EFL Students’ In-Class Motivation toward Non-Native English Speaker Teacher and Native English Speaker Teacher

Chung Yi Cheng
Ph.D. Student in Department of English, National Changhua University of Education, No.1 Jinde Rd., Changhua City, Changhua County 500, Taiwan (R.O.C.)
Email: raycheng1018@gmail.com
https://doi.org/10.33329/rjelal.7119.382

ABSTRACT

Students’ learning motivation is always the major topic being researched in the language teaching and learning field. It is also one of the major factors in second language learning. This study examined students’ learning motivation toward non-native English speaker teacher (NNEST) and native English speaker teacher (NEST). Students were divided into seven learner archetypes and their motivation differences were investigated and discussed. During the process of investigation on the in-class motivation, the assumptions which caused the changes were also carried out. The result indicated all the students’ motivation went up during the lectures and unmotivated students always started with a lower point in contrast with highly motivated students. This study identified students’ in-class motivation toward NEST and NNEST in an EFL context.
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Introduction

Motivation

Numerous studies have been conducted to investigate second language learners’ motivation. Gardner and Lambert (1972) probably are the earliest ones who had discussions on the factors. The socio-psychological theory of L2 is brought up and the individual differences are explained and discussed in second language learning. Gardner has identified two types of motivation which are instrumental and integrative motivation. As Law (1999) sited, “Learners with strong integrative orientation tend to be motivated by a desire to understand the culture of the target language and want to interact with people of the target language.” On the other hand, “Learners with strong instrumental orientation tend to be motivated by more pragmatic motives such as passing examinations or finding good jobs.” (Law, 1999, p. 8). Learners with different motivation have their own goals to achieve. Dornyei (1994) has developed an extended framework in the motivation field. He introduced three levels in motivation which are language level, learner level and learning situation level. However, he did not further explain the relationships between the components. The Self-Determination Theory (SDT) was evolved in the 1970s and it was until mid-1980, the SDT was formally introduced. Deci et al. (1985) made the distinction between different types of motivation and they distinguished intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. They indicated, “…intrinsic motivation, which refers to doing something because it is
inherently interesting or enjoyable, and extrinsic motivation, which refers to doing something because it leads to a separable outcome.” (Ryan et al., 2000, p. 55). Previous studies indicated the varieties of motivation and also signified the contribution to second language learning.

**NESTs and NNESTs**

Native English speaker teachers (NESTs) and non-native English speaker teachers (NNSTs) are always being compared in the field of language teaching. Merino (1997) argued the stereotype which a native speaker is the best person to teach his or her foreign language. He followed Medgyes’ 3-dimensional frameworks which are native/non-native, non-native/non-native and native/native (Merino, p69). The result of the study indicated that both NESTs and NNST have their own strength and weakness. As Ma (2012) indicated, in the workforce worldwide, there are nearly three-quarters of the ESL (English as a second language) or EFL (English as a foreign language) teachers are NNESTs. She examined the strengths and weaknesses of NNESTs and NESTs by adopting mixed methods and found out that NNESTs have pedagogical strengths and linguistic weakness. On the other hand, NESTs have linguistic strengths, but pedagogical weakness. The Students’ perception and attitude toward NESTs and NNESTs are different since the differences of the cultural backgrounds. Law (1999) conducted a study with having both NESTs and NNSTs teach in the classroom context, she found that most of the students (low achievers) were generally motivated and found the class enjoyable in the class with NESTs. However, it doesn’t mean NESTs are better than NNSTs. They have their own strength and weakness throughout the teaching process. Sahin (2005) examined learners’ attitude and motivation toward native speaker teachers of English in a Turkish setting. The results indicated that learners tended to have a more positive attitude and motivation towards target language when they were exposed to native English speaker teachers. Walkinshaw et al. (2014) examined students’ perception toward native and non-native English language teachers in Vietnamese and Japanese context. The participants were university students in Vietnam and Japan. In the study, authors particularly looked at the advantages and disadvantages that students identified when they participated in the experiment. The results indicated that both NESTs and NNESTs have their own advantages and disadvantages. As for NESTs, students found they were poor at explaining grammar and the tension was created because of cultural differences; however, they were considered as the models of pronunciation. As for the NNESTs, students thought that it was easier to interact with them since they shared the same culture. NNESTs were also good at explaining grammar when contrasted with NESTs; however, their pronunciation was concerned. Both NESTs and NNESTs have their own strength and weakness. It depends on learners’ proficiency and how they approach in the classroom. Alseweed (2012) conducted a study in reporting university students’ perception of NESTs and NNESTs in the English language classroom. Qualitative and quantitative methods were used to collect data and the results revealed that higher level students showed more preference toward NESTs and their previous experiences on learning language might affect their preferences toward NESTs and NNESTs. As for the NESTs, students found they were better in adopting different teaching strategies. On the other hand, learners showed favorable attitudes toward NNESTs since they could provide a serious learning environment and also response to learners’ needs. Students’ perception of NESTs and NNESTs might be different based on what they need. Cheung et al. (2007) also examined university students’ attitude toward NNESTs. A questionnaire and interviews were used in the experiment in order to collect data. They found that students showed a positive attitude toward NNESTs. The NNESTs’ strengths are pointed out as “ability to use students’ mother tongue in teaching, effective pedagogical skills, knowledgeable in English language, positive personality traits, and examination-oriented teaching approach” (Cheung et al., 2007, p. 265). In contrast, there are some shortcomings such as “over-correcting students’ work and limited use of English” were indicated by the participants in the study. As the authors revealed, NNESTs had their own strengths and weaknesses in teaching language and learners’ attitude toward them is positive. Tsou (2013)
explore university students’ perceptions toward NESTs and NNES in EFL contexts in Taiwan. She conducted the experiment by using both qualitative and quantitative methods. The results showed that students’ preferences toward NESTs are better than NNES; however, the participants believed that both NESTs and NNES have their own strengths and weaknesses in English instruction. She indicated NESTs were superior in their good English proficiency and also their ability in helping students’ English learning. As for NNES, they had a better understanding of students’ learning difficulties and also they have the advantage of communicating in the first language. The participants thought that NESTs were more difficult to communicate with and NNES’ English proficiency is limited. The author revealed that NESTs and NNES work cooperatively can create an effective English learning environment for language learners. Chang (2010) conducted a study on Taiwanese elementary students’ motivation toward learning English in English Village Program. One of the research questions is about students’ learning motivation toward the native English-speaking teacher’s instruction. As the result showed that a large number of students who participated in the program thought that they were motivated by the native English speaker teacher’s teaching style and their standard pronunciation.

Purpose

Previous studies have shown learners’ perceptions and attitudes toward native and non-native English language teachers; however, only a few studies have been conducted in motivation toward native English speaker teachers or non-native English speaker teachers. Since there are more and more NESTs come to Taiwan to teach English, students’ motivation toward learning English with a NEST or NNES is needed to be considered. Parents in Taiwan always think that a school with foreign teachers or NESTs is better since they are native speakers; they can teach and handle the English classes better. Some parents think that when their children are taught by the NESTs, their motivation will be higher and are willing to learn English. Luo (2007) refers to Lin’s (2001) study and indicated that the students who just enrolled in the NEST program became more interested in English learning. However, students’ in class motivation hasn’t been investigated. Some students tended to be more motivated when NESTs teach the class, but some of them were not. This study is going to investigate students’ in class motivation when a NEST and a NNES enrolled in teaching the class.

Research Question

1. What is students’ in-class motivation in NEST’s and NNES’s classes?
2. How is the motivation differing between 7 learner archetypes?
3. What are the assumptions caused the changes in their in-class motivation?

Methodology

Participants

12 elementary school students (four boys and seven girls) participated in the study. Four in the 5th grade, seven in the 4th grade, and one in the 2nd grade. Their English proficiency was tested through the in-class examination on all four skills of English (Listening, Reading, Writing, and Speaking). Their average scores were based on the previous level’s examinations. Participants were categorized into seven different archetypes based on Chan et al. (2015) study in learner archetypes. They invited a group of teachers to identify the seven salient learner archetypes among the students in the study. The students were between years 7 to 9 and were categorized into seven different archetypes and used a retrodictive qualitative modeling approach in order to study L2 motivation. Since one of the purposes to conduct this study is to examine the motivation differences between each kind of learner archetypes. The categorization was done throughout the discussion between 3 teachers. All three teachers have taught the students for at least half a year and they know the students’ behavior and proficiency well. Seven learner archetypes were listed in Table 1.
Table 1 Seven learner archetypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A highly competitive and motivated student, with some negative</td>
<td>Eric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An unmotivated student with lower-than-average English proficiency</td>
<td>Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A happy-go-lucky student with low English proficiency</td>
<td>Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mediocre student with little L2 motivation</td>
<td>Shirleen, Jeff, Ryan, Angela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A motivated yet distressed student with low English proficiency</td>
<td>Bella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ‘perfect’ English learner</td>
<td>Wiwi, Lora, Joanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An unmotivated student with poor English proficiency</td>
<td>Candy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructional tool

Two instruments were used to measure the participants’ in-class motivation. ‘Motometer’, a classroom observation form which was adopted from Waningie et al. (2014) was used in the experiment. They followed the example of a longitudinal classroom study by Garneder et al. (2004). The Motometer contains ten real-time motivation measurements and each class session was about 60 minutes. Participants need to rate their own motivation every 6 minutes by drawing a horizontal line. The Motometer is a thermometer-shaped figure and it shows “0” as the lowest and “100” as the highest points. Participants would rate their own motivation based on two questions related to their learning motivation. One is “How much effort do I want to put into learning the material right now?” and the other is “How much do I enjoy this lesson right now?” (Waningie et al., 2014, p.723). The questions were translated into Chinese since all of the participants are elementary school students. They need L1 in helping them understand the details in doing the experiment. At the bottom of the A4 paper, participants could leave any comments regarding the experiment. A short in-class interview will be conducted at the end of each session to investigate the possible variables that affect their motivation. Participants who left comments or had questions would be the priority in doing the interview. The interview lasted about 3 to 5 minutes.

Procedures

This study is designed to measure students’ motivation toward NEST and NNEST. 12 students and 3 teachers participated in the experiment. First, students were categorized into 7 archetypes based on their learning behavior and proficiency by three teachers. Second, Students were asked to complete two A4 papers which contained a ‘Motometer’ separately. They finished one ‘Motometer’ in the lesson which was instructed by a NEST and the other with a NNEST. The A4 papers were collected at the end of each lesson and the data were analyzed in order to investigate their motivation in a particular lesson. The curriculum plans for both lessons from NEST and NNEST are provided in the appendix B. Basically; both lessons were reviewing the materials which were taught in the previous lessons. Before participants did the Motometer, they had training on how to do the Motometer in the correct way since they are still elementary school students. They needed to understand that when they drew a line, it indicated his or her motivation at that moment. Third, a few participants were chosen in doing the short in-class interview. Finally, all the data from the Motometer and a short interview was collected and analyzed for the study.

Results

Motivation in NEST’s Class

12 participants had done their Motometer during the experiment and they understood that they were responsible for rating their own in-class motivation at the moment when a NEST gave lectures in the classroom. The data from Motometer is presented as figures in order to have a clear view of the motivational progression of different types of participants.
As Figures 1, 2, and 3 showed, the participants’ motivation went up toward the end of the class and two differences are shown in Figures 1 to 4. Candy was categorized as an unmotivated student and her English proficiency tended to be lower than other students. Figure 4 shows that her motivation was very low at the beginning of the lecture in comparing with other participants. However, her motivation slightly went up and it reached around 75 at the end of the class. Her motivation was still lower than average. Wendy is another participant who was also categorized as an unmotivated student. Her motivation slightly went down and reached the lowest point around 42 minutes. It suddenly went up because she was doing a review game and she has understood the sentence patterns well. As an unmotivated student, she does not like to participate in the activities during class time because she gets nervous easily and she did not want to prepare for it. Wendy’s motivation dropped down at the end of the class because she was punished by the teacher. She was arguing with another classmate, Eric.
Figures 5 and 6 indicated four highly motivated participants. Eric, Wiwi, and Lora showed steady motivation from the beginning to the end of the lecture. By looking at Joanne, her motivation started much lower in comparing with other three highly motivated students. However, her motivation started to go up around 42 minutes and reached the same point as the other three participants at the end. In the short interview, she explained that she forgot to review the vocabulary from previous, so she was afraid of participating in the vocabulary games. However, she was good at the sentence patterns and started to get confident in answering the questions.

**Figure 7: A mediocre student with little L2 motivation**

Figure 7 indicated the mediocre students with little motivation. Jeff’s motivation was unstable; it went up and down during the lecture. One possible reason is that he was talking to his classmates all the time even after the teacher warned him not to interrupt other classmates. He still attempted to talk with other classmates. As a mediocre student with little motivation, he needs to pay more attention to the materials and lectures. Shirleen, who is the youngest participant, is a special case in the experiment. After I explained the procedures of doing the Motometer and did the training with all the participants. She still rated her motivation as 100 throughout the whole period. While we were doing a short interview, she told me that she rated her motivation as 100 because she felt her motivation was always high. She was eager to answer questions and participate in the activities. The reason that teachers put her as a mediocre student with little motivation is that she is motivated during class time, but she has little motivation in doing reviews or even homework at home. The result of her motivational progression may due to her age since she is too young to participate in the experiment. However, the motivational progression of Shirleen may reflect on Students’ learning motivation. Elementary school students start to have English lessons after they get to the third grade. In this case, they will have English tests and homework. Some students will feel stressful since English is not just a language to them now. It becomes a subject that they need to study. At this moment, they will think that learning English is not fun anymore. Shirleen who is a second grader does not have any English lesson at school yet, so she thinks it is fun to attend the class and join the activities. It is possible to examine Shirleen’s motivational progression after she gets to the third grade.

**Figure 8: Motivational Progression of all the participants toward NEST.**
Figure 8 indicated, most of the students’ motivation went up except Wendy and Eric. As mentioned above, Wendy and Eric were arguing at the end of the lecture and both of them were punished by the teacher, so their motivation went down. Candy’s motivation was expected by the teachers since she did not have any motivation in participating in the lecture. In contrast with other classmates, most of the participants’ motivation was high and stable which indicate that they enjoy the class with a native English Speaker teacher.

**Motivation in NNEST’s Class**

Motivational progression of the participants toward NNEST’s class was also put into figures to indicate the data clearly as following pages:

Figure 9: A motivated yet distressed student with low English proficiency

![Figure 9](image_url)

Figure 10: An unmotivated student with lower-than-average English proficiency

![Figure 10](image_url)

Figure 11: A happy-go-lucky student with low English proficiency

![Figure 11](image_url)

Figure 12: An unmotivated student with poor English proficiency

![Figure 12](image_url)

Figures 9 to 12 represent students with low English motivation and even unmotivated. Their English proficiency tends to be low and some of them struggled in learning English. In comparing Diego and Bella with Wendy and Candy, their motivation started around 80, but as for unmotivated students, their motivation started lower as 35 and 70. As the figures indicated, most of the students’ motivation moved upward toward the end of the class except Wendy. Figure 2 showed there are two drop points on her motivational progression. After the short interview was conducted, she mentioned that she did not memorize the vocabulary, so her motivation went down when the teacher was reviewing the vocabulary. Her motivation dropped again around 43 minutes because she had a vocabulary quiz and she hesitated when she was doing it. As for Candy, she was aware that the teacher was going to give the class a vocabulary test and her mother helped her review the vocabulary. Being unmotivated students, preparation before the class can still enhance their learning motivation.
Figure 13 and 14 showed highly motivated students’ motivational progression. All the students’ motivation smoothly moved upward and reached their highest point in the lecture. During the short interview, Joanne told the teacher that she needs to get ready for the class every time when she has an English class. She gets nervous at the beginning and felt confident at the ending of the lecture. The teacher noticed Joanne is a ‘perfect’ English learner and she always does assignments such as workbook and grammar practice very carefully. Since she is a careful learner, she always starts with a lower motivation and when she gets confident, her motivation moves upward.

Figure 15 shows the mediocre students’ motivational progression. As discussed above in NEST’s class, Jeff was still lack of his concentration during the class time. He liked to chat with classmates and was always notified by the teacher. Shirileen still showed her high motivation when she attended the class. She raised her hand to answer the questions and was always ready to participant in the activities. Angela’s motivation dropped dramatically at around 30 minutes when she was told that they would have a vocabulary quiz later. She got nervous and did not pay any attention. In the short interview, she told the teacher that she was nervous even thought the teacher just helped them review the vocabulary. She wanted to take out the vocabulary list and memorize them again because she did not want to have a make-up quiz. Angela is a nice student; however, she dropped out of the class once because she did not want to do any homework and exam. She thought it was too stressful to do them. After a few months later, she is ready to come back to the class, but she still gets nervous when there is an exam.
Figure 16 shows the motivational progression of all the participants and most students’ motivation moved upward and reached their highest point except Jeff. Since he always interrupted other classmates during the lecture, he was the last one to get the communicate book sighed. Furthermore, figure 8 shows that four students include Bella, Diego, Wendy, and Candy who were categorized as low motivation and unmotivated students started the class with lower motivation in contrast with other classmates. As for other participants, their motivation is around 80 to 100 which indicate that they enjoyed the class and wanted to put more effort into participating in the activities.

Discussion

The results from both NEST’s and NNEST’s class were indicated through the figures. To answer the first research question, most students’ in-class motivation went up toward the end of the lectures in both classes. It means that participants enjoyed the lectures and wanted to put effort on what they were doing. Except for some students such as Wendy, Angela, and Joanne, they got nervous easily or felt hesitated during the lessons. They want to be prepared before they take any quiz or start class. As for the second research question, the figures show that most of the participants’ motivation smoothly went up especially those who were categorized as higher motivation ones. The rate of their motivation increased from around 80 to above 90 out of 100 which indicate that they were motivated in the lectures. The same situation occurred in both NEST’s and NNEST’s class. Students showed their interests and enjoyed the lectures given by both NEST and NNEST. Since there were a lot of variables affected students’ in-class motivation, the third research question is hard to answer. According to the short interviews, students explained that their motivation was affected by their emotion toward the activities. They got nervous or felt unprepared when they knew there was going to be a vocabulary quiz. Also, they did not pay attention to the activities or interrupted by other classmates. All these assumptions affected their motivation in the class. One of the ‘perfect’ students made a comment about her motivation toward the activities in NEST’s class. She wrote, “I wanted to participate in the activities, but the teacher always play the same game and I do not want to compete with other classmates anymore.” Another unmotivated student wrote, “I like to have the class with NEST because I do not need to worry about doing homework and I also can play games all the time. I can compete with my classmates and even though I sometimes cannot finish the sentences, the teacher will help me.” Some limitation such as the size of the participant, the length of the experiment, and the design of the interview of the study can be identified. Since there were only 12 students participated in the
experiment, the results cannot represent for all the elementary students. The number of participants can be expanded in further study. The length of the experiment can also be expanded to a semester or even a year-long study. In this case, researchers may be able to understand students’ motivational progression toward more specific assumptions. They can even compare and contrast the differences between the students. Last, the design of the interview can be changed into a more detailed interview. Teachers can prepare some questions regarding students’ motivation and ask the participant to answer. By doing it, researchers may find the differences or similarities in students.

Conclusion

This study helps the researcher to understand learners’ in-class motivation toward NEST and NNEST. By dividing students into different types, the researcher can easily understand the motivational differences between them. The comments made by students and the thoughts from the interview helped the instructors understand students’ needs and the criteria that could be adjusted in the class. Even though the study did not show impressive results, it helps the instructors realize that learners’ motivation toward NEST and NNEST are high and they want to put more effort into the class. Even unmotivated students’ motivation grew during the lecture and it means their learning motivation can be triggered at some points. Instructors can take advantages to help students in increasing their motivation during class time. When students’ motivation increased, their learning efficiency will become better, then teachers only need to worry about the ways of keeping students with high learning motivation.
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APPENDIX A

Motometer

Rate your learning motivation, considering your motivation to learn the material:

- How much effort do I want to put into learning the material now?
- How much do I enjoy this lesson right now?

0 = completely not interested, 100 = completely interested. Please circle your score for self-evaluation.

100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Comments (意見):

Appendix B

Lesson Plan from Non-native English Speaker Teacher’s Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Review Way To Go sentence patterns and vocabulary with games</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review phonics rules</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vocabulary quiz</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Explaining and practicing grammar focus</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sighing communication books and listening to workbook CD.</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lesson Plan from Native English Speaker Teacher’s Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Review Way To Go vocabulary with games</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review Way To Go sentence patterns with games</td>
<td>35 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sighing communication books</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>