Research Article

Students' Perception toward Teaching Strategies of Native and Nonnative English-Speaking Teachers: A Case Study in Indonesia

Fathor Rasyid [iD],[1] **Prodhan Mahbub Ibna Seraj** [iD],[2] **Abd. Ghofur** [iD],[3] **and Andi Asrifan** [iD][4]

[1]*IAIN Kediri, Kediri, Indonesia*
[2]*American International University-Bangladesh (AIUB), Dhaka, Bangladesh*
[3]*IAIN Madura, Madura, Indonesia*
[4]*Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang, Sidenreng Rappang, Indonesia*

Correspondence should be addressed to Prodhan Mahbub Ibna Seraj; mahbub.seraj@aiub.edu

This study aimed to investigate the students' insights toward native English-speaking teachers' (NESTs) and nonnative English-speaking teachers' (NNEST) teaching strategies and to examine the reasons for their insights. Fifty-eight English students, 30 females, and 20 males, with prior experience of learning from both NESTs and NNESTs in East Java, Indonesia, participated in the study. They were purposively selected. A set of questionnaires was used to elicit quantitative data on students' perceptions and focus group discussion was used to elicit qualitative data on the underlying reasons for their perceptions. Quantitative data were analyzed with descriptive and inferential statistics, whereas qualitative data were analyzed based on themes. The finding revealed that the students perceived NESTs slightly better than NNESTs, with a grand mean of 9.92 and 3.74. Another finding indicates that the perception percentage for NESTs is 75%, while NNESTs achieved 63.8%. However, when the grand means of both groups are tested statistically using a correlated sample t-test, it reveals that there is no significant mean difference ($p < 0.05$). This means that the mean difference of 3.92 and 3.74 occurred by chance only, and it is not considered different statistically. This suggests that the students perceived NESTs and NNESTs the same. The qualitative data were classified into six themes: explanation, class interaction, teaching strategy, improvization, and ideal teachers. The data indicated that students have more or less similar reasons for these themes. Eventually, the results of qualitative and quantitative data analysis suggest that NESTs and NNESTs are not two distinct groups, one necessarily better or more qualified to be teachers than the other.

1. Introduction

Although the number of nonnative speakers of English is recently, in fact, greater than those of native speakers [1, 2], and consequently, although the number of nonnative English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) has been larger in number than that of native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) for a long time [3, 4], research on NESTs and NNESTs is a fairly recent phenomenon and has been studied by many researchers [5–8]. This is a logical consequence since in the field of English language teaching (ELT) there is a growing number of teachers majoring in English and interested in teaching English. Even Canagarajah [3] estimates that more than 80% of the world's English language teachers are nonnatives.

It is really intriguing to conduct a research study on NESTs and NNESTs as English has become the global language. It is even more intriguing to study it, particularly in an English as a foreign language (EFL) setting, such as in Indonesia, as it is taken for granted that NESTs are better language teachers for one thing and EFL setting is the least successful setting since English is only used in classroom for another. Graddol [2] classifies English speakers into first-language speakers, second-language speakers, and EFL speakers. He estimated that the number of EFL speakers is double compared twith first language users as well as second language users. Three-circle model is similar to Kachru [9]. The inner circle refers to English used as a first language, the outer circle refers to nonnative settings; English is used as a second language, and the expanding circle refers to the

territories where English is learned as a foreign language. The importance of English keeps increasing in the world, especially in the expanding circle. Learning English in any circle, as mentioned by Graddol [2], could affect the level of language competence, and later cause problems when they become language teachers.

There is a stereotype in the EFL setting, including Indonesia, that NEST is considered to be a good example of an English teacher that makes NNESTs leave little room to receive good perception [10]. It is not uncommon to hear English students express that they prefer being taught by NESTs, whether or not they are qualified in teaching English as a second language (ESL) or EFL. In fact, there are as many as 80% of the world's English teachers are nonnative English speakers. In Indonesia, the percentage could be more than that. Therefore, a research study on this is worth conducting.

Many research studies that have been conducted dealing with NESTs and NNESTs could be classified into five. The first is examining the strengths and weaknesses of NEST and NNEST [11, 12]. Another is dealing with whether NESTs are better or not [11, 13–15]. Other researchers conducted studies on students' preferences toward NESTs and NNESTs [16–18]. Next, researchers did studies examining the impact of NESTs and NNESTs on language acquisition [19, 20], and, last, researchers conducted studies investigating the impact of NESTs and NNESTs on students' motivation [17].

Although several research studies have been conducted, there are limited numbers of researchers who investigated the preferences of students toward the teaching strategies employed by NESTs and NNESTs in the Indonesian setting in particular. This is very significant since the language ability of both groups is already obvious in that NESTs have better language skills. However, in the pedagogical ability, research studies do not yet indicate which group outperforms the other. In addition, examining students' perception of their teachers influences students' learning behaviors and thus later affects their learning outcomes [21]. It is for these reasons that the researchers are interested in conducting a research study dealing with students' perceptions and views toward their NESTs and NNESTs.

2. Literature Review

2.1. NESTs and NNESTs Defined.
Traditionally, a native speaker of a language is someone who speaks that language as his/her native language, mother tongue, first language, or L1. Davies [22] defines native English speakers from various perspectives. However, he concludes that nonnative speakers of a certain language may become native speakers of that language, and he can acquire a master native's language intuition, spontaneity, pragmatic control, and creativity. "Therefore as he explains that nonnative speakers and native speakers cannot just be differentiated by their autobiography" [22]. Furthermore, he classifies five kinds of native speakers. They are native speakers by birth, native speaker by being native-like, native speaker through lingua franca, native speakers by being a native user, and native speakers through long residence in the country.

Even though many experts have defined the term native speaker, researchers do not reach the same definition [23], and consequently, they define them on their own definitions [23]. However, normally, a native speaker refers to a person who has acquired a language since childhood and continues to use it as a dominant language. Native speakers communicate the language grammatically, fluently, and appropriately and have good intuitions about grammaticality and ungrammaticality in the language. This definition is widely accepted among researchers and experts [24].

Furthermore, the distinctions between NESTs and NNESTs have been widely and massively discussed. Then, arguments for those who are in favor of both groups or against them have been sharply discussed and tossed back and forth to convince others [25–27]. Yet, most studies in this field reveal no agreement on who has better teaching knowledge as well as better teaching skills. That is, findings of research studies reveal inconsistent results.

NNESTs may be considered to have inadequate language ability, even though they already have joined a number of trainings because they frequently have insufficient native speaker performance and competence in the target language and the target culture. Yet, they possess better and deeper knowledge and understanding of learners' native languages and an ability to explain as well as compare first and second language features in ways that students can easily understand. This all indicates that both NESTs and NNESTs are good in the sense that they have their own strengths and weaknesses. Therefore, it is unfair to judge them only based on their challenges, merits, and demerits [16, 28, 29]. Brown [30] concluded that the differences between NESTs and NNESTs do not make one better than the other.

2.2. Merits and Demerits of NEST and NNEST.
When discussing the strengths and weaknesses of both NESTs and NNESTs, Medgyes [15] classifies some favorable features of NNESTs. First, they can be a good learner model to their students since they already have the experience of being language learners. Second, they can use language learning strategies very appropriately. Third, NNESTs can provide and compare first and second languages more effectively. Fourth, they know the problems, the difficulties as well as the needs of their students. Fifth, they can predict and anticipate problems in learning a second language. Last, but not least, EFL teachers can use the student's native language. Medgyes [15] then explains that both groups have an equal chance to improve their professions. As long as NNESTs have good second language ability, they could gain the same professional success as NESTs. That is to say, in order to be professional teachers, they at least have two competencies. That professional competence and pedagogical competence.

Furthermore, differences between NESTs and NNESTs were highlighted by Árva and Medgyes' [31] study that revealed seven differences. First, it is obvious that NEST speaks English better and more fluently than their nonnative counterparts and uses it naturally. Second, NESTs have superior metacognitive knowledge of English language components, particularly vocabulary and grammar. Third,

NNESTs follow textbooks faithfully, whereas NEST employs a vast variety of language learning activities such as newspapers, posters, and other related authentic materials. They rarely stick to a lesson plan and to what is available in the course book. Fourth, NESTs are much more tolerant and more lenient with student errors and mistakes.

Fifth, NESTs frequently encourage students to be more enthusiastic and motivated since they are more forced toward the use the L2 as a means of communication. In this sense, they play their roles as mentors and facilitators in the teaching–learning process. Sixth, NNEST does better preparation, and this is done carefully and professionally. Seventh, since NEST knows the culture of the language being learned, they provide the students with more cultural understanding and insights. This becomes an accurate and rich cross-cultural understanding. However, even though NNEST cannot aspire to acquire a native speaker's language competence, it does necessarily mean that NNESTs are less efficient [31].

It is true that English teachers must have good language competence both in language skills and language components, and it is obvious that it is easy for NNESTs to acquire those competencies perfectly since it is almost impossible to be native-like. Consequently, NNESTs encounter some challenges in the English teaching profession [32]. In this instance, Maum states two challenges faced by NNESTs: accent and credibility [33]. These two are important since problems in these two are unfavorable as they will not give good models and, consequently, affect the learners negatively. They are likely viewed by students, fellow teachers, and administrators as incompetent teachers. Yet, according to Medgyes [15], even though NNESTs cannot use English accurately and appropriately and cannot use the language as well as NESTs, it does not mean that NNEST cannot become good and proficient users of the language [34]. Further, NNEST can still become professional language teachers.

Villalobos Ulate [35] states good teachers, in general, and good language teachers, in particular, are not related to native and nonnative teachers but those who are well-prepared professionally and personally to be teachers. It is true to a certain extent that to achieve native-like is important but to gain pedagogical competence to help students acquire a language is also important. According to Medgyes [15], language teachers must be employed based on their professional ability and virtue, regardless of their educational background in general and language background in particular. Non-NESTs who are qualified enough in both competencies can teach a language effectively.

Similar to Villalobos Ulate [35], Madrid [16] argues that there are some underlying advantages and disadvantages of NESTs and NNESTs, depending upon their competencies, ability, and personality. They further argue that a good teacher is one who masters well the subject matters, is eager and willing to help and share knowledge, has a passion for teaching, and has an appropriate personality. Liu [36] and Park [37] suggest cooperation in the form of co-teaching is better for improving the quality of teaching. When both are teaching, ideal teaching could be attained.

2.3. Perception toward NESTs and NNESTs. Numerous studies about native and nonnative have been conducted in this matter. Madrid's [16] research, for instance. The results of their study revealed that students do not evince a preference for native teachers. They value and appreciate them in the same way. Nonetheless, they also portrayed that the more advance the students are in learning a language, their preference toward NESTs increases. Another study was conducted by Alseweed [26]. The findings showed that the perceptions of students toward NESTs and NNESTs differ significantly. The respondents in the study perceived that NNESTs effectively contribute to better teaching since, by virtue, they have the experiences of being language learners and later becoming language teachers. But, as the respondents go higher up in their education, the student's preferences for NESTs increase as a result of their previous learning experiences.

More recent studies about students' perceptions toward NESTs and NNESTs have been conducted by researchers [16, 17]. They found similar results. The findings of the research studies yielded that students perceived that both NESTs and NNESTs have their own merits and demerits. NESTs have better pronunciation, vocabulary, and culture, while NNESTs have better grammatical knowledge and writing skills. They also preferred NNSTs since they are more empathetic when the students use translation. This group of teachers is preferable for lower-level students as the use of students' native language is still needed.

In the Indonesian context, it is of paramount importance to conduct a research study dealing with students' views and reasons toward their NESTs and NNESTs. Specifically, there are two research questions in the study: (1) what are the students' perceptions toward NESTs' and NNESTs' teaching strategies? (2) Why do the students prefer to choose NESTs' or NNESTs' teaching strategies?

3. Research Methodology

3.1. Research Design. This is a mixed-method approach study. Both quantitative and qualitative data were elicited. It investigates the characteristics or views of a group of students having experiences of being taught by NESTs and NNESTs.

3.2. Participants. Fifty-eight English students, thirty females, and twenty males, with prior experience of learning from both native and nonnative English-speaking teachers in East Java, Indonesia, participated in the study. They had been taught by both teachers for more than 1 year. They studied general English, and the level was intermediate. Of 58 students, 10 students were randomly selected, as they were already representative, to participate in the focus group discussion (FGD). The FGD was led by the researchers and lasted for 90 min. The NNESTs under study were Indonesian experienced English teachers qualifying in English language teaching, and the NESTs were volunteer native English teachers qualifying also in English language teaching.

3.3. Instruments. The questionnaire was adapted from Alseweed [26] and Brown [30] with the main preceding research conducted by Medgyes [15]. The questionnaire is a closed-questionnaire, written in both English and Bahasa Indonesia to help the students and to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation as the students are nonnative speakers. The statements of the questionnaire cover the students' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs based on the instructional strategies used in the classroom. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part is about asking the respondents' identity and the second part consists of 20 items of statements using a five-point Likert Scale. Basically, the 20 items were developed from six subscales of the perception construct.

An interview guide to elicit students' reasons for their perception was designed and used in FGD to collect qualitative data. Ten students purposely selected participated in the FGD. They were randomly chosen, and it was done in Bahasa Indonesia so that the students could express themselves clearly and frankly about their perception of their teachers. The FGD was led by the researcher and was intended to elicit students' underlying reasons for their views.

3.4. Data Collection. This research was conducted to gain the students' perception toward NESTs and NNESTs. First, the questionnaire was administered to 58 students. From this instrument, quantitative data could be elicited and collected. Then, FGD was held for 10 representatives, randomly selected, students to collect qualitative data. The procedure of this research was a sequential procedure in which the researchers seek to explore the finding of one method with another method [38]. The study began with a quantitative method in which theories or concepts of NESTs and NNESTs are verified, administered by questionnaires, followed by a qualitative method eliciting qualitative data through focus group discussion. This last step was intended to reveal students' reasons for their perceptions. Finally, triangulation was done for the trustworthiness of the findings.

3.5. Data Analysis. The questionnaire was analyzed based on means, frequencies, and percentages. Then, to determine the strength level of perception for each statement (high, medium, and low), the formula in Equation (1) was used to determine the interval width [39]. Finally, one sample *t*-test was employed to examine the significant difference between the two grand means. Qualitative data were analyzed inductively and used to support the quantitative data [40]. First, the collected qualitative data were grouped and classified based on the theoretical framework (subscales). Second, the data were then interpreted to find out the underlying reasons for their perception. Eventually, the interpretation or finding triangulation was made for its trustworthiness using the following equation:

$$\text{Interval width} = \frac{\text{Maximum point} - \text{minimum point}}{\text{Number of levels}}$$

(1)

Interval width: low, from 1 to 2.33; medium, from 2.34 to 3.67; high, from 3.68 to 5.

4. Findings

4.1. Students' Perception. The results from the questionnaire consisting of 20 statements are presented in Table 1. It presents the students' perception of NESTs and NNESTs. This simple tabulation consists of the mean level of agreement.

Table 1 indicates that of the 20 questionnaire items, they could be categorized into four classifications. The first is that both NESTs and NNESTs received the same high ratings, as indicated by items number 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, and 20. This means that students are perceived highly by both groups of teachers. The second is that both NESTs and NNESTs received the same medium ratings, as in items number 2 and 14. The third is that students rated NESTs better than NNESTs only in three items: number 1, 9, and 16. The fourth is that NESTs received lower perception, as indicated by items number 5 and 6. In general, both groups of teachers received similar perception strengths.

Table 2 shows that of 20 questionnaire items, 15 are of a high level of perception with a percentage of 75%. The means range from 3.75 to 4.95. Furthermore, four questionnaire items are of medium level of perception with a percentage of 20%; and only one item is of low-level perception. This reveals students' good perception of their NEST.

Table 3 summarizes that 13 statements of 20 questionnaire items are of a high level of perception. The percentage reached up to 65%. Six items are of medium level of perception (30%), and only one statement is of low level of perception (5%). The quantitative data above reveal that students preferred a native teacher as their English teacher (75% for NESTs and 65% for NNESTs). This slight difference needs to be tested statistically as the following.

Table 4 shows the result of the statistical test, which tests whether there is a significant difference between the two grand means, as shown in Table 1. The grand mean of NEST is 3.92, whereas the grand mean of NNEST is 3.74. This looks similar, and when tested statistically using a correlated sample *t*-test, there is no significant mean difference, as in Table 4 in which sig. is lower than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). This means that the mean difference of 3.92 and 3.74 occurred by chance only, and it is not considered different statistically. This suggests that the students perceived NESTs and NNESTs the same.

4.2. Students' Reasons for Their Preferences. Table 5 indicates respondents' responses for their preferences toward NESTs and NNESTs. It is summarized from FGD in which students freely expressed their reasons why they preferred NESTs and/or NNESTs.

5. Discussion

The 20 questionnaire items could be categorized into six classifications that are discussed below.

5.1. Explanation. The means score for clarity of explanation of NESTs is $M = 3.95$ which is much higher than its counterpart, $M = 3.20$. This means that NESTs could explain much clearer. When respondents were asked about the clarity of

TABLE 1: Overall results of students' perception toward NEST and NNEST.

No.	Statements	NEST		NNEST	
		Mean	Level	Mean	Level
1.	Explains the lessons clearly	3.95	High	3.20	Medium
2.	Prepares me for independent learning better	3.30	Medium	3.20	Medium
3.	Encourages me to learn to speak English better	4.70	High	3.95	High
4.	Corrects errors consistently	4.25	High	3.80	High
5.	Relies heavily on course book	2.00	Low	3.00	Medium
6.	Applies pair work in class regularly	3.10	Medium	3.40	High
7.	Applies group work in class regularly	4.25	High	3.80	High
8.	Explains difficult concepts well	4.35	High	3.85	High
9.	Focuses on speaking skills	3.90	High	3.55	Medium
10.	Believes that translation is important	4.10	High	4.10	High
11.	Uses Indonesian to clarify unfamiliar terms	4.05	High	4.40	High
12.	Is happy to improvise	4.45	High	4.00	High
13.	Interested in learner's opinion	4.40	High	4.00	High
14.	Speaks most of the time during lesson	3.15	Medium	3.35	Medium
15.	Uses innovative teaching strategies	4.85	High	4.15	High
16.	Puts more emphasis on grammar rules	2.40	Medium	2.30	Low
17.	Sticks more rigidly to lesson plan	3.75	High	4.10	High
18.	Gives motivation to the students	3.90	High	4.35	High
19.	Applies game for ice breaking	4.95	High	4.65	High
20.	Is the ideal example of an English teacher	4.65	High	3.80	High
	Grand means	3.92		3.74	

TABLE 2: The strength of the students' perception toward NEST.

	Rating	Frequency	Percentage (%)
High	3.68–5	15	75
Medium	2.34–3.67	4	20
Low	2.33–1	1	5
Total		20	100

TABLE 3: The strength of the students' perception toward NNEST.

	Rating	Frequency	Percentage (%)
High	3.68–5	13	65
Medium	2.34–3.67	6	30
Low	2.33–1	1	5
Total		20	100

TABLE 4: One-sample test.

	t	df	Sig. (two-tailed)	Mean difference	95% Confidence difference	
					Lower	Upper
NEST	22.347	19	0.000	3.92250	3.5551	4.2899
NNEST	30.406	19	0.000	3.74750	3.4895	4.0055

explanation of their NESTs and NNESTs, they uttered "The native teacher could show clearer expressions. They used body language in explaining that makes it easier for the students to catch what the teacher meant." This finding is in line with Medgyes' [15] statement on perceived differences in teaching behavior of NESTs and NNESTs [15]. He stated since NEST is considered as the confident one in using English, no wonder whether she is able to express expressively, the students understand more by being explained by NEST or not. This finding also corroborates Árva and Medgyes' [31] finding revealing that NEST obviously uses English better than

NNEST. They do not have any language barriers in providing explanations.

Furthermore, the use of translation with $M = 4.10$ for both teachers does not matter in the sense that the students agreed that it is important to use the translation for both teachers although they rarely use translation. In this instance, Dweik and Al-Barghouthi [8] studied the attitudes of Jordanian graduate students toward NESTs and NNESTs. The finding yielded that students preferred NESTs for teaching pronunciation, oral skills, and culture, whereas NNESTs were in favor of teaching grammar and writing skills. They believe when

TABLE 5: Students' responses toward their perception.

No.	Statements	Responses
1.	Explains the lessons clearly	NESTs explain more clearly because they use English language more fluency.
2.	Prepares for independent learning better	NESTs prepare students more in independent learning because it is their culture.
3.	Encourages me to learn to speak English better	NESTs are accustomed to use English and always encourage them to use English.
4.	Corrects errors consistently	NESTs correct more because they know the language better.
5.	Relies heavily on course book	NNESTs want to finish the course book soon.
6.	Applies pair work in class regularly	NNESTs rarely use pair work. They explain and talk much.
7.	Applies group work in class regularly	NESTs often conduct the lesson using games, and the games are running in a group
8.	Explains difficult concepts well	Because English is their language, NEST could explain better.
9.	Focuses on speaking skills	NESTs ask many things such as daily activities, favorite food, where we live, and routines.
10.	Believes that translation is important	Both teachers are quite seldom in doing translation because both teachers are focused on the students understanding.
11.	Uses Indonesian to clarify unfamiliar terms	Both use Indonesian to explain difficult terms, but NNESTs use more Indonesian.
12.	Is happy to improvise	NESTs use games in her teaching. The games were always new and were never repeated. They can add real-life experiences.
13.	Interested in learner's opinion	NESTs give more appreciation. Although we often made mistake they still give an appreciation.
14.	Speaks most of the time during lesson	NNESTs talk more probably because they know more the concepts and the materials.
15.	Uses innovative teaching strategies	NESTs created new games, songs and told a funny story so that the students did not feel bored.
16.	Puts more emphasis on grammar rules	NESTs have natural stronger linguistic background, but never talk about grammar.
17.	Sticks more rigidly to lesson plan	NESTs know more about curriculum, in making lesson plan, than NNESTs.
18.	Gives motivation to the students	Both give motivation but the way they give motivation is different.
19.	Applies game for ice breaking	NESTs are more creative in applying new games in class. And in every meetings' they always have new games.
20.	Is the ideal example of an English teacher	Because native teacher is more patient, always explains in with clear expression, is easy to improvise in every meeting, easy to be adaptable with the students as we know that she has different culture, comes from different country and language also. She is also more kind as she always gives us appreciation in every our opinion.

teachers know the first language of students, they become more empathetic and they can use translation. This corresponds with Shin's [32] study revealing that NNEST has many distinct merits over NEST, including a better and deeper understanding of learners' mother tongue. In addition, it is easier for NNEST to use translation when explaining second language features.

However, it is distinct enough to seek the reason why the students prefer their NNESTs ($M = 4.40$) compared with ($M = 4.05$) NESTs to use Indonesian language to clarify unfamiliar terms because nonnative teacher owns their language. Although NESTs also can speak Indonesian, NNESTs are more competent in using it. According to Brown [30], NEST tries to use the target language (Indonesian) more to prove that they also can speak Indonesian, while NNEST uses English more often to prove that they are equally proficient in English, even though English is "bookish".

It was, however, quite surprising to see that native teachers have a higher perception of the statement of explaining difficult concepts ($M = 4.35$ and $M = 3.85$). Students stated that even though native teacher used English that was not really familiar to the students, they still believed that NEST explained the difficult concepts well to them. The reason why

the students gave such a kind of perception is that native teacher uses simple and appropriate expressions in her explanation. NEST's clear expression leads the students to their imagination about what the teacher explained. The students also can directly describe what the teacher wants to explain through their expressions.

5.2. Class Interaction. An unexpected finding was found in relation to class interaction. Although the level of agreement between NESTs and NNESTs only achieved a high level ($M = 4.25$ and $M = 3.80$), the students preferred to have nonnative teachers because they mostly apply for pair work in the class. The students innocently in FGD said that "the nonnative teacher is often very busy and has so many activities outside the class. We often have no class, that's why she often gives us the task individually in order that the class is not noisy. The task is submitted when finished." It is also evident from Árva and Medgyes' [31] study that native teachers employ a vast gamut of activities (newspaper clippings, photocopies, posters, realia) and seldom stick to the course book.

In addition, the native teacher is found to be more interested in the learner's opinion on the level of agreement ($M = 4.40$) than nonnative teacher ($M = 4.00$). Achieved 0.40 higher than nonnative, the students have an interesting direct perception toward this statement. The students said on FGD that "because the native teacher gives more appreciation to our opinion…". "although we often made mistakes in conveying our opinion, she still appreciated by saying 'Good' or gives us a sticker." A good appreciation will make the students feel that the teacher fully pays them attention. Whether the student's answer was wrong, NEST still gave her appreciation for their effort in answering. It is different from nonnative teachers, who often blame the students who cannot answer well in every question given. It is related to Benke and Medgyes' [34] statement that native teacher tends to tolerate errors, while nonnative teacher tends to correct or punish errors.

5.3. Teaching Strategy. The students tend to choose native teacher who uses innovative teaching strategies on teaching with $M = 4.85$ for NESTs and $M = 4.15$ for NNESTs. The students believed that the NEST uses more innovative teaching strategies to make them feel comfortable in class, although their class is running in the afternoon. NEST handles the class creatively so that the students do not feel bored. Moreover, the NEST always gives good appreciation to the students who are active in class.

The finding is corroborated by Liu and Zhang's [28] research. They found that students believe the NEST is friendlier and therefore they enjoy it more in the classroom. It might be because NEST is the one who is easy to improvise and uses innovative teaching strategies. This confirms Árva and Medgyes' [31] finding that NESTs employ a vast gamut of activities (newspaper clippings, photocopies, posters, realia) and seldom stick to the course book.

Moreover, the students' reason for NESTs being more creative in conducting the class using games is in line with Liu and Zhang [28], who found more than 60% of the students believe that their NESTs are friendlier and more flexible in teaching. NESTs communicate and interact more with their students compared with their NNESTs in the classroom. And the way that NEST is believed to be more creative and flexible and interact with students in this research is by using games.

Another reason why the students chose native teacher to be higher on this statement than nonnative is the teacher's own use of English. The students said, "when we make mistakes, the native teacher corrects us." The students' direct perception reveals that the native teacher corrects errors consistently, as the students said on FGD. "She often corrects our pronunciation and gives us correct examples." Natives are much more lenient with student mistakes and casual in giving their lessons [31]. This finding is supported by Medgyes [15] who described that native teacher focuses on fluency, meaning, language use, oral skills, and colloquial register.

5.4. Improvisation. The students perceived that nonnative teacher focuses more on the course book in learning ($M = 3.00$ for NEST and $M = 2.00$ for NNEST). This finding is supported by Árva and Medgyes' [31] finding. According to the finding of their research, NNEST follows textbooks faithfully, whereas NEST employs an abundance of activities such as newspapers, posters, realia, and other authentic resources. This finding is corroborated by other research findings. For example, according to Medgyes [15], the NEST is known to be more innovative in teaching, whereas NNEST is known to be more cautious in teaching. This means that native teacher is happy to improvise regarding their attitude to be more innovative in teaching.

As the students also mentioned in their direct perception through FGD that the NEST uses games in her teaching. "The games were always new, and the games were never repeated in all meetings." The native teacher also has so many sources. She does not just rely on the one-course book, and she often uses English magazines as sources of learning. Native teacher also makes use of real experiences while teaching, and therefore, students enjoy and get more beyond the textbook.

In teaching grammar rules, the students gave a low level of agreement with both teachers ($M = 2.40$ and $M = 2.30$). However, the students prefer native teacher because she is considered to have better English than nonnative. In using English, NEST is more natural than NNEST, who generally have learned English as a second/foreign language, while the NEST is considered to have a stronger linguistic background as she has learned English her whole life. NNESTs are better at explaining grammar [16]. They also have a far superior metacognitive knowledge of English grammar [31]. Mahboob's [41] study yielded similar findings. It revealed that NESTs were believed and perceived to have good oral skills, good and wide vocabulary, and better knowledge about their own culture. However, they usually have little grammar knowledge and consequently face difficulty in explaining complex grammatical items.

When asked about their perception of the lesson plan, the students preferred to have nonnative teacher as she sticks rigidly to the lesson plan. The students argued that nonnative teachers considered understanding more about the curriculum in making lesson plans than native teachers did. The students believed that nonnative teachers knew more about the topic materials. NNESTs prepare their lessons meticulously and more professionally [31].

Liu and Zang [28] also found that the students preferred NNEST in this case. In their research, they found that more than half of the students also believe that their Chinese teachers spend more time than their foreign teachers preparing their course material and are better organized in class. It seems that the nonnative teacher prefers to have controlled activities, as Medgyes [15] stated in his finding about the differences in teaching behavior, especially in nonnative attitudes toward teaching.

5.5. Motivation. Another important aspect is providing motivation. The students gave a good perception toward both groups of teachers as both levels of agreement are high ($M = 3.90$ for NEST and $M = 4.35$ for NNEST). But there is a significantly different level of agreement which makes the

native teacher receive a bit better perception than nonnative. Nonnative teacher is one who is keen on telling stories that are encouraging and motivating. Therefore, the students preferred to have NNEST in giving motivation. It might be because NNEST knows the students' condition as they both come from the same culture. In this instance, Medgyes [15] stated that NNESTS could be more empathetic to the needs and problems of their learners. Since they never cease to be learners of English, they encounter difficulties similar to those of their students, although at an obviously higher level [34]. As a rule, this constant struggle makes nonnatives more sensitive and understanding.

This finding is somewhat different from Alseweed's [26] finding that 65% of the subjects of the study stated that NEST motivates students. They also developed students' confidence to use the language both in the classroom and outside the classroom. In addition, the finding of the study also does not correspond with Wu and Ke's [27] finding. They explored the perceptions of 107 Taiwanese university students toward NESTs. The majority supported native-speaker teachers as friendly, informal, and a source of encouragement to students.

5.6. Ideal Teacher. Who becomes the ideal example of an English teacher? The students prefer native teacher as an ideal example of an English teacher, with the mean of 4.65. Native teacher received a high level of agreement, while nonnative only received $M = 3.80$. Seventy percent of the students "strongly agree" that native teacher is an ideal English teacher. The students said, "because native teacher is more patient, always explains with clear expression, is easy to improvise in every meeting, is easy to be adaptable with the students, has a different culture, and comes from a different country and language."

Furthermore, the students believed that the native teacher prepared them to be more independent in learning. Not telling the students directly about the meaning of a word, for example, made them search by themselves. This finding seems to support previous research findings by Alseweed and Dhaif-Allah [42]. He stated that 79% of the respondents prefer the teaching strategies that are employed by NESTs. They further foster independent learning, and the focus of their teaching is on the process instead of the outcome.

In sum, research studies that have been conducted on this matter provide inconsistent findings. This inconsistency can be traced to different subjects of the studies, the methodology employed, the definition of the NEST and NNEST, language setting, and the like [26, 27, 43]. However, instead of looking at NESTs and NNESTs as two distinct groups, one necessarily better or more qualified to be teachers than the other, cooperation and mutual help between NESTs and NNESTs are of wiser judgment since both groups of teachers have specific advantages and disadvantages.

6. Conclusion

The study concludes that the participants in this research prefer native teachers as their ideal example for English teachers. It is shown from the strength of students' perception toward native teacher that received 74.1% on a high level of

perception. In addition, the reason why a native teacher gets better perception from the students is revealed in the FGD. They believed that the native teacher is an ideal example of an English teacher as she is more confident in conveying the material, more expressive, and uses innovative teaching strategies. Even if the perception toward NEST is better a bit, the difference is not significant ($p > 0.05$).

It is evident from the finding of the study that NESTs and NNESTs have their own merits and demerits as perceived by students. Quantitatively they have rated NESTs and NNESTs more or less the same. The different ratings found only occur by chance. In addition, qualitatively, students expressed similar views toward their NESTs and NNESTs, meaning that none are the best teachers.

7. Pedagogical Implications

It is obvious that discrimination against nonnative speakers is still present and that native and nonnative speakers of English are still treated as two different species. Consequently, more research needs to be conducted in a variety of contexts and with new research approaches in order to better understand the challenges faced by both groups of teachers. These studies should bring about a better understanding of language teaching and help prepare and support both native and nonnative speakers of English to be successful ESL/EFL teachers, ultimately putting an end to discrimination based on patterns of unfair oversimplifications.

Another pedagogical implication is to create awareness for students, teachers, and administrators in an attempt to enable NESTs and NNESTs to achieve their highest potential and become effective teachers regardless of their nativeness or nonnativeness. They need to cover their own weaknesses and to maximize their potentials. Weakness is not meant to be used as a negative term here, but to indicate an opportunity for professional growth.

Therefore, a combination of both native and nonnative EFL teachers would create a healthy and productive learning environment for English language learners. Regardless of the native language, both groups have special training and can be good and qualified teachers. In addition to reflecting on their own teaching, NESTs and NNESTs should be supported by the administration to diversify their teaching experiences.

Data Availability

The first author is responsible for revealing data based on the request.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

References

[1] D. Graddol, "The decline of the native speaker," in *Translation Today: Trends and Perspectives*, G. Anderman and M. Rogers, Eds., pp. 152–167, Multilingual Matters, Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit, 2003.

[2] D. Graddol, *The Future of English?: A Guide to Forecasting the Popularity of the English Language in the 21st Century*, pp. 1–66, The British Council, 2000.

[3] A. S. Canagarajah, *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice*, Routledge, 2004.

[4] A. S. Canagarajah, "Interrogating the 'native speaker fallacy': non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results," in *Non-Native Educators in English Language Teaching*, pp. 77–92, Routledge, 2013.

[5] H. G. Widdowson, "The ownership of English," *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 377–389, 1994.

[6] Y. G. Butler, "How are nonnative-English-speaking teachers perceived by young learners?" *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 731–755, 2007.

[7] C. McDonald and S. McRae, "A pre-trial collection and investigation of what perceptions and attitudes of Konglish exist amongst foreign and Korean English language teachers in terms of English education in Korea," *Asian EFL Journal*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 134–164, 2010.

[8] B. Dweik and E. Al-Barghouthi, "Attitudes of jordanian graduate students towards native and non-native English language teachers," *Journal of Education and Human Development*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 627–646, 2014.

[9] B. B. Kachru, *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures*, University of Illinois Press, 1992.

[10] L. Moussu, "Shortcomings of NESTs and NNESTs," in *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, J. I. Liontas, T. International Association, and M. DelliCarpini, Eds., pp. 1–6, Wiley, 2018.

[11] M. Masrizal, "Native vs non-native English teachers," *Jurnal Ilmiah Didaktika*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2013.

[12] I. G. Merino, "Native English-speaking teachers versus non-native English-speaking teachers," *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, vol. 10, no. 10, pp. 69–79, 1997.

[13] K. Kurniawati and D. Rizki, "Native vs. non-native EFL teachers: who are better?" *Studies in English Language and Education*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 137–147, 2018.

[14] S. Li and C. Jin, "Analysis on whether native or non-native english speaking teacher is better in TEFL in China," in *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Culture, Education and Economic Development of Modern Society (ICCESE 2020)*, pp. 1098–1104, Atlantis Press, 2020.

[15] P. Medgyes, "Native or non-native: who's worth more?" *ELT Journal*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 340–349, 1992.

[16] D. Madrid, "Teacher and student preferences of native and nonnative foreign language teachers," *Porta Linguarum Revista Interuniversitaria de Didáctica de las Lenguas Extranjeras*, no. 2, pp. 125–138, 2004.

[17] R. A. Adara, "Students' motivation and preferences toward native and non-native English speaking teachers," *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–21, 2018.

[18] N. R. Díaz, "Students' preferences regarding native and non-native teachers of English at a university in the French Brittany," *Procedia–Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 173, pp. 93–97, 2015.

[19] M. Alqahtani, "The effect of native English-speaking teachers on the language acquisition of EFL learners," *International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 613–621, 2019.

[20] T. Elyas and N. M. Alghofaili, "Native English speakers versus non-native English speakers: the impact of language teachers on EFL learner's English proficiency," *English Review: Journal of English Education*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 27–38, 2019.

[21] B. Uzum, "Students' attitudes toward native and non-native english speaking teachers," in *TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, pp. 1–6, Wiley, 2018.

[22] A. Davies, *The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality*, Multilingual Matters Ltd, Clevedon, 2003.

[23] S. L. Mckay, *Teaching English as An International Language: Rethinking Goals and Approaches*, OUP, Oxford, 2002.

[24] J. C. Richards and R. Schmidt, *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, Pearson Education, England, 2010.

[25] G. Braine, *Non-Native Speaker English Teachers: Research, Pedagogy, and Professional Growth*, Routledge, NY, 2010.

[26] M. A. Alseweed, "University students' perceptions of the influence of native and non-native teachers," *English Language Teaching*, vol. 5, no. 12, pp. 42–53, 2012.

[27] K. H. Wu and I. C. Ke, "Haunting native speakerism? students' perceptions toward native speaking English teachers," *English Language Teaching*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 44–52, 2009.

[28] M. Liu and L. Zhang, "Student perceptions of native & non-native English teachers' attitudes, teaching skills assessment and performance," *Asian EFL Journal*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 157–166, 2007.

[29] G. Laborda, "Native or non-native: can we still wonder who is better?" *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2006.

[30] E. Brown, *Native and Non-Native English Speaking ESL/EFL Teachers in Sweden: A Study on Students' Attitudes and Perceptions Towards the Teaching Behavior of Native and Non-Native English Speaking Teachers*, El Colegio de México, 2013.

[31] V. Árva and P. Medgyes, "Native and non-native teachers in the classroom," *System*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 355–372, 2000.

[32] S. J. Shin, "Preparing non-native English speaking ESL teachers," *Teacher Development*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 57–65, 2008.

[33] R. Maun, "Non-native English speaking teachers in the English teaching profession," *Eric Digest*, 2002.

[34] E. Benke and P. Medgyes, "Differences in teaching behaviour between native and non-native speaker teachers: as seen by the learners," in *Non-Native Language Teachers. Educational Linguistics*, E. Llurda, Ed., pp. 195–215, Springer, Boston, MA, 2005.

[35] N. Villalobos Ulate, "Insights towards native and non-native ELT educators," *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 56–79, 2011.

[36] J. Liu, "Chinese graduate teaching assistants teaching freshman composition to native english speaking students," in *Non-Native Language Teachers. Educational Linguistics*, E. Llurda, Ed., pp. 155–177, Springer, Boston, MA, 2005.

[37] E. Park, "The Korean university students' preferences toward native English teachers," *Modern English Education*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 114–130, 2009.

[38] D. Ary, L. C. Jacobs, and C. Sorensen, *Introduction to Research in Education*, Wadsworth, Belmont, 2010.

[39] F. J. Gravetter and L. B. Wallnau, *Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*, Cengage Learning, 2017.

[40] L. Cohen, L. Manion, and K. Morrison, *Research Methods in Education*, Routledge, London, 6th edition, 2007.

[41] A. Mahboob, *Status of Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers in the United States*, Bloomington, 2003.

[42] M. A. Alseweed and A. S. Dhaif-Allah, "University students' perceptions of the teaching effectiveness of native and nonnative teachers of english in the saudi context," *Language in India*, vol. 12, no. 7, pp. 35–60, 2012.

[43] G. Braine, *Teaching English to the World: History, Curriculum and Practice*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, New Jersey, 2005.