Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

2003

Self-perceptions of non-native English speaking teachers of English as a second language

Kathryn Ann Long
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Applied Linguistics Commons](#), and the [First and Second Language Acquisition Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Long, Kathryn Ann, "Self-perceptions of non-native English speaking teachers of English as a second language" (2003). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 3605.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.5489>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

THESIS APPROVAL

The abstract and thesis of Kathryn Ann Long for the Master of Arts in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages were presented June 27, 2003, and accepted by the thesis committee and the department.

COMMITTEE APPROVALS:

Susan Conrad, Chair

Kimberley A. Brown

DeLys Ostlund
Representative of the Office of Graduate Studies

DEPARTMENT APPROVAL:

Stephen Reder, Chair
Department of Applied Linguistics

ABSTRACT

An abstract of the thesis of Kathryn Ann Long for the Master of Arts in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages presented June 27, 2003.

Title: Self-perceptions of Non-native English Speaking Teachers of English as a Second Language.

It is important that teachers be examined as individuals whose life experiences define them, rather than defining those teachers based on one or two identifying characteristics. Instead of assuming sweeping generalizations about effective non-native English speaking teachers, their self-perceptions should be addressed in order that educators and researchers have a better understanding of what their teaching behaviors are and what factors contribute to such behaviors.

The purpose of the present study was to examine the self-perceptions of effective non-native English speaking teachers (non-NESTs) of English as a Second Language (ESL) regarding their teaching behaviors. The study also sought to discover the relationship between effective non-NEST perceptions of their teaching behaviors and stereotypes for those behaviors. It further sought to define what experiences have contributed to their non-conformation if their perceptions do not fit the negative stereotypes of teaching behaviors of non-NESTs.

Three effective non-NESTs participated in the study. Each participant self-identified as a non-NEST had at minimum a Bachelor's degree with a TESL certificate and had been employed for at least one year to teach ESL. They each completed a questionnaire and participated in a follow-up interview.

The non-NESTs were found not to perceive themselves as having the negative stereotypical teaching behaviors of non-NESTs. In general, the participants cited cultural factors and theories about language acquisition as their reasons for such behaviors. These findings suggest that categorical comparisons should not be made about non-NESTs.

SELF-PERCEPTIONS OF NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKING TEACHERS OF
ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

by

KATHRYN ANN LONG

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
in
TEACHING ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES

Portland State University
2003

In loving memory of my mother and best friend, Hazel Long, who always encouraged
me to follow my dreams.

To my son, Nathan, who provided the inspiration for those dreams.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Susan Conrad, who has helped me find my voice in the TESOL field. Her patience has been appreciated as I have faced some of the most bizarre obstacles on my way to complete my thesis. She has been a marvelous mentor and a good friend.

I also would like to thank my committee members, Kimberly Brown and DeLys Ostlund. Kim's passion has inspired me to take a stand for what I believe. She has challenged me to live the examined life. DeLys has truly been a model for me as I have pursued higher education. I am grateful for her guidance as I received my undergraduate degree and her willingness to serve on my committee.

Additionally, I would like to acknowledge the instructors in the Intensive English Language Program at Portland State. Their support and friendship has helped me enormously as I have grown as an instructor. I would especially like to acknowledge Nancy Dollahite, whose wisdom and encouragement have meant a great deal. Above all, I would like to thank Lena Koessler, my mentor, who has taught me more about teaching than a library full of texts could ever do. I am eternally grateful for her friendship and understanding.

Finally, I would like to thank my friends and family who have been supportive of me over the years as I have worked to achieve this goal. I especially appreciate my brother, Gordon, who never stopped believing in me. My deepest gratitude, however, goes to my son, Nathan, who has been my greatest motivation of all. My thanks go to him for never complaining when I needed quiet time to work and for being available for a hug when I needed one most.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	4
World Englishes and the ownership of English	4
Determining the ownership of English	5
Resistance to non-native speaker authority in the teaching field	8
NEST/Non-NEST dichotomy	11
Summary	18
III METHOD	19
Participants	19
Instruments	20
Data collection procedures	23
Data analysis	23
IV RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	27
Overview of participants	27
Participant 1: Elizabeth	28
Her own use of English	28
General teaching attitude	32
Attitude to teaching the language	33

Attitude to teaching culture	37
Participant 2: Mary	38
Her own use of English	39
General teaching attitude	41
Attitude to teaching the language	42
Attitude to teaching culture	45
Participant 3: Laura	46
Her own use of English	47
General teaching attitude	49
Attitude to teaching the language	50
Attitude to teaching culture	51
Culture and language acquisition	52
V CONCLUSION	55
Summary of the findings	55
Implications for TESOL	58
Applications for teacher educators	58
Applications for teacher supervisors	59
Applications for teachers	59
Limitations of the study and future research	60
REFERENCES	62
APPENDICES	65
A: QUESTIONNAIRE	65
B: INFORMED CONSENT LETTER	69

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1 Perceived differences in teaching behaviors between NESTs and non-NESTs	14
2 Teaching behaviors used in questionnaire	22

I INTRODUCTION

Not long after I became interested in studying linguistics and becoming an English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher, a non-native speaker (NNS) of English in my program told me that during her studies in Japan, her English teacher told her that there was a hierarchy for English teachers: the best English teachers are trained native speakers; the second best English teachers are trained non-native speakers; the third best are untrained native English speakers; and the worst are untrained non-native English speakers. After I heard this, I felt disturbed, because I could not see how I could be considered to be better than someone else who had the same training simply because I am a native speaker (NS). As I continued with my coursework, I sought to understand why some individuals—both native and non-native English speakers—felt that native English speakers might automatically be considered better teachers. I discovered that this was a traditional way of thinking, but that there were some people opposed to the idea of using labels such as NS and NNS to distinguish between qualified teachers. As I continued with my quest to better understand what both NSs and NNSs had to offer to the field of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), I realized that I had found an area that I wanted to research. From my search for knowledge came the desire to look at self-perceptions of NNS teachers.

Background

Colonialism has been at the root of much linguistic influence. Portuguese, Spanish, French, and English have all been planted in various areas around the world

as individuals have uprooted themselves and traveled to new areas where they could spread their seeds of culture and language. Even after countries broke free from colonialist rule, some continued to retain the language imposed on them by their colonizing country.

Among these colonizing languages, English remains unique in its exponential spread throughout the world. Currently, there are more non-native English speakers in the world than there are native English speakers (Kachru 1992). And the demand for English teachers is increasing.

When the spread of English first began, it was clear who would be the teachers of English: native English speakers. For years the NS model that represented countries such as Britain and the United States was promoted as the ideal when teaching English. Since the NS was fluent, knew idiomatic language, and was an expert on cultural issues, many felt that there was no need to question the superiority of NSs (Phillipson 1992).

Recently, however, individuals in the linguistic community have begun to question whether the native speaker is the only authority on English. Many have begun to make claims that NNSs can be effective teachers in their own right, and that in some instances they may prove to be more effective due to the insights they have as individuals who have learned English as a second language.

This has led to much discourse about the merits of native English speaking teachers (NESTs) and non-native English speaking teachers (non-NESTs). However, much of the talk about these teachers has been done with sweeping generalizations

such as “Native speakers do not know English grammar” or “Non-native speakers do not have a sufficient vocabulary.” It seems that it is time to take a look at the specific behaviors of individual teachers, rather than continuing with discourse that pushes all individuals into two separate categories.

Research questions

In order to better understand non-NESTs, I chose to examine the self-perceptions of effective non-NESTs regarding their teaching behaviors. This seemed to be the best choice since I could never experience what it is like to be a non-NEST. Instead of accepting the stereotypes, I wanted to find out firsthand about them. The research questions are as follows:

1. What are effective non-NESTs’ perceptions of their teaching behaviors?
2. What is the relationship between effective non-NEST perceptions of their teaching behaviors and stereotypes for those behaviors?
3. If their perceptions do not fit the negative stereotypes of teaching behaviors of non-NESTs, what experiences have contributed to their non-conformation?

Preview of the study

In the chapters that follow, the non-NEST is discussed in detail. Literature related to non-NESTs is discussed in Chapter II. Chapter III provides details of the participants in the study, the procedures, and methods used to answer the research questions. In Chapter IV, the findings are presented and discussed. Finally, in Chapter V, I discuss the implications of the findings.

II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter provides background in three areas important for the current study. The first section addresses the World Englishes perspective and the concept of ownership of English. The second section discusses resistance to non-native English speaker authority in the teaching field. The final section deals with the NEST/non-NEST dichotomy.

World Englishes and the ownership of English

English is no longer seen as a language that is used primarily for communication between native speakers. It has become more of an international language and is now used as the lingua franca for many individuals. Since it is being used for numerous reasons throughout the world, it has undergone transformations as a result of local innovations in regions where English is spoken as a foreign or second language. As a result, this language is now seen from a World Englishes perspective. This World Englishes perspective is explicated by Kachru (1985), who places the different varieties of English within three concentric circles: the Inner Circle, which refers to the English that is spoken in the United States, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand; the Outer Circle, which refers to the English that is spoken in countries such as Nigeria and India, where English was introduced as a colonial language and became an official or national language; and the Expanding Circle, which refers to the English that is spoken in countries such as Zimbabwe and Korea, where English is a foreign language whose use is growing. Brown (1997)

states that by using this perspective as a framework for addressing how English is used and taught, it becomes evident that no one variety of English is “better” than another variety, that local innovations in language use are acceptable, and that part of the identity of a non-native speaker is the acknowledgement as a speaker/user of English. As more emphasis is placed on a World Englishes perspective, it becomes clear that the traditional views on what constitutes a speaker of English are changing.

Determining the ownership of English

Traditionally, to be a true speaker of a language, one needed to be native-like. Only by sounding like a native speaker could one then own the language. By owning that language, that person could then have control over it to decide upon acceptable lexical and grammatical issues and to use in whatever manner was desired.

However, in order to judge whether one spoke like a native speaker, one would then need to be able to define what a native speaker is. Medgyes (1999) describes the characteristics of a native English speaker as someone who:

- 1 was born in an English-speaking country; and/or
- 2 acquired English during childhood in an English-speaking family or environment;
- 3 speaks English as his/her first language;
- 4 has a native-like command of English;
- 5 has the capacity to produce fluent, spontaneous discourse in English;
- 6 uses the English language creatively;

7 has reliable intuitions to distinguish right and wrong forms in English. (p. 10)

Unfortunately, these characteristics are fuzzy and do not take into account certain situations which blur the lines between NS and NNS. Some examples of these situations are described in a study by Liu (1999) of non-native professionals in TESOL: an Italian who came to the U.S. as a first-grader and therefore received all of her education in English; an individual from Hong Kong who learned English in a bilingual context from a native speaker beginning in kindergarten; and an individual from the Philippines who learned English from birth by her parents and Tagalog from her playmates. Is it not possible that they, too, could be considered native speakers?

Davies (1991) suggests that the determination of membership as a native speaker should be “a matter of self ascription not of something being given” (p. 8). Therefore, rather than someone receiving the label of native speaker or non-native speaker from a list of criteria created by some authority on nativeness and non-nativeness, the identity comes from within the individual.

However, there are those who still want to cling to this notion that the definition of native speaker should come from an external source. Kramsch (1997) feels that “it is acceptance by the group that created the distinction between native and nonnative speakers” (p. 363) that defines native speakership. This, in turn, is placing linguistic power back into the hands of the Inner Circle countries and revoking the legitimacy placed on all varieties by the World Englishes perspective.

The idea that the individuals from within the Inner Circle can determine who is a native speaker and who is a non-native speaker reveals another factor that comes into play: race. Amin (1999), a non-White with a Pakistani accent, describes the resistance she encounters when she attempts to identify herself according to the language she knows best—English:

When I self-identify as a native speaker, there is a look of bewilderment, disbelief, and embarrassment on their faces. They, too, are reflecting an unsaid tenet of the ESL profession and a dominant belief of Canadian society—that only a White accent qualifies one to be a native speaker. (p. 97)

While discussing a study she performed in Toronto, Canada, Amin (1997) reveals that teachers perceive their students as believing that only Whites can be classified as native English speakers; only native speakers know “real” English; and only Whites are “real” Canadians (p. 580).

These kinds of judgments that come from prejudices and stereotypes will continue to exist so long as the varieties from predominantly White Inner Circle countries are viewed as being better than all other varieties. It is only when we accept what Pennycook (1994) refers to as the “worldliness” of English that we can see that the only requirement for determining who is a native speaker and who is a non-native speaker is self-ascription, regardless of how an individual comes to that conclusion.

Although there is disagreement about how to classify someone as a native speaker of English, it is evident that the term native speaker will continue to exist, particularly with regard to defining most English speakers from the Inner Circle.

However, according to Widdowson, the way that English develops in the world “is no business whatever of native speakers in England, the United States, or anywhere else” (1994, p. 385). He explains that native speakers do not have sole custody of English, that it “is not a possession which they lease out to others, while still retaining the freehold. Other people actually own it” (1994, p. 385). This idea is reiterated by Norton, who speaks of English belonging “to the people who speak it, whether native or nonnative, whether ESL or EFL [English as a foreign language], whether standard or nonstandard” (1997, p. 427). So in response to the question of who can own English, we find the answer: all of those who speak English.

This is an important revelation because it shows that non-native speakers are an authority on English because they, too, own the language. Therefore, the way that non-NESTs use the language and how they teach it can be regarded as valid because of their authority.

Resistance to non-native speaker authority in the teaching field

We now see that if English belongs to those who use it, the standards within the Inner Circle can no longer be applicable to all varieties of English, and therefore *deviations* from the norm should be accepted and not regarded as *deficiencies* simply because they come from a non-native speaker (Kachru, 1992, p. 62). Unfortunately, this idea is a difficult one to establish due to the strong feelings that are currently held about the superiority of the NS and Inner Circle varieties. This is especially true in English language teaching, where many feel that an NS norm should be followed. In a study conducted by Tsui & Bunton (2000) to discover the language attitudes of

English teachers in Hong Kong, they examined the discourse in 1,234 language-related messages that were posted over a two-year period on *TeleNex*, an internet-based computer network used by English teachers in Hong Kong. The messages examined were composed of one section of the network dealing with questions and ideas on how to teach English, as well as one section allowing the teachers to ask questions about such topics as grammar and vocabulary. Participants in this study were NS and NNS teachers, as well as the staff at the Teachers of English Language Education Centre (TELEC), the language center that created the network. The authors concluded that most all the teachers deferred to the authority of printed media, but mainly those sources published in Inner Circle countries rather than local textbooks. NNS teachers viewed the staff at *TeleNex* as sources of authority and felt former teachers were more authoritative than colleagues. However, NS teachers had a tendency to form their views on the basis of their own knowledge or use of the language. According to the authors, these results indicate that the model of English adopted and accepted in Hong Kong is exonormative.

This attitude is also seen in a study conducted by Friedrich (2000) to discover Brazilian students' perceptions of the following: one, the status of English as an international language; two, the role of English in Brazil; and three, the role of English in the life of the learners, including the time and effort involved in attaining English proficiency. The study was composed of a questionnaire given to adult learners of English who attended a private language institute in São Paulo. The author concluded that the respondents had stereotypical ideas about English (like the belief that English

has just two varieties—American and British) and learning (such as the belief that the goal of learning is to become native-like). Furthermore, attitudes are directed at the stereotype of the speaker, for example the belief that a speaker of British English is “easier” to understand, despite the respondents’ claim of having little exposure to that variety. The participants also viewed English proficiency as a means of social ascension and equated it with the opportunity to attain material success. Finally, the majority of the respondents also had unrealistic language goals, such as becoming fluent or native-like in four years or less. These results indicate that students bring traditional feelings, stereotypes, and expectations to the learning experience.

The stereotypes evident in these two studies show just some of the difficulties that non-native speakers face when they enter the English language teaching profession. These and other issues are addressed by Polio & Wilson-Duffy (1998) in their study of international students involved in the practicum component of an MA TESOL program at Michigan State University. In a survey of three international MA students, data were gathered from three interviews, teaching logs, and writing assignments that described one of their classes. Although the participants felt confident about their ability to develop good lesson plans, create a comfortable classroom, and foster good relationships with students, they expressed numerous concerns about various aspects of teaching: a lack of language skills, such as not being fluent and not knowing slang/idioms; an inability to understand students and be understood by them; disappointment by the students that they had an NNS teacher; an inability to answer students’ questions; and a lack of confidence in discussing U.S.

culture. The authors concluded that international MA TESOL students have many concerns about their ability regarding language and cultural competence. It seems, then, that NNSs who become ESL teachers need to address these concerns that will follow them throughout their career.

NEST/non-NEST dichotomy

Non-NESTs are not the only ones judged according to the label that they carry. Barratt & Kontra (2000) sought to describe the positive and negative experiences of students and colleagues of NESTs who teach outside of their culture. Two surveys of the same questionnaire were performed, one in Hungary in 1993, and one in China in 1996. In the survey conducted in Hungary, 116 students and 58 teachers responded, while in the survey conducted in China, 100 students and 54 teachers responded. Both questionnaires asked the participants to free write in English about positive and/or negative experiences with NESTs. The responses were then categorized, classified as either positive or negative, and rank ordered. Both sets of participants perceived similar positive characteristics of NESTs, such as having native-language authenticity and a positive personality, and giving the students an opportunity to learn about the culture. Additionally, both sets of respondents also listed similar negative attributes of NESTs, such as being inexperienced or not real teachers, having a lack of understanding of the students' native language (L1) and/or culture, and providing practice but no real instruction. This study shows that the label NS carries with it inherent characteristics that are attributed to those who identify themselves as such.

In fact, the more that one examines the NEST/non-NEST dichotomy, the more one can see that there seem to be characteristics developing from these identities that appear to be opposites of each other. One example can be seen in a survey conducted by Reves and Medgyes (1994), which attempted to do three things: one, define the differences in teaching behavior between NESTs and non-NESTs; two, discover if the differences are due to divergent levels of language proficiency; and three, describe how the awareness of differences in language proficiency influences the non-NESTs' self-perception and teaching attitudes. Data was collected from a questionnaire with 23 questions, most of which were closed-ended. There were 216 participants from ten countries spread across five continents. Eighteen of the respondents were NESTs, and the remaining 198 represented 18 different L1s. Of those non-NESTs, 86 had never been to an English-speaking country. Ten percent had spent more than one year in an English-speaking country, and the rest had spent between less than one month to about one year in an English-speaking country. The majority of the respondents claimed that NESTs and non-NESTs differed in their teaching behaviors. Those behaviors were then grouped into three main areas: one, use of English (e.g., NESTs use real language while non-NESTs use "bookish" language); two, general teaching approach (e.g., NESTs are less empathetic and non-NESTs are more empathetic); and three, specific language teaching approach (e.g., NESTs teach items in context and non-NESTs teach items in isolation). These differences appeared to be due to the discrepancy between NESTs' and non-NESTs' language proficiency. Finally, the authors concluded that the awareness of these differences affected the non-NESTs'

self-perception and teaching attitudes, whereas teachers who were not aware of the differences did not perceive themselves as negatively as those who were aware of the differences.

Medgyes (1999) used the results from this survey and a previous one to establish a dichotomous description of the perceived differences in teaching behaviors between NESTs and non-NESTs (see Table 1). Medgyes emphasized that the respondents to his surveys, in explaining their answers, revealed that the differences found in their teaching behaviors were a result of the discrepancy in language proficiency between NESTs and non-NESTs. For example, since groupwork and pairwork can lead to unpredictable situations in which a teacher can be asked questions for which he is not prepared, teacher-fronted work allows the instructor more control over class work, and therefore he can feel more secure. Medgyes acknowledged that some of these behaviors do not carry value judgments, referring to these behaviors as equal. After all, depending on the specific teaching environment, a teacher may want to focus on both accuracy and fluency. However, there are definitely others that do carry such value judgments. One of these is that non-NESTs are more insightful than NESTs, a behavior that is definitely seen as more positive for non-NESTs. Another is that non-NESTs teach items in isolation, whereas NESTs teach items in context, a description that is decidedly negative for non-NESTs considering the current desire in the linguistic field to teach items in context for improved language acquisition.

Table 1

Perceived differences in teaching behaviors between NESTs and non-NESTs (based on Medgyes, 1999)

NESTs	non-NESTs
<i>Own use of English</i>	
Speak better English	Speak poorer English
Use real language	Use "bookish" language
Use English more confidently	Use English less confidently
<i>General attitude</i>	
Adopt a more flexible approach	Adopt a more guided approach
Are more innovative	Are more cautious
Are less empathetic	Are more empathetic
Attend to perceived needs	Attend to real needs
Have far-fetched expectations	Have realistic expectations
Are more casual	Are more strict
Are less committed	Are more committed
<i>Attitude to teaching the language</i>	
Are less insightful	Are more insightful
Focus on	Focus on
fluency	accuracy
meaning	form
language in use	grammar rules
oral skills	printed word
colloquial registers	formal registers
Teach items in context	Teach items in isolation
Prefer free activities	Prefer controlled activities
Favor groupwork/pairwork	Favor frontal work
Use a variety of materials	Use a single textbook
Tolerate errors	Correct/punish for errors
Set fewer tests	Set more tests
Use no/less L1	Use more L1
Resort to no/less translation	Resort to more translation
Assign less homework	Assign more homework
<i>Attitude to teaching culture</i>	
Supply more cultural information	Supply less cultural information

Árva & Medgyes (2000) also used the information as a foundation for further study. They looked at five British NESTs and five Hungarian non-NESTs teaching English in secondary schools in Budapest. All of the non-NESTs had been to an English-speaking country, and the duration for their stay ranged from two weeks to a year and a half. Each participant was videotaped giving a language lesson to their class, then interviewed afterwards regarding their strengths and weaknesses as either a NEST or a non-NEST. Next, the participants' perceptions of themselves were compared to the strengths and weaknesses as described by Medgyes (1994) and a great deal of correlation was found between the two sets of data. The authors next compared their responses to their behavior on the videotape to see if there were differences between how the teachers perceived their behavior and how they actually behaved. Discrepancies were indeed found as the videos were reviewed. Some of what the NESTs and non-NESTs viewed as strengths did not seem as positive as they believed, and some of what they viewed as weaknesses did not seem as negative as described, and in some instances proved to be assets. For example, it was believed that the NESTs would exhibit a lack of commitment and present an attitude that was too casual. However, although they were seen as relaxed in the classroom, the classes were well-organized and the lessons were viewed as a success. The authors concluded that the interview aspect of the study increased the validity of Medgyes' (1994) previous findings, but that the classroom observation aspect indicated that teachers' perceptions of themselves are not a reliable gauge when distinguishing between NESTs and non-NESTs.

This conclusion by the authors seems to call into question whether or not NESTs and non-NESTs by definition have different teaching behaviors. It also calls into question whether or not these teachers started out with stereotypical teaching behaviors but then later changed those behaviors, perhaps without even being aware of those changes.

The situation of NNS professionals in TESOL is addressed in a study by Liu (1999) containing the following questions: (1) What is the rationale for classifying a certain group of people into the category of non-native speaking professional in TESOL? (2) How do TESOL professionals come to the conclusion that they are either NNSs or NSs? (3) Who defines the term NNS of English? (4) Does defining oneself as an NNS professional in TESOL create a disadvantage in finding a job? (5) What conflicts do NNS teachers of English have in the language classroom? The research consisted of both e-mail and face-to-face interviews conducted over a 16-month period. The participants were seven professionals at a major Midwestern university in the U.S., and all represented different cultural/linguistic backgrounds which spanned Europe, Asia, and Africa. None had English as an L1. The results of this study show that defining the terms NS and NNS and classifying individuals into these two groups are problematic. For example, while one respondent defined an NNS as someone who did not have English as an L1, she did not label herself as an NNS even though Danish was her mother tongue. Some of the participants claimed that their label of NS or NNS for themselves did not reflect the label given to them by others, partially due to ethnicity. The participants all seemed to be in agreement over the difficulty in finding

a job when being identified as a non-native English speaking TESOL professional. In pedagogical situations, defining oneself as an NNS would occasionally intimidate ESL students due to the teacher's competence in English. These instructors felt that they may present themselves to some students as a model that could not be imitated. Overall, the author concluded that the difference in being an NS or an NNS teacher is complex and involves many factors.

Interestingly, though, the researcher decided to label these professionals as NNSs of English due to the fact that English was not their L1; however, the participants themselves did not necessarily classify themselves as such. It would seem that research involving NNSs of English should differentiate between whether the participant is identified as an NNS by an external source or whether the participant is self-identified as an NNS. The mere fact that the author claimed to be studying NNS TESOL professionals while some clearly did not identify as such calls into question how such a term is defined in research.

Some research has concluded that the NS-NNS dichotomy should be discarded. One such study is that by Brutt-Griffler & Samimy (1999). They suggested the term "*international English professional*" (p. 428) as an alternative to NS-NNS. However, throughout their research, they continued to use the labels that they claimed are detrimental to the TESOL profession. Many alternative titles have been offered, but none have been able to outlast the labels of native speaker and non-native speaker. Perhaps it is time to stop trying to come up with a new label for non-NESTs and instead take a closer look at how they define themselves in terms of their

teaching behaviors. Rather than ask non-NESTs to compare themselves to NESTs, it seems that it would be useful to ask non-NESTs to describe their behaviors, and then examine how those behaviors compare to the stereotypes.

Summary

Through a review of the literature, this chapter has established that the way English is used in the world is changing, and therefore all users of English should be seen as owners of the language. As a result of being owners of English, fluent NNSs should be viewed as authorities on English. Additionally, this chapter has shown that a dichotomous relationship has been established to differentiate between NESTs and non-NESTs. However, there is a need to study the teaching behaviors of self-identified NNSs who are effective teachers to see how their self-perceptions relate to these stereotypes of non-NESTs as a whole. The third chapter will discuss how this study identified participants and then collected and analyzed data.

III METHOD

Introduction

This chapter explains the methods used to answer the three research questions. First, the participants involved in this study are described. Next, instruments and data collection are discussed. Finally, the analysis of data is examined.

Participants

Three teachers participated in this study. They were found through personal contacts. There were three criteria for the participants in this study. First of all, the participants needed to be self-ascribed NNS teachers of ESL. As described in the review of the literature, it is important to differentiate between individuals who are identified as an NNS of English by an external source, and those who self-identify as an NNS of English. I felt that it was important to use participants who viewed themselves as NNSs of English, since the very fact that someone did not view herself as an NNS might affect the results of the study. The participants met the first criterion in that, when asked, they all stated that they were non-native English speakers.

Secondly, they were required to have at minimum a Bachelor's degree with a TESL (Teaching English as a Second Language) certificate. By developing this criterion, all of the teachers would have received education in both linguistic theory and teaching theory. As a result, their replies would not be affected by a lack of knowledge in either of these areas. The second criterion was also met. The educational background of the participants ranged from a Bachelor's degree with a TESL certificate to a Ph.D in linguistics.

Finally, they had to be effective teachers. Effective teachers were defined as those who had been employed more than one year at a U.S. school in the Northwest and who considered themselves to be effective teachers. By selecting teachers who had been employed more than one year at a school, this showed that those who employed the teacher believed her to be effective. Since the teachers themselves felt that they were effective, based on their individual belief, this showed that the teachers had good self-esteem regarding an ability to teach and therefore were not influenced by issues of esteem when responding to the questionnaire and interview questions. All the participants met this final criterion.

Pseudonyms have been given for the three participants: Elizabeth, Mary, and Laura. Names were chosen that are a rather generic type of name so as not to reveal any kind of ethnicity of the participants, in order to retain their anonymity.

Instruments

Data were collected through a survey and an interview of the teachers. The questionnaire was composed of both closed-ended and open-ended questions (see Appendix A). Each closed-ended question consisted of a statement regarding teaching behaviors similar to what was described by Medgyes (1994, see description in Chapter II). However, since that description used comparatives, I altered the wording of the behaviors so that they could stand alone in a statement (see Table 2). For example, Medgyes described NESTs as ones who “speak better English.” Since a participant would face difficulty rating such a statement (“Better than what?”), this statement was changed to “speak English well.” The participants rated their agreement with each

statement as it pertained to them, using a five-point Likert scale: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral/don't know, agree, and strongly agree. Each teaching behavior had a pair of statements correlated to each other, such as "I speak English well," and "I speak English poorly." All behaviors fell into one of four categories: own use of English; general teaching attitude; attitude to teaching the language; and attitude to teaching culture. Although some behaviors could be considered positive, some negative, and some equal (neither negative nor positive), all behaviors were addressed in the questionnaire. The open-ended questions asked for general background information and allowed for the participants to address any behaviors that they felt were not represented on the questionnaire but that described them.

The interviews were based on the results of the questionnaire, and therefore each interview varied depending on the answers given. However, the questions in the interviews provided follow-up so that the participants could further explain their responses. Broad questions were given to address the four main categories of teaching behavior. For example, I asked one participant, "You agreed that you supply a lot of cultural information when you teach. Could you talk a little about that?" Next, additional questions were asked for clarification or further explanation. For example, after the participant answered the above question, describing how she includes culture in lessons, I followed up by asking, "And how do the students respond?" The interviews were semi-structured and ranged from approximately 45 minutes to 75 minutes in length.

Table 2
Teaching behaviors used in questionnaire

NESTs	non-NESTs
<i>Own use of English</i>	
Speak English well	Speak English poorly
Use real English	Use “bookish” language
Use English confidently	Lack confidence in their use of English
<i>General teaching attitude</i>	
Adopt a flexible approach	Adopt a guided approach
Are innovative	Are cautious
Lack empathy toward students	Are empathetic toward students
Neglect real needs of students	Attend to real needs of students
Have unrealistic expectations of students	Have realistic expectations of students
Have a casual attitude	Have a strict attitude
Lack commitment	Are committed
<i>Attitude to teaching the language</i>	
Lack insight about English	Are insightful about English
Focus on	Focus on
fluency	accuracy
meaning	form
language in use	grammar rules
oral skills	printed word
colloquial registers	formal registers
Teach items in context	Teach items in isolation
Prefer free activities	Prefer controlled activities
Favor groupwork/pairwork	Favor teacher-fronted work
Use a variety of materials	Use a single textbook
Tolerate errors	Correct for errors
Set few tests	Set many tests
Use only English	Use students’ native language
Avoid translating to students	Translate to students
Assign little homework	Assign much homework
<i>Attitude to teaching culture</i>	
Supply much cultural information	Supply little cultural information

Data collection procedures

I arranged through e-mail to meet each of the participants individually. At the meeting, my study was explained and each participant was offered the opportunity to consent to participating. Once the participant agreed, she read and signed an informed consent letter (see Appendix B). She also received a copy of the letter for her own personal records. She was also given a copy of the questionnaire to complete. One participant mislaid her paper copy, so I sent her the questionnaire as an e-mail attachment, and she filled it out and returned it online. The other two returned their paper copies to me.

Within a week of receiving the surveys, I sent an individual e-mail to each participant to establish a time and location for the interview. Two interviews were held on a college campus, and one interview was held at a location where a participant worked. Each interview was held in a small room with just the two of us. We sat facing each other, and a tape recorder was placed between us to record the interview.

Data analysis

In order to answer the first research question about the non-NESTs' perceptions of their teaching behaviors, I recorded their responses to the questionnaire on a separate sheet of paper, distinguishing which behaviors were stereotypical of NESTs and which were of non-NESTs. At this point the behaviors were not divided into positive, negative, or equal, so that I could more easily look at the four categories holistically.

Next, to answer the second research question about the relationship between effective non-NEST perceptions of their teaching behaviors and stereotypes for those behaviors, I examined how strongly each participant agreed with both sets of behaviors. I counted a behavior for each individual as being more like a NEST or a non-NEST if there were a minimum of two points differing between the dichotomous behaviors. I then highlighted those behaviors. For example, if a participant agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “I speak English well,” and disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement “I speak English poorly,” I noted that this individual perceived herself as being more like a NEST. Additionally, I noted when a participant agreed or strongly agreed with two dichotomous behaviors. Those were also highlighted. For example, if a participant agreed or strongly agreed with both the statement “I focus on fluency” and the statement “I focus on accuracy,” I also noted this.

Finally, in order to answer the final research question about what experiences have contributed to their non-conformation if they do not fit the negative stereotypes of teaching behaviors of non-NESTs, I analyzed the interviews. However, before the interviews, I identified each teaching behavior as being positive, negative, or equal (neither positive nor negative). The following are positive behaviors attributed to NESTs: speak English well; use real language; use English confidently; adopt a flexible approach; are innovative; teach items in context; use a variety of materials; and supply much cultural information. Positive behaviors attributed to non-NESTs are the following: are empathetic; attend to real needs; have realistic expectations; and are

committed. The following are negative behaviors attributed to NESTs: lack empathy; neglect real needs; have unrealistic expectations; and lack commitment. Negative behaviors attributed to non-NESTs are the following: speak English poorly; use “bookish” language; lack confidence in use of English; adopt a guided approach; are cautious; teach items in isolation; use a single textbook; and supply little cultural information. The remaining teaching behaviors for both NESTs and non-NESTs are considered equal.

Upon completion of conducting the interviews, I then transcribed each interview. The follow-up interviews were based on the responses in the survey and provided me the opportunity to explore the reasons behind any non-conformation. Since I addressed the four main categories of behaviors that were previously established, those were the initial four main themes I examined: own use of English; general teaching attitude; attitude to teaching the language; and attitude to teaching culture. I created additional themes that applied to each individual, since there was some digression in content as a result of the interviews being semi-structured. For example, a theme in each interview dealt with characteristics of successful teachers. Within each theme I coded the data according to behaviors that were addressed in the questionnaire. For example, if a participant addressed a specific teaching behavior such as “focusing on fluency,” this was placed into a sub-category under the theme “attitude to teaching the language.” After organizing and coding the data that was addressed in the questionnaire, I then used additional coding to further classify data that was not a part of the original questionnaire, such as the sub-category “teachable

moments” that one participant included in describing her attitude to teaching the language. Once the data for each interview were categorized and reduced, I then looked for similar ideas that emerged from each interview. For example, when each participant commented on why she strongly agreed that she speaks English well, each individual commented on cultural factors.

I decided to focus on the behaviors relating to the four main categories, since those were the four areas that were addressed by all participants. I chose information that seemed best to summarize those individuals and their teaching behaviors, as well as the experiences that have led to those behaviors.

Summary

In this chapter, the methods used to answer the four research questions were explained by describing the participants, instruments, data collection, and data analysis. The fourth chapter will present and discuss the results of the study.

IV RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

In this chapter, the results of the data collection and analysis are presented and discussed. Each participant is addressed in turn and discussed with reference to the three research questions and the four main categories of teaching behaviors: own use of English; general teaching attitude; attitude to teaching the language; and attitude to teaching culture.

Throughout the chapter, when quoting the participants, I noted when certain fillers or phrases such as “you know,” “kind of,” and “going to” were reduced. I also used hyphens to indicate false starts or stammering. I only used commas where participants made a brief pause, and I only used periods to indicate falling intonation; therefore, quotations do not necessarily follow conventional forms of spelling and punctuation. Ellipses were used when I omitted some of the spoken transcript from the text.

Overview of participants

All participants in the study were female. Each participant had a different L1, with differing cultures that spanned one continent. They have had from between six to 40 years of experience teaching English. Their total length of stay in the U.S. ranges from 2.5 to 51 years, although not all of that time has been consecutive for all of the participants. Two of them spent a year in the U.S. as exchange students. All of them first experienced the U.S. before becoming adults. The participants have taught either survival English or academic English, or a combination of the two.

Participant 1: Elizabeth

Elizabeth first experienced the U.S. through an exchange program when she was in high school. She then returned to the U.S. about a decade later as an adult, and has lived here for almost two years.

In general, Elizabeth's self-perceptions of her teaching behaviors did not conform to the negative stereotypes of teaching behaviors of non-NESTs. She provided numerous reasons for her non-conformity.

Her own use of English

Regarding her own use of English, Elizabeth perceived herself as one who speaks English well, uses real language, and uses English confidently. She did not identify at all with the stereotypical behaviors of non-NESTs, which are that they speak English poorly, use "bookish" language, and lack confidence in their use of English.

During the interview, I asked Elizabeth why she feels that she speaks English well and uses real language. The main factors that she discussed were positive feedback from others and motivation to learn English.

First of all, Elizabeth described the positive feedback she received in her work environment:

A lot of people say that my English is pretty good. Um y'know one piece of evidence may be the fact that I was allowed to teach at [a university] where they had only native speakers and then I was allowed to teach as the only non-native speaker and they're pretty picky about that.... And so I feel confident

about that, and I've gotten very positive feedback...about my English, my teaching English also...and feedback from colleagues.

For Elizabeth, her placement at a university that normally staffs only native English speakers, as well as positive feedback from colleagues, was sufficient evidence for her to feel confident that she has good English skills.

Long before she began teaching, though, Elizabeth had a successful experience as an exchange student here in the U.S. This success helped her with learning English so well. Elizabeth was always interested in learning languages, and the warm reception she received from her host family and classmates added to her desire to work on her English skills. When asked if it was easy for her to learn English, she gave the following reply:

Um, I think maybe it was for me because I've always really been into languages. Um, I don't know, I was-y'know what certainly added to it was that I was an exchange student and I had a wonderful host family and they were really an incentive to me. Y'know I identified with my host family a lot, um, I identified with a lot of things in the U.S.

Her ability to identify with her host family and host culture created a safe space in which she could improve her English skills. She pointed out, though, that U.S. culture was not like her home culture. However, her host parents were well traveled and well educated and therefore open to other cultures. In her words, they made her feel "a part of the society."

Not only did her host family welcome her, so did the students at her school. She joined an international club that consisted of both international students and American students. They did many activities together, and this positive feedback helped her transition into U.S. culture.

This is not to say that every experience was a good one. Elizabeth mentioned how, when some individuals were introduced to her and discovered her nationality, they wanted to discuss events from her country's past. However, Elizabeth had traveled to the U.S. to learn about a different language and culture, and she did not want to dwell on such events. These experiences, though, were in the minority, and they did not overshadow all of the events that encouraged her to improve her English skills.

In addition to external sources, Elizabeth also had an internal source that fed into her desire to learn English: motivation. Elizabeth described how her motivation has affected her:

I just y'know I worked on my accent for one thing and I was just very very motivated to learn languages and pick up as much vocabulary as I possibly can. And I still do that y'know when I read the newspaper or when I hear something on TV like let's say a political speech or something and I-I catch something and I'll write it down and look it up because I just want to improve all the time.

Her desire to improve her English skills and be successful in the U.S. did not diminish, even when faced with a second round of culture shock on her second trip to

the U.S. Since she was now an adult, she faced some issues that were non-existent when she was visiting the U.S. as a minor. She was shocked at the U.S. health care system and health insurance. Additionally, she learned a new word in English: pre-existing conditions:

I had never heard about pre-existing conditions so that was a big issue and then all of a sudden I have this huge bill and my insurance would not pay because it was a pre-existing condition and I hadn't been insured for six months. It was a totally new concept.

This was a difficult time for Elizabeth, because she was learning not only new words, but also new concepts of U.S. culture. It did not end, however, with the health care system. She also discovered at the end of tax season that she needed to immediately file with the IRS. Further, she discovered that businesses did not want to extend credit to her beyond the expiration date of her visa. These events frustrated her:

Some of the things I went through were a culture shock and a lot of times I felt like I wasn't treated the same way as a normal person.... I felt like an outsider in some senses and that was quite shocking.

Yet, even with these added areas of culture shock, Elizabeth was undeterred in her efforts to make a life for herself in the U.S. When asked if these events affected her motivation, she gave the following reply:

No, not at all. Ever since my exchange year I have wanted to come back.... I was struggling but I was very positive and very sure I would make it because

this is where I wanted to be. And I kept telling myself that I just have to go with it because this is where I want to be and this is what I want to do.

In general, Elizabeth had positive feedback from others and strong motivation. These two factors led to her desire to remain in the U.S. and improve her English to a point where she feels confident when speaking the language.

General teaching attitude

Regarding Elizabeth's general attitude toward teaching, she perceived herself as one who adopts a flexible approach and is innovative; therefore, she did not identify with the negative stereotypes of non-NESTs, which are that they adopt a guided teaching approach and are cautious when they teach. A contributing factor to these attitudes seems to lie in her relationship with her students.

During the interview, I asked Elizabeth to describe the ways in which she was flexible. She gave the following reply:

I think I'm flexible in a way that I give my students a lot of choice in topics or things they want to contribute. I have a certain curriculum obviously but then I try to kinda give them a choice as to what to do. And I'm also flexible-y'know I offer them if they cannot come to class or if they can't turn in an assignment for a specific reason and they let me know ahead of time then I'm willing to accept an assignment later.

Her flexibility, then, can be seen in her relationship to her students and how she is willing to deal with them on an individual level, rather than merely collectively.

Next, I asked Elizabeth to discuss how she is innovative. She expanded on her description in the following way:

I don't stick to y'know traditional teaching techniques or necessarily the ones that are suggested in the teacher's manual if you have a teacher's manual. And I don't always stick to the book anyway. I do pull what I think is valuable and what I think is necessary from the book but I think I'm innovative in a sense that I supply them with materials that aren't necessarily suggested by the book or the teacher's manual or that are not necessarily part of the curriculum. I look for teachable moments, I'm pretty flexible about teaching the same structure or whatever it is with different approaches instead of just one.

Later in the interview, she provided a more concrete example: "Let's say I'm teaching uh past progressive, I probably won't present it in one way for all students. I will try to approach it...with different techniques to make sure my teaching reaches all." For Elizabeth, it is important for her to be able to reach all of her students, and her innovation facilitates that goal. She feels that part of her success as an ESL teacher is due to the fact that her classes are "learner-centered," and she has "good rapport with students." Thus, her desire to treat her students as individuals and foster a good relationship with them seems to have contributed to her unexpected teaching behaviors as a non-NEST.

Attitude to teaching the language

Regarding her attitude toward teaching English, Elizabeth perceived herself as one who teaches items in context, uses a variety of materials, and uses no or less L1.

In these areas, she did not identify with the stereotypical behaviors of non-NESTs, which are that they teach items in isolation, use a single textbook, and use the students' native language when teaching. Additionally, with regard to some of the equal behaviors, she perceived herself as one who focuses on both fluency and accuracy, both meaning and form, and both language in use and grammar rules.

To Elizabeth, language is closely related to culture; therefore, it is important for her to teach items in context. As she explained during our interview, "I think teaching language is very closely connected with culture." This idea of an interconnection between culture and language has led to her belief of teaching items in context.

As Elizabeth previously mentioned with regard to innovation, she believes in using a variety of materials. This allows her to reach more of her students, which is a primary goal.

When marking on her questionnaire that she agreed that she uses no or less L1, Elizabeth qualified her comment by saying that she uses English unless contrasting two languages could help. I asked her to expand on that during the interview. She described a previous EFL teaching situation, saying that the students had, in addition to English, one language in common (it was an L1 for some, and a second language for others). She then explained how contrasting English and the shared language—or even the L1 of specific students—helped in teaching tense and aspect:

Most learners have very big very persistent difficulties with the English tense and aspect system. And they always grew up with the fact that English has

fourteen different tenses. And I disagree with that from what I learned at grammar classes from [a university] and what I learned from my own research, and so I'm teaching two different categories...and that you have to mark them each at different levels. And so what I did then is I explained that in English and then I contrasted it with how you would say the same thing in your native language. So for example...I would ask some of the Russian learners how they would say it in their language. And then they would give me the example and translate it into English and a lot of times it was clear that they didn't have the aspect form. It made it clear to them that this was a different form from their first language and they were able to grasp it better.

Elizabeth's occasional use of L1 in the classroom suggests that it is not used as a tool for simple translation of information, but rather as a way to take what is familiar to the learner and then open up an area that is unfamiliar. So even though she perceives herself as someone who uses little L1, the occasions when she does use it stem from a belief that examining the L1 will help with the acquisition of the second language (L2), rather than the stereotypical non-NEST motivation of providing translation.

Finally, Elizabeth was asked to expand on her perception that she focuses on dichotomous equal teaching behaviors, such as fluency and accuracy, meaning and form, and language in use and grammar rules. She offered the following example:

It really depends first of all on the content of what I'm teaching.... [I]f I have a grammar class I focus more on accuracy than lets say if I'm teaching a speaking class or a reading class for example. Um and it also depends on the

content. Let's say I teach um if I teach something in a reading class, in the summer we talked about a novel. And the students had to give a little short presentation on questions I gave them or that they had to make up themselves. And it was really more important to me to see that they got the content and that they could draw some conclusions from the text that they really truly understood the text and conveyed that to the class, and I did not interrupt them for grammar-grammatical errors.... However, if we have a discussion in class, let's say about the same novel and then they do make a grammatical error that actually leads to misunderstanding then I would pick that up because I think it's important to point out if they are saying something that could be totally misunderstood or they could get in trouble for what they said I would point it out to them. It depends on the situation.

From Elizabeth's description, it seems that she does not view these teaching behaviors from an "either/or" viewpoint. In fact, her example appears to put these behaviors more along the line of a continuum, which may be why she feels that she can fluctuate her focus in class.

There are numerous factors involved in Elizabeth's non-conformation with the negative stereotypes of teaching behaviors associated with her attitude to teaching English. Additionally, behaviors that on the surface appear to be occasionally fitting those negative stereotypes were revealed to have a deeper meaning than what might be expected.

Attitude to teaching culture

Regarding Elizabeth's attitude toward teaching culture, she perceived herself as someone who supplies much cultural information. She did not identify at all with the negative stereotypical behavior of non-NESTs, which are that they supply little cultural information.

During the interview, I asked Elizabeth to further elaborate. Her response was as follows:

I think teaching language is very closely connected with culture. If I give my students material on culture, then there's always something they can relate to because they can compare certain things with their own culture and I totally believe that by looking at aspects of the new culture they will also learn more about their own culture as they look at it from a distance. And I find that a very important process as y'know as part of language acquisition being part of a culture.... [U]nderstanding between cultures is one part of one very important aspect of teaching languages. Just teaching a language does not help you look at a culture from a different perspective. You need to supply language material, you need to supply the cultural material and trigger topics or give them insight that they can talk about that they can relate to. That's basically what I do and why I do it.

From this, it appears that Elizabeth is giving three important reasons for her supplying cultural information to her students: one, it promotes understanding of the student's own culture; two, it promotes understanding of the target culture; and three, the bridge

created by understanding the two cultures helps facilitate language acquisition. For Elizabeth, the teaching of language necessarily includes the teaching of culture.

To summarize, Elizabeth views herself as one who speaks English confidently and has good English skills. She is flexible and innovative, and she values her relationship with her students. She believes that it is important to teach items in context. Occasionally she does use a student's L1, but this is due to her belief that by contrasting the L1 and the L2, a student can better acquire the L2. Last, she provides much cultural information, in order to facilitate acquisition of the L2. It is apparent that Elizabeth does not perceive herself as one who has the negative stereotypical behaviors of non-NESTs. Further, a number of her behaviors are based on her desire to have her students succeed in their acquisition of English.

This section presented and discussed Elizabeth's results of the data collection and analysis. The next section addresses the second participant, Mary.

Participant 2: Mary

Mary first came to the U.S. as a teenager. She moved here with her family, and although she has returned to visit her native country, she has lived in the U.S. for the past 51 years.

Like Elizabeth, Mary's self-perceptions of her teaching behaviors did not fit the negative teaching behavior stereotypes of non-NESTs. Although some of Mary's reasons for non-conformity matched those of Elizabeth, she stated additional factors involved in the development of her teaching behaviors.

Her own use of English

Regarding Mary's own use of English, she perceived herself as one who speaks English well, uses real language, and uses English confidently. As with Elizabeth, she did not identify with the stereotypical negative behaviors of non-NESTs.

I began the interview by asking Mary why she perceived herself in such a way. There were several factors that she discussed: her love of English; her hope to escape the atrocities of Europe; her desire to fit in with U.S. culture; and her belief that speaking English well will help her students to understand her.

First, she first gave me the following reason as to why she feels that she speaks English well and uses real language:

Because I have made a special effort to make that true. Um, when I came to this country at thirteen, being fairly limited in my English although I had started learning English by, at least by kindergarten or the first grade. I majored in English uh in school, and it was my big love. I made a deliberate and overt uh effort to be very fluent in English and I actually have a better vocabulary than most native English speakers.

For Mary, her love of English was a catalyst for improving her English skills with such deliberation that she feels extremely confident about her use of English.

I then asked Mary what factors were involved with her moving to the U.S. at a young age, and how that affected her adjustment. She then described that time in her life:

All teenagers want to be a part of whatever is present in their lives at-at the moment and-and I was no exception to that. I wanted to cast off all of the ugly war and, you know, because I was born during all the revolutions in-in Europe. Franco was taking over as dictator of course in 1938, and Mussolini was doing his worst as were Hitler and Stalin. So it was a big mess you see Guernica Picasso that's what my childhood looked like and so by the time we managed to get out of that mess and get to the United States I was very eager perhaps more than most teenagers to cast away anything other than what was really-really fitting in, being one of the group, be part of the group, you know one of the kids. And of course my English at that time was British English my grandmother was Scottish and I started learning English at a very early age and came to this country speaking uh English a little bit differently and with a different accent than most of my peers so I worked on that as well. I haven't been quite as successful with the accent as I have been with everything else otherwise my English is as perfect as it gets.

As Mary illustrated, her early years were filled with unpleasant memories, and she longed for a way to escape them. She also hoped to fit in with her peers and become "one of the group." By focusing on her use of English, she was able to turn her attention on something that did not have negative associations and that would help her become accepted more readily by her peers.

Since Mary commented on her accent (something I did not notice until she mentioned it), I asked her to describe how she felt about it. She provided the following explanation:

I don't worry about it, and the students seem to appreciate it because I speak with great clarity. They often remark that they appreciate that so much because I speak uh as if I intended to be understood. And most Americans in the street do not speak as if they intended to be understood it's all sort of the open mouth nom nom with all of the, with all of the schwas instead of any vowel and that sort of thing. But uh their motives are different. I like to be a good teacher, and so I go to some pains to speak very clearly for my students and they do like it.

It seems that it is important to Mary that she be understood by her students.

Therefore, this desire has contributed to her efforts to speak English well, and the feedback she has received from her students appears to demonstrate to her that she is successful in her use of English.

General teaching attitude

With regard to her general attitude toward teaching, Mary responded "neutral/don't know" for the negative stereotypical teaching behaviors of non-NESTs: adopt a guided approach and are cautious. She agreed with the positive stereotypical teaching behaviors of NESTs: adopt a flexible approach and are innovative. Since there was only one point of difference between each of these behaviors, I viewed this as her fitting neither the NEST nor non-NEST stereotypes. Since this did not fit my

criteria for information to discuss in the interview (a minimum of two points differing in the dichotomous behaviors, or both an agreement or strong agreement of two dichotomous behaviors) we did not discuss her general teaching attitude.

Attitude to teaching the language

Regarding her attitude toward teaching English, Mary perceived herself as someone who teaches items in context and favors groupwork and pairwork. In these areas, she did not identify with the negative stereotypes of teaching behaviors of non-NESTs, which are that they teach items in isolation and favor teacher-fronted work. In addition, Mary responded “neutral/don’t know” about most other teaching behaviors related to this category.

As a result of her answers on the questionnaire, I asked her to describe the classes she has taught and how she feels about them. Mary then gave this reply:

I love to te-teach listening and speaking and I-I like very much teaching writing, I don’t object to teaching reading, I’ve never been particularly enamored so much of-of specifically teaching grammar. I like to teach grammar in connection with uh, the other elements of speech production. Uh, but again, y’know uh whatever is beneficial for the students is all right.

From this description I was able to detect that although she liked teaching the four different skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking, she had a special fondness for the class that focused on oral/aural skills. I inquired about teaching pronunciation, since she had mentioned how important it was for her to speak clearly. She then gave her views on teaching that particular aspect:

In connection with listening and speaking classes we've had this discrete pronunciation of particular punctuation, however I do not believe in belaboring the whole phonics and phonetics business uh, I, that-that used to be the big thing in teaching English as a second language, we had to make sure that everybody pronounced things the way we thought they should be pronounced, correctly, whether or not all of us really were sure of what was the correct pronunciation or not. But, I don't think uh most people do that anymore and I certainly do not. I pull out discrete chunks for the students who are having specific problems with some elements and-and we address those and move on.

Interestingly, even though she has worked hard on her speech so that her communication is clear, she does not seem to expect this same level of perfection for her students. This discrepancy seems to be summed up in her earlier comment: "I like to be a good teacher, and so I go to some pains to speak very clearly for my students." In other words, as the teacher, part of her success is in how well she facilitates communication between her and her students. However, she does not force her students to attempt to pronounce all words correctly when it can be more effective to address only specific problems.

Mary then continued on with an explanation as to why grammar classes—particularly those that decontextualize grammar—are not her favorite:

It's possible to do that you know teach discrete grammar points but, I like to teach grammar in connection with reading and writing, that sort of thing and of

course as part of listening and speaking as well. But language is not easily divided from itself.

For Mary, it is important that she teach items in context because she believes that the meaning must be kept intact for the students to learn better. The communication aspect plays heavily in listening and speaking classes but can be neglected in grammar classes; therefore, she prefers the classes that have a communicative aspect as their foundation.

Even though Mary believes in focusing on communication and contextualization, this does not mean that she has abandoned focusing on certain items when necessary. She describes her belief as follows:

I think it should be contextualized in all cases and you may have to pause and make some uh amendments along the way, and very often I-I don't stop I simply repeat uh something in the correct way a couple of-of times and-and whether or not that's repeated, I like the students to repeat that too but I just don't make a case of-of-of errors and corrections. I-I think uh we can stay holistic can keep communicating course if it's global, if the communication is broken down then of course you do stop and-and you fix that, but if it's just a local error that's not impairing the communication tha-that's still getting done still happening then uh, I don't uh, stop and-and make a discrete point out of something, as a teacher.

The ideas that Mary stated are similar to those of Elizabeth in that the focus will depend upon the situation, but global errors that break down communication must be

addressed in all situations, whereas local errors that do not affect meaning do not need to be examined each time that they occur.

Mary does not strongly agree or disagree with some of the stereotypical behaviors regarding her attitude toward teaching English. However, she does strongly agree with teaching items in context in order to facilitate learning, which is one aspect that is an essential part of her teaching philosophy.

Attitude to teaching culture

Regarding her attitude toward teaching culture, Mary responded “neutral/don’t know” to both the statement “I supply much cultural information when I teach” and “I supply little cultural information when I teach.” Yet when I asked her to discuss how she supplies cultural information, she described a teaching behavior that did not conform to the negative stereotypes of non-NESTs.

To begin with, Mary shared her belief of how culture and language are intertwined:

Cultural information is part and parcel of what we do.... [L]anguage in use is culture in use. I mean I think there’s no way you can accept uh, separate culture from language so, you’re teaching real language and trying to make a realistic learning situation for the students then you’re dealing with culture.... [Y]ears ago there were all sorts of rote kinds of ways and repetitious ways that we taught language and because, only accidentally only because the students had brains they-they did make learning out of it but it was sure a dumb way to teach.... [W]e don’t make it so difficult for the students anymore I think all

good teachers include uh, cultural elements in what they're doing because that's what makes language real and useful.

Mary gives an important reason for supplying cultural information to her students: it facilitates language acquisition by creating a realistic learning environment.

Interestingly, this idea of supplying cultural information to facilitate language acquisition is one of the same reasons that Elizabeth gave for her supplying cultural information in her classroom.

To summarize, Mary views herself as one who speaks English well and uses real language. She believes that it is important to teach items in context. Last, she provides much cultural information in order to facilitate language acquisition. Mary does not seem to perceive herself as one who has the negative stereotypical behaviors of non-NESTs.

Mary's results of the data collection and analysis were presented in this section. The final participant, Laura, is addressed in the next section.

Participant 3: Laura

Laura first experienced the U.S. through an exchange program when she was in high school. After her exchange, she returned to her native country. Feeling dissatisfied in her native country, she left it after one year and once again came to the U.S. Although she visits her native country, she has lived in the U.S. since 1976.

Like Elizabeth and Mary, Laura's self-perceptions of her teaching behaviors did not fit the negative teaching behavior stereotypes of non-NESTs. In general, her

non-conformist behaviors were perceived to be similar to one or both of the other participants' behaviors.

Her own use of English

Regarding her own use of English, Laura perceived herself as one who speaks English well, uses real language, and uses English confidently. As with Elizabeth and Mary, she did not identify with the stereotypical negative behaviors of non-NESTs, which are that they speak English poorly, use “bookish” language, and lack confidence in their use of English.

Beginning the interview, I asked Laura to tell me why she perceived herself in such a way. She explained how developing from a teenager into an adult affected her language development:

I developed as an adult in the English language. Um, I feel there is a shift that um when you're monolingual you really don't realize though but when you go from one country you're a child or a teenager and then you develop, you go beyond the teenage years and you become an adult. Things shift and you become more yourself. And so the person you're able to express in that language is the person you're going to be with, yourself, for the rest of your life. And so I became who I am in English so I'm very comfortable with it.

For Laura, both her language and her personality were evolving at the same time, and the connection between becoming an adult and being able to express what that meant affected her positively.

But before that actual metamorphosis occurred, Laura found herself in an exchange program where she stayed with a dynamic family that welcomed her. Just as Elizabeth found a safe environment with her host family, Laura did, too: “I was raised in a family where...you don’t express yourself uh emotionally. And so I came here and the host family I was with was very warm and very open.... And that was really neat.” Not only was Laura in a situation where she was culturally encouraged to express herself, she could express herself with new words in English, words that she did not have in her native language. One of those words was “challenge.” As Laura explained, this was an interesting word for an important reason:

It was very difficult to translate.... If you’re going to explain what it is it’s a nebulous concept which does not have a direct translation.... And that’s because you know it’s because the whole American history and the y’know the-the frontier and-and this challenging thing whereas in [my native country]...you get one job and you don’t midway through life you don’t decide to get a second career.... So a lot of the language that I could use in the United States I could not really use...back home because people would not understand what I was talking about.

The word “challenge” was not a simple word one could translate, because numerous cultural aspects were involved which made expressing this concept difficult in the language of another culture that did not contain those aspects. Laura was pleased with her ability to express herself in a way that she could not before.

Unfortunately, though, re-entry into her native country proved to be a definite challenge: “What was difficult was going back and conforming and not being able to express myself the way I was as an entire person.” Laura had reached a point where the words she had acquired in English were now so connected with who she was that she felt compelled to later return to the U.S. so that her identity could once again become complete. With her identity tied so closely to her ability to express that identity in English, it seems that this factor is a major reason why her perceptions of her use of English do not conform to the negative stereotypes of non-NESTs.

General teaching attitude

Regarding Laura’s general attitude toward teaching, she perceived herself as one who is innovative; therefore, she did not identify with the negative stereotype of non-NESTs, which is that they are cautious. She strongly agreed that she adopts a flexible approach, yet she also agreed that she adopts a guided approach. Her perceptions that she is innovative and flexible are identical perceptions as those of Elizabeth. However, Laura’s reasoning behind the behaviors differs from Elizabeth’s. Laura described how her desire to be intellectually challenged and her creativity contribute to such behaviors:

I hate being bored. And I have to be intellectually challenged.... And if I have a lesson in which everything is set um, I become very bored and then I bore my students to death. And as a veteran teacher I can see what needs to be addressed um a lot, and for me to remain flexible I can have a skeleton-skeleton, that’s a word I can’t say very well um of the lesson, a root structure

and then if something comes up they-it can be dealt with right away. But I need to be flexible to that. So I'm this way and I'm creative I just have to be creative otherwise um, otherwise I'd die (laughter).

Her flexibility, then, is a tool for her to engage her audience. For Laura, this is an essential behavior in the classroom.

Attitude to teaching the language

Regarding Laura's attitude toward teaching English, she perceived herself (as did Elizabeth and Mary) as someone who teaches items in context. She also perceived herself (as did Elizabeth) as one who uses a variety of materials. Therefore, like the other two participants, she did not identify with the stereotypical negative behaviors of non-NESTs, which are that they teach items in isolation and use a single textbook. In addition, with regard to some of the equal behaviors, she perceived herself as someone who focuses on both fluency and accuracy, both meaning and form and both language in use and grammar rules. This is the same type of balance that Elizabeth perceived as having.

Laura described how her class, which does not rely on a single textbook, provides her students with the tools of communication:

It's general fluency but it's also um very basic questions and adapting them to different situations. Um, for example today-um, numbers are really big for beginners.... And, so we worked with that a lot and then final-today, the final activity was for them to do a conversation matrix and at this point I can put on the conversation matrix I had name, telephone number and zip code and they

need to be able to say, and they can by now what's your name, what's your phone number, what's your zip code. And so...they can ask a simple question and they can write it down. And so that was the basic communication.... I'm thinking about negotiation of meaning.

Since Laura's students are looking for ways to survive in the U.S. with limited English proficiency, contextualizing her lessons is extremely important to her. She wants to equip her students with the ability to negotiate meaning with others.

Attitude to teaching culture

Regarding Laura's attitude toward teaching culture, she perceived herself as someone who supplies much cultural information. She did not identify with the negative stereotypical behavior of non-NESTs, which is that they supply little cultural information.

Mary described her teaching of culture as being "in context." She gave a description of how she might approach holidays, such as Valentine's Day, which usually occurs on a day when class is held: "We talk about y'know who celebrates it and what people do here and what they do in their country, where does all-what they didn't do in their country. We often talk, well we have this activity for varying levels." Culture, in this instance, is a way to draw the students out and encourage participation, since the students are able to talk about something they are familiar with.

Besides using culture as a way for students to practice the language, Laura also uses it as a way to help them be more successful in their navigation through U.S. culture when they step outside of the classroom. Laura shared how this aspect helps

her students. She said that she can teach them what is “formal and informal what is acceptable with certain people and not acceptable with others. For example, I ask them to call me by my first name because I’m calling them by their first name.” The teaching of this aspect of culture is for their benefit. Laura shared how this cultural information is important in the workplace:

They’re not going to call their boss Mr. or Mrs. Some-so and so. If they did they’d be-then they’re looked at as someone who’s not understanding the cultural aspects of the fact that you need to call people by their first names unless otherwise indicated. You know they have to know those things otherwise it sets them apart.

For Laura, cultural information is essential for her students, so she supplies it for them.

To summarize, Laura views herself as one who speaks English well, uses real language, and uses English confidently. She is flexible and innovative. She believes that it is important to teach items in context. Last, she provides much cultural information. Laura does not seem to perceive herself as one who has the negative stereotypical behaviors of non-NESTs.

Culture and language acquisition

All three participants perceived themselves as individuals who speak English well, use real language, and use English confidently. A major factor involved in their language acquisition seems to be their integration into U.S. culture through early contact in their teen years and their subsequent acceptance of U.S. culture. Elizabeth described her desire to learn about U.S. history and culture and not dwell on the

history of her own country. Mary described her desire to fit into U.S. culture and forget about the atrocities that occurred in Europe. Laura described her desire to continue to express herself in English and her frustration at not being able to do so in her L1. Furthermore, Laura explained to me how she has avoided the expatriate community here in the U.S.:

I purposely avoided and still do the [expatriate] community.... In those communities, there is a tendency to put American customs or putting things down. We...are better. I don't want to have any part of that value judgment.... I want my children to practice [my native language]. I try to go back [to my native country] regularly.... And...it would make me part of a group which I am not good at. It just didn't work for me.

As Laura explained, she did not want to focus on the negative aspects, either regarding her native country or the U.S. She was able to find the best of both worlds. She could take the positive aspects of her native culture and language, and reflect on these and share these with her children. She could also embrace the positive that she had encountered in the U.S. and also celebrate that and share that with her children. It was not a matter of rejecting one country over another, but rather the ability to fluctuate between two cultures.

This ability to adapt is seen in both Elizabeth and Laura, who both felt that they are flexible and innovative individuals and provided examples of that flexibility. They both described how these characteristics benefit their students.

Third, all the participants perceived themselves as individuals who teach items in context and use a variety of materials. Each participant gave examples of the importance of teaching in context to facilitate acquisition of English in their students.

Finally, they all perceived themselves as individuals who provide cultural information. The participants view culture and language as being closely related, and they believe that the teaching of culture facilitates language acquisition.

These findings are significant, because they show that not all non-NESTs conform to the stereotypical behaviors of non-NESTs that are described in the literature. Further, it shows that two of the basic motivations behind such behaviors are cultural influences and the desire to promote language acquisition among students.

Summary

This chapter has shown that there are similar behaviors in which two or more of the participants did not conform to the negative stereotypes of non-NESTs. These behaviors include the following: speaking English well; using real language; using English confidently; adopting a flexible approach; being innovative; teaching items in context; using a variety of materials; and supplying much cultural information.

Through the presentation of the results of the data collection and analysis, this chapter discussed how each participant's perception related to the negative stereotypical behaviors of non-NESTs. The fifth chapter will summarize the study and discuss the implications.

V CONCLUSION

Introduction

In this final chapter, the findings of the study are summarized and the implications discussed. Included are some applications in the TESOL field. Finally, the limitations of the study are discussed as well as some suggestions for possible future related research.

Summary of the findings

Through the administration of a questionnaire and follow-up interview, this study has shown that not all effective non-NESTs of ESL conform to the stereotypes of teaching behaviors. The first research question asked what the self-perceptions of non-NESTs' teaching behaviors are. It was found that the non-NESTs involved in the study did not all perceive their behaviors to be the same. In some instances, they did agree. For example, regarding their own use of English, all three participants strongly agreed that they speak English well. They also tended to agree with positive stereotypes attributed to non-NESTs, such as being committed. However, there were numerous occasions when their answers were not identical. Most of these differences were found in the behaviors that I have labeled "equal." For example, regarding errors, Elizabeth strongly agreed with the statement "I tolerate errors," whereas Laura agreed with the statement and Mary marked "neutral/don't know." Laura also agreed with the statement "I correct for errors." However, both Mary and Elizabeth marked "neutral/don't know" for the same statement, but Elizabeth qualified her statement by writing on her questionnaire "depends on learners, class, and situation." From this one

example, as well as others presented earlier, it seems that it is unadvisable to use sweeping generalizations when describing the teaching behaviors of non-NESTs.

The second research question addressed the relationship between non-NEST perceptions of their teaching behaviors and stereotypes for those behaviors. Although they conformed to the positive stereotypes, they did not conform to the negative stereotypes in the four main categories: own use of English; general teaching attitude; attitude to teaching the language; and attitude to teaching culture. Most notable in their non-conformation is their unanimous positive perceptions of their own use of English. They all agreed or strongly agreed on their questionnaire that they speak English well, use real language, and use English confidently. They also readily gave reasons behind those perceptions when asked in the interview.

Finally, the third research question addressed the factors that have contributed to their non-conformation to the negative stereotypes of teaching behaviors. Although there were numerous factors involved, there were a few that recurred for at least two of the participants. With regard to their use of English, a strong theme was a desire to fit into U.S. culture and an early exposure that encouraged such a fit. Another theme was the motivation to learn English. Regarding their attitude toward teaching English, an important factor involved was teaching items in context to facilitate language acquisition. And lastly, concerning their attitude toward teaching culture, the major factor there was a belief that culture and language cannot be separated, and cultural learning also facilitates language acquisition.

These contributing factors suggest that the participants were able to overcome the negative stereotypes regarding their own language acquisition by their ability to become a part of U.S. culture. In turn, they have embraced the concept of culture and language as inseparable and, therefore, exhibit teaching behaviors that contextualize activities and that reinforce the belief that language acquisition is facilitated by the presentation of cultural material.

I have used Medgyes' (1999) descriptions of the dichotomous behaviors of NESTs and non-NESTs as a basis for the behaviors in my study. The results I have found differ from those of previous studies (Reves & Medgyes 1994, Árvai & Medgyes 2000). First of all, each participant was exposed to American English and American culture at a young age. Secondly, they were exposed for a longer period of time. Although it is unclear at what age his participants were exposed, none were exposed for longer than a year and a half. These factors are important to note because they may have been what influenced their language acquisition and, therefore, their perceptions of their use of English.

It was actually a challenge to find participants for this study. The greatest difficulty was finding individuals who met all three criteria. While it was not difficult to find willing volunteers, it was not easy to find non-NESTs who met the education and employment criteria. The majority of individuals who contacted me or discussed my study with me were students involved in PSU's MA TESOL or TESL certificate programs in the Department of Applied Linguistics. This led me to an important

question: Why is it so difficult to find non-NESTs in this region who have completed their education and have been at a teaching establishment for at least one year?

Once I found individuals who met those criteria, the final criterion was a definite challenge: they had to self-identify as being a non-NEST. I discovered that quite a few individuals who were identified as non-NESTs by external sources did not themselves self-identify as non-NESTs. Most explained that even though they had moved to the U.S. as children, they had been here too long to consider themselves to be non-native speakers of English. This led me to another important question: At what point does one no longer consider herself a non-native speaker of a language? This is another question that is beyond the scope of this study, but would definitely be a good question to pursue in future research.

Implications for TESOL

Applications for teacher educators

The results of this study clearly demonstrate that not all non-NESTs conform to stereotypical teaching behaviors. Therefore, teacher educators should question the practice of describing NESTs and non-NESTs in dichotomous terms. For example, in the teacher educator classroom they could address issues of self-perception, taking into account the possibility of non-stereotypical behaviors of the student teachers, rather than assuming that all NNSs will exhibit the same behavior.

Additionally, this study suggests that effective non-NESTs may be able to facilitate language acquisition through supplying cultural information. However, all three of the participants described how they themselves were able to incorporate the

target culture into their own identity. Therefore, teacher educators may want to look at additional ways of addressing cultural issues so that future teachers can truly understand the powerful connection between culture and language. For example, it seems important to address the importance of acculturation if a NNS has an interest in teaching ESL in the U.S. These future teachers need to understand how their reaction to U.S. culture may affect their effectiveness as non-NESTs.

Applications for teacher supervisors

Since this study shows that not all effective non-NESTs conform to stereotypical teaching behaviors, it is important for teacher supervisors to be aware of this when hiring non-NESTs. Non-NESTs should not necessarily be hired merely to teach grammar classes or other classes in which a non-NEST is viewed as one who has superior knowledge to a NEST. Non-NESTs should also be considered for teaching positions in which they can prove their ability to teach items in context or classes that are traditionally reserved for NESTs, such as pronunciation or listening/speaking classes.

Applications for teachers

This study shows that teachers do not necessarily fit into the dichotomous categories that describe teacher behaviors. Instead of accepting these ill-fitting labels, teachers should examine their own self-perceptions and make informed decisions about the kinds of teaching behaviors they currently exhibit and the kinds they wish to embrace. Rather than falling into the either/or fallacy, teachers can view these

behaviors as being on a continuum and that the behaviors may fluctuate depending on the class, students, experience, and a myriad of other reasons.

Additionally, non-NESTs should not limit themselves to teaching classes that are traditionally given to NNSs, and NESTs should not limit themselves to teaching classes that are traditionally given to NSs. They should request classes that allow them to stretch their abilities as teachers. Further, all teachers should spend time observing others in TESOL, so that they have a better idea of what types of teaching behaviors their fellow teachers exhibit. It is imperative that teachers not assume that they know the teaching behaviors of others in their field.

Limitations of the Study and Future Research

The study only addresses the NNS ESL teachers' perceptions of their behaviors, which may not reflect their actual behaviors. Although the participants gave examples to illustrate some of their points, those examples are being filtered through the teacher, rather than an objective observer. Future research might incorporate observations of the participants in addition to their self-perceptions, in order to compare the two.

Furthermore, this study examined only three non-NESTs, which may not reflect the perceptions of non-NESTs as a whole. Studies with more participants are needed. Additionally, since all the participants came from the same continent, it might be useful to look at non-NESTs from numerous countries and multiple continents. It would also be helpful if male non-NESTs were included in a future study.

Finally, this study only addresses ESL teaching situations. It would be useful to examine how non-NESTs perceive their teaching behaviors when they are in EFL contexts. This would be especially helpful since the conclusions drawn in this study related so much to acculturation, which may not be a factor if a non-NEST is teaching in his native country.

Conclusion

Although the dialogue regarding NESTs and non-NESTs is far from over, the conclusions of this study should be of interest to those who want to better understand speaker identity. People do not fit into neatly labeled categories, so the desire to sort and file ESL teachers by their NS status needs to be suppressed.

Interestingly, when I asked each participant what kind of teacher would be successful in their type of situation, the answers varied greatly. Some behaviors were suggested, but they were not the ones listed in this study. Among those behaviors were the following: setting clear expectations, establishing a clear curriculum, and creating a learner-centered class. Additionally, character traits were suggested: compassion, patience, warmth, empathy, and a willingness to learn. Knowledge of the language was also mentioned, as well as the ability to convey that knowledge. However, the most important response was stated by Elizabeth and Mary in almost exactly the same words: there is no recipe for a perfect teacher. So as members in the TESOL field examine their own behaviors, perhaps it would be wise to refrain from making categorical comparisons, but rather to embrace the possibilities of how individuals are defined.

REFERENCES

- Amin, N. (1997). Race and the identity of the nonnative ESL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly* 31(3), 580-583.
- Amin, N. (1999) Minority women teachers of ESL: Negotiating White English. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 93-104). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Árva, V., & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System* 24(3), 1-18.
- Barratt, L. & Kontra, E. H. (2000). Native-English-Speaking teachers in cultures other than their own. *TESOL Journal* 9(3), 19-23.
- Brutt-Griffler, J. & Samimy, K. (1999). Revisiting the colonial in the postcolonial: Critical praxis for nonnative-English-speaking teachers in a TESOL program. *TESOL Quarterly* 33(2), 413-431.
- Brown, K. (1997). A world language perspective: English, French, and Spanish. In K. Bardovi-Harlig & B. Hartford (Eds.), *Beyond methods: Components of second language teacher education* (pp. 137-151). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Davies, A. (1991). *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Freidrich, P. (2000). English in Brazil: Functions and attitudes. *World Englishes* 19(2), 215-223.
- Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English

- language in the Outer Circle. In R. Quirk and H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literature* (pp. 11-30). Cambridge/London: Cambridge University Press/The British Council.
- Kachru, B. (1992). Models for non-native Englishes. In B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 48-74). 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Kramsch, C. (1997). The privilege of the non-native speaker. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 112(3), 359-369.
- Liu, J. (1999). Nonnative-English-speaking professionals in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly* 33(1), 85-102.
- Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher*. London: MacMillan Publishers.
- Medgyes, P. (1999). *The non-native teacher*. 2nd ed. Ismaning, Germany: Hueher Verlag.
- Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly* 31(3), 409-429.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Longman.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Polio, C. & Wilson-Duffy, C. (1998). Teaching ESL in an unfamiliar context: International students in a North American MA TESOL practicum. *TESOL Journal* 7(4), 24-29.
- Reves, T. & Medgyes, P. (1994). The non-native English speaking EFL/ESL teacher's

self-image: An international survey. *System* 22(3), 353-367.

Tsui, A. B. M. & Bunton, D. (2000). The discourse and attitudes of English language teachers in Hong Kong. *World Englishes* 19(2), 287-303.

Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly* 29(2), 377-389.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Self-perceptions of Non-native English Speaking Teachers of English as a Second Language

Part 1

Please answer the following questions as completely as possible.

What is your native language?

What is your ethnicity?

How many years/at what academic level did you study to qualify as a teacher of ESL?

How long have you been in the US?

How many years of experience do you have as an English teacher?

Describe the school where you teach.

What is your motivation to be an ESL teacher?

What do you think accounts for your success as an ESL teacher?

Part 2

Please indicate how strongly you agree with the following statements by circling the number that corresponds to your perceptions:

Strongly Disagree = 1

Disagree = 2

Neutral/Don't Know = 3

Agree = 4

Strongly Agree = 5

	<u>SD</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>SA</u>
I speak English well.	1	2	3	4	5
I use real language.	1	2	3	4	5
I focus on form.	1	2	3	4	5
I use "bookish" language.	1	2	3	4	5
I lack confidence in my use of English.	1	2	3	4	5
I adopt a flexible teaching approach.	1	2	3	4	5
I lack insight about English.	1	2	3	4	5
I focus on fluency.	1	2	3	4	5
I adopt a guided teaching approach.	1	2	3	4	5
I am innovative when I teach.	1	2	3	4	5
I focus on oral skills.	1	2	3	4	5
I lack empathy toward my students.	1	2	3	4	5
I attend to real needs of my students.	1	2	3	4	5
I correct for errors.	1	2	3	4	5
I set many tests.	1	2	3	4	5
I focus on meaning.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>SD</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>SA</u>
I teach items in isolation.	1	2	3	4	5
I have a strict teaching attitude.	1	2	3	4	5
I focus on colloquial registers.	1	2	3	4	5
I am committed to my teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
I have unrealistic expectations of my students.	1	2	3	4	5
I have a casual teaching attitude.	1	2	3	4	5
I focus on accuracy.	1	2	3	4	5
I speak English poorly.	1	2	3	4	5
I focus on language in use.	1	2	3	4	5
I use English confidently.	1	2	3	4	5
I assign little homework.	1	2	3	4	5
I focus on grammar rules.	1	2	3	4	5
I supply much cultural information when I teach.	1	2	3	4	5
I focus on formal registers.	1	2	3	4	5
I teach items in context.	1	2	3	4	5
I prefer free activities.	1	2	3	4	5
I favor group or pair work.	1	2	3	4	5
I lack commitment to my teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
I am insightful about English.	1	2	3	4	5
I favor teacher-fronted work.	1	2	3	4	5
I use a variety of materials.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>SD</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>SA</u>
I use my students' native language when I teach.	1	2	3	4	5
I am empathetic toward my students.	1	2	3	4	5
I use a single textbook.	1	2	3	4	5
I tolerate errors.	1	2	3	4	5
I set few tests.	1	2	3	4	5
I neglect real needs of my students.	1	2	3	4	5
I prefer controlled activities.	1	2	3	4	5
I have realistic expectations of my students.	1	2	3	4	5
I use only English when I teach.	1	2	3	4	5
I translate to my students when I teach.	1	2	3	4	5
I assign much homework.	1	2	3	4	5
I am cautious when I teach.	1	2	3	4	5
I focus on printed word.	1	2	3	4	5
I supply little cultural information when I teach.	1	2	3	4	5
I avoid translating to my students when I teach.	1	2	3	4	5

Please discuss below any teaching behaviors that you feel are not represented on the questionnaire but that describe you.

APPENDIX B
INFORMED CONSENT LETTER

Self-perceptions of Non-native English Speaking Teachers of English as a
Second Language

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Kathryn Long from Portland State University, Department of Applied Linguistics. The researcher hopes to learn about the teaching behaviors of non-native English speaking teachers (non-NESTs) of English as a second language (ESL). The study is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree, and it is under the supervision of Susan Conrad, a faculty member at PSU. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are a non-NEST who is currently teaching ESL.

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire by answering questions about your teaching behaviors. It should take approximately forty-five minutes to complete the questionnaire. You will then be asked to participate in a follow-up interview on the same subject. This interview will be audiotaped and will take approximately two hours to complete. While participating in this study, it is possible that you may feel uncomfortable talking about your teaching behaviors, particularly to a native English speaker. However, I assure you that I will meet with you prior to handing out the survey. That way, you can get to know who I am so that you can feel more comfortable with the interviewing process. You do not need to answer any questions that you do not want to answer, and you may simply move on to

the next question. Also, you will be allowed to ask questions at anytime regarding any part of the survey or interview. Furthermore, the research is not concerned with your performance of English, and there will be no analysis of your proficiency. Some potential benefits of participation in the study are the following: one, a better understanding of your teaching behaviors, which can lead to better performance; two, self-empowerment as you are given a platform on which you can speak and be heard regarding your teaching behaviors; and three, a reinforcement of your established identity within the TESOL community.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be linked to you or identify you will be kept confidential. Participant identities will be kept confidential by coding your data so that no one could identify you by looking at the data. The coding information will remain sealed. All data will be stored separately from the coding information. There will be no identifying marks on the data except for my codes, so there will be no way anyone could identify the participants. All audiotapes of interviews will remain at my home. At the conclusion of data analysis, all data will be stored in a sealed container in my home, separate from the sealed coding information. This data and all records will be stored for the minimum three years required after the completion of research.

Your participation is voluntary. Your decision to participate or not will not affect your relationship with the researcher or with Portland State University. You may also withdraw from this study at any time without affecting your relationship with Portland State University.

If you have concerns or problems about your participation in this study or your rights as a research participant, please contact the Human Subjects Research Review Committee, Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, 111 Cramer Hall, Portland State University, 503-725-8182. If you have questions about the study itself, please contact Kathryn Long at 846 NE 102nd Ave, Portland, OR 97220-4007, 503-725-9194 or 503-504-1532.

Your signature indicates that you have read and understand the above information and agree to take part in this study. Please understand that you may withdraw your consent at any time without penalty, and that, by signing, you are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies. The researcher should provide you with a copy of this form for your own records.

Signature

Date