NOVITAS ROYAL
RESEARCH ON YOUTH AND LANGUAGE

TURKISH EFL LEARNERS' PERCEPTIONS OF NATIVE ENGLISH-SPEAKING TEACHERS AND NON-NATIVE ENGLISH-SPEAKING TEACHERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

İNGİLİZCEYİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRENEN TÜRK ÖĞRENCİLERİN YÜKSEKÖĞRETİMDE ANADİLİ İNGİLİZCE OLAN VE ANADİLİ İNGİLİZCE OLMAYAN ÖĞRETMEN ALGILARI

Ali KARAKAŞ[1], Hüseyin UYSAL[2], Selçuk BİLGİN[3] & Talat BULUT[4]

Abstract: The question of what makes a good teacher of English has aroused researchers' interest for many years, and the existing studies comparing NESTs (native English-speaking teachers) and NNESTs (non-native English-speaking teachers) have focused mostly on students' perceptions of these teachers. The current study aims to explore in the first phase if there is a meaningful difference between Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs on their first encounter with them. The second phase explores whether any changes have occurred in students' preconceptions regarding NESTs within the course of time. The participants are 120 Turkish monolinguals from a private university. Quantitative data was collected through questionnaires consisting of Likert-scale items in both phases. An interview session was added to the second phase to obtain more in-depth insights into students' perceptions. The findings showed that students had neutral perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs. However, in the second phase, the data analysed via qualitative content analysis demonstrated that students' perceptions were found to have positively changed for NESTs, particularly in terms of personality dimension. In both phases, students perceived NESTs in linguistic and professional dimensions, and NNESTs in pedagogical dimension rather positively.

Keywords: EFL teaching, Prototype theory, Native English speaker

Öz: İyi bir İngilizce öğretmeni nasıl olur sorusu, eğitim araştırmacılarının uzun yıllardır ilgisini çekmiş ve anadili İngilizce olan ve olmayan öğretmenleri ele alan çalışmalar öğrencilerin bu öğretmenlerle ilgili algılarını araştırmıştır. Bu çalışma, ilk aşamasında, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen Türk öğrencilerin anadili İngilizce olan ve olmayan öğretmen algıları arasında, bu öğretmenlerle ilk karşılaşmalarında anlamlı bir fark olup olmadığını incelemektedir. İkinci aşama ise öğrencilerin anadili İngilizce olan öğretmenlere yönelik yerleşmiş fikirlerinde zaman içerisinde bir değişim olup olmadığını araştırmaktadır. Katılımcılar, özel bir üniversitede öğrenim gören 120 Türk öğrencidir. Veriler, her iki aşamada Likert ölçeğinden oluşan anketler aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Öğrencilerin algılarını hakkında daha derin anlayışlar kazanılması amacıyla, ikinci aşamaya mülakat seansları eklenmiştir. Sonuçlara göre anadili İngilizce olan ve olmayan öğretmenlere yönelik öğrenci algıları tarafsızdır. Ama ikinci aşamada, nitel içerik analizi ile çözümlenen veriler öğrencilerin algılarının anadili İngilizce olan öğretmenler lehine, özellikle kişisel boyutta olumlu yönde değiştiğini göstermiştir. Her iki aşamada da öğrenciler, anadili İngilizce olan öğretmenleri dilbilimsel ve mesleki boyutlarda ve anadili İngilizce olmayan öğrencileri de eğitimsel boyutta olumlu yönde algılamıştır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Öntür kuramı, Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğretimi, Anadil olarak İngilizce konuşan öğretmen

---

[1] Ph.D., Department of English Language Teaching, Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Turkey, akarakas@mehmetakif.edu.tr
[2] Ph.D. Student, School of Teaching and Learning, University of Florida, USA, huysal9@ufl.edu
[3] Instructor, School of Languages, Özyeğin University, Turkey, selcuk.bilgin@ozyegin.edu.tr
[4] Ph.D. Candidate, Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, National Central University, Taiwan; Lecturer, Department of Speech and Language Therapy, Istanbul Medipol University, Turkey, tbulut@medipol.edu.tr

1. Introduction

Over the past centuries, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of second and foreign language speakers of English, which is, at present, more numerous than the number of native speakers of English. Such a demographic and linguistic change has, in practice, transformed English into "a language -the language- on which the sun does not set, whose users never sleep" (Quirk, 1985, p. 1). In other words, English has become "a bridge of communication" for people from different walks of life, who speak different first languages (Gallego, 2012). In this regard, Crystal (1997) propounded the argument that globalization has caused a shift in the deep-seated position of English as a foreign language by converting it into a global language that can be embraced by any speaker across the world. Added to this, Canagarajah (2007) conceived of English as a language that will be spoken chiefly in multilingual environments as a second language and, most likely, as a lingua franca among speakers who do not share the same L1.

With the mushrooming use of English and number of non-native speakers, the issue of teaching English in non-English-dominant contexts has been brought to the fore in discussions and empirical research. The question, who makes better language teachers of English, has received considerable attention in the literature on native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) and non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) thus far (e.g. Medgyes, 1992; Merino, 1997). This question was of particular prominence during the 1990s. Although the question itself seems to be not valid anymore, the issue of NESTs and NNESTs is still attention-grabbing in the current era when the majority teachers of English (both EFL and ESL) are non-native, thus meriting further investigation from different outlooks.

There has been much discussion addressing the subject of NESTs/NNESTs, and much empirical research has been done, centring primarily on teachers', and students' self-perceptions of NNESTs and NESTs (e.g. Barkhuizen, 1998; Garrett & Shortall, 2002; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2002; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999). However, the interest in the subject of NESTs/NNESTs appears to have risen in recent years in the Turkish context. Therefore, there are many questions that wait to be answered. Moreover, much of the current research has been done in the USA in ESL settings and East-Asian contexts, and the focus has been largely on participants' attitudes towards either NESTs or NNESTs, but rarely towards two groups in the same time. Namely, a comparative approach in the previous studies was rarely adopted. Hence, there is still scant research in what is commonly known as EFL contexts. However, in Turkey, to which this research belongs, to the best of authors' knowledge, not much research has been found exploring EFL students' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs in the context of higher education where students are highly likely to have classes with NESTs alongside NNESTs (e.g. İnceçay & Atay, 2009; Ürkmez, 2015). Particularly, none of the studies consulted in the Turkish and international contexts built their theoretical framework on the prototype theory while investigating their participants' attitudes and perceptions. The prototype theory claims that the categorization of concepts occurs around the most representative one. It might be hence useful to explain the dichotomy between NEST and NNEST in a systematic way by highlighting the distinctive features of each, which would presumably make the distinction easier. Another major gap in the literature is that previous studies addressing students' perceptions of NESTs did not pay mind to whether their participants have encountered or had any prior experience with NESTs. Encountering and having real-world experiences with NESTs can seriously influence participants' perceptions because perceptions based on experiences with real-world characters (i.e. NESTs) and perceptions of imagined NESTs can be quite different and even

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

contradictory. This research has, thus, emerged as a reaction to this gap in the literature and attempts to investigate Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs in two phases: before and after encountering NESTs in their institution.

With an attempt to fill the research gap identified in the literature, the study is guided by the following research questions:
1. What are Turkish EFL students' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs?
2. Is there a meaningful difference between the perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs among Turkish EFL learners on their first encounter with NESTs in the university environment?
3. After encountering NESTs, have any changes occurred in students' perceptions of NESTs/NNESTs? If so, what has changed in students' preconceptions within the course of time?

For the purpose of shedding further light on the students' preconceptions of NESTs and NNESTs, drawing on the prototype theory, some dimensions related to these speakers, such as personal, pedagogical, linguistic, professional and cultural dimensions, were also analysed while seeking to answer the research questions.

2. Conceptual Framework and Literature Review
2.1. NESTs and NNESTs: Conceptualizations and Debates
The literature includes several contradictory definitions for the notions of *native speaker* and *non-native speaker*. Overall, the concept of *native speaker* is defined as "someone who has spoken a particular language since they were a baby, rather than having learned it as a child or an adult", according to Cambridge Dictionaries Online. Macmillan Dictionary Online similarly defines the same concept as "someone who has learnt a particular language from the time that they began to speak". As for the term *non-native*, *The Free Dictionary Online*'s definition describes non-native speakers as "persons born in another area or country than that lived in"; e.g. "our large non-native population". However, as Selvi (2010) noted based on a comprehensive review of a number of studies (e.g. Amin, 1997; Braine, 1999; Davies, 2003; Llurda, 2005; Medgyes, 1994), the notion of *non-native* still generates a continuous discussion, as it has already done for over two decades in the field of EFL/ESL. As a result of these debates, even many related expressions have been compiled (Benke & Medgyes, 2005). Some of the definitions of NNES (non-native English speaker) made by prominent scholars in the field are cited by Arva and Medgyes (2000) as follows; "more or less accomplished users of English", "expert speakers and affiliation", "English-using fellowships to stress" and "We-ness instead of the 'us and them' division" (p. 356).

Until recently, NESs (native English speakers) have been considered to be the sole owner of the language alone, which, of course, creates a paradox now in the sense that there are an estimated four NNESs for each one NES (Clouet, 2006; Crystal, 1997; Graddol, 1997). Furnishing support for this proportion, Canagarajah (1999) estimated that 80% of the world's English language teachers are also non-native teachers. It must be this idea of ownership that has led to the assumption that inasmuch as NESs own the language, it is best taught by NESs, although they are by and large in the minority in teaching situations.

Research and scholarly discussions on NESTs and NNESTs have attempted to pinpoint the differences and similarities between them from several vantage points in order to determine in what aspects they enjoy advantages and disadvantages over each other (e.g. Canagarajah,

1999; Davies, 2003; Medgyes, 1994). There has been a general consensus on the fact that linguistic competence and target culture knowledge (norms and values/pragmatic competence) are among the advantages of NESTs. However, foreign/second language learning experience and sharing students' mother tongue and culture give a big advantage to NNESTs in teaching. Such advantages enable NNESTs to easily sympathize with their students and help them cope with language learning difficulties. However, as argued by Medgyes (1994), NESTs and NNESTs' advantages or disadvantages cannot be deemed as a benchmark in judging who makes a more effective language teacher, given that they are "two different species" (p. 27), and dissimilar from each other as regards language proficiency and teaching practices, which do not avert them from being equally successful teachers in their own capacities.

2.2. Previous studies on NESTs and NNESTs

The discussions relating to the teaching of English either by NESTs or NNESTs where they are compared in terms of their teaching quality and their preference amongst students have become a grave issue as a result of the increased need for English and the growing number of NNESTs in the field (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999). Such heated discussions have resulted in a myriad of empirical studies investigating NESTs and NNESTs from different perspectives. Among these perspectives, the attitudinal studies immediately stand out. For example, previous studies conducted at diverse research settings, ranging from China to the USA, demonstrated that overall, students held favourable attitudes towards their NNESTs in their home countries (e.g. Liang, 2002; Cheung, 2002; Ling & Braine, 2007; Mahboob, 2004; Moussu & Braine, 2006). Notable in these studies is that there seemed to be a growth in positive attitudes towards NNESTs over time. Not surprisingly, attitude studies towards NESTs discovered that students were highly positive about NESTs for a range of reasons to be discussed in the subsequent lines (e.g. Hadla, 2013; Mermelstein, 2015; Murtiana, 2011; Rao, 2010; Ürkmez, 2015; Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014).

Turning to EFL students' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs in non-Anglophone contexts, the research to date has, more or less, shown a similar pattern of findings irrespective of research contexts, chronological order of the studies, and the methods adopted in the collection and analysis of the data. For instance, a number of researchers across different EFL settings found that NESTs were perceived positively by students in the following areas: oral skills (e.g. pronunciation, accent, authentic speech), listening, the ability to use functional and correct English, knowledge of target culture(s), vocabulary knowledge and friendliness (e.g. Cheung, 2002 in Hong Kong; Diaz, 2015 in France; Hadla, 2013 in Lebanon; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2002 in the Basque country; Mahboob, 2004 in the USA; Mermelstein, 2015 in Taiwan; Rao, 2010 in China; Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014 in Vietnam; Wu & Ke, 2009 in Taiwan). Students' negative perceptions of NESs were reported being related to grammatical competence, lack of an ESL/EFL experience, lack of an ability to interact with students, lack of knowledge about students' own culture and education system.

On the other hand, NNESTs were perceived to be superior to NESTs in teaching grammar (Cheung, 2002; Diaz, 2015), in predicting students' difficulties, and in being sensitive to their needs (Hadla, 2013), in sharing the same cultural background with students (Mahboob, 2004), in resorting to students' first language (Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014), and in classroom performance. The labels chosen by students to describe NNESTs were also positive in general, including, *hard-working*, *good teachers of grammar*, *good communicator, experienced ESL learner, insightful teacher,* among others (e.g. Mahboob, 2004; Walkinshaw

& Oanh, 2014). However, NNESTs were generally perceived to be weak at native language authenticity (inferiority in oral skills), target culture knowledge, and correct usage of English (e.g. Moussu & Braine, 2006). It is probably because of their weaknesses in such areas that generally, students preferred NESTs over NNESTs (Diaz, 2015; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2002). It is worth noting that the results were not always clear-cut. For example, NESTs were perceived to be more friendly and encouraging than NNESTs in some occasions (e.g. Wu & Ke, 2009), whereas they were not in others (e.g. Rao, 2010).

The research findings in Turkey relating to the subject of NESTs and NNESTs mostly agree with the findings of research across a wide range of contexts, as summarized above. For instance, the study done by Üstünlüoğlu (2007) with Turkish EFL students identified a meaningful difference between NESTs and NNESTs from the students' perceptions. It was found that NESTs were perceived to better fulfil in-class communication skills and provide more favourable qualities than NNESTs do. However, it emerged out of students' perspectives that NNESTs were better at in-class teaching and in-class management roles. The results led to the conclusion that NESTs were seen as good communicators while NNESTs as more favourable in teaching and classroom management.

Demir's (2011) study with undergraduate EFL students correspondingly observed that NESTs were perceived superior to NNESTs in classroom management, and classroom communication, but in classroom teaching in which NNESTs were perceived as having a higher success rate compared to NESTs. This study's findings also showed that students' previous contact with NESTs affected students' perceptions. That is, the students who had already studied with NESTs were inclined to have more positive attitudes towards NESTs than NNESTs, which was earlier revealed by Şahin (2005) who found that the learners with previous contact with NESTs had more positive attitudes toward NESTs than those who did not study with a NEST before. Similarly, İnceçay and Atay (2009) found a predominant preference for NESTs over NNESTs among Turkish EFL students. The students perceived NESTs to have a friendlier relationship with students, have more flexibility (e.g. in correcting mistakes) and freedom (e.g. calling teachers by their first name) in classes. Some students believed, though that NNESTs would make good English teachers, especially in the early years of language learning because they can use students' L1, especially in explaining complex grammatical points.

Another study in this area is the work of Ürkmez (2015) with 120 EFL students at a Turkish state university. She found that there was an overall preference for NESTs among students, being in tune with the findings of İnceçay and Atay (2009). Students were also of the perception that classes of high level students should be run by NESTs, whereas low level classes by NNESTs. The underlying reason behind such a perception was that NESTs were considered to be more proficient in language, especially speaking, and more knowledgeable about the target culture compared to NNESTs. Students also perceived NESTs to be more relaxed and friendly in comparison to NNESTs. However, most students argued that EFL lessons should be taught by both NESTs and NNESTs as both groups have their own strengths and weaknesses, and one can compensate the weaknesses of the other. For instance, NNESTs were perceived to be more effective in terms of teaching grammar and writing, performing better with low level classes, being more aware of students' learning styles and culture. A recent study by Karakaş (2016) with students enrolled in English-medium universities reached a similar result in that students had a strong preference for NESTs for EAP courses in the preparatory school due mainly to NESTs' linguistic advantage. Çelik et al.

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

(2013) found that effectiveness of the language teacher is indicated by their achievement in classroom management and reducing learner anxiety.

2.3. Categorization: Prototype theory

While exploring EFL students' perceptions, the current study is structured around the framework of categorization, i.e. a process of classification in mind (Ungerer & Schmid, 2006). In daily life, the human mind perceives and stores the world knowledge as both concrete and abstract concepts in a systematic way. Akmajian et al. (2010) defined the term *concept* as "mentally represented categories of things" (p. 231). Likewise, Tye (2006) referred to *concepts* as "mental representations of a sort that can occur in thought" (p. 506). To the contrary, Bermudez (2008) alluded to them as "semantic entities rather than psychological entities" (Section 1. Para. 8).

One key purpose of categorization is, as Rosch (1978) remarked, "to reduce the infinite differences among stimuli to behaviorally and cognitively usable proportions" (p. 3). In addition, "grouping objects together into categories" helps, in the acquisition process, "make sense of the vast diversity of objects and entities" (Graham et al., 2010, p. 280). Conceptualization makes it possible for the mind to organize or categorize real world entities based on similarities and relations (Gökmen & Önal, 2012). Depending on a given concept, the human mind may have difficulty in putting the object into a certain category, which directs researchers to consider categories with and without boundaries. For example, it may be challenging for most students to decide on whether a teaching assistant is a teacher or a student. Conversely, for the same students, a school teacher may stand for a better example of the teacher category, as it is easier and less fuzzy to categorize. To put simply, we need boundaries as strict and clear as possible to comprehend a category. In practice, "by perceiving the similarities and the dissimilarities between objects, we can create classes of objects to effectively reduce the overwhelming number of entities in the world to more manageable proportions" (Newell & Bülthoff, 2002, p. 114). As noted before, we need boundaries, i.e. similarities and dissimilarities, as maintained by Frawley (1992), between teaching assistant and school teacher to put one into or exclude one from the category of teacher.

Earlier discussion regarding categorization descends from Western philosophy and dates back to Aristotle. This understanding of *concept* is named as Classical View, and based on the core idea of necessary and sufficient conditions. Earl (2006) substantiated this view as follows:

> A classical analysis for a complex concept C gives a set of individually necessary conditions for being a C (or conditions that must be satisfied in order to be a C) that together are sufficient for being a C (or are such that something's satisfying every member of that set of necessary conditions entails its being a C) (para. 1)

Let us take the notion of teacher again. Being a 'human-being' is necessary for being a 'teacher'. "Such characteristics specified in necessary conditions are shared by, or had in common with, all things to which the concept in question applies" (Earl, 2006, section 3a, para. 1). In that case, being a 'teacher' is sufficient for being a 'human-being'. Overall, this view rests on the assumption that features help draw a boundary between members. There are some questions that need to be answered at this juncture, though: Are there actually clear boundaries between members as suggested? Does a member have to be in only A or only in B? Do members represent their category equally well? What is a prototype?

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

The answers to the above questions were sought by psychologist Rosch (1973), who saw *prototype* as the most "central member" of a category (p. 331). It may be a real exemplar, or combination of features of other exemplars. For instance, in the category of the classroom tool, a pen could be the prototype or more prototypical than a stapler or an abacus. Membership in a category is set down by closeness to the prototype, and in this case is expressed with the terms "graded structure" and "fuzzy boundaries". Akmajian et al. (2010) maintained that "There is psychological evidence that our system of cognitive classification is structured in terms of prototypes, in that some instances of a concept are more typical (closer to the prototype) than others" (p. 231). In short, some members have many features in common with the prototype, which makes them good members, while others may have fewer similar features to prototype, which makes them difficult to classify into a category. Similarly, Uysal (2015) investigated Turkish monolingual children and discovered a tendency for being prototypical among body-part concepts which are likely to be seen, to be used daily and to be moving (as in HAND vs. TOOTH). What is prototypicality considered crucial for? Most importantly, as stated by Rosch et al. (1976):

> one purpose of categorization is to reduce the infinite differences among stimuli to behaviorally and cognitively usable proportions. It is to the organism's advantage not to differentiate one stimulus from others when that differentiation is irrelevant for the purposes at hand" (pp. 384, 428).

Johnson (1985) similarly addressed the issue at length in the following manner:

> There are then two basic cognitive principles operating: the first is to achieve maximum differentiation, with the prototypical instance of a category being that which distinguishes it most clearly from all other categories. The second is to avoid cognitive overload, which would result from over differentiating and a consequent loss in flexibility in grouping those things which share important characteristics, whilst being in other respects unlike (pp. 12-13).

In short, the meaning of words is commonly claimed to be achieved as a whole set of features, because none of them is individually sufficient or necessary. Long before, Seferoğlu (1999) pointed out that further research on prototype theory may contribute to the neurological and psychological research. Following this suggestion, this research will explore how EFL learners will categorise and distinguish NESTs and NNESTs from one another in their perceptions. These discrete research studies actually point to the significance of this study in particular because most attitudinal and perceptual studies on NESTs and NNESTs are atheoretical and teacher characteristics are thus too varied to be satisfactorily grouped together in a meaningful way. Nevertheless, this research explores students' perceptions, drawing on prototype theory in order to delve into how students differentiate NESTs and NNESTs, and what prototypical characteristics relating to these teachers they bring to the forefront and pass off in their perceptions. In this manner, it will be possible to find out the most distinctive characteristics separating NESTs and NNESTs based on students' perceptions before and after encountering NESTs.

3. Method
3.1. Participants
The research was carried out in two phases, namely in a pre-test/post-test kind of implementation. In the first phase of the study, 98 preparatory school students (43 females, 55 males) participated. Students were studying English at A1/elementary and A2/pre-intermediate levels (identified from their level of English language classes) at preparatory school of a private institution of higher education in south-eastern Turkey. The respondents,

whose ages ranged from 17 to 25, were mostly native speakers of Turkish, and 14 of them speak Kurdish as their second language. The second phase was conducted with the same questionnaire, which was modified in terms of lay-out and colour. For the interview task, 15 students (7 females, 8 males) were randomly chosen out of the target group having participated in the second phase.

3.2. Teacher profile at the preparatory school
The five NESTs students encountered were all instructors working at the Preparatory school of the institution. Two teachers were from England, one from the USA, one from Australia, and one from New Zealand. They taught in modules starting from A1 to B2 level. They had teaching experiences in various countries, including America, European, and Middle Eastern countries. 3 of them were female and 2 male. On the other hand, there were 21 (14 female, 7 male) NNESTs (i.e. all Turkish speakers and from Turkey in our case, although there can be NNESTs from other countries in other institutions) teaching at the preparatory school. They all learnt English as a foreign language. They had a B.A. and Master's degrees in English language teaching or English language and literature. However, six of them reported to have studied as an exchange student in various European countries for 6 to 8 months during their undergraduate study. While collecting data about NNESTs, we asserted that the student participants are supposed to think about their Turkish-speaking teachers who learnt English as a foreign language.

3.3. Instrument and data collection
The main data collection tool was an adopted framework consisting of several attributes of an English language teacher. The framework, called Language Teacher Characteristic Framework, was obtained from Walkinshaw and Duong (2012), who designed it by drawing on Brown's (2001) checklist of good language teaching characteristics. The framework is structured as follows:
Professional characteristics:
      i) Experience of teaching (Brown, 2001)
      ii) Teaching qualifications relevant to EFL (Brown, 2001)
Personal characteristics:
      iii) Friendly personality (Brown, 2001; Prodromou, 1991)
      iv) Enthusiasm for teaching (Borg, 2006; Brown, 2001; Lee, 2010)
Pedagogical characteristics:
      v) Able to teach interesting, informative classes (Brown, 2001; McBer, 2000;
      Miller, 2012; Walls et al., 2002)
Cultural characteristics:
      vi) Understanding of/familiarity with the students' local culture (Brown, 2001)
Linguistics characteristics:
      vii) Advanced communicative competence in the L2 (Brosh, 1996; Brown,
      2001; Çelik et al., 2013; Arikan et al., 2008)

It should be noted that the above framework is not claimed to be a panacea for researchers in evaluating teaching skills. However, it serves the purpose of this research in its attempt to investigate the conceptual mappings of EFL students from various standpoints. To maximize the validity of and answer the first research question, in the first phase, we aimed to determine which adjectives/phrases would be used by students when describing NESTs and NNESTs. After listing the words collected, mostly adjectives, a questionnaire with a 5-point Likert scale of 23 items was developed (see Appendix B). By doing so, we aimed to address Turkish EFL

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

learners' probable preconceptions of both teacher types in the questionnaire. The purpose of the first phase was, hence, to evaluate Turkish EFL learners' preconceptions of NESTs and NNESTs before their first encounter with these teachers in the university context. Thus, an item was included in the questionnaire to ensure that participants with previous experience with a NEST would be removed from the sample. The administration of the questionnaires lasted around 10 to 15 minutes. The same questionnaire was distributed to the same group after three proficiency levels/courses, which amounted to 7 months after the first phase of the study.

To support the findings of the second phase with qualitative data, an interview session was incorporated into data collection. The interview questions were linked to the characteristics listed in the framework. By scheduling appointments with voluntary students, interviews were made in a silent room. During the interviews, students were asked to make comments and arguments about the given theme. Each interview lasted 5 to 10 minutes, and was administered in Turkish and recorded with a digital sound recorder. The complete interview guide is available in Appendix C.

4. Data Analysis
Students' descriptions of NESTs and NNESTs were analysed via content analysis, and categorised into two groups according to their strengths and weaknesses. This way of analysing the data was opted as the central focus was on the content of students' accounts. For quantitative data analysis, the means and standard deviations were calculated across participants for each survey category (personal, pedagogical, linguistic, professional and cultural) for the first and second phase of the study, using SPSS 22. Repeated measures ANOVAs with pairwise comparisons (Bonferroni corrected) and two-tailed paired samples t-tests were carried out to see whether there was a meaningful difference in students' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs according the test scores obtained in the pre and post-test.

To analyse the qualitative data, the interviews were, first transcribed, making annotations with the help of Microsoft Word 2013. The data was then compiled as a corpus, from which relevant statements were extracted for presentation. Since the interviews were in Turkish, the extracts to be presented were translated into English by one of the researchers and cross-checked by the others to ensure translational fidelity and transparency. The measurement of validity in the analysis of the interviews was made in reference to Maxwell's (2002) categories, i.e. descriptive validity, interpretive validity, theoretical validity, generalizability and evaluative validity. Thus, to ensure descriptive validity, we did our best to remain loyal to what the participants told us during the interviews, without forging or fabricating their accounts. For interpretive validity, much effort was made to free the interpretations of their quotes from our own standpoints and then to ground our explanations in their own words. We theoretically built our constructs earlier while discussing the notions of NESTs, NNESTs, and the prototype theory and discussed the link among them. As for generalizability, we gave a bulk of information on our sample, methods and analytical framework so that other researchers can make connections of our case or population to more general cases, wider populations and different contexts. Finally, for evaluative validity, we avoided making assertions that derived from our own understanding of the case at hand but instead tried to depend on the data itself to lead the evaluations.

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

5. Findings

To answer the first research question, students were asked to describe their perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs in brief, either by using adjectives, phrases, or a single sentence on a piece of paper (see Appendix A). The aim was to delve into students' mental categorization of these two groups in their minds, especially before they encountered NESTs/NNESTs. The analysis of students' comments on NESTs and NNESTs in Table 1 indicates that NESTs were perceived as being superior to NNESTs in the areas of personality traits, linguistic competence (e.g. speaking), professionalism, cultural knowledge of the target language.

As for the methodology, i.e. who can teach better, there was not a clear-distinction in students' perceptions, yet NNESTs seemed to enjoy some advantage over NESTs as a result of speaking the same mother tongue with students and sharing the same culture. Intriguing was that NNESTs were viewed as being good at communicating with students, creating a relaxed classroom atmosphere since they can easily sympathize with students regarding the language learning process.

Table 1
Students' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs in terms of their strengths

NESTs	NNESTs
• Speak English very well • Very cool, charismatic • Outgoing, natural, sociable, active • Exciting feelings of emulation • Cultural ambassador • Good model of spoken English (e.g. pronunciation, accent) • Good for practising speaking English • Good at methodology and teaching skills; are knowledgeable • Can increase openness to other countries/cultures • Encourage students to speak more English; are inspiring • Often bring more creativity or different methodology • Can think in English more easily	• Can understand students' lives and stresses better • Know the students' culture and can behave appropriately • Can easily communicate with students • Can encourage students more • Can better teach English to students • Can put the students at ease / help them to learn in a more comfortable way • Can provide extra help, translation and Turkish equivalents for difficult aspects of English

Students also described their perceptions of these two groups of teachers in terms of their weak points, as summarized in Table 2.

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

Table 2
Students' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs in terms of their weaknesses

NESTs	NNESTs
• Can create a fear of comprehension • Create a feeling of humiliation • May not teach English effectively • Can bring unrealistic expectations to the class/school • Can be out of touch with students • Cannot empathise with students/be insensitive to their needs • Can say/do inappropriate things • Can overvalue themselves in the host culture • Can be too arrogant and self-opinionated	• Cannot speak native-like English • Can have foreign-accented speech • Are ordinary people (lack of professionalism) • Can overuse L1 (Turkish) so easily • Can be overly mechanical (heavy emphasis on grammar) • Can be heavily dependent on textbooks • Can reproduce mistakes or bad pronunciation

Students perceived NESTs to have trouble communicating with students (the intelligibility issue), to set unrealistic expectations of students, to be inapproachable by students, to display inappropriate behaviours and say inappropriate things, and to be arrogant. Additionally, students perceived some concerns regarding NESTs' teaching skills (i.e. whether they can be affective at teaching English), their personality (e.g. arrogance, self-worth), and lack of knowledge about students' cultural values.

Nonetheless, NNESTs were perceived to be weak at using native-like English and displaying professionalism. Students also alleged that NNESTS might overuse students' mother tongue (Turkish), have an accented-speech, and be overly mechanical, with a great emphasis on grammar, and above all can reproduce mistakes and wrong pronunciations. Students also thought that NNESTs are largely dependent on textbooks in classes and not being very creative.

From the interviews, more elaborate answers were obtained as to NESTs' and NNESTs' strengths and weaknesses. On the professionalism dimension of NNESTs (Turkish teachers in our case) and NESTs, several students (n=7) comparing and contrasting NESTs and NNESTs sided with NNETS (i.e. Turkish teachers of English). For instance, one student stated:

> S1: A Turkish teacher can estimate what students can grasp and cannot grasp. If s/he goes beyond what students are already capable of doing, s/he knows that it may be detrimental to students' learning. A NESTs follows a standard way and might have trouble sinking into students' level of English proficiency.

Some other students were more concerned with teachers' qualifications rather than their nationality background. Therefore, their point of emphasis was on how qualified they were in teaching English. A couple of them (n=4) disfavoured NESTs who graduated from a non-English major discipline. In relation to this argument, one of the students made the following remark:

> S2: If both groups are qualified in their profession, it does not matter which group teaches English to students. However, if a NEST earned his/her degree, say, in management, s/he can have trouble with grammar.

In another group, 9 students agreed that Turkish teachers are by nature the best option for students with low level language skills, and that Turkish teachers can include more fun elements in their classes. Two students described their views on this issue as follows:

S3: Turkish teachers make better teachers for students whose level of proficiency in English is rather low. They are thus best suited for beginner-level classes.

S2: In terms of making lessons interesting and fun, Turkish teachers are way better, particularly because they can communicate more effectively with students.

With respect to personality traits, it emerged from the interviews that many students referred to Turkish teachers with positive accounts. Among them, some students (n=5) stressed the point that Turkish teachers are humorous and can easily break the boredom during classes. One student described the NESTs and Turkish teachers as follows:

S4: Turkish teachers love their profession. If the classes get to be boring, they can push aside the lesson in order to motivate students, and then continue the lesson. With a NESTs, the lesson turns into a dead end as s/he does not know how to act in such a case (S4).

The majority, as S7 noted below, shared the view that Turkish teachers treat students in a more amicable manner whereas tensions tend to arise while trying to interact with NESTs:

S7: Turkish teachers are much better and friendlier. They can better understand and sympathize with us. We're having trouble communicating with NESTs.

Finally, while several students considered NESTs superior to Turkish teachers in various dimensions, primarily the linguistic one, they agreed that Turkish teachers manage role duality far better than NESTs:

S5: Both groups have different personality traits. We see how merry the tiny differences between us and NESTs. NESTs have better traits. However, Turkish teachers, as to subtle humour, can retain a role duality, namely they can act as both our teacher and can approach us like a friend.

With regards to the linguistic dimension, students were mainly doubtful about NESTs' poor grammar knowledge, which is quite important for student due mainly to their concerns about exams. S5 explains this point, stating:

S5: We're having difficulty in learning complex and complicated grammatical structures with NESTs. Turkish teachers can simplify such intricate rules.

Many students (n=8) drew attention to the fact that experienced teachers can help students more than inexperienced teachers. Students see Turkish teachers more optimal for beginner level students as they can easily sympathise with them. Hereof, one student argued that:

S6: Experience matters a lot because along with experience comes lots of knowledge. At the first stages of learning, Turkish teachers are preferable. It might be shocking for student to start learning English with a NEST.

Once it comes to the cultural/pedagogical dimensions, most students, such as S6, considered NESs to be more knowledgeable compared to NNESTs for the reason that NESTs have a strong command of the target culture. S6 remarked:

S6: I believe that NESTs are more knowledgeable. They possess the target culture. That's why, I think they perform more efficiently at teaching.

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

However, a few students (n=5) did not agree with the above view, arguing that NESTs fail to take into account the local cultural elements in their classes while Turkish teachers can easily and effectively achieve this. Regarding this point, one student fiercely argued that:

> S7: I experience problems stemming from cultural differences. Turkish teachers are more empathetic to and conservative about local culture. Let's say there's a wedding, a familial matter. NESTs pay no mind to and cannot understand it. You cannot take a fancy to them. Consequently, they cannot grasp the cultural differences, and they're particularly unaware of the local culture in Gaziantep. A sympathetic approach can better motivate students towards lessons.

To answer the second research question, the scores given by each participant for each item on the questionnaires were grouped in accordance with the five teacher evaluation categories (personal, pedagogical, linguistic, professional and cultural), with the testing time (pre-test and post-test) and teacher type (NESTs and NNESTs). To investigate whether there is a statistically meaningful difference between students' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs at the time points (pre- and post-test) in terms of the five measures explained above, within-subjects repeated measures ANOVAs were carried out for each of the measures with the factors testing time (first/second) and the teacher type (NESTs/NNESTs) as within-subjects factors. Table 3 shows the ANOVA results of the mean scores for the five measures of teacher evaluation. Post-hoc analyses with pairwise comparisons (Bonferroni corrected) were carried out on the significant effects.

Table 3
ANOVA results of the mean scores for the dependent measures

Dependent Variables	Source	df	Mean Square	F	p
personal	Teacher	1	.059	.178	.674
	Test	1	2.581	7.954	**.006**
	Teacher * Test	1	3.957	12.276	**.001**
pedagogical	Teacher	1	1.261	5.517	**.021**
	Test	1	.179	.515	.475
	Teacher * Test	1	.112	.409	.524
linguistic	Teacher	1	96.517	252.520	**.000**
	Test	1	.033	.055	.815
	Teacher * Test	1	3.740	11.762	**.001**
professional	Teacher	1	5.166	22.065	**.000**
	Test	1	.737	1.875	.174
	Teacher * Test	1	.125	.527	.470
cultural	Teacher	1	.470	1.474	.228
	Test	1	1.810	2.158	.145
	Teacher * Test	1	.882	2.247	.137

Except for the cultural measure, all other dependent variables showed at least one source of effect, and each is explained in detail below.

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

Personal dimension
Regarding the personality measure, post-test scores (M= 3.909, SE= 0.046) were significantly greater than pre-test scores (M= 3.747, SE= 0.039) ($p = .006$). As for the interaction between teacher type and testing time, 2-tailed paired-samples t-tests showed that while in the pre-test NNESTs (M= 3.859, SD= 0.522) were rated higher than NESTs (M= 3.633, SD= 0.645) (t(97) = 2.540, $p = .013$), this was reversed in the post-test, with NESTs being rated higher (M=3.997, SD=0.562) than NNESTs (M = 3.821, SD = 0.601) (t(97) = -2.387, $p = .019$).

Pedagogical dimension
As for the scores for pedagogical section, NNESTs (M=4.035, SE=0.039) were rated significantly higher than NESTs (M= 3.922, SE= 0.038) ($p = .021$) regardless of testing time.

Linguistic dimension
The scores for the linguistic measure were significantly higher for NESTs (M= 4.306, SE= 0.053) than NNESTs (M= 3.293, SE= 0.051) ($p < .000$). In order to break down the interaction between teacher type and testing time, 2-tailed paired-samples t-tests were conducted, which showed that in the pre-test NESTs (M= 4.415, SD = 0.709) were rated higher than NNESTs (M = 3.202, SD = 0.738) (t(93) = -12.819, $p < .000$), similarly in the post-test NESTs (M= 4.189, SD= 0.667) received greater scores than NNESTs (M=3.392, SD= 0.647) (t(97) = -10.668, $p < .000$), although the difference between NESTs and NNESTs decreased numerically.

Professional dimension
Pairwise comparisons on the scores for the professional measure revealed that NESTs (M= 2.908, SE= 0.044) received a significantly higher score than NNESTs (M= 2.679, SE = 0.041) ($p < .000$) without any interaction with the testing time.

Cultural dimension
There were no significant effects associated with the cultural measure as shown in Table 3.

Summary and discussion of results
The results revealed significant differences between the perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs in multiple dependent measures and certain effects of testing time were also observed. In summary, it was discovered that among the four measures showing significant effects, NESTs were invariably given higher ratings than NNESTs for linguistic and professional measures whereas NNESTs were given higher ratings in pedagogical dimension. On the other hand, for the personality measure, NNESTs received a higher score than NESTs in the pre-test, but this was reversed in the post-test, where there is a notable change in learners' perception. As for the cultural dimension, it was not addressed due to equality of scores between testing time and teacher types. Each of these findings are discussed in the relevant sub-sections below.

Personal dimension
The questionnaire items related to personal dimension are based on *friendliness* and *enthusiasm for teaching*, which were measured via the following criteria: cheerfulness, arrogance, being principled, sociability, encouragement, tolerance, sensibility and modesty. Although there does not seem to be any significant difference in students' perceptions of the two teacher types in the general sense, NNESTs received higher ratings in the personal dimension in the pre-test, which indeed suggests that the students have already known the Turkish culture and the expected personality traits of a teacher. It may be speculated that the

reason behind this positive evaluation was students' familiarity with the Turkish culture and teacher model. Furthermore, this higher rating was an expected outcome, considering the benignancy and compassionateness features of Turkish teachers at secondary schools (Gültekin, 2015). Further, the obscurity of a foreign teacher model might have posed a slight negative connotation. Without any doubt, this negative connotation did not emanate from exposure to any NESTs, because the students having been taught by a NEST before were removed from the study. Another possible reason for this negative connotation might be the effect of students' exposure to media and movies, where one can possibly see different cultural items and more formal relationships even among close family members. It can be presumed that Turkish students perceive that the oriental culture and personal relationships are sincerer and people are more open to close interaction and sharing when they share the same L1 and culture (Karakaş, 2013).

In the post-test, NNESTs' scores remained almost the same, which suggests that students' expected model of NNESTs did not change in the university setting, while NESTs were rated significantly higher compared to the scores in the pre-test. Presumably, learners' fear about NEST's personality was diminished by experience, and the post-test score may be speculated to view us the actual perception of NEST by the learners, which matched the earlier findings as well (e.g. Şahin, 2005).

Pedagogical dimension
In terms of pedagogical dimension, NNESTs scored significantly higher in the pre and post-tests. The aspects we addressed in our test items drawing on the previous studies were about appropriateness for beginners and advanced learners, high expectations from students, familiarity with the English learning difficulties, competence in teaching grammar, creativity and fun, being organized, classroom management, transferring the content, being a good model of English language teacher. This result was consistent with the findings of earlier studies, as well (e.g. Hadla, 2013; Mermelstein, 2015; Ürkmez, 2015). Nevertheless, the post-test results did not spot any significant change in students' perceptions, since NNESTs were still scored higher than NESTs. A possible explanation for this might be that the NEST model at the university was not satisfactory in terms of the target pedagogical aspects included in the questionnaire. This result can be also explained by the limited number of NESTs that students have met. Otherwise stated, students were not exposed to enough number of personalities of NESTs to form a reliable concept of NESTs at the time of the study.

It is likely that students scored higher for NNESTs in the pre-test, because their previous exposure to Turkish-teacher-environment might have compelled them to think that teacher education in Turkey is better compared to other countries and teachers are well-trained. Additionally, here again, the elusiveness of a NEST might have posed a negative effect. Another possible explanation for this might be the strict model of teachers in Turkey, especially since the education system in Turkey is intensely based on discipline. For instance, teachers and students have had to wear uniforms at school and queue for flag raising ceremony until quite recently. Assuming that these kinds of routines are a sign for a good education system for Turkish students, this might have affected students' understanding of good education and a good teacher.

Linguistic dimension
NESTs had significantly higher ratings in oral skills, which were tested via the items on pronunciation, stress and vocabulary. This result also confirms the long-standing association

between strong oral skills and NESTs, being in line with the findings of previous studies (e.g. Diaz, 2015; Rao, 2010; Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014). As for NNESTs, the current findings went some way towards enhancing our understanding of students' ideas about English language teachers working at university level. In the post-test, NNESTs received partially a higher score than the one in the pre-test, which suggests that students' preconceptions of NNESTs in terms of linguistic competence moved towards the positive end. English language teachers at primary and secondary schools may have been thought to underperform in pronunciation, stress and lexicon, which might have influenced the pre-test scores. It is also probable that NNESTs have linguistic insecurity (Kachru & Nelson, 1996), and this insecurity might have been noticed by students. However, it cannot be claimed on the basis of the pre-test that NNESTs are inefficient in English speaking skills, as the participants' preconceptions might be a reflection of their general opinion of a Turkish person who cannot manage oral skills in English. On the other hand, the post-test results may be an indicator of how the Turkish-speaking instructors' language competence is comparatively high enough to change learners' negative pre-conception of NNESTs. This finding actually harkens to Medgyes's (1992) non-native/non-native dimension in which they are compared among themselves. It is worth noting that students' preconceptions of NNESTs might have led them to put NNESTs into a low proficiency category. However, their hands-on experiences with NNESTs might have shown that some NNESTs could have higher proficiency in English in sharp contrast to their preconceptions, which are mostly formed by perceptions of widely held beliefs/stereotypes rather than actual sense experiences.

Professional dimension
As for the professional qualities, the attempt was to determine how students perceive, firstly the experiences of teaching and secondly the teaching qualifications relevant to EFL. To test students' pre-conceptions and conceptions of NEST and NNESTs, we incorporated the following statements in the survey: "S/he is a knowledgeable and an expert teacher in her/his field" and "S/he needs to have a bachelor's degree in language teaching". It is worth noting that the second item about the bachelor's degree was included to confirm the first item. The students agreeing with the first statement were expected to disagree with the second statement. Based on the pre and post test results where NESTs scored slightly higher than NNESTs in terms of professional qualities, it can be ventured that Turkish students' expectations from NESTs were met to a satisfactory extent, which was shown in the post-test. Some possible reasons for their preference might be the NESTs' higher average of age, while NNESTs at the university were mostly young teachers having no or 2 years of teaching experience.

Although some scholars, such as Medgyes (1992) and Merino (1997), argued long before that language competence without a teaching degree will not permanently make NESTs better than NNESTs in real life, many students did not seem to be concerned about NESTs' educational background, i.e. whether they held a degree in language education. This contradictory result is likely to be related to the fact that NESTs' having an educational background abroad evoked a positive impression on students, who might thus have ignored whether NESTs had a degree in language-related disciplines or not. A second reason for students' disagreement with the second statement might be attributed to the fact that English is the mother tongue of NESTs. It is therefore very probable that the students might have side-lined whether NESTs had a degree in language teaching owing to their perceived superior linguistic competence in oral skills.

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

Categorization of NESTs and NNESTs

This subsection aims to illustrate how the category of English language teacher is formed and developed in students' perceptions. Hereunder, we discuss a model of Turkish EFL learner's categorizations of NESTs and NNESTs based on their perceptions. To start with, it is useful to revisit the notion of 'concept', which is mentioned as "mentally represented categories of things" (Akmajian et al, 2010, p. 231) or "mental representations of a sort that can occur in thought" (Tye, 2006, p. 506). In the context of *teacher*, many categories can be listed depending on the aspect of an approach embraced, such as, English language teacher, class teacher, supervisor, foreign teacher. As the function of this categorization system is "to reduce the infinite differences among stimuli to behaviorally and cognitively usable proportions" (Rosch, 1978, p. 3), for the categorization to take place, differences and similarities play an important role. This being the case, the students in our study must probably be thinking about questions like 'What is the difference between a NEST and a NNEST who learnt English in the same way I did?' to make a distinction between NESTs and NNESTs. While answering these questions, the students go through a process of drawing boundaries as strict and clear as possible to grasp the two separate categories.

Narrowing down the findings to teachers in this study, we may speculate about prototypes of NESTs and NESTs by listing the features attributed to them. Some features may be shared by these two categories, such as the ones in cultural dimension, while the others may be shared in different proportions by the two categories, which makes it possible for mind to categorize these entities (Gökmen & Önal, 2012, p. 3). However, contrary to Classical View, dating back to Aristotle and based on the core idea of necessary and sufficient conditions, Rosch (1973, p. 331) claimed that these categories are formed around a central member called *prototype*. In this case, membership in the category of NESTs is set down by closeness to the prototype, which is expressed with the terms "graded structure" and "fuzzy boundaries". So, we can postulate that our participants must have a prototype, i.e. the best member, of NESTs, to which some certain features are ascribed. However, we did not include survey items related to the example of NESTs representing its category in the best way. In this respect, we generalize our findings by taking the average of the scores NESTs were given, so we cannot estimate where in the scale our NESTs are situated at.

In short, NESTs and NNESTs have some semantic shared and unshared features. What was more interesting was to observe how this relation changed in our pre and post-tests. It seems that the participants' positive evaluation of NNESTs in personal dimension, which showed their tendency to attribute the features related to personality to NNESTs, was reversed in the post-test. Furthermore, while the participants marked more adjectives related to linguistic and professional dimension for NESTs in both tests, more adjectives related to pedagogical dimension were attributed to NNESTs in both tests.

6. Conclusions and final remarks

This paper set out to explore Turkish EFL students' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs before their encounters with these teachers, and investigated whether any perceptual difference emerged after their encounter. The findings demonstrated that our participants preferred Turkish teachers, which indicates that cultural proximity may have a positive effect in their motivation and approach. In this respect, it may be helpful to offer trainings to NESTs to learn the basics of the host culture before starting to work with local students. Further, the results strengthen the idea that NESTs should be trained intercultural communication for the purpose of learning how to interact with people from different cultural backgrounds and how

to negotiate their culture during their term of employment. The findings of this research also provide insights for collaboration among NESTs and NNESTs. For example, NNESTs can be assigned as mentors to aid novice NESTs until they acquire a basic cultural knowledge and awareness of students' learning styles. Furthermore, NESTs may be trained in grammar teaching because many teachers in Turkey commonly use grammar translation method as communicative skills are not part of assessment at the primary and secondary levels of education. In the same vein, but for the context of Korea, Lee and Cho (2015) suggests that NESTS would benefit from being trained as in-service teachers of English especially for EFL environment.

Another implication of this study is about teacher recruitment policies of higher education institutions. Although students did not seem to be aware of the importance of NESTs' having a degree in teaching, it is beyond doubt that hiring NESTs with a degree in ELT/Applied linguistics will make positive contributions to students' learning. Thus, there should be more straightforward hiring policy, with a focus on teaching qualities of teachers, be they NESTs or NNESTs rather than the nationality of teachers. The study also raised some important questions about who makes a better teacher considering the level of students at preparatory schools. The results highlight that NESTs are best suited for students with a higher proficiency in English and for the teaching of communication-based lessons, yet NNESTs can perform better with students with lower level proficiency in English, especially for grammar instruction. In the same vein, Arikan et al. (2008) have found that students preferred teachers who speak Turkish and can explain language items to them and that the students were also aware of English fluency and correct pronunciation. As a humble suggestion, we remind the importance of integrating meaning, form and function. For that using concordances as supplementary materials could be helpful for NNESTs, since concordances are sources of authentic examples and language content acquired from native speakers of English (Uysal et al., 2013). Similarly, Coady (2015) highlights the role of field experiences as "learning potential for teachers" (p. 363). We can conclude by combining these opinions, and suggest that teacher preparation programs train teachers by reminding these challenges and encouraging them for field experiences.

It should be noted that the study has some limitations. The first limitation is the limited number of NESTs students encountered, which may have led the students to form a prejudice against them. In this respect, some amount of caution is needed while interpreting the results. For this reason, the findings can only be generalized within the limits of the conditions and target group involved in this study; however, the results might benefit other similar institutions and students enrolled in them. Second, we did not consider the educational background of students as a variable; however, it might be a crucial factor in shaping their preconceptions of NESTs and NNESTs, bearing in mind that private schools in Turkey have a more diverse teaching staff, including NESTs compared to state schools where only Turkish nationals are allowed to teach English. It is worth mentioning that Silverman (2001, 2007) warned that any data obtained from interviews and focus groups is 'got up' or 'manufactured', and are not suggested unless severely needed (Edley & Litosseliti, 2010). Our findings are also limited to the interview environment, not on observations of student-teacher interactions. Another point is the participant group's being one type of universe, which was a foundation university in Gaziantep, where most of the students were from the nearby regions. However, because of the rich student profile at a state university a different result can be obtained in relation to students' perceptions of NESTs/NNESTs.

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

The study makes several recommendations for further empirical work, especially in the light of the shortcomings of this study. For instance, it would be interesting to investigate the prototype of an ideal teacher, especially in a cross-cultural study so that a comparison between the education systems of two or more countries can be made. A further study could also explore the same issue countrywide, with the participation of both state and private university students. Further work needs to be done with students by creating a video corpus of in-class student-teacher interaction, which may yield more authentic data compared to the interview and questionnaire techniques.

There are some variables, such as age and gender, whose effects on students' perceptions can be investigated in a further study. Another interesting area for further work is the comparison of NNESTs sharing the same L1 with students and NNESTs-but-foreigners, such as Hungarian, Syrian, Iranian, in the case of this study. If the debate is to be moved forward, a future study can be done on perceptions of Turkish NNESTs and NESTs with a Turkish origin so as "to achieve maximum differentiation" and "to avoid cognitive overload" (Johnson, 1985, pp. 12-13). In such a comparison, considering the fact that students need boundaries to categorize these teacher groups into two separate poles, students are likely to disregard cultural and even personal differences, with a more stress on minor differences, which may give us fine-grained details.

Acknowledgments

References

Akmajian, A., Demers, R. A., Farmer, A. K., & Harnish, R. M. (2010). *Linguistics: An introduction to language and communication* (6th ed.). Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Amin, N. (1997). Race and the identity of the nonnative ESL teacher. *TESOL quarterly*, *31*(3), 580-583.

Arikan, A., Taşer, D., & Saraç-Süzer, H. S. (2008). The effective English language teacher from the perspectives of Turkish preparatory school students. *Education and Science*, *33*(150), 42-51.

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

Barkhuizen, G. (1998). Discovering learners' perceptions of ESL classroom teaching/learning activities in a South African context. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*(1), 85-108.

Benke, E., & Medgyes, P. (2005). Differences in teaching behaviour between native and non-native speaker teachers: As seen by the learners. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 195-215). New York, NY: Springer.

Bermudez, J. L. (2008). Nonconceptual mental content. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved July 19, 2014 from http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/content-nonconceptual/

Borg, S. (2006). The distinctive characteristics of foreign language teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, *10*(1), 3-31.

Braine, G. (1999). *Nonnative educators in English language teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

Brosh, H. (1996). Perceived characteristics of the effective language teacher. *Foreign Language Annals*, *29*(2), 125-138.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.

Canagarajah, S. (1999). Interrogating the 'Native speaker fallacy': Non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 77-92). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Canagarajah, S. (2007). Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *Modern Language Journal*, *91*(1), 923-939.

Cheung, Y. L. (2002). *The attitude of university students in Hong Kong towards native and nonnative teachers of English*. (Unpublished master's thesis). The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong.

Clouet, R. (2006). Native and non-native teacher: A matter to think over. *Revista de Filologia de la Universidad de La Laguna, 24*(1), 69-76.

Coady, Maria R., Harper, Candace, & de Jong, Ester J. (2015). Aiming for Equity: Preparing Mainstream Teachers for Inclusion or Inclusive Classrooms? *TESOL Quarterly*, *50*(2), 340-368.

Çelik, S., Arikan, A., & Caner, M. (2013). In the eyes of Turkish EFL learners: What makes an effective foreign language teacher? *Porta Linguarum*, *20*, 287-297.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: CUP.

Davies, A. (2003). *The Native speaker: Myth and reality*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Demir, B. (2011). Undergraduate FL learners' perceptions of native and non-native language instructors. *The International Journal of Research in Teacher Education, 1*(1), 1-29.

Earl, D. (2006). The classical theory of concepts. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved August 14, 2014, from http://www.iep.utm.edu/conc-cl/

Edley, N., & Litosseliti, L. (2010). Contemplating interviews and focus groups. In L. Litosseliti (Ed.), *Research methods in linguistics*. New York: Continuum.

Frawley, W. (1992). *Linguistic semantics*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gallego, F. M. D. (2012, February 12). *Experiences of a teacher of English*. [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://fernandoexperiences.blogspot.com.tr/2012/02/792-english-as-bridge-of-communication.html

Garrett, P., & Shortall, T. (2002). Learners' evaluations of teacher-fronted and student-centered classroom activities. *Language Teaching Research, 6*(1), 25-57.

Gökmen, S., & Önal, Ö. (2012). Ön-tür kuramı çerçevesinde Türkçede anlamsal ulamların incelenmesi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, *52*(2), 1-19

Graddol, D. (1997). *The future of English?: A guide to forecasting the popularity of the English language in the 21st century*. London, England: British Council.

Graham, A. S., Namy, L. L., Gentner, D., & Meagher, K. (2010). The role of comparison in preschoolers' novel object categorization. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 107*(3), 280-290.

Gültekin, M. (2015). *İlköğretim öğrencilerinin ideal öğretmen algısı. Turkish Studies*, *10*(11), 726-756.

Hadla, Z. (2013). *Student and teacher perceptions of native and non-native English speaking teachers in the Lebanese context*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Exeter, Exeter, England.

İnceçay, G., & Atay, D. (2009, May). *EFL learners' interaction with native and nonnative teachers*. Paper presented at The 1st International Congress of Educational Research. Çanakkale, Turkey.

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

Johnson, R. K. (1985). Prototype theory, cognitive linguistics and pedagogical grammar. *Working Papers in Linguistics and Language Training*, *8*(3), 12-24.

Kachru, B. B., & Nelson, C. L. (1996). World Englishes. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp.71-102). Cambridge: CUP.

Karakaş, A. (2013). Intercultural attitudes of Turkish students studying in a UK university. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, *31*. Retrieved from http://www.immi.se/intercultural/nr31/karakas.html

Karakaş, A. (2016). *Turkish lecturers' and students' perceptions of English in English-medium universities* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Southampton University, Southampton, England.

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

Lee, J. J. (2010). The uniqueness of EFL teachers: Perceptions of Japanese learners. *TESOL Journal, 1*(1), 23-48.

Lee, Y. -J., & Cho, H. -S. (2015). Promoting collaborative teaching between NESTs and NNESTs in English slassrooms. *Studies in English Education*, *20*(1), 87-112.

Liang, K. (2002). *English as a Second Language (ESL) students' attitudes towards nonnative English-speaking teachers' accentedness*. (Unpublished master's thesis). California State University, LA.

Ling, C. Y., & Braine, G. (2007). The attitudes of university students towards non-native speakers English teachers in Hong Kong. *RELC journal*, *38*(3), 257-277.

Llurda, E. (2005). *Non-Native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges, and Contributions to the Profession*. New York, NY: Springer.

Mahboob, A. (2004). Native or nonnative: What do students enrolled in an intensive English program think? In L. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English speaking professionals* (pp. 121-147). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Maxwell, J. A. (2002). Understanding and validity in qualitative research. In A. Huberman & M. Miles (Eds.), *The qualitative researcher's companion* (pp. 37-64). London: Sage.

McBer, H. (2000). *A model of teacher effectiveness*. Report to the Department for Education and Emloyment, UK. Retrieved from http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/teachinginengland/detail.cfm?id=521

Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: who's worth more? *ELT journal*, *46*(4), 340-349.

Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher*. London, England: Macmillan.

Merino, I. G. (1997). Native English-speaking teachers versus non-native English-speaking teachers. *Revista alicantina de estudios ingleses*, *10*, 67-79.

Mermelstein, A. D. (2015). Perceptions of native and non-native English teachers by Taiwanese university EFL students. *Mextesol Journal*, *39*(3), 1-18.

Miller, P. (2012). Ten characteristics of a good teacher. *English Teaching Forum*, *50*(1), 36-38.

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

Murtiana, R. (2011, November). *Student's perceptions of native speaker and non-native speaker teachers: Implication for teacher education*. Paper presented at the 5th International Seminar: Teacher Education in the Era of World Englishes, Salatiga, Indonesia.

Native speaker [Def. 1]. (n.d.). *Cambridge Dictionaries Online*. Retrieved March 14, 2015, from http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/citation.

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

Native speaker [Def. 2]. (n.d.). *Macmillan Dictionary Online*. Retrieved March 14, 2015, from http://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/citation.

Newell, F. N., & Bülthoff, H. H. (2002). Categorical perception of familiar objects. *Cognition*, *85*(2), 113-143.

Non-native [Def. 3]. (n.d.). *The Free Dictionary Online*. Retrieved March 14, 2015, from http://www.thefreedictionary.com/dictionary/citation.

Prodromou, L. (1991). The good language teacher. *English Teaching Forum, 29*(2), 2-7.

Quirk, R. (1985). The English language in a global context. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the World: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 1-6). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Rao, Z. (2010). Chinese students' perceptions of native English speaking teachers in EFL teaching. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *31*(1), 55-68.

Rosch, E. (1973). Natural categories. *Cognitive Psychology, 4*, 328-350.

Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch & B. B. Lloyd (Eds.), *Cognition and Categorization* (pp. 27-48.) New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rosch, E., Mervis, C. B., Gray, W. D., Johnson, D. M., & Boyes-Braem, P. (1976). Basic objects in natural categories. *Cognitive Psychology*, *8*(3), 382-439.

Şahin, İ. (2005). The effect of native speaker teachers of English on the attitudes and achievements of learners. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *1*(1), 30-42.

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

Seferoğlu, G. (1999). Prototip kuramı çerçevesinde bir araştırma. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *1999*, 79-88.

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*, 156-181.

Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data* (2nd ed.). London, England: Sage.

Silverman, D. (2007). *A very short, fairly interesting and reasonably cheap book about qualitative research*. London, England: Sage.

Tye, M. (2006). *Nonconceptual content, richness, and fineness of grain*. In T. Szabo-Gendler & J. Hawthorne (Eds.), *Perceptual Experience* (pp. 504-530). Oxford: OUP.

Ungerer, F., & Schmid, H. (2006). *An introduction to cognitive linguistics* (2nd ed.). Harlow: Pearson Longman.

Uysal, H. (2015). *Çocuk dilinde deyimlerin anlamlandırılması ve öntürlük etkisi* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from Turkish Council of Higher Education's National Thesis Center Database. (Accession No. 393411)

Uysal, H., Bulut, T., & Al Hosein, Y. (2013). Using concordances as supplementary materials in teaching grammar. *Studies about Languages*, 22, 113-118.

Ürkmez, S. (2015). Turkish EFL learner perceptions of native and non-native English language teachers. *Third 21st CAF Conference at Harvard in Boston*, *6*(1), 328-334.

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

Walkinshaw, I. S., & Oanh, D. H. (2014). Native and non-native English language teachers: Student perceptions in Vietnam and Japan. *SAGE Open*, *4*(2), 1-9.

Walkinshaw, I., & Duong, O. T. H. (2012). Native and non-native English speaking teachers in Vietnam: Weighing the benefits. *TESL-EJ, 16(3),* 1-17.

Walls, R. T., Nardi, A. H., von Minden, A. M., & Hoffman, N. (2002). The characteristics of effective and ineffective teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 29*(1), 39-48.

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

Wu, K., & Ke, C. (2009). Haunting native speakerism? Students' perceptions towards native English speaking teachers in Taiwan. *English Language Teaching, 2(3)*, 44-52.

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Sample papers displaying adjectives/phrases associated to teachers

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

Appendix B
Questionnaire

Bu anket Türk öğrencilerin Anadili İngilizce ve Anadili Türkçe olan İngilizce öğretmenleri algılamaları üzerine bilgi toplamal

ANKET

Size uygun olan seçeneği işaretleyin.

1 Yaşınız?   16-20   21-24   25-30   31-35   35-38   39 ve üzeri

2 Cinsiyetiniz?   Erkek   Kadın

3 Önceden lise ya da üniversite düzeyinde yabancı dilde hazırlık okudunuz mu? Okuduysanız, kaç yıl?
   Evet, ... yıl   Hayır

4 Daha önce yabancı uyruklu bir öğretmenden İngilizce dersi aldınız mı?
   Aldıysanız, hangi milliyetten olduğunu yazınız.
   Evet, milliyeti ....   Hayır

			Tamamen katılıyorum	katılıyorum	kararsızım	katılmıyorum	Hiç katılmıyorum
5	Neşelidir.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
6	İlişkilerinde kendini beğenmiş bir yapısı vardır.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
7	Hayat felsefesi olarak prensiplidir.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
8	Sosyal ilişkilerinde iletişime açıktır.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
9	Çevresindekileri çeşitli konularda teşvik eder.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
10	Başlangıç seviyesi için uygun öğretmendir.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
11	Farklı düşünce ve inanışlara hoşgörülü olmaya çalışır.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
12	Çevresindeki olaylara duyarlıdır.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
13	İngilizce telaffuz ve tonlamada iyidir.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
14	Öğrenciden beklentilerini yüksek tutar.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

			Tamamen katılıyorum	katılıyorum	kararsızım	katılmıyorum	Hiç katılmıyorum
15	Çok duyulmamış ve akademik İngilizce kelimeler kullanır.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
16	İngilizce öğrenme sürecinde öğrencinin zorlandığı noktaları bilir.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
17	İngilizce dilbilgisi öğretiminde başarılıdır.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
18	İleri düzey İngilizce için uygun öğretmendir.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
19	Yaratıcı ve eğlenceli öğrenme ortamı oluşturur.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
20	Alanında bilgili ve uzman bir öğretmendir.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
21	Çevresinde olup bitenlere kulak asmaktan kaçınır.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
22	Derslerde ve akademik çalışmalarında planlı bir şekilde hareket eder.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
23	Sınıf yönetimi iyidir.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
24	Bilgiyi öğrenciye aktarmada başarılıdır.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
25	Alçak gönüllüdür.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
26	Dil eğitimi alanında üniversite mezunu olması gereklidir.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					
27	İyi bir İngilizce öğretmeni modeli oluşturur.	Anadili Türkçe olan öğretmen					
		Anadili İngilizce olan öğretmen					

Katkılarınızdan dolayı teşekkür ederiz.

Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10*(2), 180-206.

Appendix C

Interview Protocol

Name: ....
Age: ....
L1(s): ....
Have you studied abroad? Yes ( ) No ( )
Have you studied at English Prep School at university level before? Yes ( ) No ( )
Have you ever been taught English by a foreign teacher? Yes ( ) No ( )
If yes, please write his native language? ....

1. What was your initial motivation to learn English?

2. Why do you want to learn English?

3. What do you think about the personal characteristics of foreign teachers of English language and of Turkish teachers of English language? What kind of differences are there between their behaviours or personalities?

4. Is there any difference between the linguistic performances of the two teachers? In terms of pronunciation, intonation, using academic words, etc...

5. Which one of them can understand you more in your learning process?

6. Who do you think is better at teaching English? Someone who has studied abroad or someone who has a diploma from a Turkish university?

7. Is it enough to have a diploma from an abroad university, even in Business Management to be an English language teacher? Or would you prefer someone having a major in a language-related field from a Turkish university?

8. What kind of a cultural sensibility do you feel in your teachers who are native speakers of English in terms of being sensitive to your culture while showing interest to learning your own culture?

9. Which one would you prefer at a more advanced proficiency level of learning?

10. Which one makes you more engaged in the learning process in the classroom with his or her enthusiasm?