

# How University Students Perceive Their Native and Non-Native English Speaking Teachers

Elif Kemaloglu-Er

School of Foreign Languages, Bogazici University, Bebek, Istanbul, Turkey

E-mail: [ekemaloglu@gmail.com](mailto:ekemaloglu@gmail.com)

## Abstract

In several educational settings aiming to teach English as a foreign language, the myth of the superiority of native English speaking teachers (NESTs) over non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs) seems to hold strong especially among students. Contrary to this, the present study, which investigated the perceptions of university students studying intensive English at an English-medium university in Turkey about NESTs and NNESTs, is a promising verification of the equality between two teacher groups in several pedagogical aspects. The data were collected by means of a 30-item questionnaire and focus group interviews. Both teacher groups were assessed with respect to four aspects: (1) in-class teaching roles, (2) in-class management roles, (3) in-class communication skills and (4) individual qualities. According to the findings, there is no significant difference between NESTs and NNESTs in terms of in-class teaching roles as well as in-class management roles. On the other hand, NESTs are perceived to be significantly better in in-class communication skills, show more favorable qualities and have more enjoyable lessons. In this context marked with the joint collaboration of NESTs and NNESTs, both groups are reported to display a sound partnership and high levels of professionalism.

**Keywords:** Native English speaking teachers, Non-native English speaking teachers, NEST, NNEST

## 1. Introduction

The increasing demand for English all over the world and the ever-increasing number of non-native teachers in the field have caused debates regarding whether English should be taught by native English speaking teachers (NESTs) or non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs) and whether NESTs or NNESTs are better in terms of teaching the language. NNESTs have long been in majority with steadily increasing numbers all over the world. On the other hand, there have been several reports in the field about the common belief that foreign languages should be taught by native speakers of the language. Phillipson (1992) calls this misconception *native speaker fallacy*. As he states NESTs' high command of the target language does not automatically prepare them to teach it. Canagarajah (1999) argues that the native speaker fallacy is chronologically misplaced and emphasizes that the approach is over conservative especially in such a period when we witness the thriving globalization of English and the massive numbers of NNESTs. Kramsch (1997) suggests that one of the reasons why native speech in pedagogy has become overwhelmingly valued is on account of the high importance attached to students' communicative competence in the foreign language classroom and urges the stakeholders about the value of multilingualism as opposed to the idealized native speaker phenomenon. Modiano (1999) suggests the issue should be viewed through an egalitarian lens taking into account the specific characteristics of both teacher groups and synthesizing them in harmony in educational contexts.

The discussions focusing on the distinctive qualities of NESTs and NNESTs were sparked off with the pioneering work of Medgyes (1992). In his article, Medgyes (1992) highlighted the fact that although NESTs may have a seemingly powerful advantage over NNESTs in terms of language competence, this does not mean that they are better professionals. Medgyes (1992) maintains that NNESTs, as learners of the second language themselves, have got many strengths. For instance, they can teach learning strategies more effectively, provide learners with more information about the English language, especially structures, be more empathetic to the needs and problems of their learners, take advantage of sharing the learners' mother tongue and are more competent in anticipating language difficulties that may arise on the learning path.

Medgyes (1994) is also known for one of the leading studies in this field where he conducted three surveys on 325 teachers from 11 countries. It was found that the areas of difficulty most frequently mentioned by NNESTs were vocabulary, oral fluency and pronunciation. On the contrary, these were the perceived strengths of the NESTs. Among the linguistic aspects, it was grammar which was found to be an emphasized strength of NNESTs. Also, NNESTs were stated to be better than NESTs in predicting students' difficulties and estimating their potential. NESTs were also concluded to be less strict than NNESTs. Medgyes (1994) also defined NESTs as good language models for the students. On the other hand, NNESTs were identified as good learner models because of the experience they have in learning English as a second language.

Similar to Medgyes (1994), Cook (1999) refers to the process of acquiring English as an additional language as an advantage of NNESTs and points out that it is this quality which makes NNESTs sensitive to the linguistic and cultural needs of their students. Also if the same L1 is shared with their students, it is more likely for NNESTs to forecast language structures that may appear to be problematic for the students (Árva & Medgyes,

2000). On the other hand, providing more information about L2 language and culture, using more 'real' language and using English more confidently are some distinguishing characteristics of NESTs (Samimy and Brutt-Griffler, 1999).

Studies investigating the perceptions of students concerning NESTs and/or NNESTs have been conducted in both ESL and EFL contexts. As an example for the former, Moussu (2002) found that the ESL students in general assessed the educational period with NNESTs to be a positive experience and stated with admiration and respect that they could learn English just as well from a non-native speaker as from a native speaker. Thomas (1999) in the descriptive account of her own teaching experience as a NNEST in the US pointed out that the students reported high levels of satisfaction with her with regard to teaching, encouragement, correction and advice in the end-of-the-year evaluations. Another study into ESL students' perceptions about NESTs and NNESTs was made by Mahboob (2004) and the findings revealed both positive and negative comments about the NESTs and NNESTs. In the case of NESTs, the positive comments were about oral skills, vocabulary and culture. Negative comments on NESTs were concerned with lack of grammar, having no experience as a second language learner, inability to answer questions, and ineffective methodology. In the case of NNESTs, experience as a second language learner was mentioned most as a positive quality, followed by grammar, affect, oral skills, methodology, hard work, vocabulary, culture, ability to answer questions, and literacy skills. The negative comments about NNESTs were related to oral skills and L2 culture.

There are also studies on the students' perceptions about NESTs and/or NNESTs conducted with EFL students. In Shimizu's (1995) research at a Japanese university, the findings indicated that over half the students thought that English classes taught by NNESTs were boring, strict, and serious. In contrast to this, over half the students felt that English classes taught by NESTs were interesting, humorous, and energetic. Lasagabaster and Sierra (2002) surveyed undergraduates in Spain and the participants showed preferences for NESTs in the areas of pronunciation, speaking and listening, vocabulary, and L2 culture and civilization and for NNESTs in learning strategies and grammar. In the research of Cheung and Braine (2007), university students studying in Hong Kong had a favorable attitude towards their NNESTs. Several students cited the ability to use students' mother tongue in teaching, effective pedagogical skills, being knowledgeable in English language and positive personality traits such as being kind and responsible as positive qualities of NNESTs. On the other hand, some students expressed their concerns with their examination-oriented teaching approach, over-correcting students' work and limited use of English. In some other studies in different EFL contexts student reports about NESTs and/or NNESTs showed similar findings as regards their specific characteristics (Cheung, 2002; Hadla, 2013; Mermelstein, 2015; Rao, 2010; Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014; Wu & Ke, 2009).

In Turkey, there are a few studies on students' perceptions on NESTs and NNESTs. In Koksals's (2006) research conducted with private high school students, NESTs were characterized as informal and confident with better communication skills whereas NNESTs as sensitive to the students' needs and problems, but dependent on course books. In Devrim and Bayyurt's (2010) research with high school students, a great majority of the participants stated that NESTs teach English better than NNESTs from Turkey and are much better in informing the students about the L2 culture. There are also studies conducted with university students in the Turkish context. In Ustunluoglu's (2007) study, the findings showed that NNESTs were perceived to fulfill in-class teaching and in-class management roles better than NESTs whereas NESTs were thought to perform in-class communication skills better and display more favorable qualities. NNESTs were also perceived to be stricter and more in control of the class than NESTs. In Inceciay & Atay (2009), NESTs were deemed to be superior in teaching, and their classroom observations showed that in the classes with NESTs, students felt more confident in initiating a conversation, tried to give longer answers, received much less error correction and were exposed to much more humour in communication. In the study of Demir (2011), NESTs were perceived to be better than NNESTs in classroom management and classroom communication while NNESTs were seen to be superior in classroom teaching. In Urkmez (2015), the student participants thought that low level learners should be taught English by NNESTs while high levels learners by NESTs. In the study of Karakas, Uysal, Bilgin and Bulut (2016), NESTs received significantly higher ratings than NNESTs for linguistic and professional measures whereas NNESTs were given higher ratings in the pedagogical dimension. To sum up, research has displayed multifaceted perceptions about NESTs and NNESTs and defined their distinctive qualities. Yet, studies on the university students' perceptions about NESTs and NNESTs are still few and this study has been intended to partially cover this gap by investigating the issue at an English-medium state university in Turkey where both teacher groups work in joint collaboration.

The study aims to explore the university students' perceptions about NESTs and NNESTs with regard to four aspects: (1) in-class teaching roles, (2) in-class management roles, (3) in-class communication skills and (4) individual qualities. In accordance with this aim, the research addresses the following questions:

1. Is there a significant difference between the students' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs in terms of in-class teaching roles?
2. Is there a significant difference between the students' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs in terms of in-class

management roles?

3. Is there a significant difference between the students' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs in terms of in-class communication skills?

4. Is there a significant difference between the students' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs in terms of individual qualities?

5. If there are any significant differences with regard to in-class teaching roles, in-class management roles, in-class communication skills and individual qualities, which specific characteristics of NESTs / NNESTs are perceived by the students to contribute to such differences?

## 2. Method

A 30-item questionnaire developed by Ustunluoglu (2007) has been used to collect the main data about the student perceptions regarding NESTs and NNESTs. In addition, two follow-up interview sessions were held in the form of focus group interviews with twelve students in total to ensure triangulation.

### 2.1. Participants

The data were collected from 95 students studying intensive English in the preparatory classes of an English-medium university in Istanbul, Turkey. 57 students were from the intermediate level classes and 38 students from the advanced level classes.

The students evaluated 5 NESTs and 5 NNESTs, from whom they received intensive English instruction on varying subjects and skills throughout the academic year. In the selected research setting, each class had two teachers and there was one NEST and one NNEST assigned to each class. Thus each student evaluated one NEST and one NNEST.

In the given school curriculum, NNESTs in general are responsible for the instruction of grammar, reading, and writing whereas NESTs for mainly listening and speaking. However, NESTs, are also responsible for giving supplementary reading and writing instruction to support the classes of NNESTs. Both NESTs and NNESTs assessed by the students were experienced teachers. The teaching tenures of NESTs in Turkey varied between 6 to 13 years whereas those of NNESTs between 8 and 14 years.

### 2.2. Data collection instruments

#### 2.2.1. The questionnaire

The questionnaire developed by Ustunluoglu (2007) was used to collect the quantitative data. It included four sections: (1) in-class teaching roles (items 1-10), (2) in-class management roles (items 11-17), (3) in-class communication skills (18-22), and (4) individual qualities (items 23-30). The items were responded on a three-point scale with the following descriptors: "(3) demonstrate", "(2) partly demonstrate", and "(1) does not demonstrate" (See Appendix). The same 30 items were responded by the students twice; the first assessment was made about their native teacher of English and the subsequent one about their non-native (Turkish) teacher of English.

The questionnaire of Ustunluoglu (2007) was chosen since it had an extensive and meaningfully designed content stated by the researcher to be developed through discussions with experienced experts in the field to ensure face validity. Besides, the validity of the items was tested via an item-scale correlation with the total coefficient obtained as .30 and above, suggesting that the scale measured the roles it was intended to test. The reliability was also reported to be high in terms of the internal consistency of the items (Cronbach's Alpha > 0.70).

#### 2.2.2. Interviews

Two sessions of focus group interviews were conducted with 12 participants in total. The groups consisted of 6 participants from the same proficiency level groups (from intermediate or advanced classes). Of these six students, two were high achievers, two moderate and two low achievers. The focus of the interviews was on the assessments of NESTs and NNESTs with respect to in-class teaching roles, in-class management roles, in-class communication skills and some individual qualities.

#### 2.2.3. Data collection

The data were collected towards the end of the academic year following a period of 30 weeks in which the respondents received intensive English education from both NESTs and NNESTs. The respondents participated in the research on a voluntary basis.

#### 2.2.4. Data analysis

Paired samples t-test was used in order to analyze the significant differences between the NESTs and NNESTs with regard to four item groups (i.e. in-class teaching roles, in-class management roles, in-class communication skills and individual qualities). The questionnaire items displaying significant differences were also specified. Also, the interviews were recorded, transcribed and translated into English. They were thematically analyzed in terms of the defined roles and individual qualities.

### 3. Findings

#### 3.1. Questionnaire findings

The results displayed that there is no significant difference between the NESTs ( $X = 26.08, S = 2.7$ ) and NNESTs ( $X = 25.26, S = 4.8$ ) in terms of in-class teaching roles,  $t(94) = 1.908; p < .05$  (See Table 1).

Table 1. Paired samples t-test analyses with regard to in-class teaching roles

Group	N	In-class teaching roles	$\bar{X}$	$S$	$df$	$t$
Student	95	NEST	26.08	2.7	94	1.90
		NNEST	25.26	4.8	94	

The findings also revealed that there is no significant difference between NESTs ( $X = 18.66, S = 1.47$ ) and NNESTs ( $X = 18.91, S = 2.01$ ) with regard to in-class management roles,  $t(94) = 1.076; p < .05$  (See Table 2).

Table 2. Paired samples t-test analyses with regard to in-class management roles

Group	N	In-class management roles	$\bar{X}$	$S$	$df$	$t$
Student	95	NEST	18.66	1.47	94	1.076
		NNEST	18.91	2.01	94	

On the other hand, the findings showed there is a significant difference between NESTs ( $X = 13.63, S = 1.22$ ) and NNESTs ( $X = 12.17, S = 2.05$ ) with respect to in-class communication skills,  $t(94) = 6.322; p < .05$  (See Table 3).

Table 3. Paired samples t-test analyses with regard to in-class communication skills

Group	N	In-class communication skills	$\bar{X}$	$S$	$df$	$t$
Student	95	NEST	13.63	1.22	94	6.322*
		NNEST	12.17	2.05	94	

Note: \*  $p < .05$

The individual items within the in-class communication skills category were also analyzed in terms of significant differences to find out which specific characteristics of teacher groups contributed to the students' perceptions about the NEST/NNEST dichotomy. As the results showing significant differences suggest, NNESTs were said to address the students by their names more than NESTs. On the other hand, NESTs were perceived to make the lesson more enjoyable, use more body language and treat students more respectfully compared to NNESTs (See Table 4). Finally, there was no significant difference between the means of NESTs and NNESTs in praising the students frequently ( $X_{NEST} = 2.37, X_{NNEST} = 2.50$ ).

Table 4. In-class communication skills displaying significant differences

In-class communication skills	N	Teacher	$\bar{X}$	$S$	$df$	$t$
...addresses the students by their names.	95	NEST	2.37	.55	94	2.55*
		NNEST	2.86	.37		
...makes the lesson enjoyable.	95	NEST	2.84	.36	94	9.32*
		NNEST	2.06	.75		
...uses body language.	95	NEST	2.91	.31	94	9.62*
		NNEST	2.15	.73		
...treats students respectfully.	95	NEST	2.81	.44	94	2.78*
		NNEST	2.58	.61		

Note: \*  $p < .05$

Lastly, according to the findings, there is a significant difference between NESTs ( $X = 22.96, S = 1.71$ ) and NNESTs ( $X = 20.35, S = 4.01$ ) as regards the given individual qualities,  $t(94) = 6.00; p < .05$  (See Table 5).

Table 5. Paired samples t-test analyses with regard to individual qualities

Group	N	Individual qualities	$\bar{X}$	$S$	$df$	$t$
Student	95	NEST	22.96	1.71	94	6.000*
		NNEST	20.35	4.01	94	

The item-wise analyses of the individual qualities revealed that NESTs are perceived to be significantly more cheerful, trustworthy, energetic, respectful, consistent, tolerant and easygoing compared to NNESTs (See Table 6). Also there was no significant difference observed in "being sensitive" between two groups ( $X_{NEST} = 2.71; X_{NNEST} = 2.54$ ).

Table 6. Individual qualities displaying significant differences

Individual qualities	N	Teacher	$\bar{X}$	$S$	$df$	$T$
... is cheerful.	95	NEST	2.87	.36	94	4.41*
		NNEST	2.50	.66		
...is trustworthy.	95	NEST	2.91	.27	94	2.23*
		NNEST	2.68	.45		
...is energetic.	95	NEST	2.97	.14	94	5.82*
		NNEST	2.53	.71		
...is respectful.	95	NEST	2.92	.26	94	3.56*
		NNEST	2.70	.56		
...is consistent.	95	NEST	2.85	.38	94	4.82*
		NNEST	2.52	.66		
...is tolerant.	95	NEST	2.83	.42	94	4.76*
		NNEST	2.40	.74		
...is easygoing.	95	NEST	2.87	.39	94	6.23*
		NNEST	2.34	.76		

Note: \*  $p < .05$

### 3.2. Interview findings

The interview results were found to be in compliance with the findings of the questionnaire in terms of in-class teaching and in-class management skills. The majority of students emphasized both teacher groups “teach well”, “are well prepared”, “know their subject well”, “speak clearly and comprehensibly”, “adjust the lesson according to the level of the students”, “are punctual and prompt”, “maintain order and discipline”, “value student participation” and “praise the students”. Some students emphasized that NNESTs speak English very well, are experts of their subject and follow the syllabus more strictly. Some students stated that NESTs are more flexible in manipulating the curriculum, rely less on written materials, skip some parts and attach more importance to discussions and give extensive background information about the topic. It was also commonly emphasized that both NESTs and NNESTs do their jobs professionally.

The interviewed students also favored NESTs in effective communication skills and making the lessons enjoyable, which is in line with questionnaire findings. Some sample extracts that exemplify this finding are as follows:

“(My native teacher) is more like an actor in the class”,

“(My native teacher) has a wide range of experience in life”,

“Native teachers travel more and talk about the interesting and funny experiences they have gone through all over the world”,

“Native teachers combine the East and the West and compare them well”,

“(My native teacher) never gets bored of life and never makes you bored. He often says ‘Only boring people get bored.’ ”

“Native teachers don’t allow you to be upset.”

“Native teachers are great fun. I enjoy their classes.”

However, some students complained about spending so much time listening to their native teachers’ stories and not being able to do enough practice for the proficiency exam.

Concerning individual qualities, NESTs were stated to be more cheerful, energetic, and easygoing. The most frequent adjective used by the students about them was “enjoyable”. Students in majority also stated both NESTs and NNESTs were respectful with no remarkable difference so this finding mismatched the questionnaire result. The case was the same for being trustworthy and consistent: The participants rated NSs higher in these questionnaire items, but said both NSs and NNSs were trustworthy as well as consistent in the interviews. With respect to sensitivity and tolerance, the students’ answers varied. Some students said their native teachers were more sensitive and tolerant to their mistakes. Several students associated tolerance with the teacher’s being tolerant to students’ punctuality, attendance, and adherence to school and classroom rules and it was those students who mentioned that both their native and non-native teachers were equally strict in terms of the students’ adherence to the classroom and school rules. In addition, a great majority of students appreciated their teachers’ being strict. All in all, despite the variability in interview responses, the overall perception was that both teacher groups were perceived to perform their jobs well.

## 4. Discussion and Conclusion

As revealed by the findings of the present study, there are no significant differences between NESTs and NNESTs in terms of in-class teaching roles. Both NESTs and NNESTs in our study seem to show effective pedagogical skills in teaching English, as evidenced by the high scores of both groups in all the related items

higher than 2.5 on the given 3 point scale. Also students made positive comments about the teaching skills of both teacher groups in the interviews. Thus, the two groups seem to have been perceived almost equally successful in teaching skills. This finding contrasts with the results of studies where NESTs were perceived to be better teachers than NNESTs (e.g. Devrim & Bayyurt, 2010; Incecay & Atay, 2009; Shimizu, 1995) or vice versa (e.g. Demir, 2011; Karakas, Uysal, Bilgin and Bulut (2016); Ustunluoglu, 2007). On the other hand, this result firmly confirms the statements of Medgyes (1994) and Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) that both NESTs and NNESTs can be equally successful as English teachers.

In terms of in-class management skills, again, there are no significant differences between NESTs and NNESTs. Contrary to literature underlining the perceived superiority of either group in classroom management (e.g. NESTs in Demir (2011) and NNESTs in Ustunluoglu (2007)), in the present study, both groups were reported to be almost equally successful in managing the language classroom. Also, as demonstrated by the highly rated items about the in-class teaching and in-class management roles with no significant differences, in this study both NESTs and NNESTs are likely to have displayed high levels of professionalism.

Furthermore, as shown by both questionnaire and interview results, NESTs were stated to display significantly better communication skills than NNESTs, in conformity with the findings of Koksal, (2006), Mahboob (2004), Shimizu (1995) and Ustunluoglu (2007). Besides, NESTs' classes were found to be much more enjoyable than those of NNESTs. Also NESTs were perceived to use body language significantly more than NNESTs and give more background information about the topics by relating the content to their own multicultural experience. They were also rated as more cheerful, energetic and easygoing, which most probably increased the joy in their classes. As the students mentioned, they did not adhere to the textbooks and materials as strictly as NNESTs so were able to manipulate the content more flexibly by focusing more on communication, which is the main aim of their lessons. In their communicational exchanges, they were respectful to the students as displayed by their high means in that aspect ( $\geq 2.5$  on the 3 point scale) and the interview findings. They also seem to have maintained discipline and order. Thus a unique finding about the NESTs in this study is that they integrated not only joy but also discipline in their classes. However though the difference is not significant, NNESTs in this study appear to be stricter than NESTs to a certain extent as revealed by the questionnaire findings highlighting NESTs as more tolerant and easygoing as well as the students' interview reports indicating NNESTs as less tolerant to student mistakes.

According to Widdowson (1994), non-native speakers are more advantageous when the role of the instructor is considered due to the fact that they have extensive experience as second language learners of English. On the other hand, native speakers have the power of being reliable informants as they are likely to inform the others more of the L2 culture. In this study, it is seen that NESTs effectively fulfilled both of these in-class roles defined by Widdowson (1994) and their performance in the former role was not significantly different from the NNESTs'. They not only provided the students with information about the L2 culture and different cultures in the world as informants but also showed a high performance in their instructor role, as shown by their teaching and classroom management skills with high ratings. This result might also be due to NESTs' being experienced in the target culture. That is, their teaching tenure in the target setting is relatively long (between 6 and 13 years) and in this period, through lived experience, they might have displayed high levels of accommodation to the target culture as well as the culture of the educational context. In fact, they were said to be knowledgeable and experienced about the Turkish culture and Turkish language in the interviews. As highlighted by Devrim and Bayyurt's (2010) study, the Turkish students think that English language teachers should be familiar with cultures in Turkey as well as the target language. Accordingly, NESTs in the present study seem to have fulfilled these expectations effectively.

Furthermore, NESTs have been reported to be superior in multicultural experience. This was said to affect the intensity of the background knowledge they provide, which most probably increased the joy in their lessons. This fact also sheds light on the vitality of increasing teachers', especially NNESTs' multicultural experience via pre-service and in-service teacher training through interactive practices. As Bayyurt (2006) indicates, the more active English language teachers become about the involvement of culture in their English language teaching, the more they equip their students with the required linguistic and cultural resources to be able to communicate with people from other cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Additionally, in this research setting, the relevant strengths of NESTs and NNESTs have been taken into consideration right from the beginning, since the curriculum assigns more communicative roles to the NESTs and more grammar and writing related jobs to the NNESTs. This role definition most probably contributed to NESTs' higher scores in communication skills. Indeed in this study, NNESTs were reported to be very competent in speaking and teaching English, thus their communication skills were also strong, but not as strong as the NESTs. As the results have shown no meaningful differences in the teaching and classroom management skills between two groups, it can be said that the strengths and possible weaknesses of the groups have balanced out each other and this has paved the way for a sound partnership.

All in all, according to the present study, neither group is better than the other in teaching English and

managing the classroom. Although there are perceived differences in communication skills and some individual qualities favoring NESTs, there seems to be a sound collaboration between the parties and they appear to be perceived equally competent in several professional aspects. Indeed what matters in native and non-native teacher discussion most is the level of professionalism. Thus instead of overemphasizing the teachers' ethnic and language background, it is necessary to primarily focus on the quality of job being done. Also allocating the teaching tasks in accordance with the strengths of each group would contribute to effective outcomes. Thus it is essential to harmonize the powers of NESTs and NNESTs and accordingly to raise the quality of English language teaching through a balanced collaboration.

## References

- Árva, V. & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System*, 28(3), 355-372.
- Bayyurt, Y. (2006). Non - native English language teachers' perspective on culture in English as a foreign language classrooms. *Teacher Development*, 10(2), 233-247.
- Canagarajah, S. (1999). Interrogating the "native speaker fallacy": Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 77-92). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cheung, Y. L. (2002). *The attitude of university students in Hong Kong towards native and nonnative teachers of English*. (Unpublished master's thesis). The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong.
- 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.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185-209.
- Demir, B. (2011). Undergraduate FL learners' perceptions of native and non-native language instructors. *The International Journal of Research in Teacher Education*, 1(1), 1-29.
- Devrim, D. Y. & Bayyurt, Y. (2010). Students' understandings and preferences of the role and place of 'culture' in English Language Teaching: A focus in an EFL context. *TESOL Journal*, 2, 4- 24.
- Hadla, Z. (2013). Student and teacher perceptions of native and non-native English speaking teachers in the Lebanese context. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Exeter, Exeter, England.
- Inceçay, G., & Atay, D. (2009, May). EFL learners' interaction with native and nonnative teachers. Paper presented at The 1st International Congress of Educational Research.Çanakkale, Turkey.
- Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 10(2), 180-206.
- Koksal, K. (2006). An investigation into students' perceptions of native English speaking teachers' (Nest) and non-native English speaking teachers' (Non-nest) performance and competencies in teaching English as a foreign language. (Unpublished MA thesis). Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Canakkale.
- Kramsch, C. (1997). The privilege of the non-native speaker. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 112, 359-369.
- Lasagabaster, D. & Sierra, J. M. (2002). University students' perceptions of native and non-native speaker teachers of English. *Language Awareness*, 11(2), 132-140.
- Mahboob, A. (2004). Native or nonnative: What do students enrolled in an intensive English program think? In L. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English speaking professionals* (pp. 121-147). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Proud to be a nonnative speaker. *TESOL Matters*, 13, 4- 15.
- Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: who's worth more? *ELT Journal*, 46 (4), 340-349.
- Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher*. London: Macmillan.
- Mermelstein, A. D. (2015). Perceptions of native and non-native English teachers by Taiwanese university EFL students. *Mextesol Journal*, 39(3), 1-18.
- Modiano, M. (1999). International English in the global village. *English Today*, 15 (2), 22–28.
- Moussu, L. (2002). English as a second language students' reactions to non-native English speaking teachers. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Brigham Young University, Utah.
- Philipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rao, Z. (2010). Chinese students' perceptions of native English speaking teachers in EFL teaching. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 31(1), 55-68.
- Samimy, K. & Brutt-Griffler, J. (1999). To be a native or non-native speaker: Perceptions of non- native speaking students in a graduate TESOL program. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 127-144). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Shimizu, K. (1995). Japanese college student attitudes towards English teachers: a survey, *The Language Teacher*, 19(10), 5–8.
- Thomas, J. (1999). Voices from the periphery: Non-native teachers and issues of credibility. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 5-13). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Ürkmöz, S. (2015). Turkish EFL learner perceptions of native and non-native English language teachers. *Third 21st CAF Conference at Harvard in Boston*, 6(1), 328-334.
- Ustunluoglu, E. (2007). University students' perceptions of native and non - native teachers. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, (13)1, 63-79.
- Walkinshaw, I. S., & Oanh, D. H. (2014). Native and non-native English language teachers: Student perceptions in Vietnam and Japan. *SAGE Open*, 4(2), 1-9.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*. 28(2), 377-389.
- Wu, K., & Ke, C. (2009). Haunting native speakerism? Students' perceptions towards native English speaking teachers in Taiwan. *English Language Teaching*, 2(3), 44-52.

### Notes

Note 1. This paper was presented at the 2<sup>nd</sup> International Symposium on Language Education and Teaching in Rome, Italy on 20-23 April, 2017.

## APPENDIX Questionnaire

### PART I

Dear Students,

This questionnaire is a part of a PhD study being conducted.

Read each statement concerning what you think about the skills and qualities of **your native teacher of English**.

Please circle the number that best describes the degree of your native teacher's demonstration of each item.

Please refer to the information below in order to know the level of agreement that each number represents.

Thank you for your help.

I think...

3: My native teacher of English **demonstrates** this.

2: My native teacher of English **partly demonstrates** this.

1: My native teacher of English **does not demonstrate** this.

<b>I think my <u>native teacher of English</u></b>	<b>Demonstrates this</b>	<b>Partly Demonstrates this</b>	<b>Does not Demonstrate this</b>
1. stimulates interest at the start of the lesson.	3	2	1
2. relates the previous lesson's work with the current lesson.	3	2	1
3. adjusts the content of the lesson to the level of the students.	3	2	1
4. uses tools and materials in a timely and appropriate manner.	3	2	1
5. stages the lesson coherently.	3	2	1
6. implements effective learning methods.	3	2	1
7. gives sufficient prompts and cues.	3	2	1
8. corrects wrong and incomplete answers effectively.	3	2	1
9. checks student achievement of lesson aims.	3	2	1
10. provides activities to consolidate learning.	3	2	1
11. is punctual and prompt at arriving in the classroom.	3	2	1
12. completes the lesson on time.	3	2	1
13. is able to maintain order and discipline in the classroom.	3	2	1
14. speaks clearly and comprehensibly.	3	2	1
15. is well prepared.	3	2	1
16. knows his/her topic.	3	2	1
17. ensures active participation of the students.	3	2	1
18. praises the students frequently.	3	2	1
19. addresses the students by their names.	3	2	1
20. makes the lesson enjoyable.	3	2	1
21. uses body language.	3	2	1
22. treats students respectfully.	3	2	1
23. is cheerful.	3	2	1
24. is trustworthy.	3	2	1



<b>I think my <u>native teacher of English</u></b>	<b>Demonstrates this</b>	<b>Partly Demonstrates this</b>	<b>Does not Demonstrate this</b>
25. is energetic.	3	2	1
26. is respectful.	3	2	1
27. is consistent.	3	2	1
28. is tolerant.	3	2	1
29. is sensitive.	3	2	1
30. is easygoing.	3	2	1

## PART II

Now read each statement concerning what you think about the skills and qualities of your non-native (Turkish) teacher of English. Please circle the number that best describes the degree of your non-native teacher's demonstration of each item. Please refer to the information below in order to know the level of agreement that each number represents.

I think...

3: My non-native (Turkish) teacher of English **demonstrates** this.

2: My non-native (Turkish) teacher of English **partly demonstrates** this.

1. My non-native (Turkish) teacher of English **does not demonstrate** this.

<b>I think my non-native (<u>Turkish</u>) teacher of English</b>	<b>Demonstrates this</b>	<b>Partly Demonstrates this</b>	<b>Does not Demonstrate this</b>
1. stimulates interest at the start of the lesson.	3	2	1
2. relates the previous lesson's work with the current lesson.	3	2	1
3. adjusts the content of the lesson to the level of the students.	3	2	1
4. uses tools and materials in a timely and appropriate manner.	3	2	1
5. stages the lesson coherently.	3	2	1
6. implements effective learning methods.	3	2	1
7. gives sufficient prompts and cues.	3	2	1
8. corrects wrong and incomplete answers effectively.	3	2	1
9. checks student achievement of lesson aims.	3	2	1
10. provides activities to consolidate learning.	3	2	1
11. is punctual and prompt at arriving in the classroom.	3	2	1
12. completes the lesson on time.	3	2	1
13. is able to maintain order and discipline in the classroom.	3	2	1
14. speaks clearly and comprehensibly.	3	2	1
15. is well prepared.	3	2	1
16. knows his/her topic.	3	2	1
17. ensures active participation of the students.	3	2	1
18. praises the students frequently.	3	2	1
19. addresses the students by their names.	3	2	1
20. makes the lesson enjoyable.	3	2	1
21. uses body language.	3	2	1
22. treats students respectfully.	3	2	1
23. is cheerful.	3	2	1
24. is trustworthy.	3	2	1
25. is energetic.	3	2	1
26. is respectful.	3	2	1
27. is consistent.	3	2	1
28. is tolerant.	3	2	1
29. is sensitive.	3	2	1
30. is easygoing.	3	2	1