ever visited country/ countries of the target language? Did it make a contribution to your foreign language?

---

11- I can easily teach ( ) beginner courses ( ) elementary courses ( ) intermediate courses ( ) advanced courses. (You can choose more than one)

## **Teachers' and Students' Perspectives on Non-native Foreign Language Teachers**

The data collected from the following questionnaire will be used as a basis for a thesis entitled "Teachers' and Students' Perspectives on Non-native Foreign Language Teachers". Please mark one of the appropriate choice which describes you best For each item mark only one choice.

Thanks indeed for your invaluable contribution.

Esra BARLAK

English Teacher

### **Please start from here to mark the questionnaire.**

1- Male ( ) Female ( )

2- Class .....

3- How long have you been learning English?

5-10 years ( ) 11-15 years ( )

4- Duration of native English teacher(s)' attending your class?

1-2 years ( ) 3-4 years ( ) 5 years and over ( )

5- I am a/an ( ) beginner ( ) elementary ( ) intermediate ( ) advanced student.

### Teachers' and Students' Perspectives on Non-native Foreign Language Teachers

|    |  | <b>Strongly<br/>agree</b> | <b>Agree</b> | <b>Disagree</b> | <b>Strongly<br/>Disagree</b> |
|----|--|---------------------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| 1  | NEST supply learners with more information about language and culture.   |                           |              |                 |                              |
| 2  | NNEST go into unnecessary details while teaching.  |                           |              |                 |                              |
| 3  | NNEST present the lesson better as they make comparison between English and Turkish which has a positive effect.                 |                           |              |                 |                              |
| 4  | NEST don't have the chance to make comparison between two languages and they can't understand students' problems about language. |                           |              |                 |                              |
| 5  | The teaching of NEST ensures students enjoy the lesson more.   |                           |              |                 |                              |
| 6  | The teaching of NNEST ensures students understand the lesson more.   |                           |              |                 |                              |
| 7  | NEST lessons and examinations are mostly based on reading ability.   |                           |              |                 |                              |
| 8  | NNEST mostly teach grammar based lessons and prepare grammar based examinations.   |                           |              |                 |                              |
| 9  | NNEST generally teach formal English while NEST teach daily English.   |                           |              |                 |                              |
| 10 | NNEST are more likely to be understanding when students make mistake.  |                           |              |                 |                              |
| 11 | A NNEST is a good example of how to learn English.   |                           |              |                 |                              |
| 12 | NEST motivate the students to learn English more than NNEST.   |                           |              |                 |                              |
| 13 | Students study to learn rather than take high mark in NEST's classes.  |                           |              |                 |                              |
| 14 | Students have anxiety of mark in NNESTs class.   |                           |              |                 |                              |
| 15 | Students do not have any anxiety of making mistakes in NNESTs classes.   |                           |              |                 |                              |
| 16 | Students can express their thoughts to NNEST better.   |                           |              |                 |                              |
| 17 | Students often fall in desperate situation because they do not understand what their NEST say as he/she speaks English.          |                           |              |                 |                              |

|    |  |  |  |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| 18 | Students cannot establish a good communication with NEST as their English is limited.  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | NNEST can be a good guide for students as a learner of English as a foreign language.  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | NNEST manage the class better.   |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | NNEST follow textbooks more than NEST do.  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | NEST tend to use their body language more so that students can understand better what they say.  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | NNEST tend to use body language more sparingly compared to NEST.   |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | NNEST can be more understanding of the needs of their learners than NEST.  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | NEST are better role models for their students than NNEST.   |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | NEST present a cheerful and relaxed atmosphere related to NNEST.   |  |  |  |  |
| 27 | It is difficult for NNEST to explain to students how and why certain expressions are used in certain contexts.                           |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | NNEST can use students' own cultural background to facilitate their understanding of culture, people and society of the target language. |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | NNEST teach productive skills (speaking, writing) better.  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | Students' achievement in language learning is directly related to their teacher's effectiveness in language teaching.                    |  |  |  |  |

T.C.  
İSTANBUL VALİLİĞİ  
İl Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğü

Sayı : 59090411-605.01/ 22819  
Konu : Anket (Esra BARLAK)

21/02/2013


VALİLİK MAKAMINA

- İlgi : a) Maltepe Üniversitesinin 02.10.2013 gün ve 323 sayılı yazısı.  
b) MEB Yenilik ve Eğitim Teknolojileri Genel Müdürlüğü'nün 07.03.2012 tarihli ve 3616 sayılı ve 2012/13 No'lu Genelgesi.  
c) Millî Eğitim Komisyonunun 18.02.2013 tarihli tutanağı.

Maltepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Esra BARLAK'ın "Teachers And Student Perspectives On Foreign Language Teachers Who Are Nonnative Teachers Of English" konulu Anket çalışmasını ilimizdeki liselerde görev yapan İngilizce öğretmenlerine anket uygulama isteği hakkındaki ilgi (a) yazı ve ekleri müdürlüğümüzce incelenmiştir.

Maltepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Esra BARLAK'ın söz konusu talebi; bilimsel amaç dışında kullanılmaması, Eğitim ve Öğretimi aksatmaması koşuluyla, okul idarelerinin denetim, gözetim ve sorumluluğunda ilgi (b) Bakanlık emri esasları dâhilinde uygulanması, sonuçtan Müdürlüğümüze rapor halinde (CD formatında) bilgi verilmesi kaydıyla Müdürlüğümüzce uygun görülmektedir.

Makamlarınızca da uygun görüldüğü takdirde Olurlarınıza arz ederim.

  
Dr. Muammer YILDIZ  
Millî Eğitim Müdürü

OLUR  
.../02/2013  
  
Harun KAYA  
Vali a.  
Vali Yardımcısı

NOT: Verilecek cevapta tarih, numara ve dosya numarasının yazılması rica olunur.  
STRATEJİ GELİŞTİRME BÖLÜMÜ E-Posta: [sgb34@meb.gov.tr](mailto:sgb34@meb.gov.tr)  
ADRES: İl Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğü D Blok Bab-ı Ali Cad. No:13 Cağaloğlu  
Telefon: Snt.212 455 04 00 Dahili: 239

5070 Sayılı Kanuna Göre HARUN  
KAYA tarafından Elektronik  
Olarak  
İmzalandığı görülmüştür. <http://tutanakimlik.meb.gov.tr>

## **CURRICULUM VITAE**

**ESRA BARLAK DİLKİ**

### **PERSONAL INFORMATION**

Date of Birth: 02/08/1984  
Place of Birth: Afyon  
E-mail address: esrabarlak@gmail.com

### **EDUCATION**

- Master's Degree, Maltepe University, Department of Foreign Languages, English Language Teaching, İstanbul, Turkey 2011-2013
- Hacettepe University,- Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching Department, Ankara, Turkey 2002- 2007
- Afyon Anatolian Teacher Training High School, Turkey 1999-2002

### **PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

- Kuleli Military High School, İstanbul, Turkey 2010-....
- Çetinkaya Primary School, Sivas, Turkey 2008-2010
- Çetinkaya High School, Sivas, Turkey 2008-2009

### **FOREIGN LANGUAGES**

English: Advanced

German: Elementary