Non-NESTs and NESTs from the Perspectives of Students and Instructors in Turkish Context

Elif Nur Sezgin*, Ahmet Önal**

Abstract

   This study aims to find out the perceptions of both university preparatory class students and non-native English speaking instructors towards non-NESTs and NESTs. It has been carried out with 66 students studying in English preparatory classes at Süleyman Demirel University and 63 non-native English speaking instructors employed in eight different universities in Turkey. A five point Likert-type questionnaire has been employed as the data collection instrument. The questionnaire items selected from Çakır and Demir (2013), Köksal (2006) and Moussu (2006) have been adapted to the context of the study. Descriptive statistics, Kruskal-Wallis and Post Hoc tests have been employed in the analysis of the data. Findings have revealed NESTs are better at teaching pronunciation and speaking; however, grammar is taught better by non-NESTs. Furthermore, students give importance to use mother tongue as learning English becomes easier for them when non-NESTs make comparisons between English and Turkish in teaching.

   Keywords: *Instructional characteristics, motivation, NESTs, non-NESTs*

Öğrencilerin ve Öğretim Görevlilerinin Bakış Açısından Ana Dili İngilizce Olan ve Ana Dili İngilizce Olmayan Öğretim Görevlileri

Öz

   Bu çalışma, hem üniversite hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin hem de ana dili İngilizce olmayan öğretim görevlilerinin, ana dili İngilizce olan ve olmayan öğretim görevlilerine yönelik algılarını ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışma Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İngilizce hazırlık sınıflarında öğrenim gören 66 öğrenci ve Türkiye'deki sekiz farklı üniversitenin Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulunda görev yapan, anadili İngilizce olmayan 63 öğretim görevlisi ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Veri toplama aracı olarak Likert tipi bir anket kullanılmıştır. Çakır ve Demir (2013), Köksal (2006) ve Moussu (2006) çalışmalarından seçilen anket maddeleri bu çalışmanın bağlamına uyarlanmıştır. Verilerin analizinde betimsel istatistikler, Kruskal-Wallis ve Post Hoc testleri kullanılmıştır. Bulgular, ana dili İngilizce olan öğretim görevlilerinin telaffuz ve konuşmayı öğretmede daha iyi olduğunu; ancak dilbilgisinin ana dili İngilizce olmayan öğretim görevlileri tarafından daha iyi öğretildiğini göstermiştir. Ayrıca öğrencilerin ara sıra ana dillerini kullanmaya önem verdikleri ve ana dili İngilizce olmayan öğretim

---

*   Süleyman Demirel University, Faculty of Education, Department of Foreign Language Education, Isparta, Turkey, sezginelifnur@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-2421-7362 🆔

** Süleyman Demirel University, Faculty of Education, Department of Foreign Language Education, Isparta, Turkey, ahmetonal@sdu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-5325-4958 🆔

görevlilerinin İngilizce ile Türkçe arasında karşılaştırma yaptığında İngilizce öğrenmenin öğrenciler için kolaylaştığı tespit edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Ana dili İngilizce olan öğretim görevlileri, ana dili İngilizce olmayan öğretim görevlileri, eğitici özellikleri, motivasyon,*

Introduction

In today's globalized world, English language has become a contemporary lingua franca as non-native speakers of English outnumber the native speakers of it. That is to say, as Medgyes (2001) states, "English language is no longer the privilege of native speakers" (p. 429). Nevertheless, native speakers of English have an unchanging, explicit advantage over foreign and second speakers of it. Likewise, the concept of 'the ideal teacher is a native speaker' mentioned at the Commonwealth Conference on the Teaching of English as a Second Language held in Makerere, Uganda (1961) was common in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT) until 1990s. It was first challenged by Phillipson (1992a), who introduced the notion of 'native speaker fallacy' to emphasize the misconception of the native English speaking teachers (NESTs). Phillipson (1992a) claimed that all the tenets of the conference were wrong and they had no "scientific validity" (p. 195). Phillipson (1992b) reveals the bright sides of non-native English-speaking teachers (non-NESTs) by referring to their capabilities as follows:

> It is arguable, as a general principle, that non-native teachers may, in fact, be better qualified than native speakers, if they have gone through the complex process of acquiring English as a second or foreign language, have insight into the linguistic and cultural needs of their learners, a detailed awareness of how mother tongue and target language differ and what is difficult for learners, and first-hand experience of using a second and foreign language (p. 25).

A consensus has not been reached and many scholars and researchers accept that the issue of non-NESTs vs. NESTs remains controversial (Braine, 1999a; Davies, 2003; Medgyes, 1992; Mufwene, 1998). Medgyes (1992) argues that the differentiation should be preserved between non-NESTs and NESTs since these two groups complete each other in their strengths and weaknesses. When the related literature is reviewed, it has been observed that, after Medgyes' (1992) and Phillipson's (1992a-b) studies, it took nearly a decade to see more research into the way non-NESTs are perceived and their self-conceptions. As Llurda (2005) states, the interest for this issue has only recently appeared although the need, probably, has always been there.

Characteristics of non-NESTs and NESTs

Although it is commonly conceived as a complex issue and a satisfactory definition of it is missing in the literature (Kaplan, 1999), a native speaker traditionally refers to someone who speaks that language as a mother tongue; in other words, L1.

Nevertheless, the qualifications of the native speaker have been questioned by various researchers. According to Medgyes (2001), the most straightforward criterion is the place of birth. However, the place where people are born does not always guarantee the 'native speaker' identity, because as Medgyes (2001) indicates, the native language of an individual can be replaced by another language by reason of immigration; or the individual might be adopted by parents from a different country, culture and ethnic background in his/her early childhood. Besides, Cook (1999) asserts that an individual cannot be regarded as a native speaker unless s/he has acquired that language during early childhood. Similarly, Davies (2003) clearly indicates that most of the native speakers' significant features are more or less attainable for non-native speakers. They can achieve those features with practice, apart from the main characteristic of non-NESTs, which is 'childhood acquisition'.

It can be deduced from the above-mentioned discussion that a satisfactory definition for the terms 'native speaker' and 'non-native speaker' does not exist as yet. As Kaplan asserts, these terms "obviously and pointlessly dichotomize the world neatly into 'us' and 'them'" (1999, p. 5). Nevertheless, the reality shows that teachers who do not speak English as their mother tongue, however proficient they are in English, are frequently labeled as non-NESTs (Pasternak & Bailey, 2004). Therefore, a non-native speaker is typically defined as a person who learns the target language as a foreign or second language. According to Ulate (2011), the term non-native is generally regarded as negative by language professionals when compared to the term native, which is regarded as positive. Alseweed (2012) also echoes this claim and states that the term 'non-native' negatively affects the morale of the teachers by letting them feel inadequate and inferior to NESTs. Therefore, the label 'non-native' has an unfavorable impact on the teachers and non-NESTs generally find it difficult to keep up with native speakers in the same boat.

In a similar vein, this negative impact can even transform into some sort of prejudice against non-NESTs on the grounds that they generally lack required linguistic command to be competent in English; they seem inadequate and inferior to NESTs only because English is their foreign or second language (Çakır & Demir, 2013). There is an unrefutable reality that NESTs have more advantages in employment opportunities than non-NESTs, whether or not they have been trained in the field of ELT. According to Çakır and Demir (2013), this prevalent belief arises not only from the choices of language learners, but also mostly from college owners, administrators of educational institutions and employers. In almost every region of the world, it is an unquestionable fact that NESTs have more job opportunities than non-NESTs. As Braine (1999b) argues, even inadequate native speakers have been preferred to adequate and proficient non-native colleagues in some countries. From the point of Selvi (2010), most of the research findings show that the majority of job advertisements favor NESTs and deny non-NESTs by indicating only NESTs can apply and other applications are not needed. That is to say, native speakerism leaves behind the background of education, experience and abilities. As Bailey (2002)

stresses, where the "the blue-eyed blond back packer" (p.1) is welcomed, competent and well-educated non-NEST will be refused.

Kaplan (1999) questions such prejudice in hiring practices and maintains that it is the qualifications of teachers that should be taken into account, not their English language nativeness. According to Kaplan (1999), it is a must to be able to speak, write and read a range of English, but the capacity to teach in a specific setting is also essential. In a similar vein, Canagarajah (1999) believes that being a native speaker of a language is not enough to become a teacher as it requires an extensive pedagogical preparation and experience. Likewise, several studies suggest that instead of teachers' mother tongue, their knowledge of various teaching methods and techniques and engaging communication practices that strengthen the communication skills of students are critical (Adıgüzel & Özüdoğru, 2017; Alghofaili & Elyas, 2017). Phillipson (1992a) asserts that teachers are not born, they are self-made; and similarly, in Ezberci's (2005) opinion, 'nativeness' cannot ensure the requirements of 'teacherness'. Not enough study has been performed over the past decade on non-native speakers' linguistic skills and strengths and what they can present, instead of being compared to native speakers as a weak imitation of them (Liu, 1999). Tajeddin and Adeh (2016) point out that it is significant to arrange courses and materials for non-NESTs who have low self-esteem on the purpose of raising their awareness on their own strengths, professional status and contribution to the language teaching. Besides, Maum (2002) offers more democratic hiring practices by changing the question from 'who the candidates are (non-NESTs or NESTs)' to 'what they (their qualifications) are'.

Previous Studies on non-NESTs vs. NESTs in Foreign Language Teaching

Review of relevant literature reveals that several studies have been conducted on the issue of non-NESTs and NESTs both nationally and internationally. It has been observed that these studies dealt with the issue under investigation from different perspectives. To start with, some of the studies explore the similarities and differences between non-NESTs and NESTs and have revealed certain features attached to both groups. Medgyes (2001), for instance, examines the differences between non-NESTs and NESTs with regard to teaching behaviour. Table 1 below presents the results of a survey carried out with 325 non-NESTs and NESTs.

Table 1.
Perceived Differences in Teaching Behavior between NESTs and non-NESTs (Medgyes, 2001, p. 435)

NESTs	Non-NESTs
own use of English	
speak better English	speak poorer English
use real language	use ''bookish'' language
use English more confidently	use English less confidently

<p style="text-align:center;">*general attitude*</p>

adopt a more flexible approach	adopt a more guided approach
are more innovative	are more cautious
are less empathetic	are more empathetic
attend to perceived needs	attend to real needs
have far-fetched expectations	have realistic expectations
are more casual	are stricter
are less committed	are more committed

<p style="text-align:center;">*attitude to teaching*
the language</p>

are less insightful	are more insightful
focus on:	focus on:
-fluency	*-accuracy*
- meaning	*-form*
-language in use	*-grammar rules*
-oral skills	*-printed word*
-colloquial registers	*-formal registers*
teach items in context	teach items in isolation
prefer free activities	prefer controlled activities
favor group work/pair work	favor frontal work
use a variety of materials	use single textbook
tolerate errors	correct/punish for errors
set fewer tests	set more tests
use no/less L1	use more L1
resort to no/less translation	resort to more translation
assign less homework	assign more homework

<p style="text-align:center;">*attitude to teaching culture*</p>

supply more cultural information	supply less cultural information

Most of the non-NESTs participating in the Medgyes' survey (2001) expressed their inferiority complex against NESTs due to the defects in their idiomatic and proper use of English. Many participants commented on non-NESTs' limited insights into the intricacies of meaning and their poor speaking and listening skills. Medgyes (2001) argues that the reason why non-NESTs favor secure and controlled ways of class work such as lockstep activities is the unpredictable occasions with linguistic traps that occur in pair or group works. As Gündüz (2015) states, it is an undeniable fact that NESTs are more advantageous since they have phonetic, lexical and cultural knowledge of the language that they teach. The main strength of NESTs is their linguistic skills, fluency, authenticity and their perfect pronunciation (Barratt & Kontra, 2000; Butler, 2007; Cheung, 2002). NESTs are perceived as superior to non-NESTs since they have the intuition to use the language naturally and idiomatically

which renders them more flexible while teaching. Medgyes (2001) maintains that NESTs' superiority basically stems from their ability to use the language spontaneously in various communicative contexts.

On the other hand, there are some studies reporting several strengths that are unique to non-NESTs. To start with, Medgyes (2001) stresses that non-NESTs can be perceived as more appropriate learner models for students than NESTs as they have gone through the same process of foreign language learning after acquiring their mother tongue. In a similar fashion, Widdowson (1994) argues that it is the non-NEST who knows better what is needed to achieve learning objectives. Since they have experienced the similar process while learning the target language themselves, non-NESTs, as a source of motivation, are able to show empathy towards their students by appreciating their needs and difficulties in specific learning contexts. Kurniawati and Rizki (2018) state that English is considered as a difficult subject for some countries where English is learned as a foreign language since the desire of students to learn is weak as they are not confident that they will be able to be proficient in English. In this case, getting non-NESTs is a good way to enhance the students' motivation because they will see that their teacher was like them once, and now is a good English speaker. In a similar vein, Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) conducted a study with TESOL graduate and experienced students and found out remarkable differences in teaching styles of non-NESTs and NESTs. NESTs were much more confident while using English; however, non-NESTs were more aware of their students' learning problems and needs. Likewise, Guerra (2017) conducted a study with 32 Portuguese college students and the results indicated that NESTs were preferred since their language proficiency was perceived as better, however, non-NESTs were seemed to be more advantageous concerning their commitment to teaching and awareness of student's needs. Non-NESTs are, thus, equipped with several advantages as a result of the same process they have gone through. On the question of whether non-NESTs or NESTs were more influential in foreign language teaching, Samimy and Brutt-Griffler's participants (1999) were split and 58% chose 'both' option. Additionally, Park and Shin (2010) assert that non-NESTs are better at explaining some challenging problems as well as providing thorough feedback by sharing students' mother language. Accordingly, students' using their first language freely when it is needed by comparing the similarities and differences between mother language and target language helps students learn better (Alghofaili & Elyas, 2017; Dendrinos, 2001). In the study of Savran Celik and Aydin (2018), even though the idea that separating L1 from the learning process was the only way of successful acquisition was mentioned, it was concluded that using L1 naturally helped comprehending the further utterances and complex content, prevented misunderstanding and saved time in EFL learning. Furthermore, in ESL settings, non-NESTs can be more supportive for students who experience culture shock or homesickness as they share a similar linguistic and cultural background (Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Barratt & Kontra, 2000; Kelch & Santana-Williamson, 2002). Similarly, Kato (2011) investigated the nature of classroom communication of non-NESTs and NESTs; and found out some striking differences in their communication

styles. Findings revealed that non-NESTs played a significant role especially in culturally diverse classrooms since they showed empathy towards students with different ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

Lasagabaster and Sierra (2002) conducted a study with university students and the results indicated that NESTs were preferred by students of all levels in the concepts of vocabulary, speaking, pronunciation and culture. However, non-NESTs were mainly preferred for learning strategies and grammar. Similarly, Moussu (2006) conducted a survey on the self-perceptions of non-NESTs and NESTs questioning their professional and linguistic skills. NESTs showed self-confidence in almost every area such as writing, reading, listening, speaking and pronunciation skills; however, grammar rules were the only area where non-NESTs had more self-confidence compared to their native counterparts. Then, she asked non-NESTs and NESTs the most valuable qualities and serious weaknesses of non-NESTs to learn more about some of the characteristics of non-NESTs. The most frequent response given by non-NESTs was their "understanding of students' situation and needs". NESTs, on the other hand, mentioned non-NESTs' 'ability to comprehend and explain grammar rules', and their experience of learning a foreign language. As for the weaknesses of non-NESTs, their 'foreign accent', 'lack of American culture knowledge' and 'bad pronunciation' were referred to frequently. However, in her research, one of the participating teachers stated that it was more difficult to understand British-accented instructors in comparison to non-NESTs. In the meantime, the study of Lewis, Sonsaat and Link (2017) showed that the ESL and EFL learners preferred NESTs to non-NESTs in pronunciation teaching; however, the findings revealed that they were insufficient to distinguish native speech from non-native speech.

Tatar and Yildiz (2010) pointed out that private school administrators prefer NESTs more often and willingly than non-NESTs in the hiring processes and even applying for some schools as English teachers is not possible for non-NESTs. In a similar vein, Öztürk and Atay (2010) concluded that some private schools employ only NESTs with the aim of attracting more students, even if non-NESTs have higher qualifications and more teaching experience. It can be easily seen that most of the administrators, parents and students favor NESTs rather than non-NESTs without questioning NESTs' experiences or teaching qualifications. Tatar (2019) conducted a study with 23 pre-service teachers and investigated their opinions on native-speakerism in English language teaching. The findings showed that the participants were aware of the native speakerism in English as a foreign language (EFL) context and its ideology had a negative impact on them which results in low self-confidence. In the study, nevertheless, it is stressed that as participants observed successful non-NESTs, their attitude towards them became more positive. Daftari and Tavil (2017) carried out a study with 18 non-NESTs from different countries who work in a language center in Ankara. They investigated non-NESTs' linguistic insecurity and its impact on the productive skills of learners. They came to the conclusion that their linguistic insecurity did not indicate a significant effect on learners' speaking and writing scores. Besides, the findings showed that more experienced non-NESTs felt less insecure. In another study, Çakır and Demir (2013) analyzed the university

preparatory students' attitudes toward non-NESTs and NESTs, and revealed that non-NESTs were superior to NESTs in explaining grammar, showing empathy towards students and encouraging them. Likewise, Üstünoğlu (2007) examined attitudes of private university students toward NESTs and non-NESTs in terms of their teaching roles, communication skills, management skills and individual qualities. As for communication skills, NESTs were favored more than non-NESTs since they were better at using body language, making lessons fun and praising students. However, non-NESTs were found better at teaching roles as they also were taught about how to teach effectively. They could use several educational tools, adjust the level of subject content according to their students' levels and check students' progress better than NESTs. Likewise, students also found non-NESTs better at managing the class; in other words, they were able to create discipline, got prepared before the class and encouraged more participation in their lessons. Furthermore, Adıgüzel and Özüdoğru (2017) examined the non-NEST's and NEST's impact on students' academic achievement and speaking skills in English language. According to the results, a statistically significant higher academic achievement was observed in the post-test of non-NEST's students compared to NEST's students; while there was not a statistically significant difference between the students' speaking scores. This is also in line with the findings of the research conducted by Al-Nawrasy (2013) who investigated the effect of NESTs on high-school students' speaking level and found no statistically significant difference between test scores resulting from NEST teaching. Similarly, Koşar (2019) undertook a study to explore if there was a statistically significant difference between the speaking levels of 36 university preparatory class students who were taught by non-NESTs and NESTs. The participants took a speaking quiz, three speaking portfolios and the end of course test. The results revealed that a statistically significant difference was not observed resulting from being taught by these teachers.

The term 'perception' refers to "…the way in which something is regarded or understood" (Simonson, Smaldino & Zvacek, 2015, p. 66) and several variables may affect the perceptions of individuals positively or negatively. In line with this, regarding the studies investigating the students' perceptions of instructors, it would be not wrong to say that there are some variables such as age, gender and proficiency level that affect their opinions. Gender-related studies show that females perceived their teachers as more optimistic and dominant at both primary and secondary levels (Goh & Fraser, 1995; Levy, den Brok, Wubbels & Brekelmans, 2003; Levy, Wubbels & Brekelmans, 1992; Rickards, 1998; Rickards & Fisher, 1997; Waldrip & Fisher, 1999; Wubbels & Levy, 1993). As for the students' language level, it may influence their perceptions towards teachers as resulted in many studies; students with a higher proficiency prefer NESTs, while non-NESTs have been regarded as better for students with lower level. However, there are some other studies that show the university students with high level of English have developed more positive attitudes toward non-NESTs through time (Cheung & Braine, 2007; Moussu & Braine, 2006). In terms of the instructors' perceptions, it has been argued that their professional experience plays a significant role in making them feel competent and confident in their field (Levy et al., 1992).

In conclusion, even though several studies have been conducted regarding the effectiveness of non-NESTs and NESTs in foreign language teaching, more studies are needed to understand better the differences and strengths that these two groups hold; and overcome the prejudice against non-NESTs. The common limitation of the studies so far has been their tendency to deal with the issue from only the perspectives of the students or the instructors. In other words, there is a scarcity of research exploring both students' and instructors' perceptions towards non-NESTs and NESTs as well as the comparison between the perceptions of the two groups in Turkish context. Thus, this study aims to contribute to the literature by investigating the phenomenon from both perspectives. All in all, it has been decided to undertake the current study to reveal both preparatory class students' and non-native English speaking instructor's perceptions of non-NESTs' and NESTs' instructional effectiveness.

Research Questions

In line with the aim of the study, the following research questions (RQ) are to be addressed:

1. What are the preparatory class students' perceptions of non-NESTs and NESTs regarding instructional characteristics, motivation, communication, culture and testing/assessment?
2. What are the non-native English speaking instructors' perceptions of non-NESTs and NESTs regarding instructional characteristics, motivation, communication, culture and testing/assessment?
3. Is there a meaningful difference between the perceptions of preparatory class students and instructors toward non-NESTs and NESTs regarding instructional characteristics, motivation, communication, culture and testing/assessment?
4. Do gender, department and proficiency level have an influence on preparatory class students' perceptions of their non-NESTs and NESTs?
5. Do level of education and professional experience have an influence on non-native English speaking instructors' perceptions of non-NESTs and NESTs?

Method

This study employs a quantitative research design to shed light on both university preparatory class students' and non-native English speaking instructors' perceptions toward non-NESTs and NESTs under five headings as; instructional characteristics, motivation, communication, culture and testing/assessment. Quantitative research method was described by Aliaga and Gunderson (2002) as the explanation of an issue or phenomenon through the collection of numerical data and analysis using mathematical methods, especially statistics. Quantitative research is used to quantify attitudes and it draws conclusions from a larger group of people. The use of statistical and mathematical methods to obtain results is a part of this scientific, objective and fast research method. In this study, descriptive, quantitative methodology has been

required to compare the responses of two groups of participants. Relevant information as to the participants, instruments, data collection procedures and data analysis procedures has been provided below.

Participants

This study has been carried out with 129 participants in total. The first group of participants includes 66 students who study in the preparatory classes in departments of English Language Teaching (ELT), Education Faculty; English Language and Literature (ELL), Arts & Sciences Faculty; 'Others' (Engineering and Economics), Engineering Faculty, Economics and Administrative Sciences Faculty, SDU. The second group of participants consists of 63 non-native English speaking instructors employed in the school of foreign languages of the following universities: Süleyman Demirel University, Dokuz Eylül University, Akdeniz University, Selçuk University, Karadeniz Technical University, Gazi University, Anadolu University and İzmir Democracy University. Both groups of participants have been chosen through the technique of convenience sampling (Dörnyei, 2007) due to the easier accessibility of the intended study group.

Table 2.
Demographic Information of Preparatory Class Students

Gender of preparatory class students			Department of preparatory class students			Proficiency level of preparatory class students		
	N	%		N	%		N	%
Female	41	62.1	ELT	12	18.2	A2	17	25.8
Male	25	37.9	ELL	19	28.8	B1	15	22.7
Total	66	100	Others	35	53	B2	9	13.6
			Total	66	100	C1	25	37.9
						Total	66	100

As shown in Table 2. 62% (*N*=41) of the preparatory class students are female whereas 38% (*N*=25) of them are male. As for the department of the preparatory class students; 18% (*N*=12) of them are ELT students, 29% (*N*=19) of them are ELL students and 53% (*N*=35) of the preparatory class students study in 'Others' (Engineering and Economics) department. In terms of the preparatory class students' proficiency levels; 26% (*N*=17) of the participants perceive their proficiency in English as A2, 23% (N=15) of them perceive as B1, 14% (*N*=9) of them perceive as B2 and 38% (*N*=25) of them perceive themselves as C1 in English.

Table 3.
Demographic Information of Instructors

Gender of instructors			Education level of instructors			Professional experience of instructors		
	N	%		N	%		N	%
Female	46	73	BA	17	27	1-5 years	3	4.8
Male	17	27	MA	37	58.7	6-10 years	23	36.5
Total	63	100	PhD	9	14.3	11-15 years	16	25.4
			Total	63	100	16-20 years	14	22.2

21-25 years	7	11.1
Total	63	100

As for the instructors, Table 3. indicates that while 73% (*N*=46) of the participant instructors are female, 27% (*N*=17) of them are male. In terms of their education level; 27% (*N*=17) of them have a BA degree, 59% (*N*=37) of them have their MA degree and 14% (*N*=9) of the participants have their PhDs. As can be seen in Table 3., 5% (*N*=3) of the participant instructors have 1-5 years of professional experience, 37% (*N*=23) of them have 6-10 years of experience, 25% (*N*=16) of them have 11-15 years of experience, 22% (*N*=14) of the participants have 16-20 years of experience and 11% (*N*=7) of them are the instructors with 21-25 years of experience.

Instruments

The researchers have reviewed the questionnaires employed by Çakır and Demir (2013), Moussu (2006) and Köksal (2006) with the aim of gathering the data for the context of this study. As a next step, 54 items have been selected and adapted by benefiting from these studies as relevant to Turkish foreign language education context. These items have been grouped under 5 sub-sections *(instructional characteristics, motivation, communication, culture and testing/assessment)*. Following this, two experts who hold PhDs in ELT have been asked to review the questionnaire in terms of its linguistic and contextual applicability and their suggestions have been taken into consideration with the aim of achieving validity. As to the reliability of the questionnaire, Cronbach's Alpha was conducted and it was found that the questionnaire items were reliable since the scores were .918 and .947 respectively, as presented in Table 4. and Table 5. below.

Table 4.
Reliability Statistics of Student Participants' Questionnaire

	Cronbach's Alpha Based on	
Cronbach's Alpha	**Standardized Items**	**N of Items**
.918	.920	54

Table 5.
Reliability Statistics of Instructor Participants' Questionnaire

	Cronbach's Alpha Based on	
Cronbach's Alpha	**Standardized Items**	**N of Items**
.947	.946	54

In the process of construction of the questionnaire, Likert-scale items have been utilized as they have been regarded as highly useful and effective in collecting data

(Brown, 2001). Finally, this five point Likert-type questionnaire (5=strongly agree; 4=agree; 3=neutral; 2=disagree; 1=strongly disagree) has been conducted.

Two similar but different versions of questionnaires have been employed as two groups of participants have been employed in this study. Both versions of the questionnaires consist of two sections. The first section of the questionnaires focuses on the demographic data of the participants; namely, age, gender, department, self-perception of English level/level of education, institution, previous NEST experience and professional experience.

The second section of the questionnaires contains 54 items; however, the wording of the items has been arranged in line with the perspective of the target participant group. To illustrate, the first item of the preparatory class students' questionnaire is '*Learning English with non-NESTs is easier for me than with NESTs.*' whereas it is '*Learning English with non-NESTs is easier for students than with NESTs.*' in the questionnaire of the instructor participants.

Data Collection Procedures

As the first step of the data collection procedure, the final versions of the questionnaires have been uploaded to Google Docs. The student participants who study in the preparatory classes in departments of English Language Teaching (ELT), English Language and Literature (ELL), and 'Others' (Engineering, Economics) at Süleyman Demirel University have been reached via their institutional e-mail addresses. The link of the questionnaire has been sent to their institutional e-mail addresses and the participants have been asked to fill in both sections of the questionnaire. As for the instructor participants employed by the Schools of Foreign Languages in 8 different universities, the online questionnaire web link has been also sent to their official e-mail addresses by requesting them to fill in the form. More specifically, almost 400 instructors have been contacted by the researchers; however, only 63 of them agreed to participate in the study.

Data Analysis Procedures

After the collection of data, responses provided by both groups of participants have been uploaded onto a computer and have been analyzed by using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences, 16.0). Firstly, Cronbach's Alpha has been applied to see the questionnaires' reliability levels and it has been found that the questionnaire items are reliable since the score yielded by Cronbach's Alpha is .92 for preparatory class students and .95 for instructors, respectively.

Following the reliability analysis, One-sample Statistics has been applied to supply descriptive statistics about the variable being tested (DeCoster, 2006), comprising the mean values and standard deviations of student and instructors' responses. Since the study aims to find out if there is a statistically meaningful difference between the perceptions of preparatory class students and instructors toward non-NESTs and NESTs, Independent Sample T-test (Levene's Test for Equality of Variances) has been

performed to present the outcomes of two t-tests comparing the mean values of these two groups in this study.

According to Neideen and Brasel (2007), "to use a parametric test, 3 parameters of the data must be true or are assumed" (p.93); normal distribution, equal variance and continuous data. In this study, as the data do not meet the requirements for a parametric test, a rank-based nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis test has been utilized to examine whether students' departments and language levels; and instructors' level of education and professional experience affect their opinions toward non-NESTs and NESTs. Furthermore, Post Hoc test has been applied to uncover specific differences among the departments (ELT, ELL, Others) of participant students.

Findings

In this part of the study, it has been aimed to examine the results in line with the research questions. To start with, the first three research questions have been handled regarding the five sub-sections of the questionnaire under separate headings; namely, *instructional characteristics, motivation, communication, culture and testing/assessment*. The fourth research question deals with whether genders, departments and proficiency levels of the preparatory class students have an influence on their perceptions of non-NESTs and NESTs. In a similar vein, the fifth research question, whether non-native English speaking instructors' level of education and professional experience have an influence on their perceptions of non-NESTs and NESTs, has also been discussed. (It should be noted that, for the purposes of being as reader-friendly and concise as possible, tables have been presented for only the results that are statistically significant.)

RQ1. What are the preparatory class students' perceptions of non-NESTs and NESTs regarding *instructional characteristics, motivation, communication, culture and testing/assessment*?

Preparatory class students' overall means for each sub-section of the questionnaire has been presented in Table 6. It can be argued that, in general, preparatory class students neither agree nor disagree with the questionnaire items as their means range between ($\bar{x}$=2.52) and ($\bar{x}$=3.03). While the sub-section of culture involves the least agreed items, the sub-section of testing/assessment has the highest mean score ($\bar{x}$=3.03). Therefore, it can be inferred that preparatory class students have been found more positive towards the items concerning testing/assessment.

Table 6.
Preparatory Class Students' Overall Means of Sub-Sections

	Overall means
Teaching/learning	3.01
Motivation	2.66
Communication	2.99
Culture	2.52
Testing/assessment	3.03

Instructional characteristics

This sub-section of the questionnaire contains 36 items that focus on instructional characteristics of non-NESTs and NESTs. The mean scores of the preparatory class students' responses regarding the instructional characteristics of NESTs and non-NESTs have been examined. *Item 31 (Non-NESTs can be more helpful at beginner level)* has been the most highly agreed item by the preparatory class students ($\bar{x}$=4.13). This implies that use of L1 is welcomed by the students at beginner level and it should be decreased as the level of the students' increase. The second highest mean score ($\bar{x}$=4.07) features *Item 6 (There are many non-NESTs who teach just as effectively as NESTs)*, which indicates that the students care more about the instructional and pedagogical skills of their instructors than their nativeness.

On the other hand, *Item 7 (I wish I had only non-NESTs)* has been mostly disagreed by the students ($\bar{x}$=1.27). It can be clearly inferred that students do not disregard the instructional strengths of NESTs. In plain words, while non-NESTs have been considered better at teaching and explaining grammar, students have found NESTs better at teaching speaking and pronunciation.

Motivation

The motivation sub-section of the questionnaire involves 5 items. It can be stated that preparatory class students are mostly neutral in terms of motivational characteristics of NESTs and non-NESTs because the mean scores for the items range between 2.27 and 3.04. More specifically, preparatory class students give the highest rank ($\bar{x}$=3.04) to *Item 41 (Non-NESTs encourage the students more effectively in learning English)*. It is possible to argue that students receive more support by non-NESTs. On the other hand, the item focusing on students' attendance and participation bears the lowest mean score ($\bar{x}$=2.27). Therefore, it can be inferred that students, in general, are motivated in NESTs' classes as much as those of non-NESTs.

Communication

The communication sub-section of the questionnaire includes 8 items. It is revealed that *Item 42 (There are a lot of non-NESTs that can effectively communicate in the target language)* has been the most agreed item in communication sub-section ($\bar{x}$=3.74). It can be inferred that non-NESTs are competent and efficient enough to communicate in the target language. Preparatory class students find non-NESTs more empathetic and communicative, and they feel more comfortable while expressing their thoughts and feelings to non-NESTs since they share the same linguistic and cultural background. On the other hand, *Item 46 (As NESTs have a different sense of humour, I cannot understand and laugh at their jokes)* has the lowest mean score in this sub-section ($\bar{x}$=1.93). It is possible to state that preparatory class students do not have any problems in understanding their jokes and they find NESTs entertaining as well.

Culture

In this sub-section of the questionnaire which contains 2 items, it is possible to argue that preparatory class students tend to disagree with the *Item 50 (Non-NESTs present the cultural elements of the target language better than NESTs)* and *Item 51 (Non-NESTs supply learners with more information about English Language and its culture)* as their mean scores have been found low ($\bar{x}$=2.75 and $\bar{x}$=2.28 respectively). In other words, non-NESTs are not perceived to be better than their NEST counterparts in supplying the cultural aspects of the target language. Since NESTs have been naturally acquainted with it, they have been regarded as more competent in providing the learners with information about English language and its culture.

Testing/assessment

The testing/assessment sub-section of the questionnaire contains 3 items. With reference to the first research question, it can be concluded that preparatory class students regard non-NESTs as more effective at preparing them for the exams since the *Item 52 (Non-NESTs can prepare learners for an exam more effectively than NESTs.)* has the highest rank ($\bar{x}$=3.34). This may stem from the idea that non-NESTs are more familiar with the national exam procedures and they seem to be more conscious of their students' concerns, needs and problems. On the other hand, *Item 54 (I feel more anxious when a NEST is my examiner in my speaking exam)* has the lowest mean score ($\bar{x}$=2.78) in this sub-section. It can be stated that preparatory class students do not have problems with having NEST as an examiner in their exams.

RQ2. What are the non-native English speaking instructors' perceptions of non-NESTs and NESTs regarding *instructional characteristics, motivation, communication, culture and testing/assessment*?

Instructors' overall means for each sub-section of the questionnaire has been presented in Table 7. It can be argued that, in general, instructors neither agree nor disagree with the questionnaire items as their means range between ($\bar{x}$=2.46) and ($\bar{x}$=3.37). While the sub-section of culture involves the least agreed items, the sub-section of communication has the highest mean score ($\bar{x}$=3.37). From this result, it can be remarked that participant instructors have more positive attitudes towards the items in the sub-section of communication.

Table 7.
Instructors' Total Means of Sub-Sections

	Total of means
Teaching/learning	2.98
Motivation	2.77
Communication	3.37
Culture	2.46
Testing/assessment	3.22

Instructional characteristics

In this sub-section of the questionnaire that contains 36 items, it has been found that non-native English speaking instructors strongly agree ($\bar{x}$=4.44) with *Item 6 (There are many non-NESTs who can teach just as effectively as NESTs)*. Similar to preparatory class students, instructors value instructional and pedagogical skills rather than nativeness in the process of foreign language teaching. It may also be inferred from the results that instructors highly agree ($\bar{x}$=3.79) with the *Item 5 (Non-NESTs are good models in learning English because they have gone through the same language learning process)*. Therefore, non-NESTs can be regarded as more empathetic than NESTs as they can understand the difficulties that students encounter during the learning process. Contrarily, *Item 13 (Non-NESTs are better at teaching pronunciation than NESTs.)* has the lowest mean score in this sub-section ($\bar{x}$=1.95). So, just like preparatory class students, instructors agree that NESTs are better at teaching pronunciation.

Motivation

The findings of the motivation sub-section of the questionnaire indicate that instructors neither completely agree nor completely disagree with the items. In particular, *Item 38 (Students feel less anxious about making mistakes in non-NESTs' classes than in NESTs' classes.)* has the highest mean score ($\bar{x}$=3.17). From the instructors' perspective, it can be stressed that non-NESTs are more sympathetic and tolerable to learners' mistakes since they have experienced the similar learning process as well. Besides, *Item 41 (Non-NESTs can encourage the students more effectively in learning English.)* has been highly agreed ($\bar{x}$=2.92) by participant instructors. Similar to preparatory class students, instructors also regard the *Item 39 (Students' attendance and participation in non-NESTs' classes is more than that of NESTs' classes.)* as the least agreeable ($\bar{x}$=2.47), which implies that there is not a positive or negative correlation between nativeness of the instructor and student participation.

Communication

According to statistical results of answers given by instructors regarding the sub-section of communication, as has been observed in the results of preparatory class students, instructors have given the highest rank ($\bar{x}$=4.47) to *Item 42 (There are a lot of non-NESTs who can effectively communicate in the target language)*. Therefore, as an answer to the second research question, it can be inferred that non-native English speaking instructors believe that non-NESTs are competent enough in communication in the target language. Conversely, Item *45 (Non-NESTs give more importance to friendly conversations outside the class than NESTs)* has the lowest mean score ($\bar{x}$=2.77) in this sub-section. Regarding this result, it may be argued that participant instructors do not perceive non-NESTs as better at having friendly conversations outside the classes.

Culture

In this sub-section of the questionnaire, which contains 2 items, instructors tend to disagree with the *Item 50 (Non-NESTs can present the cultural elements of the target language better than NESTs)* and *Item 51 (Non-NESTs can supply learners with more information about English Language and its culture)* as they have low mean scores ($\bar{x}$=2.49 and $\bar{x}$=2.44 respectively). That is to say, non-NESTs are not seen as better at providing the cultural elements of the target language compared to NESTs.

Testing/assessment

Looking at the mean scores of instructors' responses to the testing/assessment sub-section of the questionnaire, *Item 54 (Students feel more anxious when a NEST is the examiner in their speaking exam)* has the highest mean score in this sub-section ($\bar{x}$=3.61). Therefore, it might be argued that non-NESTs can create a more comfortable and friendly atmosphere during speaking exam as they seem more empathetic to students' feelings and concerns. In other respect, *Item 53 (Non-NESTs can assess students' linguistic competence more reliably and realistically)* has been found as the lowest mean sore ($\bar{x}$=2.79), which indicates that participant instructors regard both groups of instructors as sufficient to assess students' linguistic competence reliably and realistically.

RQ3. Is there a meaningful difference between the perceptions of preparatory class students and instructors toward non-NESTs and NESTs regarding *instructional characteristics, motivation, communication, culture and testing/assessment*?

Instructional characteristics

Concerning the sub-section of instructional characteristics of the questionnaire, Levene's Test for Equality of Variances has been conducted and a statistically significant difference has not been observed between the preparatory class students' and instructors' perceptions toward non-NESTs and NESTs [t=-.29, p=.78). Therefore, the findings clearly show that both groups of participants share similar perceptions toward non-NESTs and NESTs in terms of their instructional characteristics.

Motivation

The comparison of the mean scores of the two groups for motivation sub-section does not reveal a statistically significant difference between the preparatory class students' and instructors' perceptions based on Levene's Test for Equality of Variances [t=.78, p=.44). Therefore, the findings clearly demonstrate that both groups of participants have similar perceptions toward non-NESTs and NESTs in terms of their motivational characteristics.

Communication

The answers of the preparatory class students and instructors to the items concerning communication sub-section have been compared and presented in Table 8.

Table 8.

Comparison of Preparatory Class Students' and Instructors' Means of Communication Sub-Section

Items	Means of Students	Means of Instructors	Total of Means
42. There are a lot of non-NESTs that can effectively communicate in the target language.	3.74	4.47	4.1
43. Non-NESTs are more sincere and empathetic than NESTs while communicating.	3.03	2.8	2.91
44. I can communicate better with my non-NESTs as I share the same culture with them.	3.27	3.26	3.26
45. Non-NESTs give more importance to friendly conversations outside the class than NESTs.	3.07	2.77	2.92
46. As NESTs have a different sense of humour, I cannot understand and laugh at their jokes.	1.93	3.07	2.5
47. Non-NESTs can simplify and adjust their language to the level of the students in a more effective way.	3.27	3.52	3.39
48. NESTs sometimes have difficulties understanding and responding to my questions.	2.33	3.47	2.9
49. I can express my thoughts to non-NESTs better.	3.33	3.57	3.45

Looking at the information emerging from responses to the questionnaires for the sub-section of communication, a significant difference between the mean scores of participants can be observed in the Item 46. While the preparatory class students do not agree with the *Item 46 (As NESTs have a different sense of humour, I cannot understand and laugh at their jokes)* ($\bar{x}$=1.93), instructors mostly agree with this statement ($\bar{x}$=3.07); as they might think that NESTs do not share the same culture and sense of humour with students. In a similar vein, instructors agree with the *Item 48 (NESTs sometimes have difficulties understanding and responding to my questions)* with a mean score of 3.47 while preparatory class students do not agree with this statement as strongly as instructors do. When compared with instructors, preparatory class students exhibit a higher mean score ($\bar{x}$=3.07) in *Item 45 (Non-NESTs give more importance to friendly conversations outside the class than NESTs).* In view of these results, it is possible to argue that non-NESTs are regarded as more sincere and intimate during the conversation even outside the class. Consequently, a statistically significant difference exists between the perceptions of preparatory class students and instructors toward non-NESTs and NESTs in terms of communication issues.

Culture

Considering the sub-section of culture, Levene's Test for Equality of Variances has been conducted and the answers of both preparatory class students and instructors have been found as similar. Therefore, there is not a statistically significant difference

between the answers of both groups of participants for the sub-section of culture [t=-.32, p=.75).

Testing/assessment

The comparison between the mean scores of preparatory class students ($\bar{x}$=3.03) and instructors ($\bar{x}$=3.22) has been conducted and the mean scores of both groups of participants to the items for the sub-section of testing/assessment have been found as similar. However, when compared with the preparatory class students, instructors agree with *Item 54 (Students feel more anxious when a NEST is the examiner in their speaking exam)* with a higher mean score ($\bar{x}$=3.61). Nevertheless, it can be inferred that there is not a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of participants concerning testing/assessment sub-section of the questionnaire.

RQ4. Do gender, department and proficiency level have an influence on preparatory class students' perceptions of their non-NESTs and NESTs?

According to the mean scores of preparatory class students' responses to the questionnaire comparing females' responses to males', there is not a statistically significant difference between females and males (*p*=.47). Therefore, it is possible to argue that gender does not affect preparatory class students' perceptions toward non-NESTs and NESTs.

Looking at the statistical results of the answers, it can be concluded that department has an influence on preparatory class students' opinions toward non-NESTs and NESTs since Table 9. indicates a statistically significant difference with a score of .025.

Table 9.
Kruskal Wallis Test Results for Departments of Preparatory Class Students

	total
Chi-Square	7.37
Df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.025

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: Department

It is possible to state that preparatory class students attending 'Others' (Engineering and Economics) department have more positive attitudes toward non-NESTs since their mean score ($\bar{x}$=3.11) is higher. The reason behind such a tendency is possibly due to the fact that students from ELT and ELL departments are more familiar with English as their department itself majors in English language. For this reason, these students may prefer learning English language and its culture from the instructors who speak that language as their mother tongue. However, students from 'Others' (Engineering and Economics) department may not especially seem to be willing to have NESTs. In fact, it is possible to state that they prefer non-NESTs because it may be significant for them to use their first language during the learning

process. With the intent of examining the difference in detail, Post Hoc Test has been applied as presented in Table 10.

Table 10.
Multiple Comparisons Post Hoc Test Results

Department	Department	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Interval Lower Bound	Confidence Upper Bound
English Language Teaching	English Language and Literature	.03	.18	.99	-.45	.51
	Other	-.31	.177	.25	-.77	.15
English Language and Literature	English Language Teaching	-.03	.185	.99	-.51	.45
	Other	-.34*	.13	.03	-.67	-.01
Others	English Language Teaching	.31	.177	.25	-.15	.77
	English Language and Literature	.34*	.13	.03	.01	.67

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

It can be clearly inferred from Table 10. that a statistically significant difference has been observed between the perceptions of preparatory class students from ELL department and 'Others' (Engineering and Economics) department (*p*=.03). It can be argued that ELL students may attach more importance to learning about English, its literature, history and culture in detail. Therefore, learning English from the instructors who speak that language as their mother tongue and have broader information about its culture may seem more attractive for those students. On the contrary, preparatory class students from 'Others' (Engineering and Economics) department may need to use their first language more frequently during the learning process. They may also want to be understood by their instructors to feel more comfortable and motivated. Consequently, department seems to be a determinant variable in the preparatory class students' perceptions toward non-NESTs and NESTs.

Considering the mean scores of the preparatory class students' responses to the questionnaire comparing their perceived language levels, there is not a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of preparatory class students with regard to their language levels (*p*=,08). In reference to these results, perceived language level does not have any influence on preparatory class students' opinions.

RQ5. Do level of education and professional experience have an influence on non-native English speaking instructors' perceptions of non-NESTs and NESTs?
Looking at the mean scores of instructors' responses to the questionnaire, it can be stated that there is not a statistically significant difference among the instructors' mean

scores regarding their level of education (*p*=.63). Consequently, level of education does not influence the instructors' perceptions.

Besides, it would be justified to claim that the attitudes of instructors with the longest experience toward non-NESTs have been found to be more positive since their mean score is higher than others ($\bar{x}$=3.14). However, a statistically significant difference among the mean scores of instructors with regard to their professional experience has not been observed (*p*=.44). To sum up, professional experience of instructors does not have an influence on their perceptions of non-NESTs and NESTs.

Discussion and Conclusion

There is no doubt that the number of non-NESTs is growing day by day. However, there is still a prevalent prejudice against non-NESTs on the belief that they are inferior to NESTs and they lack linguistic command to be considered as competent English teachers just because their first language is not English. However, as a consequence of their language learning experience and training as teachers, the qualified non-NESTs can make a major contribution to the field of foreign language teaching (Daftari & Tavil, 2017). Accordingly, the present study has intended to shed light on being a non-NEST and create a clearer picture of non-NESTs' and NESTs' effectiveness on university students studying at preparatory classes.

Both preparatory class students' and instructors' perceptions toward non-NEST and NESTs have been aimed to be revealed in terms of the five sub-sections of the questionnaire under separate headings as; instructional characteristics, motivation, communication, culture and testing/assessment. In general terms, preparatory class students and instructors have both positive and negative attitudes toward non-NESTs and NESTs with regard to different aspects. The participants have agreed with the idea that many non-NESTs are as effective in teaching English as NESTs. It has been made clear from the findings that NESTs are better at teaching pronunciation and speaking as they have acquired English; while grammar is better explained and taught by non-NESTs since students are more satisfied with the answers and explanations of non-NESTs. These results are consistent with previous research findings (Çakır & Demir, 2013; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2002; Medgyes, 2001; Moussu, 2006). Similarly, in her study, Diaz (2015) investigated the preferences of the French university students in the Applied Foreign Languages Program towards being taught by non-NEST, NEST or both of them and concluded that non-NESTs stand out in grammar subject. They were preferred for grammar teaching, especially by students at A1 level. Furthermore, Meşincigiller and Akcan (2015) achieved the same results in their study which focused on the secondary school students' preferences of their NESTs and non-NESTs. Consequently, it was stressed that students mostly preferred to be taught by NESTs for the teaching of speaking and vocabulary, while non-NESTs were mostly favoured for the teaching of grammar probably due to the fact that they could use their native languages during the course. Furthermore, the findings of the current study concerning the L1 use in language learning have been found consistent with the opinions of Dendrinos (2001) and the results of Savran Celik and Aydin's

(2018) study. In their study, it was concluded that using L1 naturally helped comprehending the content and saved time in language learning. Similarly, non-NESTs have been found better at explaining grammar since they can supply feedback by sharing students' L1 (Park & Shin, 2010). In the current study, both preparatory class students and instructors highly agreed with the notion that making comparisons between English and Turkish while teaching facilitated learning.

This finding is in line with the results of studies (Alghofaili & Elyas, 2017; Dendrinos, 2001) which defend the notion that comparing the similarities and differences between mother language and target language when it is needed helps students learn better. At this point, it should be noted that the use of native language in foreign language classrooms is a controversial issue. While some foreign language teaching methods (such as Task-Based Language Teaching) and methodologists encourage no use of native language, some others (such as Communicative Language Teaching) argue that a reasonable amount of native language may yield better results (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). From the point of instructors, it has been found that participant instructors perceive themselves better at teaching grammar while they do not think the same way for pronunciation teaching. This result is consistent with the findings of the study of Moussu (2006) which investigate the self-perceptions of non-NESTs and NESTs questioning their professional and linguistic skills. The findings showed that non-NESTs had more self confidence in grammar teaching, however, in the area of pronunciation skills, NESTs came into prominence.

This study also aims to reveal if there is a statistically significant difference between the attitudes of preparatory class students and instructors toward non-NESTs and NESTs. Among the five sub-sections of the questionnaire, a statistically significant difference between the answers of the participants has been observed only in the communication sub-section. It should not go without saying that communication is of utmost importance in foreign language classrooms in that there should be a two-way interaction between the instructor and the students as well as among the students. However, as has been mentioned above, there exist two thorny questions: whether the use of native language should be permitted and, if yes, how much native language use is to be condoned. The answers for these questions can only be provided by considering the contextual peculiarities such as the aims and proficiency levels of the students, the level of the educational institution and the instructor's competence in the target language among countless others.

In terms of communication, unlike the findings of the research conducted by Üstünoğlu (2007), preparatory class students have found non-NESTs more effective since they are regarded as more empathetic and sincere during the conversations both inside and outside the class. Students feel more motivated and comfortable to share their needs and concerns with non-NESTs since they have gone through the similar process of foreign language learning. Therefore, non-NESTs have the chance to predict areas of difficulty for their learners and may even provide the learners with strategy training to overcome the problems they have encountered. Accordingly, these findings are consistent with Samimy and Brutt-Griffler's (1999) study conducted with TESOL graduate and experienced students. The results regarding the motivation of

the students are also parallel to the findings of the study carried out by Guerra (2017) and Kato (2011) in that non-NESTs stand out in understanding and motivating learners.

As for the teaching of culture, NESTs are regarded as more effective in supplying broader information about the culture of English language. This result contrasts with the study of Diaz (2015) where both non-NEST and NEST are equally preferred by university students in the teaching of culture. In a recent study, it has been concluded that instead of choosing one instructor and making a distinction, students seem to prefer the collaboration of non-NESTs and NESTs in the field of ELT. It is consistent with the findings of the study carried out by Meşincigiller and Akcan (2015), which claims that students had positive attitudes towards both groups of teachers and preferred their cooperation. Likewise, Kurniwaiti and Rizki (2018) remark that it can be very useful to work with these counterparts since both non-NESTs and NESTs transfer their own strengths into the classroom. Nevertheless, it was revealed that both preparatory class students and instructors agreed non-NESTs were more helpful for beginner level students, while Lasagabaster and Sierra's (2002) study results indicated that NESTs were preferred by all levels in the areas of vocabulary, speaking, pronunciation and culture.

Then, it has been aimed to find out whether gender, department and proficiency levels of the preparatory class students affect their perceptions of non-NESTs and NESTs. Statistical analyses have indicated that gender has no significant impact on preparatory class students' attitudes in accordance with the findings of Çakır and Demir's (2013) research. In terms of proficiency level, it is possible to state that as the perceived language level increases, students tend to benefit more from NESTs. As to the perceptions of preparatory class students toward NESTs and non-NESTs with respect to their departments, it is possible to argue that students in Other (Engineering and Economics) departments have more positive attitudes toward non-NESTs in comparison with ELT and ELL departments. The findings have revealed a statistically significant difference between the attitudes of preparatory class students from ELL department and 'Others' (Engineering and Economics) department. It can be stated that ELL students prefer learning the target language, its history, literature and culture by NESTs who can supply broader information about English language. Lastly, whether non-native English speaking instructors' professional experience and level of education have an influence on their perceptions of non-NESTs and NESTs has been examined. A statistically significant difference between the answers of instructors regarding their professional experience and level of education has not been observed. However, since their mean scores are higher than the others, the instructors with the longest experience have been found more positive towards being non-NEST. This finding is consistent with the study carried out by Daftari and Tavil (2017), which remarks that more experienced non-NESTs feel less insecure.

To summarize, the current study has revealed that grammar is thought to be taught better by non-NESTs while NESTs are perceived to be better at teaching pronunciation and speaking. As a notable finding, students give importance to using their mother tongue every now and then as learning English becomes easier for them

when non-NESTs make comparisons between English and Turkish in teaching. It has been also found that preparatory class students who study at 'Others' (Engineering and Economics) department have more positive attitudes toward non-NESTs. Finally, both groups of participants have underscored the necessity of the cooperation between NESTs and non-NESTs.

This study is limited to 66 preparatory class students and 63 instructors and qualitative data have not been collected within the study. Further studies may be conducted employing more participants from diverse educational levels and a mixed research design may be utilized as well. The current research would be beneficial to non-NESTs in particular, prospective teachers and employers who have uninformed perceptions that underestimate non-NESTs' professional capacity. The findings presented in this study disclaim the "native speakerism" policy leading to some kind of prejudice against non-NESTs. The results of this study can shed light on both NESTs' and non-NESTs' strengths and weaknesses without considering their nationality.

Conflicts of Interest and Ethical Declaration

No potential conflict of interest has been reported by the authors. The study was conducted after the approval of Süleyman Demirel University Ethics Board (November 11, 2020 / 99-1) was obtained and informed consent was obtained from all individual participants involved in the study.

References

Adıgüzel, O.C., & Özdoğru, F. (2017). Effects of Turkish and English speaking teachers on students' foreign language skills. *Kastamonu Education Journal, 25*(1), 172-186.

Alghofaili, N.M., & Elyas, T. (2017). Decoding the myths of the native and non-native English speaker teachers (NESTs & NNESTs) on Saudi EFL tertiary students. *English Language Teaching, 10*(6), 1–11.

Aliaga, M., & Gunderson, B. (2002). *Interactive statistics*. Prentice Hall.

Al-Nawrasy, O. (2013). The effect of native and non-native English language teachers on secondary students' achievement in speaking skills. *Jordan Journal of Educational Sciences, 9*(2), 243-254.

Alseweed, M.A. (2012). University students' perceptions of the influence of native and non-native teachers. *English Language Teaching, 5*(12), 42-53.

Arva, V., & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System*, *28*(3), 355-372.

Bailey, K. (2002). Declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge, and the varieties of English we teach. *NNEST Newsletter, 4*(2), 1-5.

Barratt, L., & Kontra, E. (2000). Native English-speaking teachers in cultures other than their own. *TESOL Journal, 9*(3), 19-23.

Braine, G. (1999a). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Erlbaum.

Braine, G. (1999b). NNS and invisible barriers in ELT. *TESOL Matters, 2*(2), 14.

Brown, J.D. (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. Cambridge University Press.

Butler, Y.G. (2007). How are nonnative English speaking teachers perceived by young learners? *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(4), 731-755.

Çakır, H., & Demir, Y. (2013). A comparative analysis between NESTS and NNESTS based on perceptions of students in preparation classes. *The International Journal of Social Sciences, 14*(1), 36-47.

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*, 77-92, Erlbaum.

Cheung, Y.L., & Braine, G. (2007). The attitudes of university students towards non-native speaker English teachers in Hong Kong. *RELC Journal, 38*(3), 257–277.

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.

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(2), 185-211.

Daftari, G.E., & Tavil, Z. M. (2017). The impact of non-native English teachers' linguistic insecurity on learners' productive skills. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 13*(1), 379-398.

Davies, A. (2003). *The native speaker: Myth and reality*. Cromwell Press.

DeCoster, J. (2006). Testing group differences using t-tests, ANOVA, and nonparametric measures. Retrieved from http://www.stathelp.com/notes.html

Dendrinos, B. (2001). *The pedagogic discourse of EFL and the discoursive construction of the NS's professional value*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Non-Native Speaking Teachers in Foreign Language Teaching, Lleida, Catalonia, Spain.

Díaz, N.R. (2015). Students' preferences regarding native and non-native teachers of English at a university in the French Brittany. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 173*, 93-97.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. OUP.

Ezberci, E. (2005). *Native English speaking teachers and non-native English speaking teachers in İstanbul: A perception analysis* (Tez No. 188449) [Master's thesis, Bilkent University-Ankara]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Tez Merkezi.

Goh, S.C., & Fraser, B.J. (1995, April). *Learning environment and student outcomes in primary mathematics classrooms in Singapore.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco.

Guerra, L. (2017). Students' perceptions and expectations of native and non-native speaking teachers. In J. D.D.M., Agudo (Ed.), *Native and non-native teachers in English language classrooms* (p.183-205). Walter de Gruyter Inc.

Gündüz, E. (2015). *University preparatory students' perceptions towards native and non-native English speaking teachers* (Tez No. 391443) [Master's thesis, Çağ University-Mersin]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Tez Merkezi.

Kaplan, R.B. (1999). The ELT: Ho(NEST) or not ho(NEST)?. *NNEST Newsletter, 1*(1), 5-6.

Kato, K. (2011). *The N/NEST dichotomy and world Englishes* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gonzaga University.

Kelch, K., & Santana-Williamson, E. (2002). ESL students' attitudes toward native and nonnative-speaking instructors' accents. *CATESOL Journal, 14*(1), 57-72.

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* (Tez No: 187205) [Master's thesis, Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University-Canakkale]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı Tez Merkezi.

Koşar, G. (2019). Does being taught by native English-speaking teachers promote improvement in speaking skill more?. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 15*(3), 989-999.

Kurniawati, K., & Rizki, D. (2018). Native vs. non-native EFL teachers: Who are better?. *Studies in English Language and Education 5*(1), 137-147

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3ʳᵈ ed.). Oxford University Press.

Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J.M. (2002). University students' perceptions of native and non-native speaker teachers of English. *Language Awareness, 11*(2), 132-142.

Levy, J., den Brok, P., Wubbels, T., & Brekelmans, M. (2003). Students' perceptions of interpersonal aspects of the learning environment. *Learning Environments Research, 6*, 5-36.

Levy, J., Wubbels, T., & Brekelmans, M. (1992). Student and teacher characteristics and perceptions of teacher communication style. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 27*(1), 23-29.

Lewis, J., Sonsaat, S., & Link, S. (2017). Students' beliefs about native and non-native pronunciation teachers. In J. D.D.M., Agudo (Ed.), *Native and non-native teachers in English language classrooms* (p. 83-205). Walter de Gruyter Inc.

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

Llurda, E. (2005). *Non-native language teachers: perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession.* Springer.

Maum, R. (2002). Nonnative English-speaking teachers in the English teaching profession. *Eric Digest,* Retrieved from *http://www.ericdigests.org/2003-4/teaching-profession.htmlGoogle ScholarOpenURL query*

Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who's worth more?. *ELT Journal, 46*, 340-349.

Medgyes, P. (2001). When the teacher is a non-native speaker. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (p. 429-442). Heinle & Heinle.

Meşincigiller, S., & Akcan, S. (2015). Native and non-native English teachers: secondary school students' preferences for their English teachers. *ELT Research Journal, 4*(2), 156-170.

Moussu, L., & Braine, G. (2006). The attitudes of ESL students towards nonnative English language teachers. *TESOL Reporter 39*(1), 33–47.

Moussu, L. M. (2006). *Native and nonnative English-speaking English as a second language teachers: student attitudes, teacher self perceptions, and intensive English administrator beliefs and practices* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Purdue University.

Mufwene, S. (1998). Native speaker, proficient speaker and norms. In R. Singh (Ed.), *The native speaker: Multilingual perspectives* (p. 111-123). Sage.

Neideen, T., & Brasel, K. (2007). Understanding Statistical Tests. *Journal of Surgical Education*, *64*(2), 93-96.

Öztürk, U., & Atay, D. (2010). Challenges of being a nonnative English teacher. *Educational Research, 1*(5), 135-139.

Park, S., & Shin, S.J. (2010). "She immediately understood what I was trying to say": Student perceptions of NNESTs as writing tutors pedagogy. *WATESOL NNEST Caucus Annual Review*, 1, 110-118.

Pasternak, M., & Bailey, K.M. (2004). Preparing nonnative and native English-speaking teachers: Issues of professionalism and proficiency. In L.D. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on non-native English speaking professionals* (p. 155-175). University of Michigan Press.

Phillipson, R. (1992a). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (1992b). ELT: The native speaker's burden? In T. Hedge & N. Whitney. (Eds.), *Power, pedagogy and practice* (p. 23-30). Oxford University Press.

Rickards, T. (1998). *The relationship of teacher-student interpersonal behavior with student sex, cultural background and student outcomes* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Curtin University.

Rickards, T., & Fisher, D.L. (1997). *A report of research into student attitude and teacher student interpersonal behaviour in a large sample of Australian secondary mathematics classrooms.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australia.

Samimy, K., & Brutt-Griffler, J. (1999). To be a native or nonnative speaker: Perceptions of "nonnative" students in a graduate TESOL program. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Nonnative educators in English language teaching* (p.127-144). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Savran-Celik, S. & Aydin, S. (2018). A review of research on the use of native language in EFL classes. *The Literacy Trek, 4*(2), 1-14.

Selvi, A.F. (2010). All teachers are equal, but some teachers are more equal than others: trend analysis of job advertisements in English language teaching. *WATESOL NNEST Caucus Annual Review,* 1, 155-181.

Simonson, M., Smaldino, S., & Zvacek, S. (2015). *Teaching and learning at a distance: Foundations of distance education* (6th ed.). IAP.

Tajeddin, Z., & Adeh, A. (2016). Native and non-native English teachers' perceptions of their professional identity: convergent or divergent?. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 4*(3), 37-54.

Tatar, S., & Yildiz, S. (2010). Empowering nonnative-English speaking teachers in the classroom. In A. Mahboob (Ed.), *The NNEST lens: Non native English speakers in TESOL* (p. 114-128). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Tatar, S. (2019). Turkish teacher candidates' perceptions of native-speakerism. *Sakarya University Journal of Education, 9*(1), 7-20.

Ulate, N.V. (2011). Insight towards native and non-native ELT educators. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & literature, 4*(1), 56-79.

Üstünoğlu, E. (2007). University students' perceptions of native and non-native teachers. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 13*(1), 63-79.

Waldrip, B.G., & Fisher, D.L. (1999, December). *Differences in country and metropolitan students' perceptions of teacher-student interactions and classroom learning environments.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Australasian Association for Research in Education, Melbourne.

Widdowson, H.G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(2), 377-389.

Wubbels, T., & Levy, J. (1993). *Do you know what you look like?.* The Falmer Press.

Genişletilmiş Özet

Günümüzün küreselleşen dünyasında, ana dili İngilizce olmayan insanların sayısının ana dili İngilizce olanlardan fazla olması nedeniyle, İngilizce çağdaş bir ortak dil haline gelmiştir. Bu sebeple İngilizce artık anadili olanların ayrıcalığı olarak görülmemektedir. Fakat, ana dili İngilizce olanların değişmeyen bir avantajı olduğu düşünülmektedir. "Ana dili İngilizce olan öğretmen ideal öğretmendir" kavramı 1990'lara kadar İngilizce Öğretimi (ELT) alanında yaygın idi. Bu kavram ilk olarak, Phillipson (1992) tarafından sorgulanmıştır. Phillipson yaygın şekilde benimsenen bu kavramın bilimsel geçerliliği olmadığını iddia etmiştir ve ana dili İngilizce olmayan öğretmenlerin yeteneklerine atıfta bulunarak parlak yönlerini ortaya koymuştur. Ana

dili İngilizce olmayan öğretmenlerin, İngilizceyi ikinci veya yabancı dil olarak edinme gibi karmaşık bir süreçten geçtiklerini vurgulamış, dilbilim ve öğrencilerin kültürel ihtiyaçları, ana dilin ve hedef dilin nasıl farklılaştığı ve öğrenciler için neyin zor olduğu konularında bilinçli olduklarını savunmuştur. Bu dönemde bir fikir birliğine varılamamıştır ve pek çok bilim adamı ve araştırmacı, bu iki grubun güçlü ve zayıf yönlerinde birbirlerini tamamladıkları için aralarındaki farklılığın korunması gerektiğini savunmaktadır. İlgili literatür incelendiğinde, Medgyes (1992) ve Phillipson's (1992) çalışmalarından sonra, Ana dili İngilizce olmayan öğretmenlerin algılanma şekli hakkında daha fazla araştırma yapılmasının yaklaşık on yıl sürdüğü görülmüştür.

Anadili İngilizce olan kişinin nitelikleri çeşitli araştırmacılar tarafından sorgulanmıştır. Medgyes'e (2001) göre, en basit kriter doğum yeridir. Bununla birlikte, insanların doğduğu yer her zaman "anadili" kimliğini garanti etmez, çünkü Medgyes'in (2001) belirttiği gibi, bir bireyin anadili göç nedeniyle başka bir dil ile değiştirilebilir; veya birey, erken çocukluk döneminde farklı bir ülke, kültür ve etnik kökene sahip ebeveynler tarafından evlat edinilmiş olabilir. Ayrıca Cook (1999), bir bireyin o dili erken çocukluk döneminde edinmediği sürece anadili olarak kabul edilemeyeceğini ileri sürmektedir. Benzer şekilde, Davies (2003), ana dili İngilizce olan kişilerin önemli özelliklerinin çoğunun, ana dili İngilizce olmayanlar için aşağı yukarı ulaşılabilir olduğunu açıkça belirtmektedir. Ulate'e (2011) göre, yerli olmayan terimi, olumlu olarak kabul edilen yerli terimi ile karşılaştırıldığında, dil uzmanları tarafından genellikle olumsuz olarak değerlendirilmektedir. Alseweed (2012) de bu iddiayı yinelemekte ve 'yerli olmayan' teriminin, öğretmenlerin kendilerini ana dili İngilizce olan öğretmenlere göre yetersiz hissetmelerine izin vererek morallerini olumsuz etkilediğini belirtmektedir. Bu nedenle, 'yerli olmayan', 'ana dili olmayan' etiketinin öğretmenler üzerinde olumsuz bir etkisi vardır. Benzer bir şekilde, bu olumsuz etki, genellikle 'İngilizce yeterliliği için gerekli dilsel komuttan yoksun oldukları' gerekçesiyle ana dili İngilizce olmayan öğretmenlere karşı bir tür önyargıya dönüşebilir. İngilizce eğitimi alanında eğitilmiş olsun ya da olmasın, dünyanın hemen hemen her bölgesinde, ana dili İngilizce olan öğretmenlerin istihdam olanakları açısından daha fazla avantaja sahip olduğu tartışılmaz bir gerçektir. Bazı ülkelerde, dil eğitimi konusunda yetersiz fakat ana dili İngilizce olan öğretmenlerin, yetkin ve ana dili İngilizce olmayan meslektaşlara tercih edildiği görülmüştür. Araştırma bulguları, çoğu iş ilanının sadece ana dili İngilizce olanların başvurabileceğini belirterek verildiğini ve bu durumun yerli olmayan öğretmenleri reddettiğini göstermektedir. Anadilin; eğitim, deneyim ve yetenekleri geride bıraktığı görülmektedir. Ana dili İngilizce olan ve olmayan öğretmenlerin, öğrencilerin gözünden değerlendirildiği çalışmalara bakılacak olursa, Samimy ve Brutt-Griffler (1999) TESOL mezunu ve deneyimli öğrencilerle bir çalışma yürütmüş ve bu iki öğretmen grubunun öğretim tarzlarında dikkate değer farklılıklar bulmuşlardır. Ana dili İngilizce olan öğretmenler İngilizce kullanırken çok daha özgüvenli; ancak, Ana dili İngilizce olmayan öğretmenlerin ise, öğrencilerinin öğrenme sorunları ve ihtiyaçları konusunda daha bilinçli olduğu sonucuna varmışlardır. Başka bir çalışmada Çakır ve Demir (2013), üniversite hazırlık öğrencilerinin tutumlarını incelemiş ve dilbilgisini açıklamada, öğrencilere empati göstermede ve onları

cesaretlendirmede ana dili İngilizce olmayan öğretmenlerin üstün görüldüğünü ortaya koymuştur.

Ana dili İngilizce olan ve olmayan öğretmenlerin yabancı dil öğretimindeki etkililiği ile ilgili çalışmalar yapılmış olsa da, bu iki grubun sahip olduğu farklılıkları ve güçlü yönleri daha iyi anlamak ve ana dili İngilizce olmayan öğretmenlere karşı gösterilen önyargının üstesinden gelmek için daha fazla çalışmaya ihtiyaç duyulmaktadır. Şimdiye kadar yapılan çalışmaların ortak sınırlılığı, konuyu sadece öğrencilerin veya öğretim elemanlarının bakış açısıyla ele alma eğilimleri olmuştur. Diğer bir deyişle, hem öğrencilerin hem de eğitmenlerin bu iki gruba yönelik algılarını Türkiye bağlamında karşılaştırılmasını inceleyen bir araştırma bulunamamıştır. Dolayısıyla bu çalışma, olguyu her iki açıdan da inceleyerek literatürdeki bu boşluğu doldurmayı amaçlamaktadır.

Bu çalışma toplam 129 katılımcı ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Birinci grup, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi hazırlık sınıflarında okuyan 66 öğrenciden oluşmaktadır. İkinci katılımcı grubu, 8 farklı üniversitenin yabancı diller yüksek okullarında görev yapan, ana dili İngilizce olmayan 63 öğretim görevlisinden oluşmaktadır. Bu çalışma bağlamında veri toplamak amacıyla Çakır ve Demir (2013), Moussu (2006) ve Köksal (2006) çalışmalarında kullanılan anket maddeleri seçilerek yeniden düzenlenmiştir. 5 alt bölüm altında (öğretim özellikleri, motivasyon, iletişim, kültür ve test etme/değerlendirme) gruplanan 54 maddeli likert tipi anket, İngilizce Öğretimi alanında doktora yapmış iki uzman tarafından dilsel ve bağlamsal uygulanabilirliği açısından incelenmiş ve onaylanmıştır. Veri toplama prosedürü olarak anket linkleri katılımcılara kurumsal e-posta yolu ile ulaştırılmıştır. Verilerin analizinde betimsel istatistikler, Kruskal-Wallis ve Post Hoc testleri kullanılmıştır.

Araştırma sonuçları, ana dili İngilizce olan öğretmenlerin telaffuz ve konuşmayı öğretmede daha iyi olduğunu; ancak gramerin ana dili İngilizce olmayan öğretmenler tarafından daha iyi öğretildiğini ortaya çıkarmıştır. Yeterlilik düzeyi açısından, algılanan dil düzeyi arttıkça öğrencilerin ana dili İngilizce olan öğretmenlerden daha fazla yararlanma eğiliminde olduğunu söylemek mümkündür. Fakat, öğrencilerin ara sıra ana dillerini kullanmaya önem verdikleri ve ana dili İngilizce olmayan öğretmenlerin İngilizce ile Türkçe arasında karşılaştırma yaptığında İngilizce öğrenmenin öğrenciler için kolaylaştığı tespit edilmiştir. Mühendislik ve Ekonomi bölümünde okuyan hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin, diğer bölümlere kıyasla, ana dili İngilizce olmayanlar öğretmenlere karşı daha olumlu tutuma sahip olduğu bulunmuştur. Öğretim elemanlarının mesleki deneyimleri ve eğitim düzeylerinin verdikleri yanıtlara belirgin bir etkisi gözlenmemekle birlikte, en uzun deneyime sahip eğitmenlerin 'yerli olmama' konusunda daha olumlu/özgüvenli olduğu görülmüştür. Son olarak, her iki katılımcı grubu da bu iki öğretmen grubu arasındaki iş birliğinin gerekli olduğunu savunmaktadır.

Appendix A. The questionnaire items

Table 1.

Items Concerning Teaching/Learning

Items	Students Mean	SD	Instructors Mean	SD
1. Learning English with non-NESTs is easier for me than with NESTs.	2.54	1.09	2.96	1.01
2. While learning English. non-NESTs provide me with more useful strategies and ideas than NESTs.	3.09	1.03	3.09	1.18
3. There is no harm in the teacher's using Turkish every now and then.	3.53	1.50	2.95	1.31
4. As non-NESTs make comparisons between English and Turkish while teaching. it becomes easier for me to understand the topic.	3.69	1.02	3.71	.99
5. Non-NESTs are good models in learning English because they have gone through the same language learning process.	3.59	1.24	3.79	1.08
6. There are many non-NESTs who teach just as effectively as NESTs.	4.07	1.15	4.44	.69
7. I wish I had only non-NESTs.	1.27	.77	2.09	1.01
8. It is important that I should be able to translate into Turkish while learning English.	3.72	1.20	2.63	1.16
9. Non-NESTs provide more corrective and instructive feedback than NESTs.	3.01	1.18	2.98	1.15
10. Non-NESTs can use grammar correctly while speaking.	3.36	1.27	3.60	1.04
11. Non-NESTs are better at explaining and teaching grammar than NESTs.	3.04	1.02	3.53	1.08
12. Non-NESTs are better at teaching vocabulary than NESTs.	2.78	1.22	2.69	.99
13. Non-NESTs are better at teaching pronunciation than NESTs.	1.66	.88	1.95	1.02
14. Non-NESTs are better at teaching reading than NESTs.	2.43	.99	2.80	1.06
15. Non-NESTs are better at teaching listening than NESTs.	2.46	.96	2.52	.98
16. Non-NESTs are better at teaching writing than NESTs.	2.78	1.11	2.79	1.04
17. Non-NESTs are better at teaching speaking than NESTs.	1.72	.86	2.23	1.05
18. Non-NESTs are better at improving Intercultural Communicative Competence than NESTs.	2.24	1.03	2.58	1.05
19. Non-NESTs organize and implement pair work effectively in class.	3.54	1.06	3.71	1.02
20. Non-NESTs organize and implement group work effectively in class.	3.53	1.09	3.68	1.01
21. Non-NESTs can provide smoother transitions between different activities in comparison to NESTs.	3.04	1.014	2.88	.91
22. Non-NESTs can structure and organize the content of the class in a more coherent manner than NESTs.	3.21	.90	2.84	.95
23. Non-NESTs can relate the content of the lesson to our daily lives more effectively than NESTs.	3.56	1.17	3.14	1.04
24. Non-NESTs direct me towards autonomous learning more often and effectively than NESTs.	2.81	.87	2.71	.94
25. Non-NESTs can employ a variety of techniques and methods during the class.	3.60	.94	3.66	.87
26. NESTs prefer traditional forms of teaching.	2.65	1.15	2.23	.87
27. NESTs rely more heavily on the coursebook than non-NESTs.	3.25	1.51	2.14	.93

28. NESTs tend to speak more than non-NESTs during the class.	4	1.30	3.31	1.04
29. Non-NESTs provide us with more thinking time when they ask a question in comparison to NESTs.	2.77	1.10	2.92	1.02
30. Non-NESTs are better examples for me than NESTs in learning English.	2.69	1.14	2.96	1.13
31. Non-NESTs can be more helpful at beginner level.	4.13	1.16	3.63	1.20
32. Non-NESTs can be more helpful at intermediate level.	3.19	1.19	3.01	1.03
33. Non-NESTs can be more helpful at advanced level.	2.37	1.41	2.44	1.21
34. Non-NESTs usually behave more neutrally and equally to students in comparison to NESTs.	2.33	1.08	2.49	1.01
35. Non-NESTs are better in terms of classroom management skills.	3.19	1.21	2.80	1.21
36. Non-NESTs provide clear and understandable explanations and instruction in the class.	3.45	1.19	3.49	1.04

Table 2.
Items Concerning Motivation

	Students		Instructors	
Items	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
37. I feel more motivated while learning with non-NESTs than with NESTs.	2.33	1.16	2.61	1.03
38. I feel less anxious about making mistakes in non-NESTs' classes than in NESTs' classes.	2.74	1.54	3.17	1.18
39. My attendance and participation in non-NESTs' classes is more than that of NESTs' classes.	2.27	1.14	2.47	1.02
40. Non-NESTs are more capable of motivating learners than NESTs.	2.90	1.24	2.69	1.02
41. Non-NESTs encourage the students more effectively in learning English.	3.04	1.29	2.92	.97

Table 3.
Items Concerning Communication

	Students		Instructors	
Items	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
42. There are a lot of non-NESTs that can effectively communicate in the target language.	3.74	1.11	4.4	.64
43. Non-NESTs are more sincere and empathetic than NESTs while communicating.	3.03	1.20	2.8	1.02
44. I can communicate better with my non-NESTs as I share the same culture with them.	3.27	1.31	3.26	1
45. Non-NESTs give more importance to friendly conversations outside the class than NESTs.	3.07	1.40	2.77	1.15
46. As NESTs have a different sense of humour. I cannot understand and laugh at their jokes.	1.93	1.16	3.07	1.05
47. Non-NESTs can simplify and adjust their language to the level of the students in a more effective way.	3.27	1.19	3.52	.96

48. NESTs sometimes have difficulties understanding and responding to my questions.	2.33	1.23	3.47	.99
49. I can express my thoughts to non-NESTs better.	3.33	1.23	3.57	.96

Table 4.
Items Concerning Culture

	Students		Instructors	
Items	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
50. Non-NESTs present the cultural elements of the target language better than NESTs.	2.75	1.24	2.49	1.20
51. Non-NESTs supply learners with more information about English Language and its culture.	2.28	1.13	2.44	.99

Table 5.
Items Concerning Testing/Assessment

	Students		Instructors	
Items	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
52. Non-NESTs can prepare learners for an exam more effectively than NESTs.	3.34	1.15	3.26	1.06
53. Non-NESTs can assess my linguistic competence more reliably and realistically.	2.96	1.23	2.79	1
54. I feel more anxious when a NEST is my examiner in my speaking exam.	2.78	1.67	3.61	1.08