Native and non-native speaker teachers: contextualizing perceived differences in the Turkish EFL setting

Article

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See Guidance on citing.

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Native and non-native speaker teachers: Contextualizing perceived differences in the Turkish EFL setting

Erhan Aslan, Amy S. Thompson

University of South Florida, USA

Abstract

Although extensive research exists on learner perceptions of native and non-native English speaker teachers (NEST/NNEST), whether prior language learning experiences impact learner beliefs about these teachers has not been investigated. This study explores the beliefs of Turkish EFL students (n = 160) via the Beliefs about Language Teachers (BALT) questionnaire, focusing on beliefs about NESTs/NNESTs regarding ease of communication, teaching style, and classroom practices. An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) performed on the BALT resulted in a four-factor solution. The beliefs of multilinguals and bilinguals, categorized in two ways (experience with more than one foreign language vs. perceived positive language interaction [PPLI]) were compared using one-way ANOVAs, which revealed significant differences for some of the factors. There was not much of a difference in bilinguals' and multilinguals' beliefs of NESTs and NNESTs. The perceived effectiveness of the NESTs by the PPLI learners can be explained by those learners' high tolerance of ambiguity in the classroom, whereas the perceived effectiveness of the NNESTs by the NPPLI learners can be explained by the desired to interact in the L1 for ambiguous situations. Implications of these findings are discussed in relation to foreign language education policies and teacher education programs.

Introduction

The ELT profession has witnessed a long-standing debate pertaining to whether native English speaking teachers (NESTs) or non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs) are better in the classroom. Medgyes (1992, 1994) presented a framework of major characteristics of NESTs and NNESTs. He noted perceived differences between these two groups of teachers regarding language proficiency, personal characteristics, and attitudes towards teaching. Following this line of research, many scholars reported the perceptions of students about NESTs and NNESTs (Inbar-Lourie, 2005; Ling & Braine, 2007; Madrid & Cañado, 2004) and reached the conclusion that students have varying perceptions about NESTs and NNESTs in different areas such as pronunciation, culture, and attitudes towards teaching. To date, there is no empirical evidence that accounts for the variation of perceptions within an individual differences (IDs) framework, specifically with learner beliefs and multilingualism. More specifically, whether being bilingual or multilingual has an impact on learner beliefs about NESTs and NNESTs is a research gap the present study aims to fill. With this goal in mind, the present study was conducted in the understudied EFL context of Turkey where the NEST/NNEST dichotomy has recently initiated attempts to adopt new language teaching reforms, specifically the recruitment of NESTs from inner-circle countries (Sarıçoban, 2012; Coşkun, 2013). In this picture, it is necessary for language administrators and educators to gain a better understanding of what influences language learners' beliefs about NESTs and NNESTs.

Review of literature

Most studies in the NEST/NNEST literature focused on students' preferences in different EFL contexts. For instance, Spanish EFL students in Lasagabaster and Sierra's (2002) study preferred NESTs in the areas of pronunciation, speaking, listening and culture, while they favored NNESTs with respect to grammar and learning strategies. Similarly, in the Hungarian context, NESTs were found to focus more on speaking skills and cultural information and NNESTs to be more prepared for lessons and correct errors in class (Benke & Medgyes, 2005). In the Korean context, there were significant differences in students' attitudes towards American- and Korean-accented teachers in the areas of pronunciation, confidence, and fluency, but no differences regarding teaching strategies (Butler, 2007). At the university level in the same context, Chun (2014) found that NESTs were perceived to be more effective in their linguistic competence, whereas Korean NNESTs, thanks to sharing the same L1 with the students, were judged more effective in helping students with affective

factors of language learning, responding to students' needs and sharing their experiences as language learners with the students.

In the Turkish EFL context, which is the focus of the present study, Üstünlüoğlu (2007) reported differences between NESTs and NNESTs with respect to teaching roles, management roles, communication skills, and individual qualities. Turkish teachers were found to be stricter and more in control than NESTs, to teach learning strategies more effectively, provide more information about English, and to empathize more with learners than NESTs. NESTs were perceived to be more communicative than NNESTs for several reasons, including the "fun" aspect of the lesson and the use of body language. Similarly, Gürkan and Yüksel (2012) found that NNESTs were believed to provide better methods and strategies and help students with learning problems thanks to the advantage of using Turkish. On the other hand, NESTs were more flexible, creative and informal, and superior in terms of teaching pronunciation and culture.

As can be concluded from the abovementioned studies, learners perceive NESTs and NNESTs to be different in certain areas such as classroom management, approach to teaching, linguistic competence, and pedagogical competence. However, what variables or factors cause learners to perceive these differences are yet to be found. For instance, why do learners believe that sharing the same L1 with the teacher is an advantage for them? Why do learners believe NESTs to be more communicative than NNESTs? One way of understanding what affects learner beliefs about NEST and NNESTs could be looking at learners' previous language learning experiences, which is the purpose of the present study. Previous language learning experiences operationalized as bilingualism or multilingualism can enhance our understanding of the NEST/NNEST dichotomy, rather than focusing on preferences students have for either group of teachers as reported by most previous research.

Learner beliefs and multilingualism

Learner beliefs refer to conceptualizations that are based on cultural background, past experiences in language learning, and personality traits (Ellis, 2008). Learner beliefs, as a subfield of IDs, have been mainly studied within the domain of language learning in various second and foreign language contexts (e.g. Horwitz, 1988). Multilingualism, defined as additional language learning experiences, influences the overall linguistic system of the learner as well as creating new links and relationships (Jordà, 2005). Therefore, the belief system of a language learner is reorganized with each language learning experience.

Inspired by Kellerman's (1979) idea of perceived language distance, Thompson (2013, 2016) recently proposed a new conceptualization of multilingualism called Perceived Positive Language Interaction (PPLI). To investigate this paradigm, participants answer the following question: "If you have studied other languages in the past, do you think that this has helped or hindered your ability to learn subsequent languages? Please provide specific examples where appropriate." Multilingual learners who perceive a positive interaction between previously studied non-native languages can be grouped in the PPLI category with responses such as, "Thanks to knowing English, I was more conscious and ready to learn French." On the other hand, multilinguals who do not see positive interactions are grouped in the "No Perceived Positive Language Interaction" (NPPLI) category with answers such as, "Sometimes I would think about English grammar rules or word meanings and make mistakes in German." Thompson and Aslan (2015) noted significant differences between bilingual and multilingual learners' beliefs about learning EFL in Turkey. Additionally, they found that PPLI and NPPLI learners hold varying beliefs about different areas of language learning. To date, there have been no studies that examined the possible interface between learner beliefs about NESTs/NNESTs and multilingualism, which is the focus of the present study.

NESTs and NNESTs in the Turkish EFL context

The majority of the English teachers employed at public institutions in Turkey are Turkish NNESTs. A typical NNEST in Turkey is Turkish and has at least a BA degree in ELT, linguistics, or English/American literature fields and works in public schools at different levels including elementary, secondary and higher education settings. As for NESTs in Turkey, many are from inner-circle countries with little or no teaching experience and fewer academic qualifications (although this is not always the case). They are primarily employed by private institutions such as language schools which promote the advantages of NESTs as a student recruitment strategy in order to increase student enrollment. Due to the low English proficiency of students in primary and secondary schools, the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) in Turkey introduced the Foreign Language Teaching Improvement Project in 2011 (Saricoban, 2012; Selvi, 2014). With this project, Turkey is planning to recruit 40,000 NESTs from inner-circle countries to teach speaking classes collaborating with Turkish NNESTs. The project, which is yet to be implemented, is believed to increase opportunities for students to practice their speaking skills. However, Coşkun (2013) reports that the project received criticisms from well-known columnists, major

education unions and non-native pre-service English teachers in Turkey by means of social media. In a survey study, Coşkun (2013) found that some of the NNESTs in Turkey favored the project as they believed that the NESTs could help students improve their spoken English skills and raise their cultural awareness, while several others had unfavorable attitudes towards the project primarily because of employment and pedagogical concerns. In this state of affairs, it is important for language teachers, program administrators, and language policy makers to understand what learners believe about NESTs and NNESTs so that they can make informed decisions about the implementation of such projects.

The study

Participants and data instruments

The participants in the present study are 160 Turkish EFL learners of varying majors enrolled in different universities in Turkey. Of the 154 who reported their gender, 107 were female and 47 were male students. All participants completed the Beliefs about Language Teachers (BALT) questionnaire designed for the current study. Learner beliefs have been primarily investigated through surveys (e.g. Beliefs about Language Learning Inventory (BALLI), Horwitz, 1988). Since the BALLI focuses on learner beliefs about language learning, a new survey focusing on beliefs about language teachers needed to be designed. The BALT consists of twenty positively and negatively worded items (see Table 1) focusing on learners' beliefs about NESTs and NNESTs. The questionnaire items were created on the basis of what has been documented as perceived differences between NESTs and NNESTs in previous literature and were presented in a random order (i.e. not according the themes indicated in Table 1) in the questionnaire. The scaling technique used in the BALT is a Likert scale from 1 to 6 (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = slightly agree, 5 = agree, 6 = strongly agree). The uniqueness of the BALT questionnaire lies in its elicitation of what learners believe about NESTs and NNESTs, rather than asking learners to make preferences for either group of teachers. Additionally, an extensive background questionnaire consisting of questions about participants' previous language learning experiences was administered in order to define the grouping variables for the analysis. Out of the 155 participants who answered the relevant question on the questionnaire, 70 were bilingual and 85 were multilingual. The most commonly studied second foreign language (after English) was German (n = 55) followed by French (n = 11), Spanish (n = 4), and Russian (n = 4). Since participants had different proficiency levels in English, the questionnaire items were presented in both English and Turkish. The detailed analysis of

language proficiencies of languages including English is outside the scope of the present study.

Research Questions

The present study investigates the following research questions:

1) What beliefs do Turkish EFL learners hold about NESTs and NNESTs?

2) Is there a significant difference in the perceived effectiveness of NESTs and NNESTs in the Turkish EFL context?

3) Are there significant differences between:

a) bilingual and multilingual Turkish EFL learners' beliefs about NESTs and NNESTs?

b) PPLI and NPPLI Turkish EFL learners' beliefs about NESTs and NNESTs?

Data Analysis

A variety of statistical procedures were followed in order to address the research questions of the present study. Firstly, to answer the first research question (RQ1), an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was performed on the responses of the BALT questionnaire to identify the beliefs Turkish EFL learners hold about NESTs and NNESTs. The rationale for using an EFA is that it can reveal the underlying relationships in a set of questionnaire items. Since the concept of learner beliefs is multi-faceted and complex, the use of an EFA was deemed appropriate as a statistical data analysis procedure. For RQ2, a paired-sample *t*-test was performed using the factor averages for F1 "Effectiveness of NESTs" and F2 "Effectiveness of NNESTs" to see the trend in beliefs regarding NESTs and NNESTs in the group as a whole. To create the independent variable for RQ3a, participants were grouped as either bilingual or multilingual based on their self-reported previous language learning experiences. Specifically, the participants who only studied English were labelled as bilingual, whereas those who studied at least one language in addition to English were labelled as multilingual. Five participants were excluded from this analysis as they did not answer the relevant question in the background questionnaire. For RQ3b, a different independent variable was created. This time, the participants were divided into two groups: Perceived Positive Language Interaction (PPLI) and No Perceived Positive Language Interaction (NPPLI). The PPLI group consisted of learners who perceived positive interactions between languages previously studied, whereas the NPPLI group consisted of learners who either perceived no interaction or a negative interaction between previously studied foreign languages (see Thompson, 2013, 2016 and Thompson & Aslan, 2015 for

examples of this coding procedure). Four participants were excluded from the analysis as they did not answer the related question for this grouping. Finally, for both RQ3a and RQ3b, one-way ANOVAs were conducted to determine whether or not there were significant differences between the groups.

Results

BALT factors and effectiveness of NESTs and NNESTs

To answer RQ1, the EFA (Maximum Likelihood extraction method and oblique direct oblimin rotation method) was performed on the BALT scores via SPSS 22, which generated a four-factor solution with all 20 items of the questionnaire. The Keiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) was .826, indicating that the sample size for the EFA was adequate. The items were included if they loaded at .3 or greater onto a factor, and factors were considered if they had an eigenvalue greater than 1. Table 1 shows the factor loadings for learner beliefs.

Table 1. Factor loadings for learner beliefs

BALT factor loadings	Factor				
	1	2	3	4	h^2
Factor 1: Effectiveness of NESTs					
12. Lessons with native English speaking teachers are delivered in a more planned way than lessons with Turkish teachers.	.772				.624
14. Native English speaking teachers provide learners with more strategies for language learning than Turkish teachers.	.708				.485
9. Native English speaking teachers have more qualifications than Turkish teachers.	.695				.606
5. I enjoy English lessons more with native English speaking teachers than Turkish teachers.	.653				.504
10. Students need to learn English from a native English speaking teacher if they want to know the English language better.	.635				.746
11. I am more stimulated to learn English when I am taught by native English speaking teachers.	.607				.601
7. Communicating with native English speaking teachers is easier compared to Turkish teachers.	.593				.444
15. Turkish teachers focus more on grammar in class whereas native English speaking teachers encourage more interaction with speaking activities.	.552				.526
19. Students can learn English more efficiently with a native English speaking teacher.	.549				.628
Factor 2: Effectiveness of NNESTs					
6. Turkish teachers are overall more effective in teaching English than native English speaking teachers.		.773			.653
13. Lessons with Turkish teachers are more fun than lessons with native English speaking teachers.		.712			.605
8. Turkish teachers are more spontaneous in the class than native English speaking teachers.		.685			.480
18. Studying English with Turkish teachers makes me more motivated to learn English.		.671			.491
16. Turkish teachers are more qualified than native English speaking teachers.		.655			.549
4. Students can learn English better from a Turkish teacher than they can from a native English speaking teacher.		.624			.392
3. Native English speaking teachers spend more time on grammar exercises in the class whereas Turkish teachers heavily rely on interactive speaking activities.		.403			.312
Factor 3: NNESTs as learner models					
20. Turkish teachers are better at sharing language learning strategies than native English speaking teachers.			.598		.698
17. Turkish teachers usually correct my mistakes in class more than native English speaking teachers.			.479		.346
Factor 4: Easy-going nature of NESTs					
1. Turkish teachers are more approachable than native English speaking teachers.				-.714	.542
2. Turkish teachers tolerate my mistakes in the class more than native English speaking teachers.				-.545	.594

The resulting four-factor solution with 20 items accounted for the 63.24% of the total variance. The first factor (F1) 'Effectiveness of NESTs' contains nine items (Q5, Q7, Q9, Q10, Q11, Q12, Q14, Q15, Q19) and accounts for 25.78% of the total variance with a Cronbach's Alpha of .877. The second factor (F2) 'Effectiveness of NNESTs' includes seven items (Q3, Q4, Q6, Q8, Q13, Q16, Q18) and explains 20.67% of the total variance with a

Cronbach's Alpha of .828. The third factor (F3) 'NNESTs as learner models' has two items (Q17 and Q20) and accounts for 10.11% of the total variance with a Cronbach's Alpha of .559. Finally, the factor four (F4) 'Easy-going nature of NESTs,' which contains two items (Q1 and Q2), explains the 6.67% of the total variance with a Cronbach's Alpha of .681. Even though Q1 and Q2 are about NNESTs, they loaded negatively to F4 (these questions were reverse-coded because of their negative loadings). Therefore, these items indicated the opposite of what they originally asked. To illustrate, while Q1 originally asked whether or not students believed Turkish teachers are more approachable than NESTs, due to the negative factor loading, this item was interpreted as students believing NESTs are more approachable than the NNESTs.

In response to RQ2, to see the overall trend of beliefs regarding NESTs and NNESTs in this group as a whole, a paired-sample *t*-test was performed using the factor averages for F1 "Effectiveness of NESTs" (M=3.71, SD=1.00) and F2 "Effectiveness of NNESTs" (M=3.19, SD=0.96). The results indicate a significant difference between these two factors: $t(155) = 4.44$, $p < .001$. However, as can be seen from the mean scores, the effectiveness of NESTs was 3.72, indicating slight agreement, and of NNESTs was 3.19, indicating slight disagreement on a Likert scale. Therefore, it could be said that, although the mean scores are significantly different, the students did not have strong beliefs regarding the effectiveness of either group of teachers. In other words, Turkish EFL students seem to believe in the efficiency of both groups of teachers. The implications of these results are found in the discussion section.

Beliefs of bilinguals and multilinguals

To answer RQ3, a one-way ANOVA was performed on the BALT factor scores, which revealed a significant difference between bilingual and multilingual groups for only one factor, namely F4 "Easy-going nature of NESTs." The ANOVA results with the means and standard deviations of the four-factor scores for the two groups are shown in Table 2. It seems that multilinguals have stronger beliefs about the easy-going nature of NESTs than bilinguals ($p= .017$, $\eta^2=0.036$), suggesting that the multilingual status has an effect on beliefs regarding one specific facet of NESTs/NNESTs, but not on the general effectiveness of NESTs versus NNESTs. Specifically, multilingual learners believe that NESTs tolerate mistakes more often than NNESTs, and that NESTs are more approachable in the classroom. In other words, as learners gain multiple language learning experiences, they seem to develop more positive beliefs about NESTs than bilinguals who have only one foreign language

learning experience. Overall, due to the primarily non-significant results and small effect sizes regarding NESTs and NNESTs with respect to the other factors (F1, F2, and F3), it can be concluded that the beliefs of traditionally defined multilinguals characterized as having more than one foreign language do not differ significantly from their bilingual counterparts.

Table 2. ANOVA results for bilingual and multilingual groups

	Bilingual ($N = 70$)		Multilingual ($N = 85$)		ANOVA results			
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*
F1	3.60	.911	3.83	1.05	1, 153	2.208	0.014	.139
F2	3.35	.919	3.07	.977	1, 153	3.262	0.020	.073
F3	3.65	1.04	3.85	1.05	1, 153	1.435	0.009	.233
F4	2.75	1.15	3.23	1.32	1, 153	5.783	0.036	.017

Beliefs of PPLI and NPPLI

A one-way ANOVA performed on the BALT factor scores of NPPLI and PPLI learners revealed significant differences for three factors, namely F1, F2, and F4. The ANOVA results with the means and standard deviations of the four-factor scores for the two groups are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. ANOVA results for PPLI and NPPLI groups

	NPPLI ($N = 88$)		PPLI ($N = 68$)		ANOVA results			
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*
F1	3.57	1.00	3.90	.981	1, 154	4.169	0.026	.043
F2	3.32	.953	3.01	.940	1, 154	3.993	0.025	.047
F3	3.63	1.04	3.88	1.04	1, 154	2.343	0.014	.128
F4	2.80	1.26	3.30	1.24	1, 154	5.953	0.037	.016

The results indicate that there is a significant difference between NPPLI and PPLI learners with respect to F1 ($p = .043$, $\eta^2 = 0.026$), with the mean scores suggesting that PPLI learners believe more strongly in the effectiveness of NESTs than NPPLI learners. Therefore, it can be posited that multilinguals who perceive positive interactions between languages are more communication-oriented and believe that they can learn English more efficiently from

NESTs. Conversely, in F2 which include items describing the effectiveness of NNESTs in the classroom, there is a significant difference between PPLI and NNPLI learners (p= .047, η^2=0.025). The mean scores indicate that unlike PPLI learners, NPPLI learners have stronger beliefs about the effectiveness of NNESTs (those teachers who share their L1). The results for F4 mirror those of the bilingual/multilingual division; there is a significant difference between NPPLI and PPLI learners (p= .016, η^2=0.037) with PPLI learners having stronger beliefs about the easy-going nature of NESTs than NPPLI learners. As the results indicate, there is no significant difference between NPPLI and PPLI learners with regard to F3, which characterizes learners' beliefs about NNESTs being models for learners. This finding suggests that both NPPLI and PPLI learners believe that NNESTs provide learners with effective learning strategies and feedback with respect to student-generated mistakes.

Discussion and conclusion

The contribution of the present study to the existing NEST/NNEST literature is the discovery that previous language learning experiences operationalized as PPLI have an impact on EFL learners' beliefs about NESTs and NNESTs. The beliefs identified in this study via an EFA revealed factors that are consistent with previous research. For instance, F1 "Effectiveness of NESTs" that included more favorable beliefs about NESTs, such as more interaction and focus on speaking activities, efficient learning, and easier communication is in line with Lasagabaster and Sierra (2002) and Benke and Medgyes (2005). F2 "Effectiveness of NNESTs" in the areas of learning motivation and more effective learning was also previously noted in Chun (2014) where Asian NNESTs were found to be more approachable by students regarding learning problems. Similarly, F3 in the present study "NNESTs as learner models" was found to be a prevailing learner perception in previous studies. For instance, the perception that NNESTs provide more learning strategies was mentioned both in Üstünlüoğlu (2007) and Gürkan and Yüksel (2012). Since NNESTs have learned English as an L2, learners might assume that NNESTs can provide better learning strategies than NESTs.

The *t*-test results indicate that there is a significant difference in the perceived effectiveness of NESTs and NNESTs, with the NESTs being perceived to be more effective by the Turkish EFL students. This result should be interpreted carefully, however, given that the Turkish Ministry of National Education with the Foreign Language Teaching Improvement Project is placing an emphasis on bringing in thousands of NESTs from inner circle countries to improve the quality of English language education. In other words, it is

possible that the students' beliefs could be culturally-influenced, as opposed to being developed through personal experience. In other words, in a context where native speaker interaction is valued, promoted, or believed to provide better learning outcomes, learners may construct more favorable beliefs about NESTs even though they may not have been taught by NESTs before. Additionally, the mean score for the effectiveness of NESTs was 3.72 (tending towards "slightly agree" on the Likert scale) and of NNESTs was 3.19 (tending towards "slightly disagree" on the Likert scale). In other words, although there was a significant difference, the students did not have strong beliefs regarding the effectiveness of either group of teachers. Therefore, it can be concluded that Turkish EFL students believe in the efficiency of both groups of teachers.

Regarding the beliefs of bi/multilingual and PPLI/NPPLI learners, the beliefs of bilinguals and multilinguals about NESTs and NNESTs only differed in F4 "Easy-going nature of NESTs." Therefore, it can be concluded that traditionally categorized bilinguals and multilinguals do not differ much in their beliefs about NESTs and NNESTs. However, when the multilinguals are grouped according to whether they perceive positive interactions between the foreign languages studied, significant differences between PPLI and NPPLI learners' beliefs about NESTs and NNESTs were revealed. The fact that PPLI learners believe more strongly in the effectiveness of NESTs (F1) could indicate that perceived positive interactions result in favorable attitudes towards NESTs, including the potential for ambiguous situations in the classroom. As Thompson and Aslan (2014) indicate, learners exhibiting positive interactions between languages studied have a higher tolerance of ambiguity than those who do not perceive these positive interactions. As native speakers likely have more of a tendency to use language that is outside the spectrum of what is covered in the text than do non-native speakers, students who have a higher tolerance of ambiguity (the PPLI group in this case) would favor NESTs. Conversely, the finding that the NPPLI learners believe more in the effectiveness of NNESTs (F2) indicates that they are more reliant on teachers who share their L1 (Turkish NNESTs). More specifically, it can be postulated that positively interacting non-native languages may promote a desire for target language communication, whereas learners who do not perceive such interactions may desire a situation in which they can resort to their L1 to communicate when they encounter a learning problem.

In light of the findings of the present study, the beliefs of EFL learners about NESTs and NNESTs offer a number of implications for language and teacher education programs. This study indicates that while learners value both NESTs and NNESTs in different areas,

they do not necessarily believe that one group is superior or inferior to the other. Additionally, previous research has primarily focused on the differences between NESTs and NNESTs, whereas the current study also addresses the similarities of these groups of teachers. Therefore, program administrators who promote the advantages of NESTs with the intention of increasing student enrollment should also emphasize the advantages of NNESTs. It is a well-known fact that most students idealize "the native speaker" as the desired competence level. However, it should be noted that "native speaker" is a controversial concept (Davies, 2001). When the term "native speaker" is used, it is unclear which native speaker is meant (An English speaker from New York, USA? London, England? South Africa?). Additionally, the term native speaker also creates a barrier between the learner and the target culture and community. As highlighted by Aslan (2014), language learners live in a multilingual reality where they have to interact with native speakers as well as non-native speakers in various social, business, and educational settings. Therefore, the "English as an International Language (EIL)" approach can be reinforced in teacher education programs. In doing so, students can form more realistic expectations and beliefs about language learning and use.

Instead of dichotomizing NESTs and NNESTs in the ELT field where NESTs are usually viewed as the provider of a "language model" whereas the NNESTs serve as a "learner model," we could adopt "multilingual model" which suggests that "the successful multilingual user of English not only offers a role model for students, but also provides the LINGUISTIC model" (Kirkpatrick, 2011, p. 221). In doing so, the importance of language learning experiences can be emphasized and learners can understand and appreciate their language teachers not for their native or non-native status, but for their expertise as competent language users and teachers. Along with multilingual awareness and appreciation, students will be better prepared for the multilingual reality of the world where English is a lingua franca.

Also, it is important for both NESTs and NNESTs to take their students' language learning profiles and experiences into consideration when teaching in order to offer a wide range of teaching techniques and activities. For example, as the present study indicated, learners who have more than one foreign language learning experience and who can see positive interactions between foreign languages studied will be more likely to tolerate ambiguity during their interactions with native speakers than their bilingual counterparts. Therefore, guided practice between NPPLI and PPLI learners, which can include the sharing of language learning experiences in the form of story-telling or interviewing, can prepare the

NPPLI learners for more ambiguous communication situations. Additionally, both NESTs and NNESTs can share their own foreign language learning experiences with their students and provide guidance on how to manage ambiguity (e.g. carrying on a conversation even though one cannot come up with the right word to use in a given situation). Finally, NEST/NNEST collaboration must be emphasized in teacher education programs, and both groups of teachers must raise their awareness of common perceptions, beliefs, or misconceptions students have about language learning and language teachers.

In conclusion, the present study shows that previous language learning experiences not only influence learners' beliefs about language learning processes or outcomes, but they also influence the construction of beliefs about the instructed learning contexts where learners interact with both native and non-native speaker teachers. Additionally, perceived interactions between the previously learned languages may also influence current language learning processes as well as the beliefs or attitudes towards the learning environment. Therefore, it could be posited that with each and every new language learning experience, learners may experience changes in their beliefs about language learning, teachers, or the context in a dynamic fashion.

References

Aslan, E. (2014). Doing away with the 'native speaker': a complex adaptive systems approach to L2 phonological attainment. *The Language Learning Journal*, (ahead-of-print) 1-19. doi: 10.1080/09571736.2014.934271

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

Butler, Y.G. (2007). How are non-native English speaking teachers perceived by young learners? *TESOL Quarterly*, *41*, 731–755. doi: http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.lib.usf.edu/stable/40264404

Chun, S.Y. (2014). EFL learners' beliefs about native and non-native English-speaking teachers: perceived strengths, weaknesses, and preferences. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 35*(6), 563–579. doi:10.1080/01434632.2014.889141

Coşkun, A. (2013). Native speakers as teachers in Turkey: non-native pre-service English teachers' reactions to a nation-wide project. *Qualitative Report, 18*, Article 57, 1-21. Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR18/coskun57.pdf

Davies, A. (2001). What second language learners can tell us about the native speaker: identifying and describing the exceptions. In: Cooper, R.L., Shohamy, E., Walters, J. (Eds.), *New perspectives and issues in educational language policy: A festschrift for Bernard Dov Spolsky* (pp.91–112). John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Ellis, R. (2008). Learner beliefs and language learning. In P. Robertson, R. Nunn, & D. Lingley (Eds.), *Innovation and tradition in ELT in the new millennium* (pp. 7–25). Busan: Asian EFL Journal Press.

Gürkan, S., & Yüksel, D. (2012). Evaluating the contributions of native and non-native teachers to an English language teaching program. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46*, 2951–2958. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.596

Horwitz, E.K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal, 72*, 283–294. doi: http://www.jstor.org/stable/327506

Inbar-Lourie, O. (2005) Mind the gap: Self and perceived native speaker identities of EFL teachers. In E. Llurda (Ed.) *Non-native language teachers. Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession*. (pp. 265-281) New York, NY: Springer.

Jordà, M.P.S. (2005). *Third language learners: pragmatic production and awareness* (Vol. 12). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kellerman, E. (1979). Transfer and non–transfer: where are we now? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 2*, 37–57. doi: 10.1017/S0272263100000942

Kirkpatrick, A. (2011). English as an Asian lingua franca and the multilingual model of ELT. *Language Teaching, 44*, 212-224. doi: 10.1017/S0261444810000145

Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra J. M. (2002). University students' perceptions of native and nonnative speaker teachers of English. *Language Awareness, 11*(2), 132–142. doi: 10.1080/09658410208667051

Ling, Y.C., & Braine, G. (2007). The attitudes of university students towards non-native speakers of English teachers in Hong Kong. *RELC journal, 38*, 257-277. doi: 10.1177/0033688207085847

Madrid, D., & Cañado, M.L.P. (2004). Teacher and student preferences of native and non-native foreign language teachers. *Porta Linguarium, 2*, 125-138 Retrieved from https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=1129932

Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: who's worth more? *ELT Journal*, *46*(4), 340–349. doi: 10.1093/elt/46.4.340

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

Sarıçoban, G. (2012). Foreign language education policies in Turkey. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46*, 2643–2648. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.539

Selvi, A.F. (2014). The medium-of-instruction debate in Turkey: oscillating between national ideas and bilingual ideals. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 15*(2): 133–152. doi:10.1080/14664208.2014.898357

Thompson, A.S., & Lee, J. (2013). Anxiety and EFL: Does multilingualism matter? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16*, 730–749. doi:10.1080/13670050.2012.713322

Thompson, A.S., & Aslan, E. (2015). Multilingualism, perceived positive language interaction (PPLI), and learner beliefs: what do Turkish students believe? *International Journal of Multilingualism, 12*(3), 259-275. doi: 10.1080/14790718.2014.973413

Thompson, A.S. (2016). How do multilinguals conceptualize interactions among languages studied? Operationalizing perceived positive language interaction (PPLI). In L. Ortega, A. Tyler, & M. Uno (Eds.) *The usage-based study of language learning and multilingualism* (pp. 91–111). Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.

Üstünlüoğlu, E. (2007). University students' perceptions of native and non-native teachers. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 13*(1) 63–79. doi: 10.1080/13540600601106096