On NESTs and Non-NESTs

Li-Bi Shen* and Hung-Chang Wu**

*Department of Applied Foreign Languages,
Chia-Nan University of Pharmacy and Science,
Tainan, Taiwan 71710, R.O.C.
**Graduate Institute of Applied English,
Southern Taiwan University,
Tainan, Taiwan 71005, R.O.C.
(This paper has been presented in 2007
International Conference on Applied Linguistics
in Southern Taiwan University on November 22, 2007)

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this study were (1) to explore students' perception and beliefs on the differences between the native English speaking teachers (NESTs) and the non-native English speaking teachers (non-NESTs) and (2) to determine if students' preference on NESTs related to their age, grades, scores, and genders. A survey questionnaire was designed to conduct this research. The participants were 357 students in a university in southern Taiwan. The results of this study were consistent with Medgyes' (2001) remarks on the bright side of non-NESTs as well as on the strengths of NESTs. In general, non-NESTs provide better learner models, offer effective method in language learning strategy, provide more information about the English language, better anticipate learners' difficulties, be more sensitive to students' needs, use L1 more, and improve students' vocabulary and grammar competence more often. NESTs have more flexibility in teaching methods, are more creative and informal, focus more on fluency, prefer group work, endure students' errors more, give fewer tests, don't use students' L1 to teach, and provide more cultural information. More than half of the participants believed that NESTs' teaching hours should not be adjusted and that both NESTs and non-NESTs were effective teachers. 89.9% of the participants believed that NESTs should teach speaking courses (e.g. conversation and public speech) rather than other courses (e.g. literature, linguistics, business English, listening, reading, and writing). Of all those demographical variables, grade level, and scores were associated with their preference of NESTs.

Key words: NESTs, non-NESTs, teaching behaviors, native competence

BACKGROUND

Learning English as a second or foreign language has become essential and prominent in the era of

globalization. As Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999, p.127) depicted, "English has become a lingua franca among literate educated people and is the most widely learned foreign language in the world." Accordingly, the Ministry of Education in Taiwan has proclaimed to set out with the English education from the third year of the elementary schools in the 1990s. This policy led to the urgent need of English teachers all over the country and promoted the controversial issue of the native/ non-native dichotomy. Thus, the number of foreign teachers teaching English in the language institutes as well as schools and universities is on the rise today. Through an online search of 120 colleges and universities, we found that there are approximately 2896 (88%) non-NESTs (non-native English speaking teachers) and 381 (12%) NESTs (native English speaking teachers) in the English related departments. In both national and private universities, NESTs are outnumbered by non-NESTs. However, there are more NESTs in private university than in national universities. Specifically, more NESTs are working in the northern and southern Taiwan than in the middle (i.e., Taichung, Changhua, Yunlin, and Nantou) and the eastern Taiwan (i.e., Taitung and Hualien). Further, about 38.46% of the NESTs and 22.58% of non-NESTs in the south do not hold degrees in English related majors. How do students feel about NESTs? Does NEST perform better than non-NEST in English teaching? Are both native and non-native English speaking teachers well-qualified in their teaching jobs?

There has been a great deal of previous research contributions to the issue of NESTs and non-NESTs (e.g. Arva & Medgyes, 2000; Braine, 1999; Chou, 2006; Gill & Rebrova, 2001; Homolov & Bystrica, 2004; Huang, 2006; Kamhi-Stein, 1999; Lin, 2005; Lin, 2006; Liu, 1999; Maum, 2002; McNeill, 1993; Medgyes, 1992, 1994, 1999, 2001; Milambiling, 2000; Moussu, 2000; Phillipson, 1992; Reves & Medgyes, 1994; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999; Sommers, 2005; Suarez, 2000; Thomas, 1999; Tuitama-Roberts & Iwamoto, 2003; Walker, 2006; Wu, 2006). Some researchers examined their differences, strengths, and weaknesses (e.g. Lin, 2005; Maum, 2002; McNeill, 1993; Medgyes, 1992, 1994, 2001; Milambiling, 1999; Sommers, 2005). Others investigated the issue of employment and cooperation between NESTs and non-NESTs (e.g. Chou, 2006; Gill & Rebrova, 2001; Lin, 2006; Maum, 2002; Sommers, 2005). In the following, we were to address their differences, merits, defects, employment, and balance.

The Differences between NESTs and non-NESTs

NESTs and non-NESTs are distinctive in many ways. Earlier, Medgyes (1992) has claimed that both groups have equal chance to become successful teachers, but they take different routes. They differed in their language proficiency and teaching behavior (Medgyes, 1994). Later, Medgyes (2001) classified four major differences between NESTs and non-NESTs based on a survey of 325 teachers from 11 countries: (a) the use of English, (b) general attitude, (c) attitude to teaching the language, and (d) attitude to teaching culture. He illustrated that NESTs with native competence use real language, use English more confidently, adopt a more flexible approach, are more innovative and casual, are less empathetic and committed, attend to perceived needs, and have far-fetched expectations. Contrarily, non-NESTs use bookish language, adopt a more guided approach, use English less confidently, are more cautious and empathetic, attend to real needs, and have realistic expectations. Moreover, NESTs focus on fluency, meaning, language in use, oral skills, and colloquial registers; whereas, non-NESTs focus on accuracy, form, grammar rules, printed word, and formal registers (Medgyes, 2001). In teaching, NESTs teach items in context, prefer free activities, favor group work, use a variety of materials, tolerate errors, set fewer tests, use no/less L1, resort to no/less

translation, assign less homework, are less insightful, and supply more cultural information; however, non-NESTs teach items in isolation, prefer controlled activities, favor frontal work, use a single textbook, correct and punish for errors, set more tests, use more L1, resort to more translation, assign more homework and test, and are more insightful (Medgyes, 2001). Further, non-NESTs tend to rely on textbooks and materials, apply difference between L1 and L2, use L1 as a medium, aware of negative transfer and psychological aspects of learning, be sensitive to the needs of students, be more efficient, know students' background, and examination preparation; nevertheless, NESTs are perceived to be informal, fluent, accurate, different in methods, flexible, conversational, aware of subtleties of the language, authentic in English, and positive in students' feedback and non-examination preparation (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999). After comparing the language use, linguistic complexity, linguistic variety, and input strategies between NESTs and non-NESTs, Lin (2005) summarized that non-NESTs tend to conduct classes in L1, speak shorter utterances and less polysyllabic words, use more self-repetition words, and employ different linguistic strategies to enhance students' comprehension.

In addition to the aforementioned differences, both groups have their merits and defects in teaching. On the one hand, Sommers (2005) supported NESTs in their effective ways of instruction and their better language abilities. NESTs are at a distinct advantage in identifying problematic vocabulary in connection with reading texts (McNeill, 1993). Non-NESTs might be struggle in dealing with accent and credibility in the workplace (Maum, 2002). On the other hand, judging teachers from the perspective of knowledge, techniques, affectivity, and intelligibility, Walker (2006) believed that non-NESTs normally had a better understanding of the English grammar, English phonology, teaching techniques, greater affectivity, and more intelligibility than native speaking teachers. Thomas (1999) also pointed out that,

> NNSs not only empathize with their students, but they make another very vital contribution to the field, although rarely acknowledged. They bring something unique to the ESOL profession. They are role models; they are success stories; they are real images of what students can aspire to be. Instead of being the exception, NNSs need to be the rule, found in every rank and level of ESOL teaching. (p.12)

Further, non-NESTs have experience with explicitly learning subtle distinctions in English syntax, lexicon, and phonology in which the NESTs may not be aware of; while NESTs are in good command of colloquialisms, pragmatics, slang, and pronunciation (Milambiling, 1999). Medgyes (2001, p.436) also explained that both NESTs and non-NESTs can be equally good teachers; however, non-NESTs can "provide a better learner model, teach language-learning strategies more effectively, supply more information about the English language, better anticipate and prevent language difficulties, be more sensitive to their students, …."

The Employment of NESTs and non-NESTs: Pros and Cons

Unfortunately, the challenges that the non-NESTs face are not always merely uninformed or innocuous. There are discriminatory hiring practices, organizational invisibility, students distrust, and other challenges (Thomas, 1999). Braine (1999) used to comment that,

> As NNS scholars gradually receive recognition and assume positions of responsibility and influence in the West, prejudice and discrimination are spreading rapidly in Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and Hong King. In these countries, being a native speaker of English is often the main qualification to teach English, and this requirement is explicitly stated in job advertisements. (p.26)

Moreover, the "I'm-not-a-native-speaker" syndrome found among L2 English teachers has disastrous effects on the morale of teachers who feel inferior and inadequate when they compare themselves to their L1 colleagues (Suarez, 2000).

The employment of NESTs or non-NESTs is debatable. Although Gill and Rebrova (2001), after distinguished NESTs and non-NESTs in three categories (i.e., culture background, language use, and teaching attitude), were in favor of NESTs in teaching, some researchers disagreed to hire more native English speaking teachers in Taiwan (Chou, 2006; Lin, 2006; Maum, 2002; Merino, 2006). Lin (2006) did not support the idea of importing foreign teachers to improve students' English, because the salary the government paid for NESTs is much higher than those of non-NESTs in elementary and middle schools. Despite the merits of pronunciation and fluency, the defects of importing NESTs are (a) NESTs would occupy employment opportunity of non-NESTs, (b) NEST's salary is higher than non-NEST's, (c) NESTs are not usually qualified EFL/ESL teachers, (d) NESTs English is not standard, and (e) NESTs don't understand students' learning difficulties and needs, because English is not his second language (Chou, 2006). Further, based on Maum's (2002) summary from several researchers, native English speakers without teaching qualifications are more likely to be hired as ESL teachers than qualified and experienced NESTs, especially outside the United States. Merino (2006) suspected that NESTs might not be better English teachers than non-NESTs, because it all depended on the teaching situation and the particular teacher.

The Balance between NESTs and non-NESTs

Many researchers supported the cooperation and balance between these two groups as a better solution for the NESTS and non-NESTs dichotomy (Homolov & Bystrica, 2004; Huang, 2006; Maum, 2002; Medgyes, 1992, 1994, 2001; Merino, 2006; Tuitama-Roberts & Iwamoto, 2003). There should be a good balance between NESTs and non-NESTs, so that they can complement each other in their strengths and weaknesses (Medgyes, 2001). The cooperation between NESTs and non-NESTs can promote the exchange of cultural information and the adoption of team teaching (Huang, 2006). As Homolov and Bystrica (2004) emphasized, NESTs and non-NESTs should work together to guarantee that students being taken care of with all roles (i.e., the controller, the manager, the facilitator, and the corrector) covered. In addition, since the benefits of using both groups are to facilitate mutual learning experiences, to foster the awareness of the benefits of achieving communicative English proficiency for teachers, and to facilitate specific academic goals for students, Tuitama-Roberts and Iwamoto (2003) proposed team teaching between native and non-native speakers, utilizing divided syllabus and standardized syllabus as teaching options.

Regardless of those pros and cons on the NESTs and non-NESTs dichotomy, it is important to know what students believe and how they perceive NESTs and non-NESTs in the teaching of English language, since it is students who suffer or benefit from teacher's lessons. Hence, the following two research questions will guide this study: (1) What are students' perception and beliefs on the effectiveness and differences between NESTs and non-NESTs? (2) To what extent do students' gender, age, grade level, and academic performance related to their preference of NESTs?   Hopefully, this research can benefit both NESTs and non-NESTs in realizing their differences, strengths, and weaknesses in language teaching and in understanding what students think about them as well as in helping the employment authority to view both NESTs and non-NESTS in a positive way.

METHOD

Participants

The participants were 357 college students, 60 males and 297 females, from the Department of Applied Foreign Languages in a university in southern Taiwan. There are two full-time and seven part-time native English speaking teachers in the department. The subjects were chosen from this department rather than other departments, because 56.6% of the students have taken one course from those NESTs and 43.4% of them have taken two or more courses from NESTs. Among them, 279 students (78.2%) prefer to attend NESTs' classes, while 78 (21.8%) of them do not. With respect to the age, 9.8% of the students are under 20 years old, 55.7% of them are between age 20 and 21, 29.7% of them are between age 22 and 23, and 4.7% of them are over 24 years old. In total, 274 students (76.8%) are studying in the 4-year college program and 83 students (23.2%) are in the 2-year college program. As to their average English writing performance, 6.4% of the students scored below 60, the passing grade; 23% of them earned between 61 and 70; 38.1% of them had scores between 71 and 80; 26.6% of the students gained between 81 and 90; and 5.9% of them achieved between 91 and 100. This score is taken as a measurement standard, because most EFL students are not perfect in writing and their English teachers are more cautious and strict in giving them writing grades.

Instrument and Procedures

A survey questionnaire was designed to collect data. There were 14 major questions in the questionnaire: four questions on personal information, eight questions on learning conditions, one question with 7 items on students' beliefs of non-NESTs, and one question with 10 items on their beliefs of NESTs. The questionnaire was generated and formulated based on Medgyes' (2001) study "When the teacher is a non-native speaker." Two English teachers were invited to proofread the questionnaire and 18 students were randomly sampled from one class to fill out the first draft of the questionnaires. The researchers further revised the questionnaire based on the results of the pilot study and brought questionnaires to 9 intact classes to do the survey. The questionnaires were collected immediately right after the completion. Totally, 357 valid questionnaires were collected. Data was compiled and analyzed through totaling the frequency and percentages of the responses for each item on the questionnaire by using SPSS 12.0 for Microsoft edition. A two-way contingency table analysis was conducted and Pearson Chi-squared test was used to determine the relationships between demographic variables and students' preference of NESTs.

RESULTS

The first research question addressed the issue of students' beliefs and perception on the effectiveness and differences between NESTs and non-NESTs. Table 1 through 5 responded to this question. As shown in Table 1, among 279 students who liked NESTs, 67.74% of the students deemed that NESTs' classes were easy and funny. 58.06% of the students thought that NESTs were nice. 50.54% of them admitted that they could learn real English from NESTs. 48.39% of them liked to have more contact with foreign teachers. 43.73% of the students enjoyed NESTs' cultural information. 22.94% of the students believed that NESTs teaching contents were abundant and 11.11% of the students liked NESTs because they did not fail students.

Table 1.　The Main Reasons that Students Like NESTs

Category	N (%)
It's an easy and funny class.	189 (67.74)
Teachers are nice.	162 (58.06)
I can learn real English.	141 (50.54)
I can contact with foreigners more.	135 (48.39)
I enjoy their culture information.	122 (43.73)
The course content is abundant.	64 (22.94)
Teachers won't flunk out students.	31 (11.11)

On the other hand, as Table 2 indicated, of those 78 students who did not like NESTs, 66.7% of the students reckoned that the course contents of NESTs were boring. 58.97% of them believed their poor oral skills in English were the culprits. 44.87% of them said that they had difficulty in communicating with NESTs. 37.17% of them thought that they couldn't learn anything from NESTs, because the content of the course was insufficient. 8.97% of the students didn't like foreign teachers and 8.97% of them claimed that the NESTs would fail them.

Table 2.　The Main Reasons that Students Do not Like NESTs

Category	N (%)
The course is boring.	52 (66.70)
My English is poor, especially orally.	46 (58.97)
I have difficulty communicating with the teacher.	35 (44.87)
The course content is insufficient.	29 (37.17)
I don't like foreigners.	7 (8.97)
The teachers flunk out students.	7 (8.97)

The effectiveness of teaching between NESTs and non-NESTs is shown in Table 3. 25.5% of the students supported foreign teachers to be more effective, while 16.8% of them defended that Taiwan teachers were more effective. 52.7% of the students indicated that both NESTs and non-NESTs were effective teachers; however, 5% of them did not.

Table 3.　Students' Beliefs on the Effectiveness of Teaching between NESTs and non-NESTs

Category	N(%)
Both are effective.	188(52.7)
Foreign teachers are more effective.	91(25.5)
Taiwan teachers are more effective.	60(16.8)
Both are ineffective.	18(5.0)

As Table 4 presented, more than half of the participants agreed that non-NESTs could provide better learner's models (59.9%), offer better methods in teaching language learning strategies (64.2%), provide more information about the English language (58.8%), better anticipate and prevent learners' difficulties (72.5%), be more sensitive to their students' needs (67.8%), use students' mother tongue more frequently in teaching (66.1%), and improve students' abilities in vocabulary and grammar more often (76.2%).

Table 4. College Students' Opinions and Beliefs on Non-NESTs' Teaching Performance

Non-NESTs	SA N(%)	A N(%)	NC N(%)	DA N(%)	SD N(%)
1.provide better learner's models.	34(9.5)	180(50.4)	124(34.7)	18(5)	1(0.3)
2.offer better method in teaching language learning strategy.	41(11.5)	188(52.7)	113(31.7)	15(4.2)	0(0)
3.provide more information about the English. Language	43(12)	167(46.8)	117(32.8)	27(7.6)	3(0.8)
4.better anticipate learners' difficulties	63(17.6)	196(54.9)	85(23.8)	11(3.1)	2(0.6)
5.be more sensitive to their students' needs	65(18.2)	177(49.6)	95(26.6)	19(5.3)	1(0.3)
6.frequently use students' mother tongue to teach	48(13.4)	188(52.7)	104(29.1)	13(3.6)	4(1.1)
7.improve students' ability in vocabulary and grammar more often	75(21)	197(55.2)	78(21.8)	6(1.7)	1(0.3)

Students' opinions on NESTs' teaching performance, as shown in Table 5, demonstrated that the highest percentages and frequencies fell on strongly agree, except item number six. Most students agreed that NESTs had more flexibility in teaching methods (80.1%), were more creative (68.3%) and informal (68%) in teaching, focused more on oral fluency (69.8%), preferred group works (63.3%), ignored and endured students' errors more (55.8%), gave fewer tests (63%), did not use students' L1 to teach (76.2%), and provided more cultural information (66.6%). Less than half of the participants believed that NESTs adopted more materials with varieties to teach.

Table 5. College Students' Opinions and Beliefs on NESTs' Performance

NESTs	SA N(%)	A N(%)	NC N(%)	DA N(%)	SD N(%)
1.have more flexibility in teaching methods	82(23.0)	204(57.1)	55(15.4)	14(3.9)	1(0.3)
2.are more creative in teaching	85(23.8)	159(44.5)	95(26.6)	16(4.5)	2(0.6)
3.are more casual or informal	73(20.4)	170(47.6)	102(28.6)	10(2.8)	2(0.6)
4.focus more on fluency in oral skills	66(18.5)	183(51.3)	91(25.5)	16(4.5)	1(0.3)
5.prefer group works	72(20.2)	154(43.1)	110(30.8)	19(5.3)	2(0.6)
6.adopt more different kinds of materials	49(13.7)	128(35.9)	150(42)	24(6.7)	6(1.7)
7.ignore and endure students' errors more	47(13.2)	152(42.6)	119(33.3)	29(8.1)	10(2.8)
8.give fewer tests	58(16.2)	167(46.8)	110(30.8)	19(5.3)	3(0.8)
9.don't use students' L1 to teach	112(31.4)	160(44.8)	74(20.7)	10(2.8)	1(0.3)
10.provide more cultural information	78(21.8)	160(44.8)	93(26.1)	24(6.7)	2(0.6)

Additionally, the course that students believed NESTs should teach was speaking (89.9%). There is low percentage on other courses, such as culture (35.9%), listening (29.1%), business English (5%), reading (4.5%), literature (3.6%), linguistics (3.6%), and academic writing (3.4%). 194 students (54.3%) reckoned that there's no need to adjust NESTs' teaching hours. However, 136 students (38.1%) thought that the teaching hours of NESTs should be extended, while 27 students (7.6%) believed that the teaching hours of NESTs should be shorten.

Research question 2 examined if students' gender, age, grade level, and academic performance related to their preference of NESTs. Table 6 illustrated the answer. Scores and grade levels were related to students' preference of NESTs with significant p value and positive Cramer's v value; however, age and gender were not. Age and grade level instead of gender and scores were related to teachers' teaching effectiveness with significant p value and positive Cramer's v value. Most students believed that both teachers were effective; whereas, students with age between 20 and 21 preferred non-NESTs, and those with age between 22 and 23 preferred NESTs to teach more. Additionally, the lower their grade levels, the more they believed that non-NESTs were effective. The higher their grade levels, the more they regarded NESTs as effective. The higher their writing scores, the more they liked NESTs, except students with scores between 91 and 100. The fewer courses they took from NESTs, the more they thought that NESTs were effective.

Table 6. The Relationship among Students' Age, Grade level, Scores, teacher's effectiveness, and students' Preference

Comparison	Pearson χ^2	df	P value	Cramer's V
Scores vs. Preferences	9.813	4	0.044*	0.166
Grade level vs. Preferences	27.423	5	0.000**	0.277
Age vs. Effectiveness	33.221	12	0.001**	0.176
Grade level vs. Effectiveness	43.452	15	0.000**	0.201

*p< 0.05, **p< 0.01

CONCLUSION & DISCUSSION

This study explored students' perception and beliefs on the effectiveness and differences between NESTs and non-NESTs. It also examined the relationship among students' preference on NESTs, teacher's effectiveness, and students' age, grades, scores, and genders. Most students who were in favor of NESTs felt that the classes were easy and funny, and the teachers were nice. Those who disliked NESTs regarded their course contents as boring and indicated the difficulty in communicating with NESTs. More than half of the participants believed that NESTs' teaching hours should not be adjusted and 89.9% of the participants reckoned that NESTs should teach speaking courses rather than other courses (e.g. literature, linguistics, business English, listening, reading, and writing). Most students agreed that both NESTs and non-NESTs were effective teachers. However, less than 50% of the students thought that NESTs adopted more teaching materials with varieties. It is obvious that more teaching contents for NESTs might be

needed to strengthen their course quality. The phenomena that non-NESTs focused more on accuracy and NESTs focused more on students' oral fluency explained why most non-NESTs devoted efforts in improving students' vocabulary and grammar in the classroom, while NESTs did not.

Additionally, though opinions from the research were divided on hiring NESTs, this paper confirmed Medgyes' (2001) study on the bright side of non-NESTs as well as on the strengths of NESTs. Most students deemed that non-NESTs could provide better learner models, offer better method in teaching language learning strategy, provide more information about the English language, better anticipate and prevent learners' difficulties, be more sensitive to students, use L1 more, and improve students' language competence in vocabulary and grammar more often. They also admitted that NESTs had more flexibility in teaching methods, were more creative and informal, focused more on fluency, preferred group works, endured students' errors more, gave fewer tests, did not use students L1 to teach, and provided more cultural information. Of all those demographical variables, grade level and scores were associated with students' preference of NESTs, while students' age and grade level were associated with teacher's teaching effectiveness.

Undoubtedly, both groups have their merits and defects. However, keeping a balance between NESTs and non-NESTs is critical and urgent. Before the integration and cooperation, there are a few issues in need of careful consideration: (1) Are all NESTs qualified teachers? (2) Are all non-NESTs well-trained? (3) Should our government establish some credential measurement system to maintain the quality of our language education? A successful EFL teaching, as Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999, p.141) raised, depends on "learner factors (e.g., age, motivation, goals, aptitude), teacher factors (e.g., knowledge, skills, training, experience, personality), and contextual factors (e.g., ESL or EFL context, amount of available input, degree of contact with native speakers, availability of authentic materials)." We should think highly of teacher factors to maintain teacher's standard. Currently, it is not promising that all NESTs are qualified teachers and it is also not true that all non-NESTs can speak English well. Hence, in order to maintain the quality and standard of language education in the country, it seems that more rigorous training is needed for both NESTs and non-NESTs. The government should arrange some professional training courses for NESTs who do not hold qualified diploma or equipped professional knowledge and who are teaching English in the country. The professional training should include second language acquisition theories, teaching methodologies, language improvement, and Chinese culture understanding. The government should not issue working visa to any unqualified native English speakers. Meanwhile, the Ministry of Education has to evaluate both NESTs and non-NESTs more thoroughly when issuing them teaching certificates. Only when the authorities pay attention to this issue can our language education be improved in no time. Given the limitation of current study, further research can be conducted in different colleges at various levels all over the country to generalize the results. Hopefully, this study can incite other researchers and the authorities to contemplate our English education, especially the qualification of teachers.

REFERENCES

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

2. Braine, G. (1999). (Ed.). *Non-Native educators in English Language Teaching*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

3. Chou C.T. (2006). 試評引進外籍英語教師之議 [A Commentary on importing foreign English Speaker Teachers]. Shih-Te English teaching data bank. Retrieved Aug. 25, 2006, from http://www.cet-taiwan.com/periodical/et_show_search.asp?serno=92

4. Gill, S. & Rebrova, A. (2001). Native and non-native: together we're worth more. *ELT Newsletter*. Retrieved Aug. 29, 2006, from http://www.eltnewsletter.com/back/March2001/art522001.htm

5. Homolov, E., & Bystrica, B. (2004). Roles of NESTs and non-NESTs in the language Classroom – are they the same or different? *Humanizing Language*, 6(2). Retrieved Aug. 26, 2006, from http://www. hltmag.co.uk/mar04/sart9.htm#top

6. Huang, H.M. (2006). An Introspection regarding Native English speaking teachers — A Discussion from the book "The Non-native Teacher". *Caves English Teaching*. Retrieved Aug. 25, 2006, from http://cet.cavesbooks.com.tw/htm/m0531000.htm

7. Kamhi-Stein, L.D. (1999). Preparing non-native professionals in TESOL: Implications for teacher education programs. In G. Braine (Ed.). *Non-Native Educators in English Language Teaching*, 145-158. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

8. Lin, H.Y. (2005). *Teacher Talk on Native and Non-native English Teachers in EFL Classrooms*. Unpublished Master thesis, Ming-Chuan University, Taipei, Taiwan.

9. Lin, S.Y. (2006). 外來的和尚會唸經—引進外籍英語教師的反思 [Foreign monk can recite-Some Introspection of importing foreign English teachers.]. TheCenter for National Education Consultation. Retrieved August 25, 2006, from http://www.ieeuc.com.tw/news7-1-3.htm

10. Liu, J. (1999). Non-native-English-Speaking professionals in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 85-102.

11. Maum, R. (2002). Nonnative-English-speaking teachers in the English teaching profession. *ERIC Digest*. Retrieved Aug. 25, 2006, from http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/0209maum.html

12. McNeill. (1993). *Some Characteristics of Native or Non-Native speaker Teachers of English*. Papers presented at Annual International Language in Education Conference, Hong Kong, China. FL 023 205.

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

14. Medgyes, P. (1994). *The Non-native Teacher.* London: MacMillan.

15. Medgyes, P. (1999). Language training: A neglected area in teacher education. In G. Braine (Ed.). *Non-Native Educators in English Language Teaching*., 177-195. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

16. Medgyes, P. (2001). When the teacher is a non-native speaker. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. (3rd.ed.), 429-442. London: Heinle & Heinle, a division of Thomson Learning, Inc.

17. Merino, I.G. (2006). *Native English-speaking Teachers Versus Non-native English-speaking Teachers.*

Unpublished paper from University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa.

18. Milambiling, J. (1999). *Native and Non-native Speakers: The View from Teacher Education*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the Midwest modern language association, St. Louis, Missouri. FL 026342.

19. Milambiling, J. (2000). How nonnative speakers as teachers fit into the equation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 324-328.

20. Moussu, L. (2000). Native versus non-native speakers of English: Students' reaction. Retrieved Sep.1, 2006, from http://www.moussu.net/courses/portfolio/540.pdf#search='lucie%20moussu%20linguistics%20540

21. Phillipson, R. (1992). ELT: The native speaker's burden? *ELT Journa*l, 46(4), 340-349.

22. Reves, T., & Medgyes, P. (1994). The non-native English speaking ESL/EFL teacher's self-image: An international survey. *System*, 22(3), 353-367.

23. Samimy, K.K., & Brutt-Griffler, J. (1999). To be a native or non-native speaker: Perception of "non-native" students in a graduate TESOL program. In G. Braine (Ed.). *Non-Native Educators in English Language Teaching*, 127-144. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

24. Sommers, S. (2005, July). Student's Experience with Foreign Native Speaker English Teachers. Retrieved Aug.31, 2006, from http://scottsommers.blogs.com/taiwanweblog/2005/07/students_experi.html

25. Suarez, J. (2000). 'NATIVE' AND 'NON-NATIVE': not only a question of terminology. Humanising Language Teaching .Retrieved Aug. 30, 2006, from http://www.hltmag.co.uk/nov00/mart1.htm

26. Thomas, J. (1999). Voices from the Periphery: Non-native Teachers and Issues of Credibility. In G. Braine. (Ed.). *Non-Native Educators in English Language Teaching*, 5-13.

27. Tuitama-Roberts, R. & Iwamoto, J. (2003). A reflective study of high school EFL classes: Utilizing native and non-native speakers most effectively. *The Language Teacher*. Retrieved Aug. 25, 2006, from http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/articles/2003/04/roberts

28. Walker, R. (2006). Native or non-native? Or the best of both worlds? *TESL-EJ*. Retrieved Aug. 25, 2006, from http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej37/f1.html

29. Wu, A. (2006). The nonnative English speaking teachers' movement - How far have we gone? *TESL-EJ*. Retrieved Aug. 25, 2006, from http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej37/f1.html

淺談外國籍與本國籍英文老師

沈麗璧*　吳泓璋**

*嘉南藥理科技大學應用外語系
**南台科技大學應用英語研究所

摘　要

本文主要目的在(1)探討大學生對本國籍及外國籍英文老師的看法及接受度，及(2)研究大學生對外國籍英文教師的喜好是否與其年齡、年級、成績及性別有關聯。本研究以問卷方式訪問357名南台灣某大學之學生。本研究的結果與Medgyes(2001)所提出的本國籍及外國籍英文老師的優缺點之論點一致。本國籍英文老師提供較好的學習模式、較佳的語言學習策略、較多英語的資訊、較理解學生的學習困難、較常用母語教學、及較常增進學生英文字彙及語法的能力。反之，外籍英文老師的教學法較有彈性、較有創意、較不正式、較著重口語技巧的流利度、較喜歡分組作業、及提供較多文化的訊息。此外，超過半數的學生認爲外國籍英文老師的上課時數不用調整，而本籍或外籍教師都一樣是有效率的老師。百分之八十九點九的同學認爲外國籍英文老師應該教口說英文(例如：會話、公共演說、口語表達訓練)，而非其他課程(例如：文學、語言學、商用英文、聽力、閱讀、寫作)。在所有變數中，年級及成績與學生是否喜歡外國籍英文老師有關聯。

關鍵字：外國籍英文老師、本國籍英文老師、教學行爲、語言能力、母語智能