



PERCEIVING THE BINARY: AN ATTITUDINAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL CURRICULA BY NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE ENGLISH TEACHERS

B. Warren OLIVER*
Enisa MEDE**

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to ascertain and describe the nature of the professional binary between Native English-speaking instructors (NESTs) and non-Native English-speaking instructors (non-NESTs) within the context of English educational programs in Turkey. Additionally, this research explores the relation between the expression of the NEST/non-NEST binary at a Turkish EFL program through the role of using Native Speaking Models (NSMs) as well as the principles of English as an International Language (EIL). Data was collected from 82 teachers and department heads from 9 foundation (non-profit, private) university-based English preparatory programs in Istanbul, Turkey, via two online surveys, implementing Likert-type-scale and open-ended questions to compare how institutions explain and instructors experience this professional dichotomy. Findings revealed that schools have interpreted EIL principles to varying degrees, resulting in a spectrum of their curriculum. Meanwhile, results from the Teacher Survey displayed that teachers, who strongly believe in EIL principles, play a major part in the curriculum design process for each program. These findings indicated that, although it appears that while EIL principles are becoming more popular amongst Turkish EFL Programs, the programs often neglect the personnel aspect of their curriculum design when applying EIL principles to their programs.

Keywords: Teacher Feelings, Curriculum Design, English As An International Language, Native Speaking Models, Turkish EFL Classroom.

1. Introduction:

Although academically considered problematic as an educational standard, the view of native English-speakers has been a global staple in English language educational programs (Medgyes, 2001, 429-430 and Llorca, 2014, 2-4). Cook (1999, 188-190) attributes this professional stability for *Native English-speaking Teachers of English* (NESTs) educational programs' reliance on *Native-Speaker Models* (NSMs), where students are taught to emulate native speakers while learning a language, as a theoretical basis for language education. However, with the rise of a globalized world and the idea of English as a Lingua Franca, English the number of non-native speakers is quickly out-pacing the supply of native English speakers. With these changes, the needs of English learners has shifted away from solely communication with native speakers and towards communication of all people – regardless of their cultural upbringing (Cook, 1999, 197-199; Warschauer, 2000, 511-513; McKay, 2003b, 1-4; Nault, 2006, 314; Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008, 361-362; Sifakis&Sougari, 2010, 59-62; Alsagoff et. al, 2012, 3-6; and Kumaravadivelu, 2012, 9).

This new pedagogical EFL paradigm, commonly referred to as *English as an International Language* (EIL) focuses more on the needs of the L2 speaker as a language user rather than evaluating L2 users by their ability to mimic a native speaker. This shift is intended alter the focus of L2 acquisition towards communication and away from an L2 comparison to native speakers, and, as McKay (2003b, 2-8) states, the makes the goal to de-nationalize EFL education in order to create a more attainable version of English for students. Similarly, Nunan (1991, 295), Flowerdew and Miller (1995, 362-365), and Kubota (1999, 26-31) advocate against *Communicative Teaching Method* (CLT) in ELT because of its reliance on NSM-based pedagogy (McKay, 2003b, 13-17); and Cook (1999, 197-203) as well as Kumaravadivelu (2012, 15-21) argue towards the local creation of educational material to prevent the reliance on Center-based Educational Systems.

Within the bounds of the EIL/NSM debate Turkey is interesting because, while the Republic of Turkey and its cultural predecessors were never colonies of an Anglophone state, English has been taught within Turkey since the 19th Century and has become especially popular since the 1980s (Bektaş-Çetinkaya, 2012, 156; Tomak and Kocabaş, 2013, 183-184). The goal of these programs was to encourage trade amongst

* Florida State University College of Education, International and Multicultural Education.

** Asst. Prof. Dr. Bahçeşehir University, School of Foreign Language Education.



Turkey (originally the Ottoman Empire) and the English-speaking world—not to impose Anglophone culture into a Turkish (or Ottoman) setting. With this simple, use-based, language goal, *Turkish English Educational Programs* (TEEPs), like many other programs in Kachru's (1985, 11-30; 2006, 243-246) "outer-circle" countries of English educational development, focused on a more lingua franca version of English. At the same time, since most of these English education programs pre-date most of the studies which formed the EIL movement, the late 1990s to early 2000s, the application of EIL principles has been less uniform than in other countries. Thus, although there have been efforts to promote EIL principles within TEEP curricula, such as Çelik's (2008, 164-169) and Jenkins (2002, 96-101)-based English Phonetics for Turkish EIL programs, there is an institutional and student bias towards NSMs as well as instructor ignorance to the application of EIL principles in classrooms tend to currently cement NSM-based pedagogical philosophy as the dominant mode used in language curriculum design. This study explored the role of the NESTs and non-NESTs within TEEP through the design of ELT curricula.

Following these themes, this study to explore the native/non-Native English-speaker binary in Turkish English education through the following research questions:

- 1) How do schools in Turkey professionally define the term, "native speaker"?
- 2) How do schools use this definition to formulate and maintain a professional binary between NESTs and non-NESTs within their respective programs?
- 3) How do NESTs and non-NESTs perceive their assigned educational roles?
- 4) How do contemporary Turkish EFL programs rely on NSMs or the principles of EIL as a philosophic/pedagogical foundation for program curriculum design?

2. Defining the Native/Non-Native English Binary and EIL in Turkey

With the growth of the number of non-native speakers of English globally, the idea of English being rooted to a single culture, or group of cultures, is being challenged (Cook, 1999, 197-199; Graddol, 1999, 62; McKay, 2003b: 1-4). Instead, many scholars argue that English is becoming a lingua franca and should be taught within this more global context. Thus, it would appear that English Educational Programs could currently be in the midst of a pedagogical paradigm shift from Native-Speaker-Model-based (NSM-based) ELT curricula to an English-as-an-International-Language-principled (EIL-principled) ones. This essentially shifts the focus of English education from core-based English, British and American English, towards a more a-national and international form of form of the language applied to a more local context. In Turkey, as Uygun (2013, 192-195), İnal and Özdemir (2015, 201-205), in addition to Sifakis and Bayyurt (2015, 8-10) find, belief in EIL is popular amongst younger teachers and beneficial to ELT when applied to classrooms.

Cook (1999, 197-199) notes a growth in non-native speakers of English language since the growth of globalization during late 20th Century, which has led to this pedagogical philosophical shift from NSM-based to EIL-principled curricula. Although appealing to common sense, key concepts underlying this new movement were not initially well-defined. Instead, early pushes towards formulating a particular teaching method for EIL instruction, Nunan (1991: 295), Flowerdew and Miller (1995, 362-365), and Kubota (1999, 26-31) warn against the popularly acclaimed *Communicative Teaching Method* (CLT) in ELT because of its reliance on NSM-based pedagogy (McKay, 2003b, 18-19). For this reason, many EIL proponents, such as McKay, argue that the growth of EIL, through globalization, necessitates a new pedagogical philosophy based off of the following four assumptions of English use:

- 1) Pedagogies must respect the diverse ways in which bilingual speak English to fulfill their specific purposes.
- 2) Many bilingual English speakers do not want or need to be able to speak native-like English
- 3) No particular form or dialect of English should be preferred or privileged over any other.
- 4) English no longer belongs to a particular culture, hence there is a need for cultural sensitivity, with regard to the diversity of contexts in which English is taught and used.

These assumptions, referred to as *EIL principles* within this piece, push for linguistic goals to be de-coupled from particular native cultural trappings. Further, this will push each curriculum-stated language goal to be rooted in the particular application for a bilingual speaker instead of the imitation of a native-speaker.

In addition to the growth of non-native English speakers due to globalization, the lack of a concrete professional definition as to what constitutes a "native speaker" further complicates attitudes towards NSM-based curricula and the perceived needs for EIL-principles. Within the academic bounds of the study of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), a "native English speaker" simply is a person whose first language (L1) is English (İpek, 2009, 155-158). However, there have been no conclusive studies on the existence of a truly



universal and practical version of English. Likewise, because natives are defined by the geography of their birth—not where they have lived—a native English-speaking individual may have grown up in a foreign culture, devoid of any cultural references to their “native” culture in their language. In response to this issue, Medgyes (2001, 430-431) argued that researchers into this topic have taken one of two routes: (a) they have regionally sectioned off various English-speaking countries into relative spheres of English use, implying some nationalities as “more native” than others (as witnessed in Kachru’s (1985, 11-30; 2006, 243-246) 3-Circle Model), or (b) declare the idea of a native speaker incomplete measure of linguistic skill (Paikeday, 1985, 95-96 and Lee, 2005, 159-161). In both instances, these responses by researchers respond to the issue of nationality by blurring the definition of a native speaker even more. As a result, as Medgyes explains, linguists have drastically downplayed the Native/non-Native binary within academic circles.

Nonetheless, within a professional context, the concept of a native speaker, as well as the related concept of native acquisition, has led to a binaried view of language instructors: native speakers and non-natives (Canagarajah, 1999, 78-88; Medgyes, 2001, 432-433; Kramsch & Zhang, 2015, 88-89). Selvi (2010, 155-156) illustrates this point by finding that 60.5% of EFL jobs posted on a prominent international online EFL job boards, and the majority of postings on other boards, require an applicant to be “native speaker”, defined as a native English speaker holding core-country citizenship, to be considered for their job. Thus, although the view of native language acquisition is no longer an academically popular model because of its clear lack of a clear definition of a native speaker in relation to culture, the resulting biases created towards native speaking teachers as “experts” within their field has cemented this binary globally as a part of the professional landscape of many EFL programs.

By acknowledging the limitations of the segregated nature of professional life for native and non-native English-speaking English teachers, the pedagogical shift from NSM-based to EIL-principled EFL curricula also calls into question the nature of the professional binary between these two classes of instructor. Nonetheless, Medgyes (2001, 432-433) and McKay (2003b, 8-13) explain that despite the lack of academic support, the prominence of this professional binary in ELT, along with lack of clear descriptions for programs to implement EIL goals, makes it very difficult to remove from curricula. These issues then make many programs resistant to shift away from NSM-based curricula in favour of EIL principled ones.

From this perspective, it becomes obvious that the implementation of EIL has been mixed with regards to curriculum design. However, as applied to Turkey, where English has traditionally been a *Lingua Franca*, this dynamic becomes especially interesting to see exactly how programs apply these principles (Atay, 2005: 223-226). Further noting the central role of the professional Native/non-Native binary within NSM-based pedagogy and its relative non-role within EIL-principled curricula, it becomes even more interesting to note how exactly these programs allocate duties to their instructors based on their roles as either a native or non-native English-speaker.

Uygun (2013, 192-195), İnal and Özdemir (2015, 201-205), as well as Sifakis and Bayyurt (2015, 8-10) find, the belief in EIL is popular amongst younger teachers and beneficial to ELT when applied to classrooms, also implying a Turkish pedagogical paradigm shift away from NSM-based ELT curricula. However, mostly because of the ingrained preference of NSM-based curricula and EIL’s lack of clearly defined curricula, most TEEP’s still prefer NSMs on an institutional level. Following these ideas, the goal of this particular study was to ascertain where in this paradigm shift TEEP’s currently exist are through exploring the native/non-Native Teacher binary within university-based English Language Preparatory Programs in Istanbul.

3. Methodology:

Following the ideas presented in Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004), this study relied on a mixed methodology to describe the roles of NESTs and non-NESTs in TEEP curriculum design in order to explore the role NSMs and EIL principles play within those programs. Qualitative research design played a role in the perception of NSM and EIL pedagogical philosophies within the context of teacher professional experience and the design of TEEP curricula. Meanwhile quantitative methods served predominately to connect these philosophical concepts to the experience of NESTs and non-NESTs and the development of curricula within these programs. Thus, the methodology, influenced by McKay (2003a, 142-146), was designed to not only describe how these programs utilize NSMs and EIL principles through the Native/non-Native professional binary, but also reflect how teachers view this curricular concept.



3.1 Participants/Setting

This was a multi-case study, involving multiple university English-language preparatory programs at foundation schools in Istanbul and revolving around the similarities between each particular program. This allowed for one curriculum review per school with teacher surveys to address the role of NESTs and non-NESTs within the institution. Overall, this resulted in a study using nine schools and eighty-two English Teacher respondents, working at English preparatory programs for private, Turkish *vakıf* (non-profit foundation funded) Universities in Istanbul, Turkey.

The majority of these nine participatory English preparative were founded between the years 1990-2000. Only two of the participating programs have reported student populations greater than 2000 students. As far as the staff, there is a large variance of how many NESTs and non-NESTs are hired into their programs, but removing Universities A and E, who hired approximately 1 NEST: 1 non-NEST, the remaining reporting universities have a mean teacher ratio of 12 NESTs: 67 non-NESTs.

Participating teachers were certified English teachers, working at one of the participating university English preparatory programs during the 2016-2017 school year. Ultimately this sample, gathered via voluntary convenience sampling yielded 82 participants, 26 NEST and 56 non-NESTs. On average, the majority of the teachers involved in this study were women, aged 26-35, and held a Master's Degree. These teachers generally have six to ten years of experience teaching English and work at an institution which provided some sort of in-service teacher education.

3.2 Data Collection Instruments

To properly analyse the roles of NESTs and non-NESTs in English language preparatory schools for private universities in Istanbul, data was collected through two original online surveys, heavily influenced by educational dynamics and research design presented in McKay (2003a, 142-146) as well as the problems with the Turkish professional definition of Native speakers, witnessed in Bayyurt's (2006, 233-234) discussion of Seidlhofer (2001, 133-152) and McKay (2003b, 18-19), and analysed with SPSS and Qualtrics software. However, unlike McKay's approach, this project combined teacher-submitted surveys with a review of the schools' curricula to compare teacher attitudes with school policy.

Initially, the subject curricula for English education needed to be analysed. This process involved the member of the teaching staff who, is responsible for the TEEP curriculum design at the program, to fill out a three-part survey. After questions on demographics, this survey involved a hard copy of the curriculum being reviewed with each school, noting variations in class types, sizes, student levels, and textbook types before a section of open-ended questions to establish the school's official position towards NSMs, EIL, and the NEST/non-NEST binary. Together, these two types of data established the program baseline.

The hard analysis of the English curriculum should show if there are any irregularities between NESTs and non-NESTs, as witnessed by the official curriculum of the school. While original in its composition, this portion of the research borrows from the various elements of EFL curriculum analysis towards NSMs and EIL from Cook (1999, 197-203): *differences in class types and the types of textbooks*. In addition, this analysis also takes into account differences in *the amount of classes taught by teachers, the average sizes of each class, the recommended assignment styles/extra materials for the classes, as well as required in-service education instructors*. Further, this data was split between NESTs and non-NESTs in order to witness any differences between NEST and non-NEST experiences at the school. In short, major differences between these experiences, as a whole, would imply if the school ultimately treats NESTs differently from non-NESTs.

This data was complimented by open-ended survey questions to ask about particular aspects of teachers' official roles in working at that particular institution. The questions were based on ideas from similar studies but are designed to expand upon the quantitative data found in the hard analysis: questions 1 and 2 are a direct adaption from McKay (2003a, 143) to determine an official stance of how the school views *the role of NESTs and non-NESTs*; questions 3 and 4 follow Cook's (1999, 199-200) explanation about *the role of textbooks in EFL education*; and questions 6 and 7 come from *the problems created by Kachru's (1985, 11-30) definition of native speakers in a professional application*, presented by Bayyurt (2006, 235). These questions are then aided by question 5, which is original to the study and expanded upon *how/if the school uses similar in-service teacher education for NESTs and non-NESTs*. This additional question pushes the idea that if these classes of teachers are indeed different, the schools would want to specialize their training to fit these roles.

It is important to note that the textbooks, like class type, will be noted on three levels: *the allocation of the types of texts, the role of culture, and teacher's ability to augment texts*. The most important of these distinctions is the role culture plays (Cook, 1999, 197-203). The key portion of NSMs are their prominent use



of native speakers as a model for language. Meanwhile, EIL-based curricula conform to the language needs of their students and, while there may be native speakers used in examples, will utilize high-functioning/native-like second language users. Therefore, curricula that solely relies on native cultural backdrop, uses only native speakers in examples, or uses predominantly original texts would imply a tendency towards NSMs than an EIL-based curriculum. However, the other two research distinctions would control for the use of teachers, such as certain classes of teachers teaching particular types of text books or teachers fitting their lessons into a more local (Turkish) cultural setting.

The goal of this portion of the project was to directly ascertain the role of NESTs and non-NESTs as well as the reliance on NSMs versus EIL-based curricula in Turkish university English preparatory programs through a hard analysis of the English language curriculum and interviews with the Department Heads for these programs. This will create the foundational research for this project, and, by comparing results across programs, should also create an ideal for the school in which to test the reality of teacher roles. In this way, the results established if these ideals are isolated to a few schools or widely practiced in Istanbul.

Similar to their host-institutions, participating teachers filled out a survey concerning their experiences with the Native/non-Native binary. The first fifteen questions concerned demographics, illustrating any clear demographical differences between NESTs and non-NESTs, noting in particular whether or not teachers speak multiple language because some definitions of native speakers limit it to monolingual speakers (Cook, 1999, 188-191). Therefore, like questions 6 and 7 in the Department Head interviews, this question establishes a professional definition for NESTs, and will determine whether the schools actually use Kachru's definition.

The following section concerned how teachers felt about their work environment. Questions 18, 19, 23, and 24 all are original questions concerning how the teachers feel towards *the efficacy to work as a team with their co-workers* as well as their *program's willingness to communicate with teachers*. Questions 20-22 are adapted from McKay (2003) and concern *workplace discrimination*, with concern to the NEST/non-NEST binary. In this way, this will establish the relationship between the teachers and their respective programs. Each of these questions will be graded using a five-point Likert scale from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. Then the numerical component of the answers can be averaged, using SPSS, across each group of teachers and statistically analysed with a two tailed t-test to determine if there is a difference between the two groups as far as satisfaction towards their roles in Turkish English language education programs.

Lastly, teachers answered open-ended questions about their views on their roles as English teachers in Turkey. Many of the questions parallel the themes and questions from the School Profile Survey. However, a key difference between the responses from the department heads and these open-ended answers from teachers will be a short *needs-based analysis towards the roles of NESTs and non-NESTs* in their institution (Question 6). The purpose of this addition is to give teachers the chance to voice their opinions about the NEST/non-NEST binary. Ultimately, this will directly evidence if the instructors and institutions are on the same page, with regards towards NSMs and EIL-based curricula. After submission, this data will be pattern coded to look for similarities between institutions.

3.3 Data Analysis Procedures

To analyse data from the School and Teacher surveys, each teacher response will be divided into the NEST and non-NEST groups, and their data will be combined into a single aggregate NEST and non-NEST teacher profile; meanwhile, the pattern-coded answers for all the institutions were combined to create an "aggregate institution profile". The NEST and non-NEST groups' answers to the numerical answers to the Likert Scale survey will be analysed, using SPSS statistical software, to determine if they are significantly different from each other at a 95% confidence level ($p > .95$), and the open-ended survey answers from the each of the responses pattern-coded to also look for major differences between NESTs and non-NEST groups. If there was no significant difference between the groups and similar qualitative results found from the focus group, then the SPSS-derived data will be combined as a single group and combined and compared with the results of the Aggregate Institution. However, if there was significant difference between the groups or differences with the qualitative analysis, each of the aggregate groups will be individually compared with the aggregate institution.

The complex data analysis procedure employed in this study, was to be able to corroborate findings about the professional native/non-Native binaries employed by the nine participating programs in this study across each level of analysis: *teacher-perceived* and *institutionally-defined* descriptions of NESTs and non-NESTs. In this way, the dual survey structure of the data collection allowed for triangulated findings, as described in Eisner (1998), to illustrate the professional binary between NESTs and non-NEST as well as



qualify these descriptions with the feelings of teachers towards their experiences. Thus, each of the elements of data collection, both qualitative and quantitative were analytically intertwined to give a comprehensive description of this professional EFL dichotomy.

4. Findings

Overall, the curricula were found to be a synthesis between NSM-based and EIL-principled curricula, resulting in a weak NEST/non-NEST professional binary, and mostly defined through assigning higher levels to NESTs and lower levels to non-NESTs, within these programs. While teachers mostly had positive feelings towards their respective programs' use of NESTs and non-NESTs, there was an apparent and statistically significant difference between the attitudes of NESTs and non-NESTs towards these policies.

4.1 How TEEPs develop the Native/non-Native Binary

Overall, the adaption of Turkish EFL curricula to fit the principles of EIL teaching has been mixed. Working from the School Profile Survey, while most participant schools acknowledged that English should be taught within an international context, the interpretation of those principles are often different with regard to the distribution of work between NESTs and non-NESTs as well as the professional definition of a native speaker. Most NESTs were relegated to working with higher level students, leaving the Turkish-speaking non-NESTs to teach students who are less apt to respond to lessons taught exclusively in English. Similarly, schools that strongly favoured NSM-based curriculum were also more likely to give distinct teaching roles through class distribution. With this in mind, while most schools report themselves as not distinguishing between NESTs and non-NESTs, there is a definite difference between how most of these schools use NESTs and non-NESTs within the bounds of the programs.

4.1.2 Role of NSMs vs. EIL Principles

Of all of the answers given in the open response section of the School Profile Survey, the only truly universal answer was the rejection of the use of NSMs as a basis for cultural content in their programs. Instead, when asked "is there a particular preference for cultural content for the English courses at the university – Turkish, Core, or international culture?", all of the participating programs simply answered in the negative without explanation and, with the exception of one program, give teachers the freedom to modify their materials, after seeking approval from a program-based committee, as they see necessary. This de-emphasis of any cultural context and allowance of monitored material modification imply an attempt at rejection of NSMs and their inherent reliance on core-centric cultural contexts.

However, as Cook (1999: 197-203) described, *the role of culture in material development* is only a single component of EIL. After pattern coding the School Profile Survey's open-ended answers for the five major differences between NSM-based and EIL-principled Programs, Table 1 was formatted to display the findings. Looking at this table, it becomes obvious that there is not a uniform application of EIL principles within the participating TEEPs. There was only *one* participating university which openly used an NSM-based curriculum. Nonetheless, it would seem that the participating English language preparatory programs are attempting to apply EIL principles to their curricula.

Table 1. Mentions of NSMs and EIL Principles in Program Survey.

Program	Core-Based Nationalistic Definition of NEST	View of NESTs as Proper Models of Language	Distinct uses designed for NESTs and non-NESTs	Heavy Reliance on Pre-Designed Material	Focus on Core-Versions of Language	Total
A	1	0	1	1	0	3
B	1	0	1	1	0	3
C	2	1	1	1	0	5
D	0	2	2	2	0	6
E	0	0	0	0	0	0
F	1	0	0	0	0	1
G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
H	0	0	0	1	0	1
I	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Note: 0: No Account, 1: UnofficialAccount, 2: OfficialUse, N/A: Not Applicable.

4.1.2 Programs' use of NESTs and non-NESTs



Similar to the results of cultural context for materials, 7/9 of participating schools reported no major official professional difference between NESTs and non-NESTs. This is supported through the hard analysis of curriculum, where equal treatment, in so far as the allocation of classes, types of classes, assigned materials, size of classes, and in-service teacher education. In this way, NESTs and non-NESTs are treated as theoretical equals in the vast majority of the participating Turkish EFL programs. However, many schools are quick to report this egalitarian planning for the use of NESTs and non-NESTs as an ideal, which is normally not realized. Reasons for this lack of balance tend to correspond with both teacher preference as well as the schools overall pedagogical philosophy.

Schools note that when given the chance and/or accounting for teacher experience, teachers tend to choose their own binaries. The binary described in these particular situations tends to describe a level-based binary, where non-NESTs tend to teach lower levels and NESTs are reserved for the higher levels. The remaining two programs cited two major reasons for this level-based binary: *teacher familiarity with L1* and *emphasizing speaking with NEST instruction for more advanced learners*.

However, these two types of reasoning seem rooted in two types of educational philosophy. *Teacher familiarity with L1* is a pragmatic use of NESTs to fit into an EIL scheme. By contrast, by making NESTs central to the higher levels, as suggested by *emphasizing speaking with NEST instruction for more advanced learners*, it implies the use of NSMs for the basis of higher levels. Therefore, these singular policies can be representative of both NSM-based and EIL-principled curricula.

Another major binary noted between in this study, and a hallmark of NSM-based curricula, is the concrete definition of NESTs and non-NESTs. A near perfect example of these professional designation is from University D, who described that, because of their familiarity with English, Natives are designated as "skills teachers" and exam editors. Meanwhile the non-NESTs are relegated to teaching grammar classes.

Thus, NESTs and non-NESTs appear to be professionally split along the lines of which classes they ultimately teach because of the ability of non-NESTs to use the L1. Otherwise, there appears to be a strong attempt to use NESTs and non-NESTs equally. Like with material development, with the exception of Universities C and D, this appears to be a way for these participating schools to shift away from NSM-based classes and promote the use of EIL principles within their programs.

4.1.3 Programs' definitions of NEST

From the three programs which did supply professional definitions for NESTs, and, while they both use a core-based definition of NEST, each program defines the proximity to core-culture through three different calibres: *geography of place of birth*, *exposure to core-culture*, and *professional certification*. University C used the more traditional definition of NESTs, defined by the geography of a speaker's birth. This definition, which closely fits the traditional definition of a native speaker, pushes the major profile for NSM-based curricula: NESTs as being defined by their core-citizenship.

By contrast, University A prefers to define NESTs by their exposure to core-culture. Under this definition, the language level and exposure to core-culture is more important to University A than the geography of their teachers' birth. While it is more of a hybrid between NSM-based and EIL-principled professional definitions for NESTs and non-NESTs, this is a more inclusive definition than University C's NSM-based definition and allows for more diversity, nationality-speaking, within University A's teaching staff. Lastly, University H defines their native/non-native binary, which they prefer to explain as "international teachers" instead of NESTs, not by any connection to core culture, but instead, used the professional certifications of the teachers to determine their professional roles in their programs. The apparent goal of this definition is to completely remove the cultural aspect of English teaching from any particular professional binary.

Nevertheless, 4/9 of participant programs stated that they did not have a professional definition for a NEST. However, 4/9 of participating programs also would not consider a multi-national NEST, with citizenship with a core and a non-core country, as a "native speaker". Therefore, despite the lack of an official professional definition to be used in most of the participating programs, the concept of a NEST is centred on a singular and core-based identity. In this way, these programs would be more likely to use University C's more traditional definition of NESTs.

4.2 Generalized Teacher Reactions

Participating teachers within these TEEP's filled out the Teacher Survey, and the data collected from these particular surveys were collected and analysed to determine the overall feelings of teachers towards their respective programs as well as their experiences with the native/non-native professional binary. While, most respondent teachers had positive feelings towards their experiences within their universities and most



experienced some sort of binary between NESTs and non-NESTs, results displayed an experiential difference between the NESTs and non-NESTs with regards to their experience with their institutions and curricula.

4.2.1 Teachers' Feelings

When looking at the overall attitudes of NESTs and their respective English preparatory program, the numerical representations of answers to the Likert scale portion of the Teacher Survey were analysed and displayed on Table 2. Looking at this data, it becomes obvious that the teacher respondents have positive views towards their professional experiences within their respective programs. However, there are significant differences between NESTs and non-NESTs with responses regarding teacher communication with institution, where NESTs felt their educational role less likely to reflected their "professional potential" ($t(71)=4.67$, $p<.05$, $d=1.23$) as well as less likely to report that their institution effectively defined their position ($t(71)=2.46$, $p<.05$, $d=0.58$), and workplace discrimination, where NESTs reported that they felt marginally less likely for their students to understand their job as a teacher ($t(71)=1.94$, $p<.05$, $d=0.48$) as well as having less faith in their co-workers' qualifications ($t(71)=-3.02$, $p<.05$, $d=0.74$). When taking into account these significant statistical differences, it appears that NESTs feel more issues with communication with their institution. Meanwhile, non-NESTs mostly have issues stemming from student's respect for their position and confidence in their co-workers qualifications. Nevertheless, most NESTs and non-NEST pairings seem to feel strongly that they function well as a team.

Table 2. Means of Teacher Attitudes towards their Respective Programs.

	Teacher Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
As a whole, I feel that my job, as a teacher, reflects my professional potential, as a teacher.	Non-NEST	49	4.18	.527	.075
	NEST	24	3.04	1.197	.244
I feel that my job, as a teacher, has been well defined by my employer.	Non-NEST	49	4.29	.707	.101
	NEST	24	3.79	.977	.199
I feel that my job, as a teacher, has been well understood by my students.	Non-NEST	49	3.90	.895	.128
	NEST	24	3.46	.932	.190
My co-workers never question my abilities as an English Language instructor.	Non-NEST	48	4.02	.758	.109
	NEST	24	4.04	1.042	.213
I feel my co-workers, both native English-speaking and non-Native English-speaking, are wholly qualified to work as English teachers.	Non-NEST	49	3.24	1.011	.144
	NEST	24	3.92	.830	.169
I have never run into problems communicating with my co-workers.	Non-NEST	48	3.29	1.288	.186
	NEST	24	3.42	1.139	.232
My co-workers and I have an excellent team dynamic. Each teacher understands what role they play in the students' education.	Non-NEST	49	3.51	.938	.134
	NEST	24	3.38	1.056	.215

Statistically-speaking, there was no significant difference between how NESTs and non-NESTs felt working alongside their current co-workers. Of the three statements concerning *workplace discrimination*, the only one to have no significant statistical difference was "my co-workers never question my abilities as an English Language instructor." In both cases, NESTs and non-NESTs answered that they agree (a numerical score of 4) with the statement. Similarly, both groups of teachers responded with indifference, a relative numerical score of 3-4, to the two statements concerning the *efficacy of teamwork* pointed specifically at teamwork with their co-workers. In this way, while there may be issues between NESTs and non-NESTs, these issues feel no more out of place than any traditional intradepartmental problems, nor do these teachers



feel strongly that their teamwork is particularly out of the ordinary. With this in mind, it becomes apparent that as far as performing as teachers, both NESTs and non-NESTs feel that they are more or less professional equals.

Interestingly, while both NESTs and non-NESTs perceive each other as equals, non-NESTs appear to be more critical of their co-workers' qualifications than NESTs. This variance is witnessed by statistically significant difference to the answers to Question 21, concerning teachers' generalized feelings towards the qualifications of their co-workers, where NESTs were more likely to report confidence in their co-workers' qualifications as teachers. However, when contrasted with some of the open-ended answers to Question 23, who described the professional difference between NESTs and non-NESTs as NESTs being "less efficient teachers", it becomes apparent that many of these biases are concerning NESTs.

Similarly, 4/54 respondents stated that NESTs were given some sort of special treatment, mostly reported as NESTs being better paid than non-NESTs. In contrast, the only pattern coded response groupings that involved non-NESTs were *Non-NESTs are better Grammar Teachers*, *Non-NESTs can speak to Students in L1*, *non-NESTs do more Administrative Work*. Without a corresponding negatively defined group for non-NESTs, the implication is that NESTs are perceived to be unqualified, or at least unmotivated, as teachers while non-NESTs as underpaid and overworked.

With regards to NESTs, the particular perception split comes with regards to communication with the institution and students. NESTs were less likely to respond positively to the idea that their current position met their actual professional potential and less inclined to feel that their professional role as a native speaker was effectively communicated to them. NESTs were also marginally less likely to report that their students understood their particular role within the larger educational scheme of the EFL program than non-NESTs. Thus, NESTs appear to have more issues with understanding their particular role within the larger educational system than non-NESTs.

Combining all of these findings, it becomes obvious that there is an apparent difference between NESTs and non-NESTs with regards to their generally positive feelings about their respective programs. For the most part, NESTs' reported that they are less likely to feel that their roles are effectively communicated to them by their institution and are understood by their students. Meanwhile non-NESTs are generally more sceptical of their co-workers in terms of their co-workers' qualifications as English teachers.

4.2.2 Teachers' explanation of the Native/non-Native Binary

Following along the appearance to be a difference, between NESTs and non-NESTs, in how teachers feel about their roles within the curriculum, most teacher respondents stated that there appears that there is some sort of professional binary between NESTs and non-NESTs built into their respective programs. Although the majority of teachers report that this binary is implied more than explicitly stated by the programs and the majority of these teachers feel that English should be taught within an international context, they do feel that these roles are fair and representative with regards to NESTs and non-NESTs.

Interestingly 21 respondent teachers stated that there was no noticeable difference between NESTs and non-NESTs within their programs. Of the 28 respondent teachers that did note a noticeable difference, can be grouped into the following groups: *Definition-Binary* and *Professional Differences*. These groups can be broken down and displayed on Table 3. The interesting things about these groups is how the definition-based binary focuses on the abilities of NESTs and non-NESTs, which formulates traditional views towards on a native/non-native binary, and the professional difference highlights problems created by that same binary, which became one of the many arguments for pedagogical shifts towards EIL education. With the prevalence of this definition-based binary, it is easy to see that many teachers still feel that their programs use NSM-based view of EFL education.

Table 3. Types of Teacher Descriptions for NEST/Non-NEST Binary.

Definition-Based Binary	Professional Differences
NESTs are better language models (8/19)	NESTs are given Special Treatment (4/16)
Non-NESTs are better Grammar Teachers (6/19)	NESTs are not as good of Teachers (3/16)
Non-NESTs can Speak to Students in L1 (5/16)	NESTs teach higher levels (3/16)
	Non-NESTs do more Administrative Work (3/16)

However, only 3/54 respondents stated that their programs explicitly explain these differences to their teachers. Instead, 10/54 stated that their programs implied their professional roles through program design or left to the teachers to decide. The biggest mechanism to communicate with teachers about this



particular issue appears to be class distribution. With this in mind, teachers generally feel indifferent to these distinctions, and that the schools make professional distinctions between NESTs and non-NESTs.

26/54 respondent teachers stated that the policy, as they perceive it, as being fair to both NESTs and non-NESTs. Similarly, 12/54 reporting teacher respondents found that their programs binary were representative of their individual views towards NESTs and non-NESTs. Lastly, 47/54 reporting teacher respondents stated that they felt confident in their abilities to play their assigned teaching roles.

As far as any differences in responses about the perceptions of the professional binary between NESTs and non-NESTs, it appears that NESTs were more likely to state that they felt no binary within their program, but when they did cite a notable difference, they were more likely to cite *definition-based differences*. Meanwhile, non-NESTs were more likely to cite the *professional differences* between NESTs and non-NESTs to be the basis of any professional binary. In a similar manner, non-NESTs were more likely to view these binaries as *unfair* and less likely to view these binaries as representative of the skills and abilities of NESTs and non-NESTs. Despite these differences, most respondent teachers stated that they would not want to change their role within their program.

Combining these ideas together, most teachers experience some sort of binary within their experience at their program. However, the exact description of these binaries differs amongst teachers, with NESTs citing more *definition-based differences* and non-NESTs citing more *professional differences* as a basis for this professional binary. Further non-NESTs were more likely to find these binaries fair and representative to the skills of NESTs and non-NESTs. Despite these binaries, both NESTs and non-NESTs were confident in their abilities to complete their jobs and that English should be taught within a larger, international setting.

4.3 Comparing Program and Teacher Perceptions

When comparing the findings of the School Profile Survey and the responses to the Teacher Survey, the data collected, surrounding the anatomy of the Native/non-Native professional binary, closely resembles each other: a weak binary between NESTs and non-NESTs, implied mostly through class distribution, and emphasizing an international cultural context for the English taught. However, while many respondent teachers view this binary within these terms, the description of the terms surrounding the professional binary to be misunderstood, especially with regard to materials and the roles of NESTs and non-NESTs. For this reason, it becomes apparent that teachers, who by and large support EIL principles, have a huge influence over the outcomes of the curriculum.

5. Discussion and Conclusions

While most of the participating schools in this study appear to use a more NSM-based definition for NESTs, few overtly cite Kachru's core-based definition of a native speaker, as Selvi (2010:155-156) found in prominent international EFL job boards. Instead, most participating schools appear to define a NEST by what it is not: a Turkish speaker of English. Similarly, the results yielded that most schools employ a weak binary between NESTs and non-NESTs, defined along student language levels and concentrating NESTs with the higher levels. The predominate reasoning behind this style of binary was in order to allow non-NESTs, who speak students' L1, access to the lower level students to better help them gain a solid foundation in English. NESTs, by contrast, appear to be more of a luxury within these programs. In this way, programs use NESTs to help polish off their students but do appear not require them to operate. With this in mind, the Turkish binary fits in more with Medgyes (2001: 432-433) and Llurda (2014: 3-4) who argued that despite being academically proven to be ineffective, the binary between NESTs and non-NESTs would never really disappear because of the economy which it inspired. This shift in binary would then display that many of these programs shifted the focus of their teacher binary from a core-based focus on NESTs to the L1 abilities of non-NESTs in order to conform their overall programs to fit with the more academically accepted EIL principles.

Aside from the arguments surrounding the legitimacy of NESTs as a superior educator, Canagarajah (1999, 78-88), Medgyes (2001: 429-433), Kramsch and Zhang (2015, 88-89), and Llurda (2014: 2-4) approach the necessity of studies into this particular subject from the stand point of the inherent inequalities between NESTs and non-NESTs as a result of this particular binary. As these researchers describe it, this preference towards NESTs and NSMs is the status quo in global EFL programs. However, as this study suggests, it is important to note that these feelings towards this particular binary are also the result of how the school expresses its binary – not a result of the binary itself. Instead, the results of this study support the findings of Bektaş-Çetinkaya (2009: 113-117) and Illés, Akcan, and Feyér (2012), who described Turkish EFL programs which nominally advocate EIL principles but maintain NSM-based curricula as a result of shifting pedagogical views, and further noted by Bektaş-Çetinkaya (2012: 383-385) as well as Tomak and Kocabaş



(2013: 187-188), from NSMs towards EIL principles, because, despite the variation in application of EIL principles by participating programs in this study, each of these programs advocate, at least nominally, the use of an international form of English language for their formative EFL principle. In this way, programs are experimenting with various curriculum schemes to determine how exactly to best apply these EIL Principles.

What made this particular study unique is where it found the variations in these EFL curricula: the definitions of a NEST and the application of a particular professional binary between NESTs and non-NESTs. Most of the programs in this study appear to agree on a more EIL-principled approach towards materials and approaches to culture, but almost none of them had a concrete definition as to what the program considered was a NEST vs. a non-NEST nor which roles these particular teacher classes should play. Therefore, although it appears that EIL principles are becoming more popular and used more widely amongst TEEP's, these programs often neglect the personal aspect of their curriculum design when applying EIL principles.

These conclusions primarily imply that TEEP's should look at teachers as a part of the curriculum-creation process. Along a similar vein, participant programs appear to focus more on the application of EIL principles to material selection and design instead of their professional dynamics. Thus, although the schools agreed on an international cultural context for English teaching, it appears that they do not give the same thought to the roles of NESTs and non-NESTs, further implying the need for conversations amongst TEEP's in general to establish the necessity of NESTs, non-NESTs, and the roles of each teacher-type. Nonetheless, more research is needed to explore the themes found in the results of this study.

REFERENCES

- Alsagoff, L., McKay, S. L., Hu, G., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2012). *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language*. Routledge.
- Atay, D. (2005). Reflections on the cultural dimension of language teaching. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 5(3-4), 222-236.
- Bayyurt, Y., & Sifakis, N. C. (2015). ELF-aware in-service teacher education: A transformative perspective. In *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca*, Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 117-135.
- Bayyurt, Y. (2006). Non-native English language teachers' perspective on culture in English as a Foreign Language classrooms. *Teacher Development*, 10(2), 233-247.
- Bektaş Çetinkaya, Y. (2012). Teaching English as an international language and its reflections in Turkey. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 9(2), 378-391.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). Interrogating the "native speaker fallacy": Non-Linguistic Roots, Non-Pedagogical Results. *Non-Native Educators in English Language Teaching*, 77-92.
- Çelik, M. (2008). *A Description of Turkish-English Phonology for Teaching English in Turkey*. Online Submission, 4(1), 159-174.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185-209.
- Flowerdew, J., & Miller, L. (1995). On the notion of culture in L2 lectures. *TESOL quarterly*, 29(2), 345-373.
- Graddol, D. (1999). The decline of the native speaker. In D. Graddol & U. Meinof, *English in a changing world* [AILA Review 13], United Kingdom. 57-68.
- Jenkins, J. (2002). A sociolinguistically based, empirically researched pronunciation syllabus for English as an international language. *Applied linguistics*, 23(1), 83-103.
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). "Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come." *Educational researcher*, 33(7), 14-26.
- Kachru, Braj B. Standards, codification, and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In: Quirk, R. and H. Widdowson, (eds.) *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the language and the literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- . (2006). "The English language in the outer circle." *World Englishes*: 241-255.
- Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and ELT. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(1), 9-35.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012). *Language teacher education for a global society: A modular model for knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing*. Routledge.
- Kramsch, C., & Zhang, L. (2015). The legitimacy gap: Multilingual language teachers in an era of globalization. *The Multilingual Challenge: Cross Disciplinary Perspectives*, 16, 87.
- Illés, É., Akcan, S., & Feyér, B. (2013, May). Language awareness of prospective English teachers in Hungary and Turkey. In *Proceedings of The Fifth International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca* (p. 31).
- Inal, D., & Özdemir, E. (2015). Re/considering the English language teacher education programs in Turkey from an ELF standpoint: What do academia, pre-service and in-service teachers think. *Current perspectives on pedagogy for English as a Lingua Franca*, 135-152.
- Ipek, H. (2009). Comparing and Contrasting First and Second Language Acquisition: Implications for Language Teachers. *Canadian Centre of Science and Education Journals*, 2 (2)
- Lee, J. J. (2005). The native speaker: An achievable model. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7 (2), 152-163.
- Llurda, E. (2014). Non-Native Teachers and Advocacy. *The Routledge Handbook of Educational Linguistics*, 105.
- Lucas, T., Villegas, A. M., & Freedson-Gonzalez, M. (2008). Linguistically responsive teacher education preparing classroom teachers to teach English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59 (4), 361-373.
- McKay, S. (2003). Teaching English as an international language: The Chilean context. *ELT journal*, 57(2), 139-148.
- . (2003). Toward an appropriate EIL pedagogy: Re-examining common ELT assumptions. *International journal of applied linguistics*, 13(1), 1-22.
- Medgyes, P. (2001). "When the teacher is a non-native speaker". *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 3, 429-442.



- Nault, D. (2006). Going global: Rethinking culture teaching in ELT contexts. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 19(3), 314-328.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology* (Vol. 192). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Paikeday, T. M. (1985). *The Native Speaker is Dead!* Toronto: Paikeday Publishing.
- Selvi, A. F. (2010). All teachers are equal, but some teachers are more equal than others: Trend analysis of job advertisements in English language teaching. *WATESOL NNEST Caucus Annual Review*, 1(1), 155-181.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International journal of applied linguistics*, 11(2), 133-158.
- Sifakis, N. C., & Sougari, A. M. (2010). Between a rock and a hard place: an investigation of EFL teachers' beliefs on what keeps them from integrating global English in their classrooms. *EIL, ELF, Global English: Teaching and Learning Issues*. Bern: Peter Lang, 301-320.
- Tomak, B., & Kocabas, P. (2013, May). The Perspectives of Turkish Prospective Teachers on "ELF" and Their Awareness of It in Their ELT Programs. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca*, p.183.
- Uygun, D. (2013, May). Attitudes of Turkish prospective EFL teachers towards varieties of English. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca* (p. 190).
- Warschauer, M. (2000). The death of cyberspace and the rebirth of CALL. *English Teachers' Journal*, 53(1), 61-67.