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ABSTRACT

Taiwanese University Students’ Perceptions toward Native and Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers in EFL Contexts

(May 2013)

Shih-Yun Tsou, B.A., Ming Chuan University, Taiwan; M.Ed., University of Idaho
Dissertation Chair: Dr. Patricia A. Gomez

English has evolved into the most widely learned and internationally used language because for the increasing numbers of learners in the globalization process. With the growing demand of English education, the competencies of English teachers as Native English-Speaking Teachers (NESTs) and Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers (NNESTs) have become a significant matter of discussion.

Research to date on NESTs and NNESTs has primarily focused on teachers’ self-perceptions or their NESTs or NNESTs colleagues’ perceptions on English instruction (e.g., Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Kamhi-Stein, 2004; Llurda, 2004, 2005; Medgyes, 1999a; Moussu, 2000, 2006b; Tsui & Bunton, 2000) and has greatly related to the areas of English as second language (ESL) (e.g., Amin, 1997, 2004; Bernat, 2008; Ellis, 2002; Ma, 2009a; Moussu, 2006a; Rao, 2010; Shin, 2008; Tang, 1997). However, few studies have focused on the perceptions of English as a foreign language (EFL) students in regard to the English instruction of their NESTs and NNESTs. Also, the aforementioned studies have neglected that the group of NNESTs who hold a degree from a country where English is the dominant language may have better English proficiency and be able to provide a more efficient curriculum for language learners than the
group of NNESTs who do not hold a degree from a country where English is the dominant language. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate Taiwanese English as a foreign language (EFL) students’ perceptions and preferences toward NESTs and NNESTs who hold a degree from a country where English is the dominant language through addressing the differences of their English instruction.

This study employed a concurrent triangulation mixed methods approach, a QUAN – QUAL study. The researcher analyzed quantitative data through descriptive statistics by using Statistical Packages for the Social Science (SPSS 20.0), while ATLAS.ti.7.0 was employed to manage and systematically analyze qualitative data. All 184 participants answered the questionnaire that consisted of 28 Likert scale type statements and two open-ended questions. Only 50 participants responding to the open-ended questions were selected to analyze.

The findings revealed that the participants held an overall preference for NESTs over NNESTs; nevertheless, they believed both NESTs and NNESTs offered strengths and weaknesses in their English instruction. More precisely, NESTs were perceived to be superior in their good English proficiency and ability to facilitate students’ English learning. In terms of NNESTs, they were perceived to be superior in their proficiency in students’ first language, their knowledge of students’ learning difficulties, and at communicating in general. The characteristics that were perceived to be disadvantages of one group appeared to be advantages of the other. For example, NESTs were considered more difficult to communicate with by the participants, while NNESTs were believed to have limited English proficiency.

Interestingly, the results showed the teachers’ qualifications and experiences were seen as an important feature of excellent English teachers, regardless of his or her mother tongue.
Finally, the findings indicated that EFL programs where both NESTs and NNESTs worked cooperatively were considered an effective English learning environment for language learners.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

In the 21st century, English is no doubt the most commonly spoken language (Jeon & Lee, 2006; Foley, 2006). As a global language, English has attracted a dramatic number of people to learn English as their second or foreign language during the past several decades (Block, 2002; Crystal, 2003; Holliday, 2005; Nunan, 2001). According to World Languages and Cultures (2010), the importance of learning the English language in the global market include: (a) increasing global understanding, (b) improving employment potential, (c) improving chances for entry into colleges or graduate schools, (d) expanding study abroad options, and (e) increasing the understanding of another culture.

The craze of English language learning has swept into most of the Asian countries and Taiwan included without any exception. One of the reflections on this so called “English fever” (Krashen, 2003) was announced by the Ministry of Education (MOE) in Taiwan, which altered the beginning of English education from the “7th grade in middle school [in 1993] to the 5th grade in elementary school in 2001 academic year and to the 3rd grade in 2005” (Chang, 2008, p. 425). In addition, Yip (2011) discovered that English classes offered in university programs attracted more Taiwanese college students, ranging from a bachelor degree to any graduate degrees with majors ranging from Master of Business Administration (MBA) to engineering, social sciences, and more. English is viewed as the most popular foreign language that people desire to master in Taiwan today.
With a growing demand for English language learning, the need for well-educated and highly-qualified English as Foreign Language (EFL) teachers has become more vital in Taiwan. Under this circumstance, there has been a debate throughout the Taiwanese educational system regarding who is better qualified to teach English, native or nonnative English-speaking teachers. Admittedly, the dominant trend affirms that only native speakers of English qualify as English language teachers because of their English language competence. In Widdowson’s (1994) discussion, he stated, “there is no doubt that native speakers of English are preferred to in our profession. What they say is invested with both authenticity and authority” (p. 386). This perception leads to an assumption that Native English-Speaking Teachers (NESTs) must be better than Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers (NNESTs), which has been widely ascertained in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT) in the present day (Davies, 2003).

However, the next question that springs to mind is: Do NESTs really perform better than NNESTs in English Language Teaching (ELT)? Phillipson (1992) introduced the phrase “native speaker fallacy”, which Mahboob (2005) defined as the “blind acceptance of native speaker norm in English language teaching” (p. 82) to deny the mystery of the ideal teacher of English as a native speaker. Also, Medgyes (1996) questioned the claim, “the more proficient in English, the more efficient in the classroom” (p. 40), since successful language instruction is also influenced by other variables such as experience, age, gender, personality, enthusiasm and training. Based on these aforementioned studies in this paragraph, one should not make a conclusion that NESTs are better English instructors than NNESTs in ELT simply because NESTs have English as their mother tongue.
Most current research has been focused on whether NESTs have advantages over NNESTs in ELT. However, if we take a close look at the NNESTs, they can actually be divided into two different subgroups: NNESTs who hold a degree from a country where English is the dominant language and NNESTs who do not hold a degree from a country where English is the dominant language. It is expected that the subgroup of NNESTs holding a degree from a country where English is the dominant language get more exposure to an authentic English accent, western classroom atmosphere and western culture (Vargas, 2012; Wood, 2010). With all of these factors, this subgroup of NNESTs has both the advantages of NESTs who hold a degree from a country where English is the dominant language and NNESTs who do not hold a degree from a country where English is the dominant language. Whether this is true or not needs to be confirmed.

**Statement of Problem**

Substantial research has been conducted in the areas of NESTs and NNESTs (e.g., Amin, 1997; Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Braine, 1999; Chou, 2006; Davies, 2003; Gill & Rebrova, 2001; Huang, 2006; Krashen, 2003; Lin, 2005; Medgyes, 1992, 1994, 2001; Moussu, 2000; Phillipson, 1992; Sommers, 2005; Walker, 2006). Some of these studies explored NESTs and NNESTs in the global discourse of English education, but research focused only on the teachers’ self-perceptions or their NESTs or NNESTs colleagues’ perceptions on English instruction (e.g., Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Kamhi-Stein, 2004; Llurda, 2004, 2005; Medgyes, 1999a; Moussu, 2000, 2006b; Rajagopalan, 2005; Todd & Pojanapunya, 2009; Tsui & Bunton, 2000). Others made contributions to the teaching experiences of NESTs or NNESTs with an emphasis on English as a Second Language (ESL) contexts rather than English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts (e.g., Amin,
1997, 2004; Bernat, 2008; Ellis, 2002; Ma, 2009a; Moussu, 2006a; Rao, 2010; Shin, 2008; Tang, 1997).

However, not much research has been completed to evaluate the process and output of language teaching by NESTs and NNESTs from EFL students’ points of view. The aforementioned studies have overlooked the fact that the group of NNESTs, in fact, can be divided into two subgroups: NNESTs who hold a degree from a country where English is the dominant language and NNESTs who do not hold a degree from a country where English is the dominant language. According to Vargas (2012) and Wood (2010), NNESTs who hold a degree from a country where English is the dominant language have the experiences from a western educational system, which may directly affect their English proficiency and their ability to teach the English language. Thus, an assumption about NNESTs with a degree from English speaking countries would be they may have the capacities to develop a more efficient curriculum that applies effective pedagogy and devotes more enthusiasm to successfully assist students’ English learning due to their backgrounds of both their home country and the western culture. As a result, the proposed study that addressed NESTs and NNESTs in regard to their English teaching became a significant issue of discussion, especially with the growing demand for English education.

This study, therefore, synthesized the above knowledge gaps and aimed to provide a comparative investigation to Taiwanese EFL university students’ perceptions and preferences toward NESTs and NNESTs who hold a degree from a country where English is the dominant language by addressing the differences of their EFL teaching.
Besides, the positive or negative experiences those students had while learning from NESTs and NNESTs were also examined in the study.

**Conceptual Framework**

The target of this study was to gain in-depth understanding of Taiwanese university students’ perceptions toward their NESTs’ and NNESTs’ English language instruction, which contained various areas such as students’ preferences toward the two groups of teachers, the performances of NESTs and NNESTs in their English education, and students’ learning experiences. The conceptual framework, hence, was derived from one particular perspective: native and non-native speakers concerning language proficiency and teaching styles. Specifically, the lens was used to guide and raise research questions as to what the significant issues were and how they pertained to the problem being studied.

This study adopted Al-Omrani’s (2008) questionnaire with some modifications. Al-Omrani designed his questionnaire based on a perspective that NNESTs could be just as effective English teachers as NESTs. Originally, he insisted on the idea that native speakers of English were inherently better English teachers; he changed his mind since he was taught by a NNEST in a vocabulary class. The NNEST was familiar with students’ learning difficulties, utilized appropriate teaching materials and methods of vocabulary, and provided effective strategies that were suitable for learners. Hence, with all these merits, Al-Omrani believed NNESTs were the group of teachers who were capable, patient, helpful and friendly.

In this study, the researcher held a similar perspective as Al-Omrani: NNESTs could be just as effective English teachers as NESTs were. Therefore, Al-Omrani’s (2008)
questionnaire was modified after a pilot study to fit this study, which investigated Taiwanese university students’ perceptions and preferences toward NESTs’ and NNESTs’ English instruction.

**Purpose of the Study**

Due to a significant increase in the demand for English education worldwide, studies of NESTs and NNESTs are necessary and important. However, the research did not just simply probe into the issues of NESTs and NNESTs; the purpose of the study was to increase our understanding of whether NNESTs, who hold a degree from a country where English is the dominant language, performed better than NESTs in English education within EFL contexts. This study would be an attempt to explore Taiwanese university students’ perceptions and their preferences toward NESTs’ and NNESTs’ teaching strategies in different language skill areas. The difficulties the students faced and some positive experiences they learned in class were also discussed.

The study did not focus on indicating and determining who was better at teaching English skills; on the contrary, it examined learners’ perceptions regarding their NESTs and NNESTs, who were more effective, unique, or contributive to English education. Moreover, the research aimed to create awareness in regard to this area of focus and used the information to recognize the strengths and weaknesses of NESTs and NNESTs, so both teachers could benefit from them. The findings made implications for instructional approach selection and curriculum development in English education in order to meet both teachers’ and students’ demands. Last but not least, the research study stood to contribute a basis for future research in the field of ELT.
Research Questions

Based on the rationale the study conducted, the quantitative and qualitative research questions had been designed to investigate university students’ perceptions and preferences toward their NESTs and NNESTs in English education. Specifically, the research questions drew on the differences between NESTs and NNESTs regarding their EFL instruction in Taiwan. The following were the research questions that guided the study:

Quantitative research questions

1. What are Taiwanese university students’ perceptions in regard to the English language instruction of Native English-Speaking Teachers (NESTs) and Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers (NNESTs)?
2. From which group of teachers do Taiwanese university students prefer to learn English, Native English-Speaking Teachers (NESTs) or Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers (NNESTs) and why?

Qualitative research question

3. What positive and negative experiences do Taiwanese university students face when learning English from Native English-Speaking Teachers (NESTs) and Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers (NNESTs)?

Significance of the Study

This study provided valuable information relating to the issues of NESTs’ and NNESTs’ English teaching and learning, which could be categorized into the following areas. First of all, previous research with empirical studies stressed the perception of advantages and disadvantages between NESTs and NNESTs and then attributed the
differences to teachers’ classroom behaviors (Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Jin, 2005; Kirkpatrick, 2006; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2002; Mahboob, 2005; Medgyes, 1994, 2003), which neglected students’ opinions and feedback. The study, therefore, not only picked up the missing link of students’ perceptions but also explored the insight into NESTs’ and NNESTs’ English education in different language skill areas. By doing so, the findings may allow NESTs and NNESTs to develop an understanding of their distinct characteristics of teaching, so they would be able to build an effective curriculum by learning from each other’s unique experiences. In addition, through discussing the different challenges and positive experiences that students’ experienced in class, teachers would be able to adapt themselves to the needs of the students. Hopefully, NESTs and NNESTs could have opportunities to realize how to improve their English teaching to better serve the needs of EFL students.

Secondly, research on the perceptions of EFL learners toward NESTs and NNESTs is needed because research on these areas of focus started as early as the 21st century (Kamhi-Stein, 2004) and is still in the initial stages; the proposed research study attempted to respond to this need. This study investigated not only the perceptions and preferences of Taiwanese EFL students toward their NESTs’ and NNESTs’ English instruction, but also the two categories teachers’ teaching styles in different language skill areas.

Finally, the study had the potential to contribute to EFL or English as second language (ESL) teacher educational programs. Investigating NESTs’ and NNESTs’ different teaching strategies in the classrooms revealed teachers’ perceptions of the most efficient models of instruction in various language skill areas for EFL students. This
information could be used as valuable references to help other English language teachers who participated in teacher training programs. Also, through understanding the perspectives and experiences that NESTs and NNESTs brought to the classrooms, the teacher educational programs stood to better prepare English language teachers for becoming successful in learning and teaching English. To sum it all up, it was hoped that the research could benefit educators, language learners, curriculum planners, textbook writers, school administrators, and policy makers as well.

**Limitations of the Study**

Some limitations that might affect the findings are listed below:

1. The study focused only on university students’ responses toward their NESTs and NNESTs. However, teachers’ own perceptions toward their colleagues and English language teaching are also an important topic that should be addressed.

2. The research area of the study focused on the universities that were located in the northern part of Taiwan. Thus, the findings might not represent the perceptions of all Taiwanese EFL students, limiting its generalization.

3. The location of the research was limited to Taiwan only. In other words, the findings might not be applicable when applied to other Asian or western countries.

4. Since the researcher was also a non-native English speaking learner, the researcher might unintentionally bring personal biases into data analyses and interpretations, making the issue of researcher bias another limitation for the study.

5. The honesty of participants on the responses to the questionnaire would definitely influence the validity of the findings in this study.
Definition of Key Terms

1. English as a *Foreign* Language (EFL):

   English is not the primary language in Taiwan; hence, English is a “foreign” language rather than a second language. English as a *Foreign* Language (EFL), then, is explained as someone who learns English in a non-English-speaking country (Harmer, 2007).

2. English Language Teaching (ELT):

   ELT is explained as “the practice and theory of learning and teaching English for the benefit of people whose first language is not English” (Harmer, 2007).

3. English as a *Second* Language (ESL):

   Learning English in a country where English is dominantly spoken. For example, students from non-English-speaking countries who come to the U.S. and Canada for an extended period of time learn English as a *second* language (Harmer, 2007).

4. Native English-Speaking Teachers (NESTs):

   In this study, NESTs were referred to as English teachers who acquired English as a first language and speak it as their mother tongue.

5. Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers (NNESTs):

   In this study, NNESTs were referred to as English language teachers who were born in Taiwan with Chinese as their first language. The researcher further limited NNESTs to those who received a degree from an English-speaking country.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This study aimed to investigate Taiwanese university students’ perceptions and preferences toward their Native English-Speaking Teachers (NESTs) and Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers (NNESTs) in English education. An overview of literature associated with the study is presented in this current chapter, which is divided into seven sections: (1) native vs. nonnative English speaker, (2) the controversy of the native speaker ideal, (3) discussion on strengths and weaknesses of native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) and non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs), (4) perceptions of students toward native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) and non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs), (5) an effective English language teacher, (6) effective second language instruction, and (7) English as foreign language education in Taiwan.

Native vs. Nonnative English Speaker

As the English language expands all around the world, the term “nativeness” is actively discussed by researchers. In general, it means “who is a native speaker of English and who is not” (Al-Omrani, 2008, p. 25). According to Braine (1999), Ellis (2002), and Mahboob (2004), there is no precise definition for “native speaker,” because people cannot empirically define what a native speaker is. Medgyes (1999b) thus indicated that “there is no such creature as the native or non-native speaker” (p. 9).

Most people believe Americans born in the U.S. to be the only native English speakers in the country. However, if we reconsider this statement, there is a group of non-
Americans who attend American daycare centers or kindergarten schools, resulting in learning English before they fully acquire their parents’ mother tongue. Should they be considered as native speakers of English? Also, how about those second generations of non-Americans who were born and have grown up in the U.S. and speak English with accurate American accent? Should they be categorized as native English speakers? Hence, Medgyes (1999b) believed that “being born into a group does not mean that you automatically speak the language – many native speakers of English cannot write or tell stories, while many non-native speakers can” (p. 18). Kramsch (1997) added that “native speakership … is more than a privilege of birth or even of education” (p. 363).

Modiano (1999) indicated that the ability to use English in an appropriate and effective way decides whether someone is proficient in speaking English or not. In other words, “nativeness should not be related with birth, because birth does not determine proficiency in speaking English” (Al-Omrani, 2008, p. 27). Al-Omrani (2008) indicated five features that could determine whether someone was native English speaker or not (p. 28):

- The linguistic environment of the speaker’s formative years.
- The status of English in his/her home country.
- The length of exposure to English.
- His/her age of acquisition.
- His/her cultural identity.

In this study, the researcher referred to English teachers who acquired English as a first language and spoke it as a mother tongue as native English-speaking teachers
(NESTs), while English teachers who spoke or acquired English as a second or foreign language were referred to as non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs).

The Controversy of the Native Speaker Ideal

There is a stereotype in English instruction that a native speaker by nature is the best person to teach his or her native language. The myth of the idealized native speaker originated from Chomsky (1986). He believed that “linguistic theories primarily explained the actual performance of an ideal native speaker who knew his language perfectly and was not affected by such irrelevant grammatical elements as a distraction, a lot of interest or attention in a homogeneous speech community” (Liaw, 2004, p. 36). To be more specific, he viewed grammar of a language as “a description of the ideal speaker-hearer’s intrinsic competence” (p. 4) that coincided to the linguistic intuition of an ideal native speaker. Native speaker, thus, was viewed superior in the English language; on the contrary, a nonnative speaker, whose native language was one other than English, bore the negative stereotype and experienced a disadvantage in terms of recognition and employment (Bae, 2006). The following examples support this statement.

Freudenstein (1991) demonstrated a policy statement, which indicated that the standard foreign language teachers within European countries should be a native speaker of a language. Ngoc (2009) claimed that only native speaker teachers were capable to teach an authentic language in daily life because they had “a better capacity in demonstrating fluent language, explaining cultural connotations, and judging whether a given language form was acceptably correct or not” (p. 2).

Moreover, Phillipson (1992) pointed out that NESTs who had better English competence were more qualified to teach than NNESTs. Clark and Paran (2007)
described a hiring policy implemented among numerous ESL and EFL institutions, which emphasized only NESTs were qualified to be recruited because “students do not come to be taught by someone who doesn’t speak English” (Thomas, 1999, p. 6). The mystery of the native speakers was that they were better English teachers due to a better command of the English language, while the negative stereotype of the NNESTs had been widely disseminated in present day (Bulter, 2007; Davies, 2003; Lee, 2005). Admittedly, this theory has influenced the perceptions of language teachers, students, and the public, which leaves little room for NNESTs in the field of ELT.

However, there have been several arguments against this assumption (Barratt & Kontra, 2000; Benson, 2012; Medgyes, 2001; Modiano, 1999; Moussu & Llurda, 2008; Sommers, 2005; Thomas, 1999; Wu & Ke, 2009). These opposite opinions believed that English teachers should not be valued just by their first language; other factors such as teaching experience, professional preparation, and linguistic expertise were equally important to represent a good foreign language teacher model. Medgyes (1992) claimed that NNESTs were effective and should be equally likely to reach professional success in the English instruction. Phillipson (1992) argued that NNESTs, 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 or foreign language (p. 15).
Medgyes (2001) explained that both NESTs and NNESTs could be equally good teachers; however, NNESTs could further “provide a better learner model, teach language-learning strategies more effectively, supply more information about the English language, better anticipate and prevent language difficulties, and be more sensitive to their students” (p. 436).

Cheng and Braine’s (2007) study served as an example along the same line. In their research, EFL students in Hong Kong universities were investigated for their attitudes and opinions towards NESTs and NNESTs, the pros and cons of the teachers from students’ points of views, and the capability of these teachers to assist students’ academic learning. The results revealed that both students and their families showed positive attitudes to Hong Kong EFL NNESTs. This surprising point contradicted a previous result (Lee, 2004) which had revealed the negative perceptions of students’ families toward EFL teachers. Looking more closely, participants did not face any problems regarding a teacher’s “nativeness;” instead, they believed that NNESTs taught EFL effectively with no genuine differences while comparing to NESTs. In this case of NNESTs, their ability to empathize with students, a shared cultural background, and their stricter expectations were seen as strengths. Another significant result of the study was that senior students showed a more positive attitude toward NNESTs than other lower grade participants. The result might suggest that beginning EFL students entered the learning process with the view that NESTs were better than NNESTs, but the perception changed with experience (Lee, 2004).

Overall, it was difficult to make a straightforward comparison on the better qualified teacher between NESTs and NNESTs, particularly when realizing the following
facts: (1) teachers were educated or taught rather than born with native like competence or proficiency (Kim, 2008) and (2) effective teaching included many different elements, not simply the ability to sound like a native speaker (Laborda, 2006; Ngoc, 2009).

**Discussion on Strengths and Weaknesses of Native English-Speaking Teachers (NESTs) and Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers (NNESTs)**

There have been debates on whether NESTs are better language instructors than NNESTs, and no agreements have been reached on this controversial issue. Even so, the strengths and weaknesses of NESTs and NNESTs have been examined and documented in the field of ELT. Regarding the positive aspects of NESTs, Villalobos Ulate and Universidad Nacional (2011) noted that NESTs included the following characteristics: (1) subconscious knowledge of rules, (2) intuitive grasp of meanings, (3) ability to communicate within social settings, (4) range of language skills, (5) creativity of language use, (6) identification with a language community, (7) ability to produce fluent discourse, (8) knowledge of differences between their own speech and that of the “standard” form of the language, and (9) ability “to interpret and translate into the L1 (p. 62). Stern (1983) further indicated that NESTs’ linguistic knowledge, proficiency or competence of the target language was a crucial reference for the concept of language proficiency in English teaching. Widdowson (1992) pointed out that a NEST could be a reliable informant of linguistic knowledge due to their native language learning experiences.

Similarly, according to Medgyes’ (2001) study, NNESTs tended to have advantages in terms of six characteristics: (1) good role models for imitation, (2) effective providers of learning strategies, (3) supplies of information about the English language,
(4) better anticipators of language learning difficulties, (5) sensitive and empathetic to language learners’ needs and problems, and (6) facilitators of language learning as a result of a shared mother tongue (p. 436). Phillipson (1992) explained that the L2 learning experiences of NNESTs detailed the awareness of how the mother tongue and the target language differed and what was difficult for learners, which gave insight into the linguistic and cultural needs of learners. Cook (2005) indicated that NNESTs “provide models of proficient [second language] users in action in the classroom, and also examples of people who have become successful [second language] users” (p. 57). Modiano’s (2005) study further showed that NNESTs would be more aware of learning an international variety of English and would be in a better position to encourage diversity since they did not belong to a specific variety of English. As a result, students would “learn more about how English operates in a diverse number of nation states so that they can gain better understanding of the wide range of English language usage” (p. 40).

Thus, Medgyes (1992) concluded that an ideal NEST was the one who had achieved a high level of proficiency in the learners’ native language; as for the ideal NNESTs, one should achieve near-native proficiency in English (p. 348). As for an ideal school, Medgyes (2001) suggested that the school should have NESTs and NNESTs complemented each other in their advantages and disadvantages (p. 441).

As for the weaknesses of NESTs, Tang (1997) enumerated several points: (1) different linguistic and cultural backgrounds from learners, (2) lack of the awareness of learners’ needs, (3) unable to perceive the difficulties of learning the target language, and (4) unfamiliar with learners’ learning contexts. Shaw (1979) explained that NESTs lacked
the necessary insights into lesson preparation and delivered because they were not willing
to learn the host languages and cultures (Widdowson, 1992). In Barratt and Kontra’s
(2000) study, NESTs rarely made useful comparison and contrasts with the learner’s first
language and did not empathize with students going through the learning process, which
discouraged learners easily. Additionally, Boyle (1997) pointed out that NESTs might
understand the accuracy in grammar but were not able to explain language rules like
NNESTs did.

Regarding the disadvantages of NNESTs, it is undeniable that NNESTs’ may not
be as confident as NESTs in speaking aspects. Canagarajah (1999) and Moussu (2010)
noted that NNESTs’ higher anxiety on their accent and pronunciation greatly influenced
their English instructions and the interactions, which might lead to the failure of language
teaching. Tang’s (1997) study revealed similar results that NESTs were superior in terms
of speaking, accents and pronunciation while NNESTs’ shortcomings included the
foreign accent, insufficient knowledge of American culture, and the lack of self-
confidence (Moussu, 2006a).

While discussing the different teaching behaviors, Arva and Medgyes’ (2000)
study explored the different teaching styles between NESTs and NNESTs based on their
backgrounds of language, qualifications, and experiences. The results showed that
NESTs tended to implement a wider variety of cultural resources and more structured
activities, such as newspapers, posters, and videos, rather than a formal textbook. Besides,
NESTs often failed to manage the time for class discussion and did not provide a fair
opportunity for each student to participate. NNESTs, on the contrary, preferred a step-by-
step approach based on course books. The atmosphere in class was formal with less
interaction with students. NNESTs better explained language rules, served as a role model for students, and demonstrated how to make sense of the English language. Furthermore, Medgyes’ (1994) investigated the teaching behaviors of 325 NESTs and NNESTs. The following table shows the results of teachers’ self-perceptions (see Table 2.1).
Table 2.1. Perceived Differences in Teaching Behavior between NESTs and NNESTs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NESTs</th>
<th>NNESTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak better English</td>
<td>Speak poorer English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use real language</td>
<td>Use “booklish” language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use English more confidently</td>
<td>Use English less confidently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Attitude</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt a more flexible approach</td>
<td>Adopt a more guided approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are more innovative</td>
<td>Are more cautious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are less empathetic</td>
<td>Are more empathetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend to perceived needs</td>
<td>Attend to read needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have far-fetched expectations</td>
<td>Have realistic expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are more casual</td>
<td>Are stricter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are less committed</td>
<td>Are more committed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude to Teaching Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are less insightful</td>
<td>Are more insightful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on:</td>
<td>Focus on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language in use</td>
<td>Grammar rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral skills</td>
<td>Printed work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquial registers</td>
<td>Formal registers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach items in context</td>
<td>Teach items in isolation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer free activities</td>
<td>Prefer controlled activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favour groupwork/pairwork</td>
<td>Favour frontal work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a variety of materials</td>
<td>Use a single textbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerate errors</td>
<td>Correct/punish errors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set fewer tests</td>
<td>Set more tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use no/less first language (L1)</td>
<td>Use more first language (L1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort to no/less translation</td>
<td>Resort to more translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign less homework</td>
<td>Assign more homework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 2.1 (p. 20) demonstrates, the teaching behavior between the two groups of teachers has a number of significant differences. However, “different does not imply better or worse” (Medgyes, 1994, p. 76). That is, teachers should be valued solely on the basis of their professional virtue, regardless of their language background (Arva, & Medgyes, 2000; Watson-Todd & Pojanapunya, 2009).

In Smith et al. (2007) personal observations, teachers taught as they were taught, and the strongest predictor of language teaching success was having successful foreign or second language classroom learning experiences. That is, successful language learning classroom experiences play a crucial factor for both NESTs and NNESTs alike, which lead them to achieve the route of successful teaching (Cheng, Chen, & Cheng, 2012). Hence, Medgyes (1992) concluded, “the more proficiency in English, the more efficient in the classroom is a false statement” (p. 347).

Perceptions of Students toward Native English-Speaking Teachers (NESTs) and Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers (NNESTs)

In the past few years, studies on examining the differences between NESTs and NNESTs from students’ points of view had been recognized by researchers. This is crucial because “students, by nature, are the consumers of their teachers’ product and, as a result, can offer valuable feedback on and insight into the discussion” (Torres, 2004, p. 13).

In regard to Lasagabaster and Sierra’s (2005) study in the Basque Autonomous Community of Spain, there were 76 EFL undergraduate students who completed a Likert scale questionnaire about their preferences toward NESTs’ and NNESTs’ English instruction. The results showed that students preferred to learn with NESTs in general,
but the differences in preferences for NESTs and NNESTs were based on specific language skill areas. For example, learners preferred NESTs in “the production skills of speaking, pronunciation, and writing” (p. 136), while a swing towards NNESTs when it came to the teaching of grammar.

Liu and Zhang (2007) surveyed and interviewed 65 third year college students majoring in English language and literature in South China to determine the differences between NESTs and NNESTs in terms of attitude, means of instruction and teaching results. The findings revealed that there was no significant difference found between the two groups of teachers. That is, students perceived both groups as hardworking and competent. Specifically, the foreign teachers’ approaches to text materials were more varied, while Chinese teachers were believed to be more effective in teaching test-oriented courses such as Comprehensive English and Business English.

In another study that investigated 32 ESL students’ perceptions toward their NESTs and NNESTs, Mahboob (2004) utilized a novel and insightful “discourse-analytic” technique. The participants were required to write an essay about their opinions in regard to their NESTs and NNESTs. The results showed that ESL students had no preference for NESTs and NNESTs, since the two categories of teachers were perceived to have strengths and weaknesses in English teaching. Some participants believed NESTs as better teachers of vocabulary and culture, while others supported NNESTs for the using of good teaching methods, the ability to answer students’ questions, and being responsible for their English instruction.

Similar results could be found in Park’s (2009) study. No overall preferences for NESTs over NNESTs were concluded by 177 Korean university students while
investigating their preferences for English language teachers. It was remarkable that the participants in this study considered that an integration and cooperation of NESTs and NNESTs was appropriate and workable to enhance the possibility of learner’s academic success.

The related studies discussed above indicated no consensus in regard to the ideal English language teacher, native or nonnative. They showed that “both NESTs and NNESTs have their own merits and demerits and it is unfair to judge one group based on their disadvantages” (Alseweed, 2012, p. 45). Celik (2006), therefore, emphasized the need for NESTs and NNESTs to embrace each other and to work in a partnership; for example, co-teaching between NESTs and NNESTs could contribute to the improvement of the teaching quality of both of them (Liu, 2008).

**An Effective English Language Teacher**

According to Arikan (2010), “teacher effectiveness is one of the most profound factors affecting the quality of the language learning process” (p. 210). A question, thus, comes to mind: What is a good English language teacher? According to Astor (2000), a qualified teacher of English should be “a professional in at least three fields of knowledge: pedagogy, methodology, and psycho - and applied linguistics” (p. 18). Borg (2006) further provided five different criteria to identify the characteristics of good English language teachers: “personal qualities, pedagogical skills, classroom practices, subject matter and psychological constructs such as knowledge and attitudes” (p. 8). In this regard, simply being a native or non-native speaker of the mother tongue language would not be used to identify as an effective English language teacher. Rather, all these above areas and criteria must be learned and practiced by language teachers (Astor, 2000). That
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Informed Consent Form (English Version)
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Title of the Study:
Taiwanese University Students’ Perceptions Toward Native and Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers in EFL Contexts

Principal Researcher: Shih-Yun Tsou

Dear Student,

You are invited to participate in this research study. The goal of this questionnaire is to collect information about your perceptions and preferences in regard to your Native English-Speaking Teachers (NESTs) and Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers (NNESTs) in teaching English as a foreign language (EFL). Please read the information below and ask questions about anything you do not understand before you decide whether or not to participate. The researcher will answer any questions you have.

There has been a great deal of previous research conducted in the areas of NESTs and NNESTs. Some of these studies focused only on the teachers’ self-perceptions or their NESTs or NNESTs colleagues’ perceptions on English instruction. In addition, the aforementioned studies have overlooked the fact that the group of NNESTs in fact can be divided into two subgroups: NNESTs who hold a degree from a country where English is the dominant language and NNESTs who do not hold a degree from a country where English is the dominant language. NNESTs who hold a degree from a country where English is the dominant language have the experiences of western educational system, which may directly affect their English proficiency and their ability to teach the English language. Thus, an assumption to NNESTs with a degree from English speaking countries would be they may have the capacities to develop a more efficient curriculum that applies effective pedagogy and devotes more enthusiasm to successfully assist students’ English learning due to their backgrounds of both their home country and the western culture. This study, therefore, will synthesize the above knowledge gaps and aims to provide a comparative investigation to Taiwanese EFL university students’ perceptions and preferences toward NESTs and NNESTs who hold a degree from a country where English is the dominant language by addressing the differences of their EFL teaching.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire. Your name will be kept confidential. Your participation is voluntary, and you can refuse to participate or withdraw anytime without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.
I would appreciate it if you return the form showing you are willing and able to participate in this study. Thanks for your kind cooperation and assistance. If you have any questions please feel free to contact the researcher.

The contact information of the researcher:
Researcher: Shih-Yun Tsou
Phone: 0911238051
E-Mail: Yuin1225@msn.com

The contact information of the Department of Teacher and Bilingual Education:
Faculty Sponsor: Patricia A. Gomez, Ed.D.
Phone: (361) 593-2910
Mailing Address: Department of Teacher and Bilingual Education
    MSC 152, 700 University Blvd.
    Kingsville, Texas 78363
Phone of the Department of Teacher and Bilingual Education:
    (361) 593-2871
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The contact information of the IRB on campus:
Mailing Address: Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
    Texas A&M University-Kingsville
    MSC 201. 700 University Blvd.
    Kingsville, Texas 78363-8202
Fax: (361) 593-3409
Phone: (361) 593-3344
E-mail: kftaf00@tamuk.edu

Agreement to participate in this research project:
If you are agreed to participate in the study, you will respond to the enclosed questionnaire, which consisted of two parts. In the first part, the questions are about your gender, age, English learning experiences, etc. Part two contains 4 sections; with total 29 statements and two open-ended questions. The purpose of the questionnaire aims to investigate your perceptions and preferences toward your NESTs and NNESTs in regard to their English instruction. It may take you up to 40 minutes to complete the questionnaire.
Possible discomforts and risks:
   No discomforts or risks are anticipated.

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Shih-Yun Tsou

[ ] I am willing to participate in this study, and I am eighteen years old or over.
[ ] I am not willing to participate in this study.
[ ] I need more information before consenting my permission.

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________
Phone: ____________________________________________
Address: ___________________________________________
Witness Signatures: _______________________________________
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參與研究同意書

題目: 台灣的大學生對於本國和外國英文教師英語教學的看法

研究者: 鄒詩韻

親愛的同學:

歡迎您來參與此次的教育研究。本問卷的主要目的是在收集您對於本國英語教師和外國英語教師的看法和喜好。在您決定參與本研究之前，請仔細閱讀以下訊息。如有任何疑問歡迎您提出，現場的研究人員將詳細地回答您的問題。

在現有的研究文獻中，已有大量關於本國和外國英語教師的研究，但是大部分的研究只著重於教師對於英語教學的自我看法和對現有英語教師的英語教學的看法。而在這些研究當中，它們忽略了一項事實：本國英語教師可細分為兩類：一類是從英語國家獲得學位的本國英語教師，另外一類是從本國獲得學位的本國英語教師。從英語國家獲得學位的本國英語教師，因為經歷過西方文化和教育的洗禮，這種經歷可能會直接影響到他們的英語能力和英語教學方法。所以我們假設這些從英語國家獲得學位的本國英語教師，因為擁有西方和東方文化的背景，可能會設計出更有效果的課程，運用更有效果的教學方法，在教學上付出更多熱情，進而有效的幫助學生學習英語。為填補以往研究的不足，本研究是在比較外國英語教師和從英語國家獲得學位的本國英語教師不同的教學方法，以及調查台灣的大學生對於這兩類教師的看法和喜好。

如果您同意參與這項研究，請您完成以下的調查問卷。您的個人訊息將被妥善保密。這項研究的參與是自願性的，您有權利拒絕參與或是隨時退出此次研究。

如果您願意參加此研究，請在同意書上簽名。謝謝您的參與和配合！

以下是研究人員聯絡方式：

姓名: 鄒詩韻
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電子郵件: yuin1225@msn.com

以下是德州農工大學金斯維爾分校教學與雙語教育學系的聯絡方式：
指導教授: Patricia A. Gomez, Ed.D.
電話: (361) 593-2910
地址: Department of Teacher and Bilingual Education
      MSC 152,700 University Blvd.
      Kingsville, Texas78363
教學與雙語教育學系電話: (361) 593-2871
上班時間: 星期一至星期五 上午八點至下映五點

倫理審查委員會聯絡方式:

地址: Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
      Texas A&M University-Kingsville
      MSC 201, 700 University Blvd.
      Kingsville, Texas 78363-8202
傳真: (361) 593-3409
電話: (361) 593-3344
電子郵件: kftaf00@tamuk.edu

參與此研究協議之同意書:
如果你同意參加此研究，請您答覆以下的問卷。此問卷包含兩部分：第一部份是包含你的性別、年齡、以及英語學習經歷。第二部分包含四小部分，總共有二十九題問題和兩題問答題。第二部分問卷的目的是在調查您對於本國與外國英語教師在英語教學上的看法和喜好。本份問卷預計將耗時四十分鐘。

預計可能會發生的不適和危險性：
預計無任何不適和危險性。

謝謝您的參與！

研究者: 鄒詩韻
我願意參加此研究，並且我已年滿十八歲。

我不同意參加此研究。

在我同意參加此研究之前我需要更多訊息。

簽名: ___________________________  日期: ______________
電話: _____________________________
地址: _____________________________
見證人: ___________________________
Key Definitions

1. **English as a Foreign Language (EFL):** English is not the primary or dominant language in Taiwan; hence, English is considered a “foreign” language rather than a second language. “EFL” (English as a Foreign Language), then, is explained as learning English in a non-English-speaking country.

2. **Native English-Speaking Teacher (NEST):**
   In the study, NESTs are referred to English teachers who acquire English as a first language and speak it as a mother tongue.

3. **Non-Native English-Speaking Teacher (Non-NEST):**
   In this study, Non-NESTs are referred to English language teachers who were born in Taiwan with Chinese as their first language. The researcher further limits NNESTs to those who received a degree from an English speaking country.
Individual Background Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions and check the proper answers.

1. Gender: Male ______ Female ______

2. Age: 18 to 20 _______ 21 to 23 _______ Over 24_______

3. Academic Major: __________________________

4. What’s your college level: Sophomore _____ Junior _____ Senior ______

5. How long have you been learning English? (Including self-study and taking private English courses)
   8 to 10 years _______ 11 to 13 years _______
   14 to 16 years _______ Over 17 years _______

6. How do you rate your overall proficiency in English compared to that of other students in your class?
   Beginner ______ Intermediate _______ Advanced ______

7. How many Native English Speaking Teachers (NESTs) have you had since you started learning English? (Including taking private English courses)
   1 to 3 _______ 4 to 6 _______ 7 to 9 _______ Over 10 ______

8. How many Non-Native English Speaking Teachers (NNESTs) have you had since you started learning English? (Including taking private English courses)
   1 to 3 _______ 4 to 6 _______ 7 to 9 _______ Over 10 ______

9. Check if you have studied English courses from NESTs or NNESTs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Native English-Speaking Teachers (NESTs)</th>
<th>Non-native English-Speaking Teachers (NNESTs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceptions Toward NESTs and NNESTs’ English instruction

Please respond to the following statements by circling a number that best expresses your view.

Section One – Students’ Learning Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I learn English better from Non-NESTs because we share the same first language.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I learn English better from Non-NESTs because we share the same culture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel motivated when I take course with Non-NESTs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel anxious when I take course with NESTs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-NESTs are better than NESTs because they can understand my problems in learning English.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Non-NESTs always understand my questions and provide clear answers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Non-NESTs are a good model in learning English because they have gone through the same language learning process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In general, beginning learners learn better with NNESTs because NNESTs apply Chinese into English instruction.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In general, intermediate and advanced learners learn better with NESTs because they less rely on the Chinese support and need more opportunities to practice their English.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section Two – Teachers’ Performances in English education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In teaching oracy, NESTs are better because they have standard pronunciation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I prefer taking oral courses with NESTs because it forces me not to speak Chinese.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I prefer learning oracy with NESTs because they are fluent native speakers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I prefer to learn writing with Non-NESTs because I can describe what I want to write in Chinese to my teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. NESTs teach writing better than Non-NESTs because they know certain writing styles used in English speaking countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. NESTs teach grammar better than Non-NESTs because they can provide different variations of sentence structures in one specific grammar rule.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I prefer taking grammar classes with Non-NESTs because they provide Chinese explanations for the rules of English grammar.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. I prefer taking vocabulary courses with NESTs because they have bigger wealth vocabulary.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I prefer taking vocabulary courses with Non-NESTs because they provide explanations of unknown words in Chinese.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Culture</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. NNESTs incorporate Chinese and American cultures into American culture classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. NESTs supply learners with more information in the English language and culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of Language teaching</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. The teaching style of NESTs ensures student enjoyment of the lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Non-NESTs are better than NESTs because they frequently use Chinese to teach English.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Most Non-NESTs do not consider class activities, games, and out-of-class activities as resources of English learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Non-NESTs make comparison between Chinese and English while teaching, which helps improve English learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Non-NESTs have great teaching abilities in using different techniques and methods.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. To be an effective EFL teacher, a person needs both experience and qualification in teaching English.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Three – Students’ Overall Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. NESTs are preferable to Non-NESTs and I learn more from them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I would like to have classes where both NESTs and NNESTs co-teach in the same class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open-Ended Questions

29. Have you ever had any positive or negative experiences while learning English from NESTs? Please provide your personal experiences.

Positive experiences: ________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Negative experiences: ______________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

30. Have you ever had any positive or negative experiences while learning English from NNESTs? Please provide your personal experiences.

Positive experiences: ______________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Negative experiences: ______________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
IMPORTANT NOTE: The researcher would like to verify the responses of open-ended questions later while analyzing the data to make sure the answers you provided maintain overall authenticity. If you would like to consider taking part in this process, please write down your name, telephone number and email address below.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Name: _______________________

Tel.: _______________________

Email Address: ___________________
APPENDIX E

Questionnaire (Chinese Version)
名詞解釋和定義

1. 英語作為外語: 在台灣，英語並不是主流語言，英語被認為是一種外國語言而不是第二語言，所以英語作為外語指的是在非英語國家的英語學習。
2. 外國英語教師: 本研究中，外國英語教師被定義為英語是母語的英語教師。
3. 本國英語教師: 本研究中，本國英語教師被定義為以國語為第一語言，出生台灣的英語老師。
請回答以下問題並在合適的地方打勾。

1. 性別: 男 ______ 女 ______
2. 年齡: 18 到 20 歲 ______ 21 到 23 歲 ______ 超過 24 歲 ______
3. 主修: ______________________________
4. 您目前就讀: 大二 ______，大三 ______，大四 ________
5. 您學習英語多久了? (包括自修和補習班)
   8 到 10 年 ______ 11 到 13 年 ______
   14 到 16 年 ______ 超過 17 年 ______
6. 您覺得您的英語程度和班上同學相比會落在?
   初級 ________ 中級 ____________ 高級 __________
7. 您曾經多少位外國英語教師學習過英語? (包含補習班)
   1 到 3 位 ______ 4 到 6 位 ______ 7 到 9 位 ______ 超過 10 位 ______
8. 您曾經多少位本國英語教師學習過英語? (包含補習班)
   1 到 3 位 ______ 4 到 6 位 ______ 7 到 9 位 ______ 超過 10 位 ______
9. 請勾選您曾經上過外國英語教師和本國英語教師的英語科目。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>科目</th>
<th>外國英語教師</th>
<th>本國英語教師</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>口語</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>寫作</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文法</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>字彙</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>美國文化</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
對外國和本國英語教師英語教學的看法

請圈選 1 至 5 中的一個數字來確切地表達您的意見及看法

第一部分: 學生的學習經驗

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>問題</th>
<th>非常不同意</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>中立</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>非常同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 我和本國英語教師學英語學的比較好，因為我們說同樣的母語。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 我和本國英語教師學英語學的比較好，因為我們有同樣的文化背景。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 和本國英語教師學英語比較能激勵我學習英文的動力。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 和外國英語教師學習英語讓我覺得很焦慮。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 本國英語教師比外國英語教師好，因為本國英語教師較能瞭解我在學習上會遇到的問題。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 本國英語教師較能夠瞭解我所發問的問題，並提供明確的答案。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 本國英語教師是我學習英語的好範例，因為他們經歷過和我一樣的語言學習過程。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 一般來說，初級學習者跟本國英語教師學得比較好，因為本國英語教師能使用國語輔助英語教學。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 一般來說，中、高級學習者對母語輔助學習的依存度較小，對英語實際講演機會的需求較大，所以和外國英語教師學得比較好。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

第二部分: 教師在英語教學上的表現

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>問題</th>
<th>非常不同意</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>中立</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>非常不同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>口語會話</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 在口語會話教學中，外國英語教師更好，因為他們發音較標準。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 我較喜歡外國英語教師教授口語會話課，這使我在課堂上必須說英語。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>問題</td>
<td>非常不同意</td>
<td>不同意</td>
<td>中立</td>
<td>同意</td>
<td>非常同意</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 我較喜歡上外國英語教師教授的口語會話課，因為他們口語較流利。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>習作</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 我較喜歡和本國英語教師學習作，因為我可以用國語來解釋我想要寫的內容。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 外國英語教師教學作比本國英語教師好，因為他們理解特有的西方式寫作風格。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文法</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 外國英語教師教學文法比本國英語教師好，因為他們比較能夠在同一類文法中其他的句型變化模式。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 我較喜歡和本國英語教師學文法，因為他們能夠用國語來輔助解英語的文法。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>字彙</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 我較喜歡上外國英語教師的字彙課，因為他們的字彙量較大。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 我較喜歡上本國英語教師的字彙課，因為他們能夠用國語解釋我不懂的英語單字。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>美國文化</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 在英語教學上，本國英語教師較能夠融合中西方的文化。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 在英語教學上，外國英語教師提供更多英語的資訊和美國文化。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>關於語言學習方面</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. 外國英語教師的教學方法與方式，讓學生在課程中更能享受英語學習的樂趣。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. 本國英語教師比外國英語教師好，因為他們能夠在適當的時候用國語來輔助英語教學。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. 大部分本國英語教師不認為課堂上的遊戲活動，或是戶外活動是學習英語的有效途徑。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. 本國英語教師在教學上會採用中英文對照，此方法對教學有正面的效果。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. 本國英語教師擅於使用不同的教學方法。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. 一位教學成效良好的英語教師必須同時具備有英語教學的資格和經驗。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
第三部分：學生的整體喜好

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>問題</th>
<th>非常不同意</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>中立</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>非常同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. 我比較喜歡外國英語教師，從他們那我學到更多。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. 如果有機會，我會想要外國老師和本國老師共同合作教學。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

問答題

29. 您有任何和外國英語教師學習英語的正面或負面經歷嗎？請提供您的個人經驗。

正面經歷：_______________________________________________
___________________________________________________________

負面經歷：_______________________________________________
___________________________________________________________

30. 您有任何和本國英語教師學習英語的正面或負面經歷嗎？請提供您的個人經驗。

正面經歷：_______________________________________________
___________________________________________________________

負面經歷：_______________________________________________
___________________________________________________________
重要訊息: 研究人員分析數據時將驗證您在問答題中的回答以確保研究的真實性。如果您願意參加驗證過程，請在留下您的姓名、電話以及電子郵件。謝謝您的合作！

姓名: _______________________
電話: _______________________
電子郵件: ________________________
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