

Teacher Nationality and Student Preferences

Aaron Hahn

Abstract

At Fukuoka University, as at many other Japanese universities, English teachers are divided into foreign teachers (“native English speakers”) and Japanese teachers. While research has questioned whether or not this division has any basis whatsoever in learning outcomes, the division remains an important part of the daily lives of teachers in Japan. One underrepresented voice in the research on the benefits of dividing teachers into these categories is that of the students themselves. To examine student beliefs about their teachers, a survey was given to some second-year students, asking them for a variety of opinions about their first-year English teachers. The results indicated that Fukuoka University students find value in both types of teachers, but believe that each teacher type offers different benefits. In general, foreign teachers were valued for teaching communication skills and for being “native speakers,” and Japanese teachers tended to be valued for focusing on specific English language skills like grammar and vocabulary. While this survey didn’t demonstrate whether the teaching styles of either type of teacher is “better,” it did show that students seem to have specific expectations of their teachers that should be accounted for in lesson planning and curriculum development. A few suggestions are offered for Fukuoka University teachers based upon these results.

Fukuoka University hires two distinct, non-overlapping categories of people who teach English courses: foreign English teachers (required to be native speakers of English), and Japanese English teachers. This distinction is quite common in Japanese universities, and is presumably based upon a belief that native English speaker teachers (NESTs) offer different benefits to students than Japanese non-native English speaker teachers (NNESTs). Over about the past twenty years, there has been increasing interest within

the TESOL community, in terms of both research and political organization, in examining whether this distinction is valid, and, if it is, what it means in terms of teaching and learning.

First, I will start by saying that I stand with Holliday (2013), who indicated that despite numerous studies examining the matter, there is no objective way to differentiate between native and non-native speakers. Put another way, the supposed commonsense distinction between people who learned to speak a language “natively” and those who learned it at some later time does not hold up to analytic scrutiny. The division fails to account for the complexity of language learning that occurs across the globe, especially in places where multiple languages are learned “from the mother” simultaneously, as well as failing to account for the fact that many so-called native speakers may be able to readily communicate only with a small set of users who share their local English variant.

Having said that, however, the division remains a powerful force in the day-to-day lives of English teachers, and it exists to promote the special status of many of the established parties in the system (Holliday, 2013). That is, even though the division is not linguistically valid, it is socially “valid” in that the categorization has consequences for status, job availability, earning potential, etc. The most obvious result of this division is the devaluation of NNEST worldwide due to the presumption held by many that native speakers simply make better teachers. The first open acknowledgement of this discrimination in a published work dates back to Medgyes’s 1992 article exploring the relative “value” of NEST and NNEST. Based upon surveys of teachers themselves, Medgyes attempted to upend the presumption of native teacher superiority, instead arguing that, though NEST may have greater English ability,ⁱ NNEST offer a wide variety of things to students that NEST cannot, such as a deeper understanding of students’ likely difficulties in learning English, a (usually) stronger

explicit knowledge of grammar, and, possibly most importantly, the ability to act as a role model of future student success.

Since that time, a number of studies have sought to further understand the consequences of dividing teachers into NEST and NNEST camps from personal, political, administrative, and pedagogical perspectives. As Braine indicated in a 2005 review article, most of these studies have focused on surveys and interviews of teachers and administrators, with varied results. While some, such as Cheung's 2002 study in Hong Kong showed that teachers and students found benefits to both types of teachers (cited in Braine, 2005), others, like Mahboob, et al's 2004 study found a clear preference for NESTs, resulting in imbalanced hiring rates, even among schools that had TESOL training programs for non-native teachers.

Research on this topic has been less common in Japan, but some recent work has begun to shed light on the NEST-NNEST dynamic here, particularly in the wide-ranging collection *Native-Speakerism in Japan*, edited by Houghton and Rivers (2013). Hayes (2013) showed how the division serves to "ghettoize foreign teachers into nonstandard employment" (p. 132). It does so through a system of both rewards and restrictions, such as via contracts that limit the terms or influence of foreign (*gaikokujin*) teachers while exempting them from much of the administrative work that Japanese (*nihonjin*) teachers are responsible for. Tsumeyoshi (2013) shows how the division plays out at the primary and secondary level, in that the desire for native speaker educators is fulfilled primarily by Assistant Language Teachers who are not required to possess any formal training or certification in English, TESOL, or education (generally a Bachelor's degree in any field is the only requirement). Finally, Heimlich (2013) looks at how maintaining a strict division between NEST and NNEST is a critical part of the construction of the Japanese identity that seeks to preserve itself as untainted by foreignness.

However, one thing that Braine's 2005 review found was that a major hole in the research to date on what NEST and NNEST teachers bring to the classroom is the lack of examination of what students think. More recently, there have been a number of studies examining this issue. One common finding

was that closed-question data (such as Likert-scale questions) alone did not often provide many significant results when comparing the two types of teachers (Gurkan & Yuksel, 2012; Liu & Zhang, 2007; Madrid & Cañado, 2004). Both Gurkan & Yuksel and Madrid & Cañado found no statistically significant difference in student attitudes towards NEST and NNEST in closed questions, while Liu & Zhang found differences in some measurements, such as in perceived teacher flexibility and the amount learned, but that students thought that the two types of teachers had equal attitudes towards the students. All, however, were able to tease out some differences by looking at responses to open-ended questions and interview data.

Two studies of particular note are the above mentioned Madrid & Cañado (2004) study of students from primary school through university level in Spain; and Wu & Ke (2009), who looked at university students in Taiwan. Both studies found that students value both NEST and NNEST, though they valued different things in the two groups. NEST were generally praised for having interesting classes that encouraged student participation, especially regarding speaking and listening, and for providing "native" models of pronunciation and speaking styles. NNEST, on the other hand, were generally valued for their better understanding of student learning concerns and difficulties (especially when they shared a culture/nationality with the students, as it meant that they had gone through the same schooling process as their students had), their stronger explicit knowledge of grammar, and, in some cases, the comfort of students being able to ask teachers questions in L1. The Wu & Ke study took one step further than the other studies, in that they interviewed both teachers and students. They found that while the students expected NEST lessons to be more interactive and "fun" and were upset when NEST classes involved too much lecturing, the NESTs themselves felt that the students were too passive and unwilling to participate in activities when offered. Thus, there may be a disconnect between the expectations/desires students have about class and how students actually behave in class (or, at least, how their teachers perceive them as behaving).

Of particular interest for Fukuoka University and my research is a PhD thesis from 2011 by Nicola

ⁱ Note that Medgyes was writing at a time when it was considered appropriate to consider non-native speakers as "deficient" compared to native speakers, something that I certainly do not believe, and that has, to some degree, been rejected by the TESOL field.

Galloway, who looked specifically at the attitudes of Japanese university students. Most of the research was focused on their attitudes towards English itself (who “owns” English, is there value in learning English varieties from so-called Outer Circle and Expanding Circle countries, etc.), but some of the interview results touched on students’ opinions about who “should” teach English. These students had been taught about Global Englishes, and many had experienced study abroad programs where they interacted with native speakers of English from countries other than the US/UK and even highly fluent English speakers who did not learn English as children. Despite this, during interviews, many of the participants said that most English teaching should be done by people from the US (and, to a lesser extent, other so-called Inner Circle countries), because those people spoke “real” English and had “correct” pronunciation. Interestingly, many of the subjects hesitated and/or laughed when asked to explain their views more fully. Galloway interpreted this as the students recognizing that their preferences contradicted both their own experiences and what they had learned about Global Englishes, but that they still maintained these stereotypical attitudes.

One local study, Shimai (2013), served as my immediate introduction to this topic and lead directly to the present study. Shimai gave second year students at a large private university in Fukuoka (not Fukuoka University) a survey, comprised primarily of Likert questions, about their first year English teachers. At that university, in the year the study was conducted, all students received one NEST and one NNEST. Shimai found a statistically significant preference for non-native teachers across a number of categories. The students rated the NNESTs’ classes as more fun; the teachers as easier to consult, understand, and ask questions of; and the questions in the class (homework, tests, in-class work, etc.) as easier to answer. Shimai had already planned to conduct the survey an additional time at her university, and together we wondered if the results would hold true at an additional university. Thus, we decided to expand her study to include research at Fukuoka University, as well as to add additional questions to the survey to get a broader picture of students varying opinions about their NEST and NNEST teachers. This paper reports primarily on the results from Fukuoka University, though mention will be made in the final discussion about ways in which the results here

differed from those at the other university.

Methodology

The survey was given to mostly second year students, plus one class of third year students, at Fukuoka University in spring, 2014. The students were asked to give their opinions about their English teachers from the previous year. While Fukuoka University does not ensure that students receive both NEST and NNEST, there is a stated preference to have oral communication classes taught by NEST, and testing and writing classes taught by NNEST. As for the students surveyed, only one group reported having only an NNEST in the prior year (though a few students did not provide complete information for one type of teacher or the other).

Survey

The surveys were written in Japanese by Shimai, who is fully fluent in Japanese; they were modeled after the ones in the pilot study, to provide some inter-study comparability, but some questions were altered and the survey expanded. Each survey was two pages, with one page on each type of teacher. Note that we did not use the terminology “native English speaker” or “non-native English speaker”; rather, we asked them to talk about their *gaikokujin* and *nihonjin* teachers. As Hayes (2013) explained, the division among teachers in Japan is generally linked to nationality/race rather than level of English ability or the way in which that English was learned. This itself is a part of the Othering processes involved in the creation and perpetuation of a Japanese identity that is portrayed as fundamentally distinct from foreign identity(ies). As such, we chose to use the same terms in our survey—even though it should be obvious that there is no link between “foreignness” and English ability, or, for that matter, between “Japanese-ness” and a lack of English proficiency, we assumed that this is the division the students would be most familiar with and thus would be the most likely to produce useful results.

Each page of the survey was comprised of eight 5-point Likert scale questions and four free response questions.ⁱⁱ The first question asked students to report how frequently they felt their teachers used their non-native language (*gaikokujin no sensei* using Japanese, and *nihonjin no sensei* using English). The bulk of

the questions asked for students' opinions of the class: how enjoyable it was, how difficult it was in terms of asking and answering questions as well as understanding the teacher, and how useful it was in terms of general usefulness and specifically how much it helped (or didn't help) them learn English. Several of the Likert scale questions had accompanying open-ended questions to allow students to expand on their rankings. These questions asked for a memorable experience from the class, an explanation of why the class was or wasn't useful, and what part of English they improved at (that latter was only for students who stated in the preceding closed question that they had improved at English). Finally, the survey had a section listing eight different teaching activities, such as speaking aloud, playing games, translating into Japanese, etc.; for each activity the students gave 5-point Likert scale responses indicating how often the teacher did that type of activity and how much the student enjoyed that activity.

Responses

142 students, all of whom were non-English majors, completed the survey at Fukuoka University. A number of the surveys submitted were incomplete. In order to maintain the most data possible, I included partial responses in the results, removing data only when necessary for statistical analysis, such as removing unpaired data for comparison tests.

The data was analyzed using the Social Science Statistics website (Stangroom, 2014); non-parametric

tests were used because the data was not normally distributed, as indicated by both visual inspection of the data and a Shapiro-Wilkins test.

Results

The first question on the survey asked about students' perceptions of how often their teachers spoke in their non-native language. One broad question of this research was to determine whether or not more non-native language use correlated with any of the other measurements. Full results on this question were reported in an earlier publication (Hahn, 2014). In brief, nearly 80% of students reported that their foreign teachers spoke entirely or mostly in English, while just over 70% of students reported that their Japanese teachers spoke entirely or mostly in Japanese; only 6% of each group was reported to have spoken primarily in their non-native language. Spearman correlations were calculated comparing each of the opinion questions with the amount of language used. For foreign teachers, all questions except for class usefulness correlated with the amount of Japanese usage (i.e., more Japanese meant the class was more enjoyable, easier, etc.), while for the Japanese teachers, increased English usage correlated with student enjoyability and perception that the class improved the students' English.

The second major concern was whether or not there were differences in students' perceptions of their foreign teachers and Japanese teachers. Four questions showed statistically significant differences.

Table 1: *Questions with significant differences between foreign and Japanese teachers*

Question	Foreign teacher M (out of 5)	Japanese teacher M (out of 5)	p
Non-native language use	1.70	1.99	0.041
Enjoyment of class	3.78	3.09	0.001
Usefulness of class	3.92	3.55	0.006
Difficulty in answering questions	3.40	3.71	0.043

The Japanese teachers were overall rated as more likely to use English than their foreign teachers were to use English (though, as noted above, both groups were reported as mainly using their L1). This is not especially surprising, given that the average Japanese

ability of foreign teachers is likely to be lower than the average English ability of Japanese teachers; in addition, given the way that foreign language classes are taught in many of the countries that the foreign teachers originate in (based on my own informal observations,

ⁱⁱ A copy of the surveys used (in Japanese) can be found at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B4plpHhWAOP0YkxkFbF1DN05jdjg/view?usp=sharing>

the overwhelming majority of foreign English teachers at Fukuoka University are from the UK, US, Australia, and New Zealand), a number of the foreign teachers likely hold to the idea that foreign language classes should be taught either primarily or exclusively in the target language.

For both enjoyment and usefulness, students rated their foreign teachers significantly higher, with the difference in enjoyability being especially large. Finally, students reported that they found questions asked in their Japanese teachers' courses were easier to answer than those in their foreign teachers' classes. This item was intentionally vaguely phrased so as to include all types of questions asked in the course. However, a different question asked how difficult it was to understand the teacher, and the difference between foreign and Japanese teachers on that question was not statistically significant. Thus, it can be assumed that the difference in difficulty was not caused by an inability of students to understand their teachers, but rather that overall Japanese teachers' courses were perceived of as easier. Whether this is due to the inherent (for many students) difficulty in engaging in the types of activities

commonly used in foreigner-lead oral communication classes, or it was due to the Japanese teachers being better at matching classroom materials to student level based on their better knowledge of the learning path of Japanese students is unclear, though I'm inclined to believe that its likely a mixture of both.

For the section on class activities, students were asked about eight different classroom activities that we assumed that at least some teachers were doing: speaking aloud, grammar drills, body movement activities, playing games, translation, watching English videos/listening to English music, composition writing, and conversations. For each activity, students rated them on a 5-point Likert scale from 一度もない (didn't do) to いつもやった (always did), and a separate scale from 全く楽しくなかった (wasn't enjoyable) to とても楽しかった (was very enjoyable). Given the large number of data points, it is more useful to look at consolidated data. Table 2 breaks down each activity for foreign and Japanese teachers in terms of whether the activities were generally not done (rated 1 or 2), sometimes done (rated 3) or often done (rated 4 or 5).

Table 2. *Frequency of activity performance*

Activity	Foreign teachers			Japanese teachers		
	Didn't do (1-2)	Did sometimes (3)	Often did (4-5)	Didn't do (1-2)	Did sometimes (3)	Often did (4-5)
Speaking aloud	3.5%	29.6%	67.0%	28.5%	32.1%	39.4%
Grammar drills	27.8%	33.0%	39.1%	5.1%	21.2%	73.7%
Body moving	59.1%	24.3%	16.5%	81.0%	16.8%	2.2%
Playing games	39.1%	28.7%	32.2%	80.3%	13.9%	5.8%
Translation	42.6%	27.0%	30.4%	10.3%	19.1%	70.6%
Videos or music	38.3%	25.2%	36.5%	43.1%	21.9%	35.0%
Composition writing	17.4%	27.0%	55.7%	40.1%	29.9%	29.9%
Conversation practice	7.8%	25.2%	67.0%	51.8%	33.6%	14.6%

As with other parts of the survey, the descriptions were short and intentionally vague; thus, what one student considers, for example, a “body moving game” (身体を動かす) may not be classified as such by another student. Nonetheless, I believe there is something relevant to be learned by looking at the major differences between the activities done by foreign and Japanese teachers. A quick look seems to classify the activities into three groups: 1) Speaking aloud, composition writing, games, and conversation practice, which were all much more frequent among foreign teachers than Japanese teachers 2) grammar

drills and translation, much more frequently used by Japanese teachers, and 3) body movement and video/music, both of which were used about equal amounts, with body movement unused by both groups and movies/music having varied frequency among both groups. However, the distinctions aren't quite that simple. For instance, even though both speaking aloud and composition were more frequent among foreign teachers, the former was nearly universally used by foreign teachers, a substantial minority of foreign teachers did reject composition writing. Playing games, on the other hand was less used by both groups,

but was much more strongly rejected by Japanese teachers than foreign teachers.

The last aspect of the data to be examined is the responses to the open-ended questions. The first asked students to share a memorable experience from the teacher's class. It is difficult to draw any significant conclusions about these comments, as they generally just listed a specific activity that was done in class that they liked. One small but noticeable difference was that of the responses about the Japanese teacher, 14% referred specifically to a character trait or behavior of the teacher (e.g., "He was kind"), while 20% of the responses about the foreign teachers made such type of comments. Perhaps foreign teachers place more emphasis on interpersonal interaction in class; alternatively, it may be that students don't know how to evaluate foreigners' classes with their unusual communicative activities, and so fall back on personal evaluations of teacher behavior.

The second open-ended question asked students what aspect of the class they found to be most useful. For foreign teachers, the responses are very telling, because over 40% of them mentioned something to the effect of "talking with a foreigner" and/or "listening to a native English speaker." For Japanese teachers, on the other hand, the largest category of responses, at about 37%, were those mentioning a specific English skill that they improved at, such as grammar, reading, listening, TOEIC, etc. Also worth noting are that there were more negative responses for the Japanese teachers: 10 of the 51 responses were negative, with specific complaints including the impracticality of the course, difficulty in understanding the teacher, and that the classes merely repeated what they had learned in high school. For the foreign teachers, of the 65 responses, only 3 were negative, with all three indicating in some way that the class was not useful because the student couldn't understand it.

The third asked what aspect of English the students improved most at (though this question was only supposed to be answered by students who had rated the question about "English improvement" as a 4 or 5). On this question, there was a very clear difference between Japanese and foreign teachers. For Japanese teachers, students overwhelmingly indicated

that grammar was the main thing they improved at: 15 students answered grammar for this question, while the second through fourth most frequent responses (pronunciation, reading, and vocabulary) were only mentioned 3 times each. For foreign teachers, the distribution of top responses was flatter, though still imbalanced: 14 students said that they most improved at communication or conversation, 8 at listening, and 6 at vocabulary, followed by a smattering of other less frequent responses.

Discussion

Before trying to draw too strong conclusions from this data, a number of caveats need to be mentioned. First, as stated from the beginning, all of the reported data are student impressions of classes that they took from several months to more than half a year prior. Thus, we can assume that their opinions on the class were colored by the distance of time and intervening activities. So even for a question like "amount of Japanese/English used", we cannot take the results as an objective measurement of actual percentage of time spent speaking one language or another, but rather they represent students' broader impressions, filtered through the schema established by many previous experiences with English (and other) courses. Thus, we must accept that the results offer only a general impression of students' feelings about their English courses and teachers. Future studies wishing to examine the issue more closely would be stronger if they were conducted more closely to each class and if they were supplemented with more qualitative methods such as interviews and classroom observations.

Second, even if we accept the "fuzziness" of the results and assume that significant differences in the data indicate actual differences in student perceptions, we also have to account for the fact that the classes that students were reporting on were not identical in curricular content, and the survey did not ask which course the students took from each professor.ⁱⁱⁱ Some of the differences are likely the result of intentional pedagogical choices linked to the university-made description of the specific courses being taught. I,

ⁱⁱⁱ This was done for two reasons: First, we reasoned that many students would not be able to recall the title of their courses (a supposition I think borne out by the fact that many students couldn't even recall their teachers' names), and, second, since the data was originally collected primarily with the intention of comparing the results from Fukuoka University with a second university, there was no way to use that information since the curricula at the two schools are quite different.

for example, include very little pair work or other conversation activities in test preparation courses that I teach; so it isn't surprising to find activities of that type underrepresented among Japanese teachers' classes, who are statistically overrepresented in those types of courses.

Finally, one key missing piece of data is student English ability. Madrid & Cañado (2004) found that, among their students, preference for nonnative teachers was higher among more advanced students, with lower level students preferring native teachers who could explain more often in the students' L1. Shimai (2013) found the same thing at another university in Fukuoka, in that the lower the students' English ability (as measured by a TOEIC Bridge test), the greater the preference they had for Japanese teachers. The survey used for this study did ask the students to provide a TOEIC score or Eiken STEP Test level (if they'd taken either), or their score on the VELC placement test given by Fukuoka University at the end of each year of compulsory English courses. Unfortunately, only 15 out of the 142 respondents answered this question, making it impossible to know in what way English ability was acting as a confounding factor.

So, given all of this noise in the data, what can be gleaned? The most obvious point is that the same patterns that held in each of the prior studies were replicated here: students report that there are positive benefits to both types of teachers, but that those benefits are quite different. Looking at both the Likert-scale and open-ended questions, we can see that foreign teachers are valued for their characters, for how enjoyable the class is, and simply for being a "foreigner" and "native speaker" in a space (a typical private Japanese university) in which the students do not normally have (or seek out) access to speakers of English who are not Japanese. Some of the open-ended questions even made this completely explicit, saying things such as “普段、外国人と接触する機会がないからとてもいい機会です” (“It was a good chance to communicate with native speakers because it's rare”). One has to hope, however, that students are getting more than this from their foreign teachers, if only because we must assume that given class sizes of 24 to 45 students, it's unlikely that any given student

actually had much time to communicate directly with that foreign teacher (outside of the primarily receptive act of following said teacher's directions and acting upon them). Conversely, the Japanese teachers were valued for their ability to improve what they believe to be specific language learning skills.

Whether one form or another of teaching is more beneficial for language learning is, of course, not evident from this data (if such a question is even answerable, given the wide number of factors involved in successful language acquisition). But we can see that students seem to have some fairly clear expectations of each teacher type. While teachers neither can nor should simply do what their students want, there is some merit to the idea that, by the university level, student expectations are fairly strongly set and that simply defying them won't lead to a positive teacher-student relationship. For example, one finding of the language use data, as shown in the analysis in Hahn (2014), was that it seems that students would be happier if foreign teachers spoke more Japanese, and that they would find their Japanese teachers' classes more useful if they spoke more English. In cases where a teacher chooses not to meet those expectations, I would argue that the teacher has an ethical obligation to explain, to some degree, the pedagogical philosophy underlying their decisions.

Second, foreign teachers should deliberately take advantage of the fact that students reported enjoying their classes more. While no one really knows the “best” way to teach English,^{iv} it's fairly well agreed that high levels of exposure to English (especially interactive, communicative exposure) is a necessary component of language learning. If students enjoy their foreign teachers' classes, then they are more likely to be engaged with the activities the teacher is setting forth. Additionally, anything that teachers can do to transform the enjoyment of the class into a more general enjoyment in English use is going to increase the chance the student will study English above and beyond what is strictly required of them—and there is no doubt that fulfilling the GE requirements in English at the college level are not enough English language contact to make someone an even slightly proficient user of English. Similarly, one question that needs to be asked is whether or not there are things that

^{iv} Especially since it's highly likely that one can only define a “best” method for a specific set of students, learning environment, learning goal, etc.

Japanese teachers can adopt from foreign teachers' teaching methods to make their own classes more enjoyable.

With regards to difficulty level of the classes, this is a case where foreign teachers certainly have something to learn from Japanese teachers. Given how fairly universal Japanese junior and senior high school curricula are (and how much the entrance exams strongly constrain what is taught at cram schools), many students arrive at Fukuoka University having had somewhat similar experiences learning English. Foreign teachers who better understand the students' prior learning environments will be better able to adapt their lessons to account for (if not actually meet) student expectations. Of course, since foreign teachers at Fukuoka University are disproportionately tasked with teaching oral communication, and that very task is to a large degree alien to students' experiences, there may be a limit to how adaptive they can be. The key, though, is that one thing missing at Fukuoka University is any sort of structured cross-pollination of teaching ideas, either within or between the two supposedly distinct groups. While I personally enjoy the academic freedom given to us at Fukuoka University, I think that the differences shown in this study indicate that there would be benefit in having some sort of professional development, even mandatory, that would give teachers the opportunity to learn from one another.

Finally, it should be mentioned that, as with most TESOL research, these results need to be understood as the product of a very specific set of circumstances. The same survey was given by Shimai at another private university in Fukuoka (the same one where she conducted the pilot study). That school, generally considered to be scholastically lower than Fukuoka University, produced significantly different results. For that data, there were no statistically significant differences in the student responses to foreign and Japanese teachers; we attributed that to the lesser flexibility in teaching at that university (teachers followed a somewhat common curriculum) and to a greater lack of engagement among students with any of their classes. In addition, the open-ended results contained many more negative comments about both types of teachers, perhaps indicating a more general dislike of English among those students. As such, we cannot simply take the results from Fukuoka University and apply them elsewhere; similarly,

we must take care when attempting to apply other TESOL research results to Fukuoka University without considering the ways in which the student populations may differ.

Works Cited

- Galloway, N. (2011). *An investigation of Japanese university students' attitudes towards English* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from University of Southampton Research Repository ePrints Soton. (345128)
- Gurkan, A. & Yuksel, D. (2012). Evaluating the contributions of native and non-native teachers to an English Language Teaching program. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46. 2951-2958.
- Hayes, B. (2013). Hiring criteria for Japanese university English-teaching faculty. In S. Houghton and D. Rivers (Eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan*. (pp. 132-146). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Holliday, A. (2013). 'Native speaker' teachers and cultural belief. In S. Houghton and D. Rivers (Eds.), *Native Speakerism in Japan* (pp. 17-26). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Liu, M. & Zhang, L. (2007). Student perceptions of native & non-native English teachers' attitudes, teaching skills assessment and performance. *Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 9(4). 157-166.
- Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: who's worth more? *ELT Journal* 46 (4), 340-349.
- Madrid, D. & Cañado, L. (2004). Teacher and student preference of native and nonnative foreign language teachers. *Porta Lingarum*, 2. 125-138.
- Shimai, Y. (2013, September). Students' varied reactions to teacher nationality. Paper presented at 2013 Fukuoka JALT One-day Conference, Fukuoka, Japan.
- Stangroom, J. (2014). Mann-Whitney U-value calculator. Retrieved from <http://www.socscistatistics.com/tests/mannwhitney/Default2.aspx>.
- Tsuneyoshi, R. (2013). Communicative English in Japan and 'native speakers of English'. In S. Houghton and D. Rivers (Eds.), *Native-speakerism in Japan*. (pp. 119-131). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Wu, K. & Ke, C. (2009). Haunting native-speakerism? Students' perceptions towards native speaking English Teachers in Taiwan. *English Language Teaching*, 2 (3), 44-52.