

Effects of Turkish and English Speaking Teachers on Students' Foreign Language Skills

Anadili İngilizce Olan ve Olmayan İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Öğrencilerin Yabancı Dil Becerilerine Etkileri

Oktay Cem Adıgüzel

Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, Eskişehir

Fatma Özüdoğru

Uşak Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu, Uşak

Abstract

This research aims to investigate the effects of Turkish and English speaking teachers on students' academic achievement and English language speaking skills. For the present study, a pretest-posttest control group design was utilized. Data were collected through an achievement test, speaking test materials and a speaking test assessment criterion. Paired samples t-test, independent samples t-test, Wilcoxon signed-ranks test and Mann Whitney U test were carried out to compare the pretest and posttest scores in the experimental and control group and the improvement in students' academic achievement and speaking performance. The results showed that there was a statistically significant higher academic achievement in the post-test of non-native English speaking teacher's (non-NEST's) students compared to native English speaking teacher's (NEST's) students; however, the post-test speaking score between the students of the NEST and non-NEST did not show a statistically significant difference.

Keywords: native speaking teacher of English, non-native speaking teacher of English, academic achievement, speaking skills.

Özet

Bu çalışma anadili İngilizce olan İngilizce öğretmenleri ile anadili İngilizce olmayan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin öğrencilerin akademik başarı ve konuşma becerilerine etkilerini araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmada öntest-sontest kontrol gruplu desen benimsenmiştir. Veriler başarı testi, konuşma sınavı materyalleri ve konuşma sınavı değerlendirme kriteri yoluyla toplanmıştır. Deney ve kontrol grubunun öntest ve sontest puanlarını ve akademik başarı ile konuşma performanslarındaki gelişmeyi karşılaştırmak için bağımlı t-testi, bağımsız t-testi, Wilcoxon işaretli sıralar testi ve Mann Whitney U testi kullanılmıştır. Sonuçlar anadili İngilizce olmayan İngilizce öğretmenin sınıfındaki öğrencilerin anadili İngilizce olan İngilizce öğretmenin sınıfındaki öğrencilere göre akademik başarı son testinden istatistiksel olarak anlamlı daha yüksek başarı elde ettiklerini, buna karşın iki grup öğretmenin sınıfındaki öğrencilerin konuşma son test puanları arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark olmadığını göstermiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Anadili İngilizce olan İngilizce öğretmeni, anadili İngilizce olmayan İngilizce öğretmeni, akademik başarı, konuşma becerileri.

1. Introduction

In today's world where globalization is gaining momentum around the world, information and communication technologies are developing rapidly and economic and scientific competition between countries is increasing; it is of great importance for countries to train individuals who have the skills to adapt to these changes. Twenty-first century qualified manpower is defined as people who have skills of learning and renewal, information, media and technology, and life and job skills. In this century, it is important that countries that want to have sustainable development should configure their education systems with these skills and direct those individuals to be efficient and productive in accordance with the community in which they are living (Moran & Marchionini, 2012). One of the most important skills that serve as the key for the training of qualified individuals is the acquisition of foreign language skills (Genc, 2012). One of the most fundamental conditions in order for individuals to keep up with developments in the world, complete international projects and achieve cross-country mobility is communication in foreign languages. Therefore, it is important for Turkey to take action to develop foreign language skills in its education system (MNE, 2013).

The ability to communicate in a foreign language is one of the key proficiencies of the lifelong learning proposed by the European Commission (Evin-Gencil, 2013; Toprak & Erdoğan, 2012). Foreign language teaching has attracted more attention recently in all European Union (EU) countries, due to the work of "The Common European Framework of Reference of Languages" (CEFR), which provides common criteria for foreign language education programs, testing and evaluation, and development of course materials (CEFR, 2001). Also, in this process knowing only one foreign language has become not enough in terms of the daily life of individuals, as well as the business life. Among foreign languages, English continues to be the most common language spoken in all countries. In this context, in order for Turkey to have a strong position in the globalized world and join the EU, a group that expects individuals to know at least two foreign languages (Tok & Arıbas, 2008), students are primarily expected to be proficient in English.

In Turkey, English language teaching curriculums were revised in 2005 so as to improve language teaching as part of the process of accession to the EU. In this context, objectives, content, teaching-learning processes and evaluation dimensions went through changes (Kırkgöz, 2009). As Kırkgöz (2009) has also stated, this new curriculum encourages the use of content and language integrated learning through a selection of topics from non-language cross-curricular subjects, e.g., geography, mathematics, music and sports; cooperative and collaborative learning, arts, craft activities, drama and performance-based assessment. Also, textbooks were updated in accordance with the specified curriculum objectives, and the number of teaching hours was increased.

According to Paker (2006), in Turkey English language teaching is primarily grammar based, speaking is not given priority as the other skills and learners aren't proficient enough in speaking English though taking English courses in elementary and secondary schools. For these reasons, private schools and various language schools in Turkey and many other countries employ native English speaking teachers to attract the attention of students and parents and increase their enrollment rates by aiming to ensure effective language teaching. By taking this situation into consideration, an important question arises. In reality, are native English speaking teachers (NESTs) more effective than non-native English speaking teachers (non-NESTs) in terms of improving learners' language skills?. Other researchers have also come up with this question and the weaknesses and strengths of NESTs and non-NESTs have been discussed extensively in the following literature.

One of the strongest aspects of non-NESTs that is foreseen the problematic areas in their students' learning, since they have most probably experienced a similar learning process, and they are more likely to try to remedy these difficulties. Because of the fact that non-NESTs themselves have learned English as a foreign language, they understand learners' needs and expectations better. As foreign language learners themselves, they have probably spent a great deal of time and effort trying to master their foreign language skills. They can then share their valuable experiences with their own learners. Furthermore, sharing the learner's mother tongue may be especially crucial in teaching abstract terms and managing the classroom. Cook (2005) adds that non-NESTs have deeper knowledge of the educational system than the native speaking teachers from another country (as cited in Ma, 2012).

On the other hand, NESTs also have some strengths. Celik (2006), Ma (2012) and Medgyes (1992) point out that NESTs are perceived as superior from the point of view of language speaking ability. However, Celik (2006) still holds the view that there might be some non-native speaking teachers who have a much better command of the English language than some native speaking teachers. In contrast, Medgyes (1992) asserts that non-NESTs can never achieve native speaker's competence. However, as Chang (2011) stresses, having a better command of English and speaking fluently do not guarantee effective language teaching. Regarding the strengths of NESTs, they are also reported to be "more capable of creating motivation and an English environment in the school" and applying "more effective and innovative teaching techniques" (Reves & Medgyes, 1994 as cited in Torres, 2004: 8). According to Torres (2004), NESTs also receive high marks when it comes to teaching in specific skill areas such as pronunciation or culture.

NESTs also have cultural background knowledge of English that may help them attract learner's attention by integrating the target language's culture into their courses. Conversely, Celik (2006) claims that non-NEST's might teach better by taking the cultural expectations of the students, parents and schools into consideration. According to him, native speakers might sometimes ignore students' culture consci-

ously or unconsciously, which may lead to an ‘elevated affective filter’ in students and may cause them not to focus on learning. Moreover, as Ma (2012) cited from Boyle (1997), the weakness of NESTs is they may know what is accurate in grammar, but may not be able to explain grammatical rules. This situation stems from the fact that NESTs do not learn the language consciously or by studying as non-NESTs.

Non-NESTs also have some weaknesses like NESTs. Celik (2006) points out that non-NESTs often learn English from books rather than direct contact with authentic sources and most non-NESTs have few opportunities to speak English, which may make them feel insecure. Because of this lack of self-confidence, non-NESTs rely on textbooks more than NESTs (Ferguson, 2005).

When the strengths and weaknesses of NESTs and non-NESTs are analyzed, the most striking point is that NESTs are thought to be more competent in speaking skills. Therefore, when the differences between NESTs and non-NESTs are discussed, their effects on learners’ speaking skills should be addressed in more detail.

According to Isisağ & Demirel (2010), the main goal of most people who want to learn a foreign language is to acquire communicative competence in the target language. Therefore, the basic principle of language teaching is to teach the language for communication purposes. Out of the four basic language skills; speaking, writing, reading and listening; speaking is the most widely used skill in daily life. Thus, the teaching of speaking skills in foreign language teaching in recent times has gained considerable importance. It is thought that the ability to communicate clearly and effectively in a foreign language brings success to learners both in school and at every stage of later life. On these grounds, the teaching of speaking skills must be approached carefully.

So far, many studies have been carried out on the teaching of foreign language verbal skills, but the desired level has not yet been realized in speaking skills. The reason for this, according to Littlewood (1984) and Chang (2011) is the use of conventional teaching methods such as grammar-translation method and teacher-centered approach. People are relatively more comfortable expressing themselves in writing in the target language, but when it comes to communicating verbally, communication cannot be established effectively in spite of their training over the years. In order to overcome this problem, the foreign language education curriculum was revised in 2005 in Turkey and a more communicative approach was put forward for the teaching of speaking skills.

It is thought that speaking skills can be developed through the communicative approach. Also, the speaking skills of foreign language teachers are significant. Foreign language teachers should be a good model to the learners both in terms of phonology and syntax, as well as speaking fluently and accurately (Gunday, 2007). In this sense, the question “How do NESTs and non-NESTs affect learners in acqu-

iring foreign language speaking skills?" arises.

When the literature related to NESTs and non-NESTs is analyzed, it is seen that there are a growing number of studies for these two groups of teachers even though they are mostly limited to the perceptions and attitudes of learners towards NESTs and non-NESTs (Ahmed, 2004; Akpınar, 1996; Al-Omrani, 2008; Ezberci, 2005; Ferguson, 2005). Some of the studies have analyzed the teaching attitudes of NESTs and non-NESTs comparatively (Akpınar, 1996; Gurzynski-Weiss, 2010) but there is limited research dealing with the actual teaching effectiveness of NESTs and non-NESTs and how they affect learners' learning (Nam, 2010). In Nam's (2010) research, NESTs and non-NESTs teach collaboratively in the same class, their teaching practices are analyzed and research data is collected through qualitative data collection tools. The major finding of this study is that the NEST's classes were generally teacher-centered because class interaction was limited due to students' lack of motivation during communicative activities, pressure to succeed in exams and large classroom size so the students were not able to develop speaking skills. When the literature has been analyzed, no experimental study has been found investigating NESTs and non-NESTs' effect on learners' foreign language academic achievement and speaking skills. Moreover, the findings obtained from this research are significant in terms of showing whether NESTs, who are employed in increasing numbers in Turkey, and many other countries, and are assumed to teach the language more effectively should be preferred to non-NESTs.

1. The aim of this research is to investigate the effects of native and non-native English speaking teachers on students' academic achievement and speaking skills. This research aims to answer the following research questions:
2. Is there a difference between the students of NEST and non-NEST in terms of achievement post-test scores?
3. Is there a difference between achievement pretest-posttest scores of NEST's and non-NEST's students?
4. Is there a difference between the students of NEST and non-NEST in terms of speaking post-test scores?
5. Is there a difference between speaking pretest-posttest scores of NEST's and non-NEST's students?

2. Method

The research was implemented during ten weeks at Usak University within the scope of English II course.

General Background of Research

For the present study, a pretest-posttest control group experimental design was utilized in order to investigate the effects of native English speaking teachers and non-native English speaking teachers on students' academic achievement and speaking skills. Pretest-posttest control group experimental design is shown in Table 1 (Buyukozturk, Cakmak, Akgun, Karadeniz &Demirel; 2013):

Table 1. Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design

	Group	Pretest	T	Posttest
R	E	O ₁	X	O ₃
R	C	O ₂		O ₄

In accordance with the purpose and design of this study, experiment and control groups were formed. Within the scope of experimental design, the students in NEST's and non-NEST's class were divided into two equal groups randomly and the experiment and control groups were formed. Students in the NEST's group formed the experimental group and students in the non-NEST's group constituted the control group.

In order to answer the first and second research questions, the pretest and posttest achievement scores of students in the experiment and control groups were investigated. Also, whether there is a significant difference between and within groups was investigated. In order to answer the third and fourth research questions, focus groups from two groups were determined and in-depth analysis of research data was conducted.

Sample of Research

This study was carried out with a total of 70 students, 35 in each group. Before the experimental study started, the NEST was informed about the purpose and scope of the research and asked to participate in the research on a voluntary basis. The NEST voluntarily agreed to participate in the study. The students in the experiment and control groups were also informed about the study and consent was obtained. It was reminded that they could withdraw from the research at any time.

There is no school of foreign languages or intensive preparatory language program at Usak University so English is taught as a common compulsory course of the Council of Higher Education. First year students who are enrolled in various programs have to take English I and II courses. These courses are offered three hours a week in the first and second semesters. Apart from these, no English courses are available. For this reason, elementary level of English is focused on.

The native English speaking teacher in the experimental group of the study came

to Turkey via 'English Teaching Assistantship Program (ETA)' which is supported by Fulbright Education Commission and is currently working at Usak University. The NEST is female and has three years' experience; two years in Turkey and one year in another country. The NEST teaches 20 hours a week as a requirement of the ETA program. The non-native English speaking teacher in the control group is one of the researchers of this study. The non-NEST is also female and has five years' experience. The non-NEST teaches 30 hours a week. In both teachers' class, the same curriculum was covered. The curriculum in the spring semester aimed to improve students' listening, speaking, writing and reading skills at basic level and the content of the curriculum included topics such as "Past simple, 'Future tense', 'Adjectives', 'Comparatives and superlatives' and 'Countable and uncountable nouns'.

In order to find out whether the two groups are equivalent in terms of academic achievement, the achievement test was applied as pre-test at the beginning of spring semester. The pre-test mean score of students in the control group is $X=64$ and the pre-test mean score of students in the experimental group is $X=62,28$. In order to compare the experimental and the control group, independent samples t-test was used. The results showed no statistically significant difference ($p>0,05$) between the students of NESTs and non-NESTs and it can be said that they are equivalent in terms of academic achievement.

Additionally, focus groups were formed according to the results of the achievement pre-test scores in order to investigate the effects of the NESTs and non-NESTs on students' speaking skills. Focus groups were formed according to the achievement pre-test scores: Four students with a high level of academic success, four students with a medium level and four students with a low level of academic success. Focus groups included a total of 24 students; 12 students from each group. These students were given the same speaking test as pre-test and post-test.

Having formed the focus groups, the speaking test was carried out as pre-test at the beginning of spring semester in order to find out whether the students are equivalent in terms of speaking skills. As revealed by Mann Whitney U test, the pre-test speaking score between the students of the NEST and non-NEST did not show statistically significant difference ($p>.05$). Students in both groups got similar scores. The result shows that students are equivalent in terms of speaking ability. This result is also consistent with the results of the achievement test. The groups are equivalent to each other in terms of both academic achievement and speaking ability since there is no significant difference in the pre-test results of the achievement and speaking test.

Instrument and Procedures

In this study, an achievement test, speaking test materials and speaking test assessment criteria were used as data collection instruments.

Achievement Test

As a data collection instrument, an achievement test was developed by the researchers by taking the fall semester English I topics into consideration and validity and reliability studies were realized (Adiguzel & Ozudogru, 2013). First, a question pool including 65 items was prepared. While creating the achievement test, a table of specifications that showed the relationship between items and topics was prepared in order to achieve content validity. The questions that were included in the achievement test were arranged to represent the topics which had been taught. For validity purposes, the test was presented to two language education experts. In accordance with the opinion of the language education experts, necessary adjustments were implemented and the test was ready for pre-implementation. The draft test contained 50 multiple-choice items. The test covered the curriculum of English I: "To be, 'Singular, plurals, this, these, that, those', 'Simple present tense', 'Nationalities, countries', 'Talking about time,days', 'Prepositions of time', 'Family members', 'Have got/has got', 'Object pronouns', 'There is,are', 'Some, any, a lot of, countable, uncountable nouns', Prepositions of place', 'Asking the way', 'Present continuous tense', 'Can,can't, 'Making polite requests', 'Jobs', 'Like, would like', 'Conjunctions: and, but, or, then, because', 'Possessive adjectives', 'Places in a town' and 'Suggestions'.

In order to ensure the reliability of the test, it was administered to 102 first year students who were enrolled in various departments of the same university during the last week of the fall semester, and item analyses were performed. Item difficulty and discrimination were calculated for each question. During item discrimination analysis via the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), items whose index of discrimination was above 0.10 were omitted. For the index of item difficulty, the number of respondents who gave correct and incorrect answers and the percentage of correct items were analyzed through a frequency parameter. During the analysis, the item difficulty index (p) was considered to be between 0.20 and 0.80. Items with a difficulty level below 0.20 were considered 'very difficult', items with a difficulty level above 0.80 were considered 'very easy' and they were not included in the achievement test. Ten items (1, 2, 12, 13, 16, 23, 26, 27, 29 and 44) were eventually omitted from the test reducing the items to 40. Ultimately, the test included 14 easy ($0.60 \leq p \leq 0.80$), 13 medium ($0.40 \leq p \leq 0.60$) and 13 difficult ($0.20 \leq p \leq 0.40$) items. For the inner reliability, KR-20 (Kuder-Richardson) value was calculated. The results obtained from this show it has adequate reliability (0.80).

Speaking Test Materials

In the NEST and non-NEST's groups, 24 students who were chosen according to the results of the achievement test and divided into three different levels were given a speaking test as a pre-test at the beginning of the spring semester. 6 different types of topics were prepared as a speaking test. Each student was given a topic.

These topics were; 1) similarities and differences between two pictures, 2) sports, 3) hobbies, 4) family members, 5) daily activities and 6) talking about the events in the picture. These topics were covered in the curriculum of English I, so all the students had received preparation to be able to talk about them. Speaking test materials were presented to two language education experts for validation. Necessary corrections were made in line with the opinions of field experts. The same speaking test was applied to the same students as a post-test after eight weeks of instruction.

Speaking Test Assessment Criterion

Observational and structured approaches use a variety of rating systems for the assessment of speaking skills. However a speaking test assessment criterion (602 Oral Proficiency/Second Language Acquisition, 2014) that presents more detailed data on the speaking performance of learners was utilized in this study. This criterion has five sections: comprehension, communication, fluency, structure and vocabulary, which are all important elements of speaking.

A pilot study was carried out in order to test the effectiveness of speaking test assessment criterion and speaking test materials. Six students; two students from a high level of academic success, two students from a medium level and two students from a low level of academic success, who were not included in this research but who were in one of the other classes of the researcher, were given a speaking test. Each student was given one of the speaking test materials. In the pilot study, one of the researchers as well as another English instructor took place as evaluators. It was seen that the evaluators' grades were consistent with each other and speaking test questions were understood by the students. Moreover, two evaluators also took place during the implementation of the speaking test, and their grades were averaged. Students' voices were also recorded for reference if necessary during the speaking test.

Data Analysis

After having obtained the pretest-post test scores of the experimental and control groups, the data were evaluated and comparisons were made between the experimental and control groups. According to Pallant (2005), when the sample size is less than 30, non-parametric tests are used, and when the sample size is more than 30, parametric tests are required to be used in order to make comparisons between the groups. Therefore, a "Paired samples t-test" was used in order to compare the achievement pre-test and post-test mean scores within the experimental and control groups (sample>30) and an "Independent samples t-test" was used for the comparison of achievement pre-test and post-test results between the experimental and control groups (sample>30).

For the speaking test, a "Wilcoxon signed ranks test" was used to compare between speaking pre-test and post-test mean scores within the experimental and control groups.

rol groups (sample<30). Additionally, a “Mann Whitney U test” was used in order to compare the speaking pre-test and post-test results between the experimental and control groups (sample<30).

3. Results

In this section, data analysis of the results and findings related to the four research questions are provided.

Results of the Achievement Test

Post-test Results Between Experimental and Control Group

Table 2. Independent Samples t-test Results Regarding Achievement Post-test Scores of Experimental and Control Group

Achievement Test	N	Mean (X)	Standard Deviation (S)	Df	t	Significance (p)
Non-NEST	35	70,48	14,93	68	3,847	,000
NEST	35	57,02	14,32			

As shown in Table 2, the post-test mean score of students in the control group is $X=70,48$ and the post-test mean score of students in the experimental group is $X=57,02$. In order to compare the experimental and the control group, an independent samples t-test was used. The result of this research showed a statistically significant higher English proficiency for the student group that was taught by the non-NEST. According to these results, the academic achievement of students in the non-native English speaking teacher’s group increased more than those in the native English speaking teacher’s group. This situation may result from teachers’ relative levels of experience, their teaching styles or the non-NEST may have spoken Turkish and given explanations in the students’ mother tongue.

Pretest-Posttest Results Within Experimental and Control Group

Table 3. Paired Samples t-test Results Regarding Achievement Pretest-Posttest Scores of the Experimental Group and Control Group

	N	Mean (X)	Standard Deviation (S)	Df	t	Significance (p)
Pre-test						
Post-test of	35	62,28	10,82	34	2,001	,053
Experimental Group	35	57,02	14,32			

	N	Mean (X)	Standard Deviation (S)	Df	t	Significance (p)
Pre-test						
Post-test of	35	64	14,48			,0000
Control	35	70,48	14,93	34	-4,49	p<0,05
Group						

Data in Table 3 show that the pre-test mean score of the NEST's students is $X=62,28$ and the post-test mean score of the NEST's students is $X=57,02$. This situation shows a negative difference for the post-test. This result indicated that the average score of students became lower in the post-test. Since the sample size is more than thirty students, paired samples t-test, which is a parametric test, was used in order to determine whether the difference is statistically significant. Table 3 shows that the value ($p>.05$) displayed no statistically significant difference. In other words, the achievement of the NEST's students lowered but this does not indicate a significant difference.

It is also seen from Table 3 that the pre-test mean score of the non-NEST's students is $X=64$ and the post-test mean score of the NEST's students is $X=70,48$. In contrast to the experimental group, this result showed a positive difference for the post-test. Also, a paired samples t-test results ($p<.05$) showed statistically significant difference. Thus, it can be said that the academic achievement of students increased significantly.

Results of the Speaking Test

Pretest-Posttest Results Between Experimental and Control Group

Table 4. Mann Whitney U Test Results Regarding Speaking Post-test Scores of Experimental and Control Group

Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Z	p
Non-NEST	12	14,79	177,50		,110
NEST	12	10,21	122,50	-1,600	($p>.05$)

When the post-test results of the speaking test are analyzed from Table 3, it is seen that there is no statistically significant difference between the NEST and non-NEST students. Thus, it can be said that the speaking achievement of students did not differ significantly.

Pretest-Posttest Results Within Experimental and Control Group

Table 5. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Results Regarding Speaking Pretest-Post-test Scores of the Experimental and Control Group

Posttest-Pretest	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Z	p
Negative ranks					
Positive ranks	3				,074
Ties in	8	4,33	13,00	-1,78	(p>.05)
Experimental Group	1	6,63	53,00		
Negative ranks					
Positive ranks	1	2,00	2,00		,004
Ties in	11	6,91	76,00	-2,913	(p<.05)
Control Group	0				

As revealed by the Wilcoxon signed ranks test, the speaking post-test mean score of the NEST's students is lower than the pre-test score; however, this result showed no statistically significant difference.

The speaking post-test mean score of the non-NEST's students is higher than the pre-test mean score. The result of this research also showed a statistically significant higher speaking proficiency for the post-test. In other words, the speaking achievement of the non-NEST's students increased significantly.

This result is consistent with the results of the achievement test. The post-test results of both the achievement and speaking test showed a statistically significant difference for the student group that was taught by the non-NEST.

4. Conclusion, Discussion and Recommendations

In Turkey and many other countries, an increasing number of NESTs are employed with the promise of more effective language teaching. NESTs and non-NESTs naturally have some strengths and weaknesses. In the literature, NESTs are assumed to be superior in terms of speaking skills (Celik, 2006; Ma, 2012; Medgyes, 1992). Nevertheless, Celik (2006) asserts that nativeness does not bring the ability to teach, and non-NESTs can be effective in teaching speaking. Hence, in this research, the effects of NESTs and non-NESTs on learners' academic achievement and specifically on speaking skills have been investigated.

According to achievement test scores, a statistically significant higher English proficiency was observed both in the post-test of the non-NEST's group and within the non-NEST's students' scores. For the speaking test scores, while no statistically significant difference was found between groups, a statistically significant difference was found within the non-NEST's students' scores. In both the achievement and speaking tests, a statistically significant higher score was found in the post-tests.

This data is valuable in terms of showing the reliability of these measurement tools.

In the present research, three years' experience of the NEST and five years' experience of the non-NEST and type of the faculty the teachers graduated from could account for the differences in students' achievement levels. Because of the differences, the NEST may not have been as effective as it is expected.

Experience and qualifications of a teacher are what make a teacher successful. Though NESTs have a lot of strengths, their experience and qualifications should also be taken into consideration. This is in line with other studies conducted by Al-Omrani (2008) and Ferguson (2005). In these studies, it is stressed that both group of teachers have strengths and weaknesses. However, it was found in these studies that qualifications and experience are distinctive factors for being a successful language teacher regardless of teachers' mother tongue. Ferguson (2005) also suggests that both groups of teachers may work in the same class collaboratively so programs where NEST and non-NESTs work cooperatively and those where such cooperation is absent may be compared as further research. These kinds of programs may be found in intensive preparatory language programs of private universities where a lot of NESTs work.

Unlike the findings of the research conducted by Torres (2004) who found that students prefer NESTs more than non-NESTs, the present research suggests that teachers' awareness of different teaching methods and techniques and interactive communicative activities that reinforce students' communicative skills are also important rather than their mother tongue. Thus, teaching methods and techniques used by NESTs and non-NESTs may be investigated more in detail in order to unearth what kind of methods and techniques are used by both groups of teachers.

This research is significant in light of the many uninformed perceptions people have about the relative advantages of NESTs and non-NESTs. Additionally, this research proposes that the assumption, 'the ideal teacher of English is a native speaker' is not accurate. The findings obtained from this study are consistent with what Chang (2011) and Celik (2006) assert in their studies. As Chang (2011) emphasises, having a good command of language and being able to speak the language fluently do not guarantee effective language learning. Celik (2006) states that it is illogical to employ NESTs just because they are native speakers, and that there might be some non-NESTs who are more proficient in the language and can teach effectively. In addition, the findings are consistent with what Koksal (2006) found in his study. In this study, Koksal (2006) investigates how NESTs and non-NESTs are perceived by their students in respect of both groups of teachers' performance and competencies and concludes that non-NESTs are more effective in language teaching than NESTs if they have deep professional knowledge and experience.

The current research is limited to first year students studying at a Turkish uni-

versity with no intensive preparatory language program so this research may be replicated within other cultural and linguistic contexts and in different educational levels. The research is also limited to speaking skills. As a further research, NEST and non-NESTs' effects on students' other skills (writing, listening, reading) may be investigated. Furthermore, in the present research there were eight weeks between speaking pre and posttest. Studies within a longitudinal framework of research may be conducted by increasing the duration between speaking pre-test and post-test.

6. References

- Adiguzel, O. & Ozudogru, F. (2013). Ortak zorunlu dersler kapsamındaki yabancı dil I dersi için geçerliliği ve güvenilirliği sağlanmış bir akademik başarı testi geliştirme çalışması. *Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3 (2), 1-11.
- Ahmed, F. (2004). *ESL/EFL students' attitudes to native and nonnative speaker teachers of English in two university settings*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. York University, United Kingdom.
- Al-Omrani, A.H. (2008). *Perceptions and attitudes of saudi ESL and EFL students toward native and nonnative English speaking teachers*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Indiana University, USA.
- Akpınar, C. (1996). *A comparison between native-speaker teachers and non-native speaker teachers in their attitudes to feedback on writing*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Buyukozturk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö.E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2013). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- CEFR (The Common European Framework Of Reference For Languages) (2001). USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Chang, S. C. (2011). A contrastive study of grammar translation method and communicative approach in teaching English grammar. *English Language Teaching*, 4 (2), 13-24.
- Chang, T. S. (2011). *Whose voices? Perceptions concerning native English speaking and non-native English speaking tutors in the writing center*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Southern Illinois University, USA.
- Celik, S. (2006). A concise examination of the artificial battle between native and non-native speaker teachers of English in Turkey. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 14 (2), 371-376.
- Evin-Gencel, İ. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının yaşam boyu öğrenme yeterliklerine yönelik algıları. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 38 (170), 237-252.
- Ezberci, E. (2005). *Native English speaking teachers and non-native English speaking teachers in İstanbul: A perception analysis*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Ferguson, A. (2005). *Student beliefs about their foreign language instructors: A look at the native-speaker/non-native speaker issue*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Arizona University, USA.

- Genc, A. (2012). Türk iş dünyasının yabancı dil talebi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 42, 175, 185.
- Gunday, R. (2007). Yabancı dil öğretiminde başarısızlığa neden olan etmenler üzerine bir araştırma. *Milli Eğitim Journal*, 175, 210-229.
- Gruszynski-Weiss, L. (2010). *Factors influencing oral corrective feedback provision in the Spanish foreign language classroom: Investigating instructor native/nonnative speaker status, SLA education, & teaching experience*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Georgetown University, USA.
- Isisag, K.U. &Demirel, Ö. (2010). Diller için Avrupa ortak başvuru metninin konuşma becerisinin gelişiminde kullanılması. *Journal of Education and Science*, 35 (156), 190-204.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2009). Globalization and English language policy at primary education in Turkey. *English as an International Language Journal*, 5, 176- 181.
- Koksal, K. (2006). *An investigation into students' perceptions of native English speaking teachers' (nest) and non-native English speaking teachers' (non-nest) performance and competencies in teaching English as a foreign language*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Canakkale.
- Littlewood, W. T. (1984). *Foreign and second language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ma, L.P.F. (2012). Strengths and weaknesses of NESTS and NNESTs: Perceptions of NNESTs in Hong Kong. *Linguistics and Education*, 23, 1-15.
- Mead, N.A. &Rubin, D.A. (1985). *Assessing listening and speaking skills*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills Urbana IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED263626)
- Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who is worth more?. *ELT Journal*, 46 (4), 340-349.
- MNE (Ministry of National Education) 2014. Vocational and Technical Education Strategy and Action Plan.http://mtegm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2014_08/13021358_mte_strateji_belgesi_eylem_plani_20142018.pdf. Accessed 11 January 2015.
- Moran, B.B. &Marchionini, G. (2012). Information professionals 2050: Educating the next generation of information professionals. In G. Marchionini & B. B. Moran (Eds.), *Information professionals 2050: Educational possibilities and pathways* (pp.iii-ix). <http://sils.unc.edu/sites/default/files/publications/Information-Professionals-2050.pdf> Accessed 12 January 2015.
- Nam, H.H. (2010). *The pedagogy and its effectiveness among native and non-native English speaking teachers in the Korean EFL context*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. New York State University, USA.
- Paker, T. (2006). Çal bölgesindeki okullarda İngilizce öğretiminin sorunları ve çözüm önerileri. Cal Symposium, Pamukkale University, Denizli.
- Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS survival manual*. Australia: Allen&Unwin.
- Tok, H. &Arıbas, S. (2008). Avrupa Birliğine uyum sürecinde yabancı dil öğretimi. İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 9 (15), 205-227.
- Toprak, M. &Erdoğan, A. (2012). Yaşamboyu öğrenme: Kavram, politika, araçlar ve uygulama. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 2 (2), 69-91.
- Torres, J.W. (2004). *Speaking up! Adult ESL students' perceptions of native and non-native English speaking teachers*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. North Texas University, USA.

Yanpar-Yelken, T. (2009). Türkiye, Almanya, Danimarka öğretmen yetiştirme programlarının standartlarının İngilizce öğretmen adayı görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi. *Educational Sciences: Theory&Practice*, 9 (4), 2047-2094.

602 Oral Proficiency/Second Language Acquisition, (2014). [Available online at: <http://www1.d303.org/Portals/0/assessment/pdf/SpeakingRubrics-CPS.pdf>], Retrieved on 16 February 2014.