

## **【Practical Report】**

### **Native and Non-native: How do Differing Teaching Behaviours Affect Student Motivation in a Japanese University Context?**

James Drew

Chubu/Aichi University

*Key words:* Motivation, NEST, NNEST, Collaboration

**ACCORDING TO DÖRNYEI (2001), THE MEANING OF ‘MOTIVATION’ IS SO** vague, such an abstract and hypothetical concept, that it sometimes feels appropriate to ask the question “Is there such a thing as motivation?” (p.1). It is not surprising then, that despite the almost uncountable amount of research and discussion that has been undertaken on the subject, we are still as fascinated and perplexed by it as ever. Of course, such a question is frivolous, and Dörnyei quotes Scheidecker and Freeman (1999, p.116); “Motivation is, without question, the most complex and challenging issue facing teachers today,” to illustrate the size of obstacle that motivation seems to be.

Indeed, defining the term ‘motivation’ can be a dilemma in itself. Urdan and Schoenfeld (2006) discuss how psychologists are often trained to think of people as “self-autonomous beings with stable personalities that are somewhat resistant to environmental influences” (p.331). Less research has been done in the actual learning situation.

Since English has continued its expansion as the world’s latest lingua franca, the position of non-native English-speaking teachers (NNEST’s) has become a more and more controversial subject. This has been accompanied by a frenzy of research, focusing on all things NNEST—attitudes, preferences, attainment, etc.—and motivation, focusing on both teachers and students. The bulk of English learners in the world, however, study

in a foreign language context, therefore most teachers of English work in these contexts (Cook, 1999), and most students receive their tutelage from NNEST's (Bulter, 2007).

The context of this paper falls within this zone, in what Kachru (1985) described as the Expanding Circle. The Japanese education system has received worldwide recognition as being a great success. However, while English is now a major subject in both junior and senior Japanese high schools, the deficiencies of the system have often been deliberated, both inside and outside of the country (e.g. Doi, 1994), as well as by the Japanese Ministry of Education (MEXT) itself, who have admitted on multiple occasions that English education in Japan is failing (Igawa, 2015).

While in academic circles the notion and segregation of 'the native teacher' is fading, the reality is that on the front line—in classrooms and institutions—this divide still remains intact (Trent, 2016), though of course in some contexts more than others. It is arguable that this line can be clearly seen and felt in many Japanese contexts, including at the university level. The link to any such divides and low foreign language attainment are unclear, and a topic for another day.

While much research has been done on motivation as a separate entity, as well as the attitudes, preferences, attainment, etc., from both students and teachers' perspectives, towards native English-speaking teachers (NEST's) and NNEST's, there have been very few studies that have looked specifically at the differing effect that these two groups of teachers might have on student motivation, particularly in the Japanese university context.

This publication is a summary of a full-length Masters study, which has multiple goals and research questions. The first is to look at how the motivation of students within this context might be affected by NEST's and NNEST's, and attempting to gain some insight into what it is that teachers actually do in the classroom that affects student motivation, by looking at any differences that might exist between NEST's and NNEST's methodological practices and teaching behaviour. Indeed, it is hard to dispute that differences do exist, even within the increasingly prominent discussion of what it really means to be a NEST. It is important that if any differences are still prominent, particularly

to the students, they should first be fully recognised and discussed by teachers, in order that we may better understand one another, and better appreciate each other's strengths and weaknesses, so that we can successfully collaborate, learn from each other, and continue to improve ourselves as educators.

Whilst there are some fine organisations in Japan that bring teachers together, such as JALT (The Japan Association for Language Teaching), the fact that there is much more literature on the divide between NEST's and NNEST's than there is about how they can collaborate, in a way tells its own story. The secondary area of research in the original version of this paper, therefore, is the current state of teacher collaboration in the Japanese university context, and this paper is hoping to fall somewhere alongside the likes of Matsuda (1999) and Matsuda and Matsuda (2001), who have championed an improved collaboration between NEST's and NNEST's. However, the main research question (RQ) being focused on in this publication, concerning student motivation, is:

RQ: Do university students in Japan feel different levels of motivation to study English when being taught by NEST's and NNEST's?

This RQ is informed by a number of studies discussed in the literature review, most notably Lasagabaster and Sierra (2005), though adapted for a more motivational perspective. The Hypotheses (HP) anticipated in answer to the RQ is as follows:

HP: That Japanese University students do feel different levels of motivation to study English when being taught by NEST's and NNEST's.

Following this introduction is a short literature review covering a number of topics closely related to the study. Next, the methodological procedure of the study is briefly explained, before some of the most pertinent findings are presented and discussed.

### **Literature Review**

Plenty of studies have focused on various aspects of native and nonnative teachers of English. Whilst this literature stretches back decades, there are very few studies that have a specific link between any differing methodologies of NEST's, NNEST's and student motivation. There is of course a wealth of papers covering a number of closely related topics.

There are studies that look at student proficiency levels when paired with NEST's and NNEST's (such as oral communication, reading, writing, grammatical knowledge, etc.), studies that explore attitudes towards NEST's and NNEST's (from students and teachers alike), studies that research any differences in teaching habits and behaviours of NEST's and NNEST's, and there are of course many studies on motivation, of both students and teachers, native and nonnative. The following is a brief look at some of the most relevant literature on these topics, and how they contradict, or compliment and build on each other.

The psychological concept of motivation is an endlessly deep topic of interest and research, partly because we do not, and may never know the forces that truly lie behind it. Following is a short review of some of the literature concerning how motivation applies to second language learning, with some relation to NEST's and NNEST's.

Gardner has been a leading voice on the subject of student motivation for a number of years. Gardner and Lambert (1972) was conducted over a twelve-year period in the United States, with students of English and French, hailing from the United States and the Philippines. This was the birth of the sociopsychological theory of second/foreign language learning, suggesting that adopting linguistic and cultural values of the target language group was a key component of successful language learning. This is also supported by Clément, Gardner and Smythe (1977), who state that a positive attitude toward the second language community is integral to student motivation (though they suggest that competence is also closely related to other factors, as well as motivation).

Gardner, Smythe and Clément (1979) focused more specifically on attitudes and motivation in a French-Canadian context, with similar results, while also finding that a student's sociocultural background can strongly affect attitudes and motivation. Gardner's 1985 paper looks at the distinction between 'integrative' and 'instrumental' forms of motivation, i.e. one learner may be driven mainly by a wish to integrate with a community, while another may be driven solely by the reward that the usefulness of knowing a language can bring. This integrative motivation grew into a central part of Gardner's motivation theory, however, in his 2001 work he does state that this "has slightly different meanings to many different individuals" (p.1). In this same paper, he discusses the roles of students, teachers, and researchers in understanding motivation within second language learning, focusing on the stability or fluidity of motivation, and finding that this, along with the difference between motivation and motivating, have many implications for language teachers and learners.

McDonough (2007) presents a good overview of some other research into motivation in ELT. He initially highlights four different elements that move us to act: (a) the reasons why we want to learn, (b) the strength of our desire to learn, (c) the kind of person we are, and (d) the task, and our estimation of what is required of us. These elements are strongly influenced by Gardner, however, he goes on to point out that more recently, Gardner (1985) has been much opposed, as it disguised other significant motivational divergences, such as extrinsic and intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985), and striving for success versus the avoidance of failure (Heckhausen, 1991). McDonough also briefly discusses the work of Crookes and Schmidt (1991), who focus on other important aspects that can affect motivation, such as learning contexts, strategies, and observable learning behaviour of students, and Covington (1998), who developed the self-worth theory encompassing the learner's level of aspiration, and known and teachable learning strategies. He notes the works of Bandura (1997) and his idea of self-efficacy (how students assess their own competence and manage themselves), which is related to the self-worth theory, and Ushioda (1996), who ties these aspects of motivation

to learner autonomy. This already gives some idea of the size and scope that can be applied to the term 'motivation' in a language learning context, and the many directions it has been taken in by so many researchers. McDonough finishes by attempting to locate the role of teachers within all of these ideas, which while this seems somewhat futile, given the breadth of ideas covered, he does suggest that a key role of teachers is to avoid de-motivating their students.

Sakui and Cowie delve into the 'dark side of motivation,' as they call it, in their 2011 study, which is in a Japanese university context, making it particularly relevant to this paper. They suggest that while motivation itself is a much-researched area, a scant amount of studies have looked into this paradox of the 'dark side,' without which, a lot of knowledge is missing from our overall understanding, mirroring Dörnyei's (2001) thoughts on the subject in his excellent book 'Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom.' Sakui and Cowie make a distinction between Dörnyei's 'demotivation', and Noels, Pelletier, Clément and Vallerand's (2000) 'amotivation,' however due to the difficulty teachers have in distinguishing between these two types of anti-motivation in a classroom situation, they combine them into 'unmotivation' for much of their paper, which will also be used for the purposes of this paper. Before Sakui and Cowie discuss their own work, they cite Noels, Pelletier, Clément and Vallerand (2000) as one of the few other papers to refer to the subject of anti-motivation, and Falout, Elwood and Hood (2009) as one of the even fewer that have investigated how this issue is handled by teachers in the classroom. Their own study consisted of short, open-ended surveys that were completed by thirty-two university English teachers, and follow-up interviews with three of those teachers. Their methodology has strong validity, and encompasses a great variety of participants in terms of age, gender, nationality, qualifications, experience, and location, while their sampling for interviews was inspired by Spradley's (1979) purposeful sampling principals. However, of their initial participants, only eight can be classified as NNEST's, compared to twenty-four which can be classified as NEST's. Their results suggested three main areas where teachers felt hampered in motivating

learners, which were: institutional systems, student attitudes, and teacher-student relationships. There were some interesting findings in all three of these areas, for example, how a teacher's perceived shortcomings can affect their ability to build effective teacher-student relationships. However, this is further supported in excellent fashion by a discussion chapter that covers the acceptance of the existence of 'unmotivation,' and the pedagogical and research implications moving forward, pointing out factors such as the need for teachers to become more aware of the internal and external factors affecting student motivation and "recognising that external factors may not be within their control, whereas internal ones might be...(therefore to) focus their cognitive, pedagogical, and emotional energy on internal factors rather than external ones," (p.208) as well as providing thoughts on how to do this, and in what direction this research could follow in the future.

Kormos and Csizér (2008) performed a study entitled 'Age-related differences in the motivation of learning English as a foreign language: Attitudes, selves, and motivated learning behavior' In this two-part cross-sectional study, they explore potential differences in three groups of learners of different ages, as well as empirically testing the two main constructs (the ideal L2 self and the ought-to L2 self) of Dörnyei's (2005) motivational self-system. The main area of relevance in this study to the current paper is that it looks at the motivation of university students, and while it looks at older and younger learners in equal measure, this also provides some interest in regards to this paper's respondent's views of their own past motivation levels and learning experiences. While they had mixed results in testing Dörnyei's models, their results from the cross-sectional study reveal some intriguing findings. In summary, the university students had moved away from the English-language cultural-product based motivation prevalent in younger learners, but maintained a strong link to the importance of language learning attitudes, which was lost, to a large extent, with older learners. They suggested that this could be put down to the learners' greater knowledge of the importance/usefulness of speaking English, and their language learning attitudes still primarily being shaped by

teachers in the classroom. The questionnaires used in this study were extremely thorough, and while of course this is important in terms of validity, such in-depth questionnaires may fall on confused, or uninterested ears in alternative contexts, particularly that of the current paper.

Urdu and Schoenfelder's 2006 article is one that looks at classroom effects on student motivation. While it is not focused on language learning in particular, its description of three motivational perspectives (achievement goal theory, self-determination theory, and social-cognitive theory) and meta-analysis of the effects that the social relationships of teachers and peers can have on motivation are relevant.

Within the field of second language learning, the topics of attitudes, opinions, and preferences are all closely entwined with motivation, yet can still also be seen as clearly different concepts. According to Dörnyei (2001) attitudes can influence motivation because they "exert a directive influence on behaviour, because someone's attitude towards a target influences the overall pattern of the person's response to the target. Their impact is modified by the person's subjective norms (perceived social pressures) and perceived behavioural control (perceived ease or difficulty of performing the behaviour" (p.11). This is based upon Ajzen's (1985) theory of planned behaviour (the theory that attitude toward behaviour, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control, together shape an individual's behavioural intentions and behaviours), and reflects Urdu and Schoenfelder's thoughts on the importance of social relationships in motivation.

Igawa's (2015) short study of Japanese university students, covering both motivation and attitudes, was designed to replicate a larger scale study in a different context by Taguchi, Madid and Papi (2009), both of which used a questionnaire originally introduced by Dörnyei. Igawa received similar results to the larger study, (finding strong support for Dörnyei's 2008 tripartite construct of the L2 Motivational Self System) though among other slight variations, he suggested that learners in Japan are generally



less affected by peer pressure, and surprisingly, in the case of males, have deeper cultural interests and better attitudes towards the language.

Motivation is exceptionally complex, and it is important to remember that, as McDonough (2007, p.369) summarises, “motivation is a property of the learner, but it is also a transitive concept...it is dynamic and changes over time, especially in the usually long-drawn out process of language learning.”

Motivation, attitudes, opinions, preferences...they are all intrinsically interconnected. And while they are so closely linked, they can also be viewed as clearly separate topics. Consequently, it is impossible to avoid the inherent NEST vs NNEST debate that has become so prevalent among English language teaching discourse in recent years, and with good reason. As Matsuda and Matsuda (2001) point out, the majority of English teachers in the world are nonnative speakers of the language.

“Research on the self-perception and student perception of NNEST’s is a relatively recent phenomenon...maybe due to the sensitive nature of these issues...and political incorrectness” (Braine, 1999, p.13). Thankfully, this is no longer the case. After a short period of time in which NNEST’s were sometimes considered as unequal (Phillipson, 1992, p.194, mentions one conclusion from the Commonwealth Conference on the Teaching of English as a Second Language in 1962: “The ideal teacher of English is a native speaker.”), attitudes have (mostly) moved on. It is generally accepted that both NEST’s and NNEST’s have their own strengths and weaknesses, but that other variables such as experience, age, gender, aptitude, personality, motivation and training are equally (or more) important to good teaching than a teacher’s mother tongue (Medgyes, 1992). Indeed, the whole notion of ‘the native teacher,’ or ‘nativism’ has certainly never been a straightforward split, since there are several potential bases for categorising people as native speakers and non-native speakers (Andrews, 2008; McKay, 2002), and is now more difficult to define than ever.

Lasagabaster and Sierra (2002, 2005) and Todd and Pojanapunya (2009) all looked at differing attitudes towards NEST’s and NNEST’s, purely from the student perspective.

Lasagabaster and Sierra's 2002 study of 76 undergraduate students in Spain showed a general preference for NEST's at all levels (primary, secondary, tertiary) and in the majority of areas (vocabulary, pronunciation, listening, reading, etc.), which contradicts a number of other studies, such as Alseweed and Daif-Allah (2012).

Lasagabaster and Sierra's 2005 study utilised an excellent questionnaire that encompassed open and closed sections, also finding general preferences for NEST's. They also highlighted the fact that while previous studies (Medgyes, 1994; Brutt-Griffler and Samimy, 1999; and Liu, 1999) suggest that the debate surrounding comparative abilities of NEST's and NNEST's as language teachers might appear to be irrelevant or even counterproductive, they were "of the opinion that our students' perceptions should also be considered, as they could be different from that of those involved in the teaching world" (p.233).

Todd and Pojanapunya's 2009 study of 295 Thai university student's attitudes digs a little deeper than other similar studies by researching the students implicit, as well as explicit attitudes towards the teachers, by making use of the Implicit-Association Test (IAT). Finding complex attitudes towards NEST's and NNEST's, but with a slightly explicit preference for NEST's, they also highlight the large scale social and commercial preference for NEST's that still exists, especially in parts of Asia. This should be kept in mind in the context of the current paper, where this can often be observed, despite "academic literature and educational principles that suggest that NEST's and NNEST's should be treated equally" (p.25). Some of Todd and Pojanapunya's anecdotal evidence is particularly striking, with quotes such as, "I wouldn't have my child learn English from a NNEST" (p.25). Whilst they collected some contradictory results, this study also confirmed findings from previous survey-based research into student attitudes, which showed explicit preferences for NEST's (including Lasagabaster and Sierra, 2002, 2005). However, the continuing controversy surrounding the implicit association test (such as the lack of reproducibility of many of its results) cannot be completely ignored.

These findings are compelling in support of a NEST preference, reminiscent of the ‘NEST model’, in prominent older TESOL books from Stern (1983) and Harmer (1991), however as touched on previously, in recent years it is rarely so pronounced. When the option of a NEST and NNEST combination is offered to students alongside NEST or NNEST options, this is usually preferred, as in Preston (1984), which also reflects the (still changing) attitudes within the teaching profession.

Alseweed (2012) and Alseweed and Daif-Allah (2012) examined Saudi university student’s preferences and perceptions. Alseweed and Daif-Allah’s study agrees with the common view that NEST’s strengths lie in oral skills, while NNEST’s are in writing and grammar. General overall perceptions were not explored in this study, though Alseweed individually looked at opinions of NEST’s and NNEST’s, finding a general but marked statistical preference for NEST’s, which increases with academic level. This is significant as respondents in Alseweed’s study had exposure to both NEST’s and NNEST’s in the past, and exhibited a clear preference for NEST’s in regards to teaching strategies. Some positive attitudes were found towards NNEST’s, though, regarding the learning environment and response to learners needs. This study is commendable in its methodology—both quantitative and qualitative data was collected over two stages, including 169 initial respondents, though one negative point surrounding the data is the lack of any female participants. Xiaoru’s (2008) study of Chinese learners of English also found that students clearly recognised the respective strengths of both NEST’s and NNEST’s.

Matsuda (1999) and Matsuda and Matsuda (2001) place themselves carefully in the middle of the NEST or NNEST debate, advocating for a much more integrative and collaborative model of teacher development, while many studies have more recently attacked the idea that NNEST’s are not as adept as NEST’s (Nemtchinova, 2005), leading to further debate around what it means to ‘be native’. In this newly emerging world of English as a Lingua Franca, or International Language, Rampton (1990) suggests that the use of the term ‘native teacher competency’ is becoming irrelevant. Although Seidlhofer

(1999) suggests that language proficiency is usually associated with teaching competence, the strengths of NNEST's has been positively championed, (Phillipson, 1992) noting that going through the process of learning English as an L2 themselves gives them advantages as a teacher, such as a deeper knowledge of English language learning strategies and being more empathetic to their learners' linguistic needs and challenges (as shown in Alseweed, 2012). This point is starkly illustrated by the title of Paikeday's 1985 book 'The Native Speaker is Dead.'

Although the topics of motivation, attitudes, and preferences, etc. have been discussed here in a fairly separate manner, it is important to remember, of course, that they overlap considerably. While collaboration stands apart the most in this literature review, it also has links with each of the other topics. This returns the discussion to one of, if not the most, important aspect of this paper—that collaboration is a vital tool in the constant struggle to adjust our language teaching, to maximise the motivation, and ultimately the attainment of the students.

## **Methodology**

### **Participants**

This study was carried out in the Chubu area of central Japan, with students who have been learning and teaching English for a number of years. The students have all been taught by both NEST's and NNEST's for at least half a year (in the case of first year students), though the majority have experienced this combination for considerably longer, as is the increasingly common normality of English education in Japan, at all levels of schooling, from elementary school through high school. The students were asked how long they have been studying English, with answers ranging from 4 to 18 years, with a mean of 9.40. These students study at two private universities located in the area. There are 128 student participants in total, ranging in age from 18 to 22, with a mean age of 19.20. There are 90 female students (70.31% of the sample) to 38 male students (29.69%), which closely reflects the overall enrolment of both the universities involved in the study.

To attempt to gain a broad picture, the subjects include both English Major students (including English Teacher courses, International Communication courses, etc.), at 87 (67.97%), and non-English major students, at 41 (32.03%), who are studying a range of design and international culture courses. They encompass university year groups one through three, with 32 (25%) in the first grade, 41 in the second (32.03%) and 55 in the third (42.97%). It is hoped that the larger proportion of students in the third grade, with their relative wealth of experience of studying English at university, will be able to contribute particularly meaningful feedback, especially in the qualitative data. Subjects were also asked if they have visited an English-speaking country before, to which 58 replied yes (45.31%) and 68 said no (53.13%), with 2 no responses.

### **Instruments**

This paper uses a mixed-method framework consisting of a combination of quantitative and qualitative data, with the aim of balancing the limitations of one with the strengths of the other (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Questionnaires or surveys are universally recognised as being one of the most extensively utilised instruments in educational research (Cohen and Manion, 1989). This study is no different in that regard, and collection in the form of questionnaires featured both closed (respondents selected their degree of agreement or disagreement with proposed statements, using various versions of the five-point Likert scale) and open sections (where they were free to write down any thoughts of their own). These included sections on general information, activities and teaching methods in the classroom, and their own motivation.

This study's questionnaires are based closely on Lasagabaster and Sierra's 2005 study, and was issued to students in class, with the closed section completed first, before turning to the open, discussion section, during which each class of students was asked to form small groups (three to five students), and given at least ten minutes to discuss the questions in their groups, before completing them on an individual basis.

## Analysis of Results

### Student Results

**Closed Section of the Questionnaire.** Looking at all student participants, a general increase in motivation when being taught by NEST's is clear to see, particularly at the university level. 45.31% of respondents strongly agree, with 42.19% moderately agreeing that in university English classes they feel more motivated when being taught by a NEST. Compare this to how motivated respondents feel when being taught by a NNEST, over a NNEST, as exhibited in Table 1, and this lends strong support to the hypothesis: That Japanese University students feel different levels of motivation to study English when being taught by NEST's and NNEST's.

**Table 1.** At university, I feel motivated to study English when being taught by a...

	...NEST's	...NNEST's
Strongly Agree (SA)	45.31%	12.5%
Agree (A)	42.19%	37.5%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree (NAND)	11.72%	39.84%
Disagree (D)	0.78%	7.03%
Strongly Disagree (SD)	0%	3.13%

When scrutinised against previous papers (Todd & Pojanapunya, 2009) that have highlighted the uplifted status of NEST's that (still evidently) exists in Asia, the results of this study still suggest surprisingly high levels of motivation with NEST's in the Japanese university context, with a total of 87.5% in some state of agreement.

However, even in the face of this almost unanimous vote for NEST's in terms of effect on motivation, when given the choice of English teacher options, there is a little more balance, as can be seen in Table 2.

**Table 2.** At university I would feel more motivated by having:

	Percentage of Respondents
NEST's only	37.5%
NNEST's only	3.91%
A mixture of NEST's and NNEST's	58.59%

This result suggests that, despite the overall feeling that NEST's have a bigger effect on motivation, students still value NNEST's enough to select a mix of teachers (58.59%) above either individual group, which mirrors various other studies (Preston, 1984). It is worth noting, though, that at 37.5%, a NEST's only line-up is not too far behind.

One statistic in particular is rather telling. Students were asked to select their level of agreement to the following statement: 'I think I learn(ed) more English/better English when being taught by a NEST,' with 75% of respondents in agreement (44.53% strongly agreeing and 30.47% moderately agreeing).

Concerning the operational language in the classroom, two major questions were put to the students, one about them being allowed to use Japanese in the classroom to communicate with peers and teachers, the other about being encouraged to only use English in the classroom by the teacher. There is a much more even split here, with slight majorities feeling impartial on both points. While these results seem a little contradictory, they suggest that while students seem to want to challenge themselves to speak only English, they also desire a place for their L1 in the classroom (see Table 3).

**Table 3.** Language use in the classroom.

	I feel more motivated when I am allowed to talk to the teacher and my classmates in Japanese.	I feel more motivated when I am encouraged to only use English in the classroom.
SA	7.81%	21.09%
A	30.47%	25.78%
NAND	40.63%	32.03%
D	14.06%	22.66%
SD	7.03%	3.13%

**Open Section of the Student's Questionnaire.** The purpose of the open section of the questionnaire was to gain a more individual, detailed, and insightful glimpse of how the students feel, and more precisely what is that we, as teachers, do in the classroom, that impacts motivation.

All participants wrote down answers of some sort, although a small handful did not fill in all sections, most often omitting the negative comments box. The total number of sentences produced by the students was 454, distributed as follows: 167 describing the positive points of NEST's, and 99 describing their negative points. 100 sentences described NNEST's positive points, with 88 describing their negative points. While NEST's received more in the way of positive comments, the negative sides were more balanced. While a few comments were brief, and dare it be said, lazy, most appeared to be constructive and sincere. The biggest issue surrounding this data is its validity in terms of its relation to student motivation, rather than attitudes and perceptions. While this was



stressed by the researcher before and during the act of discussing and writing comments, it is difficult to say how much this was adhered to in the busy minds of the participants.

Positive points regarding NEST's showed the most variety in topics, with 14 categories receiving two or more acknowledgements, yet also the second most popular topic among all four sections, in pronunciation/intonation, with 48 mentions (37.5%) citing this as an area of positive motivation when being taught by NEST's (supporting qualitative findings, in which 75% of students agreed that they felt more motivated to work on their pronunciation with a NEST). Therefore, this section was chosen as a full representative example of results from this section of the questionnaire. Table 4 presents a rank-ordered summary of participants positive categories of responses, with anything receiving two or more mentions included (this seemed a reasonable cut off point).

**Table 4.** NEST's Positive Points.

Topic of Discourse	Number of mentions	Percentage of respondents
Pronunciation / intonation	48	37.5%
Fun / interesting activities	39	30.47%
Listening to good / natural / native English	32	25%
Listening practice improves	24	18.75%
We can practice speaking English	18	14.06%
Learn about other cultures	16	12.5%
NEST's are good / friendly people	7	5.47%
Specific mentions of positive motivation	7	5.47%
Speaking only English	5	3.91%
Relaxing / "free" class atmosphere	5	3.91%
Vocabulary, grammar and phrases	5	3.91%
High number of games and activities	4	3.13%
Class structure is good	3	2.34%
It improves our self confidence	2	1.56%

Concerning the negative impacts that NEST's can have on student motivation, there is one clear favourite: students can't always understand what the teacher says or means, which received 39 mentions (30.47%). One response also referred back to her elementary school experience, saying "for elementary school children I think some of them are less motivated because they don't understand at all." This certainly reflects responses in the quantitative section of this questionnaire, as well as previous studies.

The closest contender to ‘lack of understanding’ was also linguistic in nature: that students often hesitate (or can’t) ask questions in class when they are unsure of the directions, the meaning of the material, etc. This ranked at 13.28%, with 17 mentions. This compliments quantitative data, where 85.94% agreed that they feel more motivated to communicate orally with a NEST, suggesting that despite some obvious challenges, on the whole, students are trying to communicate orally with NEST’s, even when problems arise during lessons.

Concerning NNEST’s areas of positive motivation points, there was less variety of responses to those of NEST’s, however, a much clearer victor. “It’s easy to understand them,” and other similar responses regarding the ability to communicate well with the teacher appeared a total of 68 times (53.13%), in various guises. This is not surprising, with a small number of comments revealing “It’s easy to understand, as it’s mostly in Japanese,” and the meagre mentions of NNEST’s volume of English usage. NNEST’s knowledge of grammar is also valued. This comfort in the learning environment, recognition of strengths and response to learners needs, reflects previous studies, such as Alseweed (2012) and Alseweed and Daif-Allah (2012).

Finally, NNEST’s negative points, which had a wider variety of feedback than the positives influences. Whilst acknowledged less than the most popular comments in other sections, it was still comparatively clear how the students felt about NNEST’s pronunciation. With 26 remarks, including “Very bad pronunciation,” the pronunciation of some NNEST’s was cited by 20.31% of students. The personal linguistic challenge that NNEST’s face is also evident; “Sometimes English isn’t used, in fact, there are no

classes that use only English,” and “Almost all NNEST’s do class in Japanese” being some standout comments.

To summarise and compare these qualitative elements from the student questionnaires, how do these results compliment or contradict results from the quantitative section? When considering the RQ (That Japanese university students feel different levels of motivation to study English when being taught by NEST’s and NNEST’s), this seems to be supported by a number of student comments. Seven specific references to motivation, such as “Classes are active and motivate us to study English. I would like to choose native teachers over nonnative teachers so that I can acquire more English,” appear in the NEST’s Positive Points section. However, any positive comments related to motivation are lacking in the NNEST’s comments sections. Indeed, there is more than one comment referring to ‘unmotivation,’ with one example being “teacher’s pronunciation is not good, my motivation goes down.” At this point the author would like to reiterate that this paper is not in any way meant to bring NNEST’s and their teaching abilities into disrepute! The results found here do lend support however, to previously well-documented preferences to NEST’s (Preston 1984), particularly in an Asian context. This also appears to exist strongly within the domain of motivation.

There are some discrepancies, however. One of the standout examples concerns L1 and L2 use in the classroom. While both qualitative, and particularly quantitative results in this paper seem to suggest that the challenge of only using English in the classroom has a positive effect on motivation, some comments from students suggest otherwise. NEST negative comments such as “Sometimes I can’t understand what the teacher says,”

and NNEST positive comments like “I can ask in Japanese when I don’t understand something” seem to advocate for some Japanese in the classroom having a positive effect. Qualitative question 28 (I feel more motivated when I am allowed to talk to my classmates or the teacher in Japanese) also proves inconclusive.

### **Teacher’s Questionnaire Results**

The original teachers survey has two separate areas of data to discuss: motivation of students, and teacher collaboration. Only the motivational data will be discussed in this publication. To analyse data from the teachers’ questionnaire, first the quantitative data set will be discussed, comparing responses from NEST’s and NNEST’s, with any relevant qualitative responses then also being reviewed. More emphasis is placed on the qualitative side of the teachers’ responses compared to the students’ surveys, due to their (presumed!) professionalism and maturity in such tasks. Overall findings will then be compared to results from the student data set, to try and establish the strongest links and disparities in terms of the motivational impact of certain teaching behaviours.

**Results from the Motivation Section of the Teacher’s Questionnaire.** Overall, teachers are rather mixed in their opinions of whether students feel more motivated by NEST’s or NNEST’s. This is however, in stark contrast to the student results on the same matter. When asked if they think students are more motivated by NEST’s, 35.29% of teachers agreed (to some extent), 47.06% nether agreed nor disagreed, while 17.65% disagreed. Asked the same question regarding NNEST’s, only 5.88% agreed, 52.94% were impartial, while 41.18% disagreed. There was a slight difference between teacher

groups regarding this point, with NEST's tending to be more impartial, and NNEST's swinging the overall statistic more in favour of agreement and disagreement respectively. These results suggest that while teachers do, in general, recognise the fact that students may be more motivated by NEST's, they vastly underestimate the extent to which this is true. These findings are supported in a roundabout way with a handful of teacher comments. Teacher N (NNEST) suggests rather directly that "We can learn the way of how to motivate students from NEST's." Teacher H (NEST) states that "Students might be more motivated to work on speaking in a NEST's class," which rings true regarding much of the previous data, though does clash with some students' comments about being hesitant or feeling unable to ask questions in NEST's classes.

Notably though, teachers are almost totally unified in their agreement that there are differences in NEST's and NNEST's teaching behaviour (94.12% agree, 5.88% impartial), and that these differences do often have an impact on student motivation (88.24% agree, 5.88% impartial and 5.88% disagree), with only marginally more agreement among NEST's on both accounts.

This finds agreement in many teacher comments, such as "Many NNEST's view English as a subject of study, with a strong focus on grammar and theory, and not a tool for communication." (Teacher A). However, an important point is raised by five (29.41% of) teacher respondents: that NEST's and NNEST's sometimes teach different classes. NEST's are apparently often preferred for oral communication-based classes, while NNEST's are sometimes given more reading and writing classes. Whether this is right or wrong is a debate for another time, but it might help further explain teacher K's comment;

“Despite the actual teaching styles of NNEST’s, I think students tend to categorise them as less fun...based purely on stereotypical notions of how English is taught by NNEST’s in junior high schools and high schools.” This also reflects data from this study’s student questionnaires, about their feelings of motivation at previous academic levels, which is likewise in agreement with much existing literature on the topic.

That teachers differ in their methods is, however also statistically recognised extremely closely by students (91.41%), although while the majority of students also agree that these differences often affect them motivationally, it is slightly less strong, at 74.22%.

NEST’s and NNEST’s are about equal in their opinion of whether NEST’s classes are, in fact, more ‘fun’ and/or ‘interesting’ than NNEST’s, with 47.06% in overall agreement, 41.18% impartial, while 11.76% disagree. This does however, clash with the students’ verdict somewhat, where 60.94% agree to the same question. This suggests that both sets of teachers perhaps under-recognise and/or undervalue the ‘fun factor’ in the classroom practice of language teaching.

100% of all teachers either strongly agreed or agreed that their classes involve a lot of pair or group work, with 67.91% of students feeling motivated by it according to the quantitative data. However, there are some discrepancies found within the students’ qualitative comments, in which two students specifically mentioned the lack of group or pair work as a negative of NNEST’s, while other comments also hinted at such, though in a more ambiguous manner.

Regarding language use in the classroom, 58.82% of teachers usually encourage students to use only English in the classroom, with 11.76% and 23.53% not doing so. However, there are large, and arguably predictable differences here between NEST's and NNEST's. 75% of NEST's usually do so, compared to only 20% of NNEST's, with 60% of NNEST's in disagreement.

This difference between teacher groups is also present in the teachers own use of language: 60% of NNEST's strongly agree that they often use Japanese in their English classes (with the other 40% impartial), compared to just 8.33% of agreement from NEST's, with 16.67% impartial and 75% disagreeing. This is clearly reflected by students quantitative and qualitative results, while teachers comments also acknowledge this a number of times, as exemplified by teacher H (NEST), "The main reason why I think students might be more motivated to work on speaking in a NEST's class is because I think many NNEST's don't use much English in their classes, due to low confidence which is caused by native speaker-ism and lack of training. NEST's are more likely to use English most of the time in their classes, so students associate speaking in English with NEST's rather than NNEST's."

### **Discussion**

It is not the goal of this paper, nor the intention of the author to presume what methods might be appropriate to try and answer some of the questions that are clearly facing the profession. However, within some of the findings previously discussed, a few clues may lie.



According to Urdan and Schoenfelder, (2006) students are likely to experience enhanced motivation when they are “encouraged and allowed to take ownership for their learning in an environment in which they feel cared for, supported, and socially connected to teachers and peers, and when they are given meaningful and appropriately challenging work,” (p.344).

Kormos and Csizér (2008) state that within integrative motivation, implied are emotional and psychological variations with either the language community (Gardner, 2001), or, if there is no salient L2 community in existence within the direct learning environment, then an identification with values associated with the L2 community and the language, or with the language itself (Dörnyei, 1990).

Sakui and Cowie (2011) highlighted institutional systems as one of the three main areas where teachers felt hampered in motivating learners, and the current author feels it might be appropriate for the Japanese university language teaching community to ask themselves an honest question - are they doing as much as they can or should to provide these kinds of environments? This author would also argue that it must be more challenging to create such environments, where a teacher divide might exist, not only in a professional sense (i.e. courses and content), but also the social dynamic of the institution.

Sakui and Cowie also state, however, that teachers should “focus their cognitive, pedagogical, and emotional energy on internal factors rather than external ones,” (p.208) and another of the key implications going forward still appears to be L1 and L2 use within the classroom. Of course, NNEST’s English ability and confidence are key here, and

while standards are slowly improving, much more responsibility could be taken, if not institutionally, then individually, in this regard. There is considerable literature and guidelines on the topic, which it seems should be revisited en masse. Likewise, if NEST's are able to operate sufficiently in Japanese, this too may help.

Stepping carefully around the recent politically incorrect trend of cultural appropriation, the use of foreign culture could also surely be utilised more by NNEST's (and possibly NEST's). Moreover, when it comes to collaboration, excuses of teacher groups teaching different types of classes, and no official collaboration systems being in existence could also be cast aside.

In short, there are many areas in which improvements could (and probably should) be made, and in final conclusion, by embarking on a more collaborative approach, together teachers might achieve some of the following, and more:

- Provide greater coherence to the teaching aims and objectives of their faculty, or even across faculties - thereby improving the teaching expertise of teachers and the learning experience of students.
- Contribute a different perspective to research, that, in terms of results could be applied to a wider context - therefore improving the quality and activity of the research culture of the faculty and the reputation of the university.
- Improve general communication between colleagues that enhances the professional motivation and personal morale of individual teachers - and thereby students.

Within the collaborative model of teacher development, teachers are driven by both-and logic (as opposed to an either-or, or competitive logic), and as Matsuda (1999) said; “teachers see themselves as members of a collaborative community in which they share their special strengths to help each other out.” This is something that all members of the teaching profession can continue to work towards.

### **Conclusions**

#### **Do University Students in Japan Feel Different Levels of Motivation to Study English when Being Taught by NEST’s and NNEST’s?**

While the above motivation RQ concerning the motivational effect that NEST’s and NNEST’s might have on their students in Japanese universities is not particularly revolutionary, in this context further insight should be beneficial.

While there were a few surprising findings, the RQ was answered largely affirmatively. With over 90% of student participants recognising clear differences in the teaching behaviours of NEST’s and NNEST’s, and three quarters admitting that these differences often affect their motivation in some way, the hypothesis that the students do indeed feel different levels of motivation with these two teacher groups is difficult to reject. From a teacher’s point of view, findings closely reflected the students’ opinions on differences in teaching behaviour, and seemed to over-estimate the number of students that feel the effects of these differences motivationally. However, one notable disparity did appear. Student results implied that there is a significant increase in the level of motivation felt when being taught by a NEST, compared to a NNEST. Teacher results,

though, showed a large gap between students' actual motivation levels as found in this study, and the teachers understanding of them.

In brief, the data suggests that while teachers are very much aware of the differences in teaching behaviour and the breadth of its impact, they markedly underestimate the depth to which these differences might be affecting individual student motivation levels.

A number of slight differences were found to be potentially in existence between NEST's and NNEST's, such as use of movement, group work, and popular culture. However, the most notable results relate to language use in the classroom, in which teachers admitted to large differences in approaches, which appear to leave learners feeling torn between challenging themselves to operate and improve in the L2, whilst also desiring the support that L1 usage can undoubtedly provide. Findings here suggest that this is a balance that is not being very successfully struck by either group of teachers.

In terms of improvements, one factor that could have been added to the student questionnaire is to do with their own individual goal structures. There is a growing body of research to suggest that classroom goals are based more on subjective individual constructions of students than they are objective reality, and as Urdan (2004) and Wolters (2004) point out, there tends to be more variety in students goal structures within classrooms, than between classrooms.

One weakness in the data collection methods used here is that they only measure explicit responses. Using a similar system to the IAT (Implicit-Association Test)

employed by Todd and Pojanapunya (2009) may be an option in any similar studies in the future, although the IAT itself is not without its detractors.

Despite these, and many other ways in which the current study could be improved, some interesting data were found, much of which was not presented here due to publication limitations.

### REFERENCES

- Ajzen I. (1985) From Intentions to Actions: A Theory of Planned Behavior. In: Kuhl J., Beckmann J. (eds) *Action Control*. SSSP Springer Series in Social Psychology. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.
- Alseweed, M. A. (2012). University Students' Perceptions of the Influence of Native and Non-Native Teachers. *English Language Teaching*, 5(12), pp. 42-53.
- Alseweed, M. A., & Daif-Allah, A. S. (2012). University Students' Perceptions of the Teaching Effectiveness of Native and Nonnative Teachers of English in the Saudi Context. *Language in India*, 12, 35-60.
- Andrews S. J. (2008) *Teacher Language Awareness*. In: Hornberger N.H. (eds) Encyclopedia of Language and Education. Boston, MA: Springer.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.
- Braine, G. (1999). NNS and Invisible Barriers in ELT. *TESOL Matters*, 2, 14.
- Brutt-Griffler, J.A.N.I.N.A., & Samimy, K. K. (1999). Revisiting the colonial in the postcolonial: Critical praxis for nonnative-English-speaking teachers in a TESOL program. *Tesol Quarterly*, 33, 413-431.

- Butler, Y. G. (2007). How are nonnative-English-speaking teachers perceived by young learners?. *Tesol Quarterly*, 41, 731-755.
- Clément, R., Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1977). Motivational variables in second language acquisition: A study of francophones learning English. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 9, 123.
- Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1989). Métodos de investigación educativa, traduzido de [Research Methods in Education]. Madrid, SA: Editorial La Muralla.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL quarterly*, 33, 185-209.
- Covington, M. V. (1998). *The will to learn: A guide for motivating young people*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language learning*, 41, 469-512.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination in personality. *Journal of research in personality*, 19, 109-134.
- Doi, A. (1994). Rich but mute: Japan's internationalization is one-way. *Japan Update*, 16-17.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign-language learning. *Language learning*, 40, 45-78.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2008). New ways of motivating foreign language learners: Generating Reports from English Teachers' Seminar 2

vision. *Links*, 38, 3-4.

Dornyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Falout, J., Elwood, J., & Hood, M. (2009). Demotivation: Affective states and learning outcomes. *System*, 37, 403-417.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C. (2001). Language Learning Motivation: The Student, the Teacher, and the Researcher. *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*, 6, 1-18.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning*. Rowlet, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Gardner, R. C., Smythe, P. C., & Clément, R. (1979). Intensive Second Language Study in a Bicultural Milieu: An Investigation of Attitudes, Motivation and Language Proficiency 1. *Language learning*, 29, 305-320.

Harmer, J. (1991). The practice of English language teaching 3rd edition. *London: New York*.

Heckhausen, H. (1991). *Motivation and action*. Berlin: Springer.

Igawa, K. (2015). EFL Learners' Attitudes and Motivation towards Learning English: In the Case of Japanese University Students. *四天王寺大学紀要*, 60, 379-408.

Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational researcher*, 33, 14-26.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English Reports from English Teachers' Seminar 2

- Language in the outer circle. In: Quirk R., Widdowson H. (Eds.), *English in the World*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kormos, J., & Csizér, K. (2008). Age-related differences in the motivation of learning English as a foreign language: Attitudes, selves, and motivated learning behavior. *Language learning*, 58, 327-355.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2002). University students' perceptions of native and non-native speaker teachers of English. *Language Awareness*, 11, 132-142.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2005). What do students think about the pros and cons of having a native speaker teacher? In *Non-native language teachers* (pp. 217-241). Boston, MA: Springer.
- Liu, J. (1999). Nonnative-English-speaking professionals in TESOL. *Tesol Quarterly*, 33, 85-102.
- Matsuda, P. K. (1999). Teacher development through native speaker-nonnative speaker collaboration. *TESOL Matters*, 9, 1.
- Matsuda, A., & Matsuda, P. K. (2001). Autonomy and collaboration in teacher education: Journal sharing among native and nonnative English-speaking teachers. *CATESOL Journal*, 13, 109-121.
- McDonough, S. (2007). Motivation in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 61, 369.
- McKay, S. L. (2002). Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and perspectives. *NY: OUP*, 142-146.
- Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher*. London: Macmillan.
- Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: who's worth more?. *ELT journal*, 46, 340-346.
- Reports from English Teachers' Seminar 2*



349.

Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clément, R., & Vallerand, R. J. (2000). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language learning*, 50, 57-85.

Nemtchinova, E. (2005). Host teachers' evaluations of nonnative-English-speaking teacher trainees—A perspective from the classroom. *Tesol Quarterly*, 39, 235-261.

Paikeday, T. M., & Chomsky, N. (1985). *The native speaker is dead! An informal discussion of a linguistic myth with Noam Chomsky and other linguists, philosophers, psychologists, and lexicographers*. Toronto: Paikeday Pub.

Phillipson, R. (1992). ELT: the native speaker's burden?. *ELT journal*, 46, 12-18.

Preston, D. R. (1984). How to Milk a Native Speaker: An Essay in TESL/TEFL Husbandry. *English Teaching Forum*, 22, 11-16.

Rampton, M. B. H. (1990). Displacing the native speaker: expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. *ELT Journal*, 44, 97-101.

Sakui, K., & Cowie, N. (2011). The dark side of motivation: teachers' perspectives on 'unmotivation'. *ELT journal*, 66, 205-213.

Seidlhofer, B. (1999). Double standards: Teacher education in the expanding circle. *World Englishes*, 18, 233-245.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston. LeCompte, MD (2000). *Analyzing Qualitative Data. Theory into Practice*, 39, 146-156.

- Stern, H. H., Tarone, E. E., Stern, H. H., Yule, G., & Stern, H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching: Historical and interdisciplinary perspectives on applied linguistic research*. Oxford, UK: Oxford university press.
- Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 motivational self-system among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian learners of English: A comparative study. In Dornyei, Z. & Ushioda, E. (Eds.) *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 66-97). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Todd, R. W., & Pojanapunya, P. (2009). Implicit attitudes towards native and non-native speaker teachers. *System*, 37, 23-33.
- Todorov, T. (1977). *The Poetics of Prose*, tr. R. Howard. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Trent, J. (2016). The NEST–NNEST divide and teacher identity construction in Hong Kong schools. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 15, 306-320.
- Urdu, T. (2004). Predictors of academic self-handicapping and achievement: Examining achievement goals, classroom goal structures, and culture. *Journal of educational psychology*, 96, 251.
- Urdu, T., & Schoenfelder, E. (2006). Classroom effects on student motivation: Goal structures, social relationships, and competence beliefs. *Journal of school psychology*, 44, 331-349.
- Ushioda, E. (1996). *Learner Autonomy 5: The Role of Motivation*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Wolters, C. A. (2004). Advancing Achievement Goal Theory: Using Goal Structures and Goal Orientations to Predict Students' Motivation, Cognition, and Achievement. *Journal of educational psychology*, 96, 236.

Xiaoru, C. (2008). A survey: Chinese college students' perceptions of non-native English teachers. *CELEA Journal*, 31, 75-82.

**About the Author**

**James Drew** is an English teacher at Aichi University, Nagoya. He was born and raised in the UK, before traveling the world and settling in Japan. He received his BA (in Graphic Design) from Lincoln University, and his MA (in Applied Linguistics and T.E.S.O.L.) from Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge. James has over 7 years of experience in English language teaching, and throughout his career he has worked with all kinds of learners, from kindergarteners to seniors.

*E-mail:* jay.drew.sensei@gmail.com