

# (Non)native Language Teachers' Cognitions: Are They Dichotomous?

Zia Tajeddin<sup>1</sup> & Hossein Askari<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author, Department of English Language and Literature, Allameh Tabataba'i University, zia\_tajeddin@yahoo.com

<sup>2</sup>Department of English Language and Literature, Allameh Tabataba'i University, haskari301@gmail.com

*Received: 22/04/2015*

*Accepted: 27/10/2015*

## **Abstract**

In view of native/nonnative language teacher dichotomy, different characteristics have been assigned to these 2 groups. The dichotomy has been the source of different actions and measures to clarify the positive and negative points of being (non)native teachers. In recent years, many researchers have revisited this dichotomy. The challenge to the dichotomy can be a source of motivation to explore if (non)native language teachers' cognitions or belief systems are different. To this end, this study compared the (non)native language teachers' perceptions of their cognition in view of their gender and teaching experience. A cognition questionnaire was administered to 66 nonnative and 46 native language teachers, and then an interview was conducted electronically. A total of 12 nonnative and 8 native teachers responded to the interview questions. Results showed a significant convergence between the (non)native language teachers' cognitions. Findings also revealed that the (non)native teachers held different beliefs about the nature of language learning and the role of materials in language learning/teaching. As to the teachers' gender and teaching experience, it was found that the male (non)native teachers and the low-experienced (non)native teachers showed no significant differences, whereas the female (non)native teachers and the high-experienced (non)native participants differed regarding their perceptions of their cognition. Accordingly, (non)native language teachers' dichotomy might need to be revisited in many respects.

**Keywords:** Cognition; Native Language Teachers; Nonnative Language Teachers; Teacher Cognition

## **1. Introduction**

With the increase in the number of English L2 learners all over the world, indigenous nonnative language teachers were needed to satisfy teaching tasks in all countries. Despite the unrivaled number of nonnative language teachers in the profession, the commonly accepted frame holds that native speaker teachers are

more competent regarding both knowledge and performance (Braine, 2010). However, the nonnative English-speaking teachers started to gain recognition and empowerment due to the rise of the English as International Language (EIL) movement (Brain, 2010).

There are, indubitably, some researchers (e.g., Phillipson, 1992) who consider nonnative language teacher better qualified because these teachers have experienced language learning in almost the same contexts where their students are learning the language. This native speaker fallacy in language teaching profession paved the way for the nonnative speaker movement founded by Braine in 1996 (Braine, 2010).

A number of studies have focused on examining the perceptions of native English teachers and nonnative English teachers of their own identity and what they think of the concept of (non)nativeness (e.g., Braine, 2005; Phothongsunan & Suwanarak, 2008). In many of such studies, the question of whether native or nonnative speakers are better language teachers was not the issue; rather, attention was directed toward the qualities native or nonnative teachers own. To fill in the gap, the current study aimed to investigate (non)native language teachers' perceptions of their cognition and to find out if their perceptions would diverge or converge.

## **2. Literature Review**

Research in applied linguistics has aimed to create a clear picture of language teachers and what they need to know. Different topics in this regard have been studied, such as the role of teachers' knowledge about language, their beliefs, values and thoughts, and factors that affect language learning. Based on a wide range of L2 learning/teaching contexts, it can be stated that the area of L2 teacher education is quite a complex one, especially when it comes to teacher cognition. Borg (2003) proposes a simple definition of the term "teacher cognition" to refer to "the unobservable cognitive dimension of teaching—what teachers know, believe, and think" (p. 81).

In the 1970s, advances in cognitive psychology—as the first factor affecting cognition research—revealed a complex relationship between people's behavior and their knowledge and beliefs. This affected the field of L2 teaching, and researchers recognized the importance of teachers' mental lives in their instructional decisions (Borg, 2009). Teachers' central roles in the classroom went hand in hand with the importance of their decisions in the context of classroom to form the second factor affecting cognition research in language teaching. Therefore, teachers' decisions became a new focus in teacher research (Tsui, 2011).

The recognition of the significance of the teachers for learning and the need for more principled approaches to L2 teacher education resulted in a greater number of studies exploring teachers' knowledge base (i.e., cognition). Over the years, a number of researchers (e.g., Freeman, 2002; Pajares, 1992; Philips & Borg, 2009) have tried to find out an answer to the question of what constitutes the knowledge base of teaching and how it relates to the content and practice of teacher education. L2 teachers' cognition studies started off its journey in the early 1990s while close to the end of the millennium the number of the studies reached its peak (Borg, 2006).

Aiming to provide a classification of the studies on the general cognitive processes which L2 teachers go through, Tsui (2011) provided four aspects: (1) teachers' planning thoughts and classroom decision-making; (2) teacher beliefs, sources of influence, and the ways in which they shape classroom practices and decisions; (3) the relationship between teacher cognition and classroom practices (e.g., whether and why teachers depart from or modify their lesson plans); and (4) the impact of teacher education on teacher cognition change. The following review of literature is presented based on the second and third aspects as the main focus of the current study:

### ***2.1 Teachers' Beliefs***

Language teachers' beliefs as part of their cognition started to gain attention in recent years. Despite this, some researchers (e.g., Tsui, 2011) believe that teachers are unable to put their beliefs into practice because of contextual constraints such as a prescribed curriculum, lack of resources, or the school culture.

Joram and Gabriele (1998) believe that teacher educators need to take teachers' prior beliefs into consideration because they believe that the selected new material needs to "compete with, replace or otherwise modify the folk theories that already guide both teachers and pupils" (p. 176). This idea can be observed in Almarza's (1996) study in which she found out that the preservice teachers interpreted the theoretical models they were presented in the teacher education program according to their own beliefs. She studied four trainee teachers. They reacted differently to the method they were being trained to use in their teacher education program. One of the teachers liked the method, but the other three did not like it and were not willing to apply them because it was not in line with their beliefs about teaching.

To find how preservice teachers' prior experiences can be made more conscious and integrated into the curriculum, Farrell (1999) conducted a study in Singapore. He aimed to find out how the teachers' prior experience could be unlocked by the use of a three-part reflective assignment. The findings showed that

the reflective assignment made these preservice teachers more aware of their past influences as learners of English. Besides, they were enabled to question these past influences through this awareness and the course readings. These preservice teachers were also able to realize that they were not to remain fixed in their approaches to teaching grammar; rather, they needed to be flexible and teach to the needs and level of proficiency of their students. Another finding was that the teachers found that “reflecting on their prior experiences of learning and actual experience of teaching” (p. 13) was a powerful method of shaping their own development as teachers.

In a study by Peacock (2001) on changes of 146 trainees ESL teachers’ beliefs about L2 learning over their 3-year program, the teachers’ beliefs were investigated to find out if any changes happened to their beliefs from the beginning to the end of a TESL training program. Contrary to the researcher’s expectation, only a slight change was observed in the teachers’ beliefs over the 3 years of study. The researcher concluded that mistaken beliefs were not to die out through a single course; rather, considerable efforts should be made to eliminate any detrimental trainee beliefs before they start teaching.

Fajet, Bello, Leftwich, Mesler, and Shaver (2005) studied preservice teachers’ beliefs and perceptions in beginning education classes. A survey and semistructured interview were used as their method of eliciting the teachers’ beliefs. The findings revealed that the preservice teachers conceived teaching primarily as a task that involves affective, interpersonal relationships, rather than a profession requiring a skilled and knowledgeable practitioner.

Busch (2010) explored the effects of an introductory SLA course on preservice teachers’ beliefs. Contrary to the findings of the above studies, the comparison between the pre/posttests showed significant changes in the beliefs of the teachers in different areas, including the length of time for acquisition, difficulty of language acquisition, the role of culture, the role of error correction, the importance of grammar, and the efficacy of audiolingual learning strategies. Their written postcourse explanation revealed that the teachers attributed their precourse beliefs to their language learning experience, whereas they attributed the changes in their beliefs to the SLA course.

Caner, Subaşı, and Kara (2010) set out to find out if teachers’ beliefs could play a significant role in their practices of teaching L2 in kindergarten and first grades in a state school. Two language teachers participated to collect the data. The overall outcome of the study stated that teaching English in early classes could be useful if the characteristics of young English L2 learners, their cognitive and language development, as well as the learning conditions that were most effective for these learners and the types of instruction that best met their needs were taken into account.

## ***2.2 Relationship Between Teachers' Cognition and Classroom Practice***

Classroom practice includes all activities teachers do in order to help learning, attention, motivation, and involvement to take place. It can range from a simple task given to learners to planning an entire lesson for a given classroom. Recent research has shown the importance of teachers in producing students' growth and teachers' variability in leading learners to the realm of success (Kane, Taylor, Tyler, & Wooten, 2010). Such findings highlight the importance of effective teaching practices. Teachers' classroom practices can be affected by many factors, one of which is their cognition. Some studies have investigated the relationship between teachers' cognition and their classroom practice.

To find out what takes place during field experiences in ELT, Farrell (2001) conducted a case study of one trainee teacher during his teaching practicum. It was actually a study of the socialization of an EFL teacher on teaching practice in Singapore. The teacher believed he was belittled by the supervisors. He also revealed that lack of good relationship with the staff was another source for his negative experiences at work—that was why he failed to establish any integrity with the learners. At the end of the practicum, the teacher was not sure whether to continue on this profession or not. The conclusion was that the socialization process through which prospective teachers are supposed to turn into competent teachers could influence their conception of the profession in a significant way.

Johnson (1992) studied the instructional actions and decision-making of six preservice teachers in USA by exploring their concerns in making interactive decisions. The study was carried out during their initial teaching experiences. It was found that the preservice ESL teachers' instructional actions were directed by unexpected student responses and the desire to maintain the flow of instructional activities. The findings also revealed that their decisions in the classroom were highly affected by the need to ensure student understanding, to increase student motivation and involvement, and to maintain control over instructional management. Johnson's study also showed eight considerations behind instructional decisions: student involvement and motivation, instructional management, curriculum integration, student affective needs, subject-matter content, student understanding, student language skills and ability, and appropriateness of teaching strategy. The suggestions are that it is really important to cognitively help teachers be better prepare for the decisions they are to make in their classes.

Numrich (1996) investigated the results of a secondary analysis of 26 diary studies by novice ESL teachers. The findings showed that the teachers' use of instructional strategies was highly affected by their experiences with those strategies

as L2 learners. It was also found that the novice teachers were preoccupied with their own teaching experiences. They also transferred teaching methods/techniques used in their own L2 learning. The teachers reported to have unexpected discoveries about effective teaching while they were continually frustrated with teaching.

### **3. Purpose of the Study**

For many years, researchers (e.g., Borg, 2006; Phothongsunan & Suwanarak, 2008) have dealt with the question whether the mainstream research in the profession should follow the dichotomy between (non)native language teachers and whether they should assign positive and negative values to being native or nonnative language teachers. Many researchers (e.g., Sutherland, 2012; Butler, 2007) hold the idea that (non)native teachers are different in many aspects. Thus, these two groups of language teachers have different concepts in their minds and act differently as they face a given situation or idea. Many still believe that native teachers are better language teachers (Merino, 1997). This belief—right or wrong—is rooted in many concepts like (non)native teachers' cognition. Many studies have focused on the pros and cons of being (non)native language teachers (e.g., Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Braine, 2005; Medgyes, 1992). However, few studies have compared (non)native teachers' perception of their cognition.

Considering the existing gap in the literature, this study was an attempt to find out how (non)native language teachers are different as to their perceptions of their own cognition. Also, the study set to find out if teachers' gender and experience would play a role in their perceptions of their cognition. To meet these ends, the following research questions were formulated:

1. What is the status of (non)native English teachers' cognition?
2. Are there any differences between (non)native teachers' cognition by gender and teaching experience?

### **4. Method**

#### ***4.1 Participants***

A total of 66 nonnative (i.e., 20 male and 46 female) and 46 native (i.e., 20 male and 26 female) English language teachers, aged between 20 and 46, participated in the study. They were chosen based on the availability criterion. The nonnative teachers were met by the researchers in the teachers' lounges of Iranmehr branches in Tehran, and 150 questionnaires were distributed among them. As many as 66 nonnative teachers filled out the questionnaires and returned them. Their teaching experiences in the field ranged from a few months to 23 years. The access to the nonnative teachers in the context of ELT in this study was easily affordable by visiting different branches of a language center. With regard to the native teachers,

the data were collected electronically. More than 1000 e-mails were sent. In total, 46 native teachers from the US, Canada, Australia, and the UK agreed to participate in the study. They were teaching in diverse contexts other than their home countries, such as Turkey, the United Arab Emirates, China, and Iran. The interview was sent electronically to those who had filled out the questionnaires, and a total of eight native and 12 nonnative teachers returned the interview questions with their answers. The interviewees' teaching experiences varied from 2 years to 18 years, and their ages from 25 to 46. The native teachers who answered the interview questions were teaching in the US, Turkey, and China. The nonnative language teachers who took the interview were all teaching English in Iran.

## **4.2 Instruments**

### **4.2.1 Teacher cognition questionnaire**

Two instruments were used to collect the data: a questionnaire and an interview. The cognition questionnaire was developed and piloted for this research study to meet the needs of the research questions. The items were formulated based on the relevant literature on teachers' beliefs about language, language learning, and language teaching. The first version of the questionnaire included 24 items. It was based on a 5-point Likert scale, varying from "*Strongly Disagree*" to "*Strongly agree*." In the pilot phase, the questionnaire was administered to 51 nonnative language teachers and five native speaking language teachers. The participants of the pilot study were selected from different branches of a language institute. It should be noted that the first part of the questionnaire elicited demographic data on the participants' age, gender, and years of experience. These factors were considered the moderating variables of the study.

The whole process of ensuring the reliability and normality of the items, collecting data, analyzing them through the SPSS software, and revising the items resulted in the final version of the questionnaire (see Appendix). The cronbach's alpha index of reliability of the questionnaire in the pilot phase was found to be .44. As .44 was a low index for reliability, the questionnaire was modified. Five items which showed to be skewed were omitted from the questionnaire. After careful examination of each item of the questionnaire with respect to its mean, kurtosis, and skewness indices, three other items were omitted from the questionnaire. The new version of the questionnaire was administered to 45 language teachers and the reliability was acceptable ( $r = .65$ ). The final version of the questionnaire consisted of 16 carefully worded items. It was utilized to collect the data for the main phase of the study. In the main phase, the questionnaire was given to 66 nonnative language teachers and 46 native language teachers.

#### ***4.2.2 Teacher cognition interview***

To gain a deeper understanding of the teachers' perceptions of their cognition, an interview was devised. The interview was informed by the questionnaire in order to corroborate the findings of the questionnaire and to add to the richness of the collected data. The interview was composed of three questions. The teachers who answered the questions were among those who had taken the questionnaire. Twelve nonnative and eight native participants were interviewed electronically. All the questions were phrased in English. The interview questions focused on the characteristics of an effective language teacher, the aspects of the language which learners need to learn in classes, and the teaching practices that can help learners the most.

#### ***4.3 Data Collection Procedure***

The data were collected over a time span of 5 months. The researchers attended the different branches of a language center in order to collect the data from the nonnative teachers who were contacted in teachers' rooms, on-the-job-training sessions, and workshops, and the purpose of the study was explained to them. About 250 questionnaires were given to the supervisors of the language center's branches to distribute among their teachers, and 66 were returned.

In the case of the native teachers, an invitation e-mail to participate in this study was sent to native English language teachers from different countries. The teachers' e-mail addresses were retrieved from the Websites of their schools and through interactions via social Websites like linkedin.com and research Websites such as researchgate.com, fluidsurvey.com, and surveymonkey.com. The teachers who did not respond to the first e-mail were sent a reminder e-mail after 2 weeks. Next, the questionnaire was sent to them electronically. In the demographic part of the questionnaire, the teachers were asked to write their e-mail addresses. The interview questions were sent to all the e-mail addresses written on the questionnaires.

#### ***4.4 Data Analysis***

In the pilot phase, descriptive statistics (i.e., item mean, median, kurtosis, and skewness indices) were obtained. The cronbach's alpha was also calculated in the pilot phase to explore the reliability of the questionnaire. In the main phase of this study, quantitative data analysis was carried out using the SPSS software (version 16). *t* test was run to compare the (non)native participants' answers to the cognition questionnaire. *t* test was also run for each single item of the questionnaire. The qualitative data from the interview questions were content-analyzed to see if the teachers' answers to the interview questions could validate their answers to the questionnaire. The techniques to content-analyze the data included word repetition,

key-words-in-contexts, comparisons and contrasts, metaphors and analogies, and connectors.

## 5. Results

### 5.1 (Non)native English Teachers' Cognition

The first research question aimed to explore the (non)native language teachers' perceptions of their cognition. Table 1 summarizes the descriptive statistics for the (non)native English teachers' data on the cognition questionnaire. The total mean scores for the questionnaire were 3.33 and 3.22 for the (non)native participants, respectively. Among all the items of this questionnaire, the highest mean score for both the (non)native language teachers ( $M = 4.50$  and  $4.26$  out of 5, respectively) belonged to item # 10, which reads "A teacher should have good relationship with learners in an L2 classroom." The English language teachers' answers to this item reveal that both the (non)native language teachers strongly believed that good relationship with their learners was a key to success in L2 classrooms. The lowest mean score for the nonnative participants was for item # 6 (1.88), which says "Learning an L2 is mostly a matter of translating from the L2 to the L1." The nonnative language teachers showed their strong disagreement to the perception that learning a language was mostly a matter of translation from an L2 to their L1. The lowest mean score for the native participants was for item # 1 (2.28), which reads "It is difficult to teach an L2 to learners."

Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics for (Non)native English Teachers' Data on Cognition Questionnaire*

Items	Groups	<i>N</i>	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Nonnative	66	1	5	2.22	1.11
	Naive	46	1	5	2.28	1.14
2	Nonnative	66	1	5	3.95	.99
	Naive	46	1	5	3.13	1.36
3	Nonnative	65	1	5	3.71	.89
	Naive	46	1	5	3.65	.99
4	Nonnative	66	1	5	3.22	1.12
	Naive	46	1	5	2.59	1.18
5	Nonnative	65	1	5	2.98	1.06
	Naive	46	1	5	2.76	1.28
6	Nonnative	66	1	5	1.88	.86
	Naive	46	1	5	2.33	1.13

7	Nonnative	64	1	5	4.45	.80
	Naive	46	2	5	3.76	1.09
8	Nonnative	65	1	5	3.66	.87
	Naive	46	1	5	3.59	.83
9	Nonnative	66	2	5	3.18	.92
	Naive	46	1	5	3.63	1.14
10	Nonnative	66	2	5	4.50	.63
	Naive	46	1	5	4.26	.95
11	Nonnative	66	1	5	3.76	1.00
	Naive	46	1	5	3.80	1.06
12	Nonnative	65	2	5	3.52	1.04
	Naive	46	1	5	3.48	1.18
13	Nonnative	63	1	5	3.63	1.11
	Naive	46	1	5	3.20	1.22
14	Nonnative	66	2	5	1.95	.64
	Naive	46	1	5	2.63	1.06
15	Nonnative	65	1	5	3.92	.81
	Naive	46	1	5	3.74	1.16
16	Nonnative	66	2	5	2.82	1.02
	Naive	46	1	5	2.80	.93
Sum of the Cognition	Nonnative	66	1	5	3.33	.32
	Naive	46	2.44	3.88	3.22	.39

To explore the possible significant differences between the means of the (non)native teachers, a *t* test was run (see Table 2). The independent samples *t* test, comparing the (non)native language teachers, indicated no significant difference between the two groups ( $t = 1.46$ ,  $df = 108$ ,  $p = .14$ ):

Table 2. *Independent t-Test Results for (Non)native English Teachers*

	Groups	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> value
Cognition Questionnaire	Nonnative	66	3.33	0.32	1.46	0.14
	Native	46	3.22	0.39		

A *t* test was, then, run for each item of the cognition questionnaire (see Table 3). Items # 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 14 significantly differentiated the native teachers from the nonnative teachers. Table 3 provides the *t*-test results for these six items. The (non)native language teachers' mean scores for these six items were 3.95 and 3.13 (item # 2), 3.22 and 2.59 (item # 4), 1.88 and 2.33 (item # 6), 4.45 and 3.76 (item # 7), 3.18 and 3.63 (item # 9), and 1.96 and 2.63 (item # 14), respectively:

Table 3. *Independent t-Test Results for (Non)native Participants for Items With Significant Differences*

Items		Groups	N	Mean	SD	t	P value
2	It is important to speak an L2 with an excellent accent.	Nonnative	66	3.95	.99	3.5	.001
		Native	46	3.13	1.36		
4	Learning an L2 is mostly a matter of learning many new words.	Nonnative	66	3.22	1.12	2.8	.005
		Native	46	2.59	1.18		
6	Learning an L2 is mostly a matter of translating from the L2 to the L1.	Nonnative	66	1.88	.86	2.3	.020
		Native	46	2.33	1.13		
7	It is important to do lots of repetition and practice to learn an L2.	Nonnative	66	4.45	.80	3.6	.000
		Native	46	3.76	1.09		
9	Learners' L1 can be used to facilitate L2 learning.	Nonnative	66	3.18	.92	2.2	.026
		Native	46	3.63	1.14		
14	Materials (e.g., textbooks) are more important than teachers.	Nonnative	66	1.96	.64	3.8	.000
		Native	46	2.63	1.06		

From Table 3, it can be inferred that the nonnative language teachers put more weight on native accent and on the idea that speaking an L2 needs to be accompanied by native accent (item # 2;  $t = 3.5$ ,  $df = 108$ ,  $p = .001$ ). It was also found that the nonnative teachers attached more importance to vocabulary in language learning (item # 4;  $t = 2.8$ ,  $df = 108$ ,  $p = .005$ ).

As L2 learners learn the language, they translate concepts from their L1 to the language they are learning. Teachers try to assure them that learning a language is not a matter of translating from L1 to L2. In this study, neither the nonnative nor the native teachers showed great agreement for item # 6 ( $t = 2.3$ ,  $df = 108$ ,  $p = .020$ ), saying that learning an L2 is mostly a matter of translating from learners' L1 to L2 (with mean scores for the (non)native teachers being 1.88 and 2.33, respectively). Surprisingly, the native teachers expressed a significantly stronger belief in translation from L1 to L2.

Table 3 also reveals that the nonnative teachers gave significantly more credit to doing lots of repetition and practice to learn an L2 (item # 7;  $t = 3.6$ ,  $df = 108$ ,  $p = .000$ ). This was not far from expectation. As the nonnative teachers had gone through the laborious process of learning the L2 by repetition and practice, it might seem the case that they believe more in these activities in learning an L2 compared with their native colleagues.

As shown in Table 3, the nonnative teachers stated more strongly that learners' L1 could not be used to facilitate L2 learning (item # 9;  $t = 2.2$ ,  $df = 108$ ,  $p = .026$ ). The nonnative teachers also believed that materials such as textbooks were not as important as teachers, whereas the native teachers stated that materials were more important than teachers (item # 14;  $t = 3.8$ ,  $df = 108$ ,  $p = .000$ ).

To gain a more profound understanding of the teachers' cognition, the qualitative data were collected through an interview. The questions were as follows:

1. What are the characteristics of an effective language teacher?
2. What aspects of language and its components should a learner learn in language classes?
3. What teaching practices can help learners the most with language learning?

**Interview Question # 1:** The (non)native participants' views on the characteristics of an effective language teacher did not seem to differ much from each other. Almost all the (non)native teachers referred to teacher traits which they thought were important in language teaching, for example, a language teacher should be patient, caring, severe, and so on. When the participants' answers to question # 1 were content-analyzed, a different theme showed to be recurrent in the (non)native participants' answers. They attributed being an effective language teacher to intrinsic locus-of-control issues, such as being knowledgeable, hardworking, confident, and strict. By contrast, the native language teachers, while mentioning the same issues, went to a broader domain and highlighted learner variables and institutional concerns like the role of institutions' syllabi, lesson plans provided by the supervisors, and amount of supervision. The contrast might be evident from the following answers given by the participants in both groups:

- **Nonnative Teachers:**

- *A language teacher should be confident enough in his knowledge of the language and his ability to teach the language.*
- *Language teachers should be knowledgeable, hardworking, helpful and strict at the same time. Teachers should have a very coherent lesson plan and follow it in the classroom.*

- **Native Teachers:**

- *Some characteristics are essential for language teachers. For example, language teachers should be caring, punctual, and organized. Of course, it needs to be said that many factors need to go hand in hand to make an effective teacher, some of these*

*factors are out of teachers' realm of action, like the schools' syllabi.*

- *An important factor is to keep pace with your learner and identify the setbacks on their learning path. And sure it is needed to have a genuine teacher inside.*

**Interview Question # 2:** The second question about language teachers' cognition was, "What aspects of language and its components should a learner learn in language classes?" The content analysis and comparison of both groups' responses to the question revealed an old-seated divergence between the (non)native language teachers. Most nonnative language teachers referred to the four language skills and the subskills of grammar and vocabulary as the aspects of the language needed to be learnt by L2 learners.

- **Nonnative Teachers:**

- *I think learners should follow the language skills the same as they learnt their Persian language: first listening, then speaking, reading, and writing.*
- *Vocabulary is the most important aspect of the language; if you know a lot of vocabulary, you can make yourself understood in all situations. Of course, grammar is very important, too but vocabulary is the base, I think.*

On the contrary, the native language teachers, besides attesting to the importance of the abovementioned skills and subskills, considered higher-order factors like culture, discourse, and shades of the word meanings. It seems that the native participants could not think of the language learning/teaching apart from these aspects, whereas the typical nonnative teacher considered the four skills and subskills to be more important.

- **Native Teachers:**

- *I am not sure what it is meant by aspects, but as the most important function of the language is to help people communicate, teachers should help learners learn whatever aspects needed to meet this function of the language.*
- *As my students try to get their message across when we are communicating, I have noticed that they use the general meaning of the vocabulary and ignore the nuances and cultural background of the words, I think teachers should consider these aspects, too because learners will learn the grammar and vocabulary anyway.*

**Interview Question # 3:** The last interview question on the language teachers' cognition was, "What teaching practices can help learners the most with language learning?" Whereas more convergence was observed among the (non)native teachers' answers, a streak of divergence could still be noticed between the two groups. The nonnative language teachers regarded modeling as a common practice needed in language classes. They stated that language teachers should present themselves as language models to their L2 learners. Moreover, they considered pushing learners to work harder as a key practice of language teachers.

- **Nonnative Teachers:**

- *Teachers should force their learners to speak; this plus presenting a good model of language speaking in the classroom can help learners the most.*
- *The best practice of language teaching is teaching through examples, both giving and asking, for examples. You should provide correct examples because learners will learn whatever you produce.*
- *The rapport between teacher and learners can make everything easier and faster in the classroom. I think this is the rapport that determines learning, and it is key accept you as the one who should be followed they will and therefore they will learn.*

In addition to stating that their learners regarded them as language models, the native language teachers assumed language learning as a discovery journey, which was to be guided by the teacher in or out of the classroom.

- **Native Teachers:**

- *To me, fun is the best a teacher can do in the class. Making the learning fun is not easy, but once a teacher makes it happen, all aspects of his teaching will be affected positively.*
- *Teachers should help learners leap into the unknown and discover the language they need. This will govern their learning. Teachers should build a kind of situation which make learners let teachers lead them into the areas they do not know.*

All in all, the nonnative language teachers' cognition showed to be different from that of their native counterparts. The nonnative teachers showed to have adopted a more synthetic view of the language, learning, and teaching. They believed, more than the native teachers, that it benefitted learners more if teachers broke down the language into subelements and presented them separately to L2

learners (like putting more emphasis on vocabulary and grammar than culture and communication). The native teachers embraced a more analytic view of the language, learning, and teaching. They believed they had to prepare learners for communication, not for the elements of language.

### 5.2 (Non)native English Teachers' Cognition by Gender

This study also aimed to find out if there were any differences between (non)native teachers' cognition by gender. To this end, the male nonnative language teachers were compared with the male native teachers, and the female nonnative teachers with the female native teachers. Table 4 presents the results of the mean scores and the *t* test comparing the male (non)native English teachers. As shown, the mean scores of the male (non)native teachers were 3.33 and 3.41, respectively:

Table 4. *Independent t-Test Results for Male (Non)native English Teachers*

	Groups	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> value
Total Cognition (Males)	Nonnative	20	3.33	0.32	-.70	0.48
	Native	20	3.41	0.38		

The results ( $t = -.70$ ,  $df = 38$ ,  $p = .48$ ) showed that the *Sig.* value (0.48) is higher than the critical value of 0.05; therefore, no statistically significant difference was observed between the mean scores of the male (non)native English teachers' perceptions of their cognition. The male participants of both the (non)native groups showed to be significantly different from each other in terms of their cognition only in item # 7 of the questionnaire. The mean scores of the (non)native language teachers for this item were 4.00 and 4.50, respectively ( $t = -2.10$ ,  $df = 38$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). The item reads "It is important to do lots of repetition and practice to learn an L2." Regarding this item, the native male teachers were found to hold stronger beliefs that repetition and practice was important in learning an L2 than their nonnative male counterparts.

To compare the mean scores of the female (non)native participants, an independent samples *t* test was applied. The mean scores for the female (non)native were 3.33 and 3.08, respectively. Table 5 reveals a statistically significant difference ( $t = 2.92$ ,  $df = 70$ ,  $p = .005$ ) between the female (non)native language teachers:

Table 5. *Independent t-Test Results for Female (Non)native English Teachers*

	Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> value
Total Cognition (Females)	Nonnative	46	3.33	.33	2.92	.005
	Native	26	3.08	.33		

After comparing the total mean scores of the female (non)native participants, *t* test was run for each single item of the questionnaire for the female language teachers. As Table 6 shows, the female (non)native teachers showed significant differences in items # 2, 4, 7, 9, 13 and 14, which reveal divergence in their attitude toward language learning/teaching:

Table 6. *Independent t-Test Results for Female (Non)native Teachers for the Questionnaire Items*

Items	Groups	<i>N</i>	Mean	Std. Deviation	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> value
2	Nonnative	46	4.09	.81	4.09	.00
	Native	26	2.88	1.36		
4	Nonnative	46	3.43	1.02	4.33	.00
	Native	26	2.35	1.01		
7	Nonnative	46	4.37	.90	5.15	.00
	Native	26	3.19	.98		
9	Nonnative	46	3.12	.99	2.12	.04
	Native	26	3.62	.89		
13	Nonnative	46	3.64	1.09	2.56	.01
	Native	26	2.92	1.23		
14	Nonnative	46	2.04	.96	2.70	.00
	Native	26	2.62	1.09		

A closer look at these six items and their results in Table 6 shows that the female nonnative teachers gave a significantly higher priority to “excellent accent” (item # 2;  $t = 4.09$ ,  $df = 70$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), “learning many new words” (item # 4;  $t = 4.33$ ,  $df = 70$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), “doing lots of repetition and practice” (item # 7;  $t = 5.15$ ,  $df = 70$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). The nonnative teachers also stated that “positive personality, communication ability, and leadership qualities” (item # 13;  $t = 2.56$ ,  $df = 69$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) could be more important than language proficiency and teaching skills. The native language teachers believed that “the use of learners’ L1” (item # 9;  $t = 2.12$ ,  $df = 66$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) could more significantly facilitate L2 learning; they also revealed that “materials were more important than language teachers” (item # 14;  $t = 2.70$ ,  $df = 70$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).

### 5.3 (Non)native English Teachers’ Cognition by Teaching Experience

This study also intended to investigate cognitive perceptual differences between (non)native language teachers by teaching experience. In this section, the cognitive perceptions of the low-experienced nonnative teachers are measured

against those of their native colleagues, and the high-experienced nonnative teachers' perceptions are compared with those of their native counterparts.

Table 7 presents the results of the *t* test, comparing the low-experienced (non)native English teachers. The mean scores for the (non)native participants were 3.40 and 3.41, respectively. The *t* test run between the low-experienced (non)native language teachers showed no significant difference ( $t = -.53$ ,  $df = 54$ ,  $p = .59$ ):

Table 7. *Independent t-Test Results for Low-Experienced (Non)native Teachers for Cognition Questionnaire*

Low-Experienced Teachers	Groups	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> value
	Nonnative	46	3.36	.293		
Native	19	3.41	.412	-.53	.59	

*t* test was run for all the individual items of the questionnaire, and the results showed that no significant differences were observed between the low-experienced (non)native language teachers for any items of the questionnaire. In other words, the low-experienced (non)native language teachers showed to be convergent regarding their perceptions to all the items of the cognition questionnaire.

As the last stage in the data analysis, *t* test was run to observe if there were any significant differences between the high-experienced (non)native language teachers' perceptions of their cognition. As shown in Table 8, the mean score for the sum of the whole questionnaire was 3.34 for the high-experienced nonnative language teachers and 3.09 for their native counterparts. The results for the whole questionnaire was  $t = 2.41$ ,  $df = 41$ ,  $p = .02$ . The *t* computation revealed a significant divergence between the high-experienced (non)native language teachers regarding their perceptions of their cognition:

Table 8. *Independent t-Test Results for High-Experienced (Non)native Teachers for Cognition Questionnaire*

Item	Groups	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> value
High-Experienced Teachers	Nonnative	19	3.34	.33		
	Native	27	3.09	.32	2.41	.02

Table 9 reports the *t* test for each item of the questionnaire for the high-experienced (non)native teachers' cognition. It reveals that the high-experienced

(non)native language teachers showed significant divergences in items # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8:

Table 9. *Independent t-Test Results for High-Experienced (Non)native Teachers for Items in Cognition Questionnaire*

Items	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	p value
1	Nonnative	19	2.88	1.25	3.11	.00
	Native	27	2.07	1.03		
2	Nonnative	19	3.42	1.23	2.27	.02
	Native	27	2.81	1.30		
3	Nonnative	19	3.82	.95	2.19	.03
	Native	27	3.37	1.04		
4	Nonnative	19	2.95	1.28	3.23	.00
	Native	27	2.11	.80		
5	Nonnative	19	3.12	1.21	4.14	.00
	Native	27	2.07	.99		
8	Nonnative	19	3.29	1.09	-2.74	.00
	Native	27	3.89	.64		

The results of the *t* test for the high-experienced teachers displayed that the nonnative teachers considered teaching an L2 more difficult than the native teachers (item # 1;  $t = 3.11$ ,  $df = 44$ ,  $p = .00$ ). As the results for items # 2, 3, 4, and 5 suggest, the high-experienced nonnative teachers put significantly greater emphasis on an “excellent accent” (item # 2;  $t = 2.27$ ,  $df = 44$ ,  $p = .02$ ), “knowing the L2 culture” (item # 3;  $t = 2.19$ ,  $df = 43$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), “role of new words in learning an L2” (item # 4;  $t = 3.23$ ,  $df = 43$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), and “role of grammar rules in learning an L2” (item # 5;  $t = 1.80$ ,  $df = 43$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). The high-experienced native language teachers, however, believed significantly more strongly than their nonnative counterparts that “communicative language teaching was the best teaching method” (item # 8;  $t = -2.74$ ,  $df = 43$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).

## 6. Discussion

The findings show that there was no significant difference between the (non)native teachers’ cognitive perceptions. The Literature Review section displayed few, if any, studies comparing (non)native language teachers’ cognition of language learning/teaching. Accordingly, the findings cannot be sufficiently discussed in light of previous studies. Lack of a significant difference between (non)native language teachers’ perceptions of their cognition might be explained in two ways. First, analogous to nearly all areas, L2 teaching profession is influenced by globalization. Many new tools such as the Internet and social networks are helping globalization to expand itself in different areas. Globalization has influenced our cognition (Hauptmann, 2010); as a result, (non)native participants seem to have comparable

cognitions. Second, learning experience of the nonnative teachers and linguistic ability of native teachers seem to counterbalance each other, as neither of the groups showed to be significantly different from the other one. The findings support Ryerson and Llurda (2008) who argue that the (non)native teacher dichotomy is no longer valid due to the intense effect of globalization on the profession.

As a second step in the current study, *t* test was run for each single item of the questionnaire. Items # 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 14 showed significant perceptual divergences between the (non)native teachers in view of their cognition. The nonnative language teachers' higher mean score for item # 2 indicates that they had significantly stronger beliefs in the importance of speaking an L2 with an excellent accent. This great emphasis on excellent accent might be rooted in the fact that nonnative speakers of a language have always praised native speakers for their accent. Tang (1997), in his study in an EFL situation, found that the native teachers were always admired for their proficiency in language, and that nonnative speakers considered themselves linguistically inferior to the native ones. This can be explained by the fact that native accent can be rarely acquired by nonnative people. Accordingly, nonnative teachers, who wish for the native accent, agree more than their native colleagues on the idea that it is important to speak an L2 with an excellent accent.

Linguistic superiority has always been a concern to many researchers. Braine (2005) conducted a study on this issue, concluding that nonnative speakers' self-perceptions include the linguistic superiority of native speakers. He states that nonnative language teachers, even those who teach in an English-speaking country, perceive themselves linguistically less competent. This feeling might emanate from the observation that native teachers have always received praises from learners and even nonnative teachers for the way they speak the language. As native teachers own an excellent accent by nature, they put less emphasis on the importance of excellent accent in language teaching compared with their nonnative counterparts. Consistent with the current study, Horwitz (1999) found that 78% of the EFL learners stated it was important to speak an L2 with an excellent pronunciation.

The nonnative teachers of this study voiced their stronger belief (compared with their native colleagues) in the statement that "Learning an L2 is mostly a matter of learning many new words" (item # 4). This reveals deep-seated beliefs about learning an L2. The findings support Wajnryb's (1992) contention that most L2 learners in EFL contexts equate language learning with learning many vocabulary words. The findings of the current study also support those of a number of other studies. Horwitz (1999) found that 76% of the language learners agreed on the item saying "the most important part of learning an L2 was learning vocabulary words." In another study, Ariogul, Unal, and Onursal (2009) asked the L2 learners if they

thought language learning was mostly a matter of learning a lot of new words, and about 70% agreed on that item. It seems that the language teachers of this study had transferred the abovementioned beliefs from their language learning background to their teaching career. Many studies (e.g., Braidi, 2002; Schmitt, 2010) reveal that nonnative speakers can equal and, sometimes, surpass native speakers in vocabulary knowledge and use in interactions. This justifies the nonnative speakers' higher emphasis on vocabulary, which could be also observed in the results of the analysis of item # 4 of the questionnaire. The idea that learning many new words means being able to talk better appears to be commonplace in nonnative settings. L2 learners believe that if they learn a lot of new words, they will be able to deal with diverse situations more competently. It should be noted that most nonnative learners learn the most common meaning of words. That might be why they tend to memorize many new words, instead of learning different usages of the words they know.

Learning an L2 has for long been accompanied by the idea that learners should not make use of their L1 in language classes and that they should not translate from their L1 to the L2 (Popovic, 2001). Many nonnative teachers attended language classes and learned English language with the idea that translating from L2 to L1 is not helpful, hence it should be prohibited. Accordingly, it might make sense that the native teachers reported higher agreement with the item that learning an L2 is mostly a matter of translating from the L2 to the L1. Of course, there are many studies documenting the usefulness of translation in learning an L2 (e.g., Cordero, 1984; Machida, 2011).

Repetition was considered as one of the mainstays of L2 teaching in the days of the audiolingual method (Duff, 2000). As the nonnative teachers of this study learned the language and practiced it, it might seem natural that they scored the importance of repetition in L2 learning higher than their native counterparts. There are several studies supporting this finding. Gupta and MacWhinney (1997) and Rydland and Aukrust (2005) report the significance of repetition in learning an L2. They argue that repetition has been extensively used in order to improve L2 learners' fluency in their L2.

Cook (2001) states that the anti-L1 use in teaching classes has been around for more than 120 years. He continues saying that monolingualism, or the use of the L2 in language classes, has been encouraged for a long time. However, recently, researchers are coming up with the findings that the use of L1 can be facilitative, rather than debilitating (e.g., Timor, 2012). Despite recent findings, some researchers believe that there is no benefit of L1 use in L2 classes, and teachers in EFL situations are still being banned to use L1 in their classes (Hawks, 2001). The ramifications of this belief is still at work, as the nonnative teachers in this study

agreed more with item # 9. This can be explained on the ground that teachers are banned to make use of L1 in their classes, as it might be interpreted as the sign of lack of competence in English.

There is a substantial difference between the way this study and other studies have surveyed gender. The review of the related literature shows that almost all studies have sought to compare a group of male participants with a female group. By contrast, in the current study, the male nonnative participants' cognition was compared with the male native participants' cognition, and the female nonnative teachers' cognition was weighed up against that of the female native ones. As teachers' gender is concerned, the male (non)native teachers showed no significant divergence, but the female (non)native participants significantly differed regarding their perceptions of their cognition. This suggests that language teachers' gender affects their perceptions of their cognition. The interpretation, however, is to be taken cautiously.

The low-experienced (non)native language teachers showed no meaningful difference, whereas the high-experienced (non)native teachers revealed a significant divergence. As the relevant literature shows, almost no studies have aimed to compare low-experienced (non)native language teachers or high-experienced (non)native language teachers. Rather, they have focused on making a comparison between low- and high-experienced teachers. Considering the high-experienced language teachers in both the (non)native groups, the results of this study showed a significant divergence in their cognition. As the only factor which changed for these two sets of comparison was their teaching experience, it might be reasonable to argue that experience is a key factor in causing differences between (non)native cognitions over time. Partial support comes from Eisentein-Ebsworth and Schweers (1997) who argue that having experience as L2 learners significantly influences teachers' beliefs about language teaching.

## **7. Conclusion**

This study examined the extent to which (non)native teachers' perceptions of their cognition diverge or converge. The findings indicate a significant perceptual convergence between the (non)native language teachers regarding their cognition. The female (non)native teachers and the high-experienced (non)native teachers also showed to be different in their perceptions of their cognition. However, the male (non)native teachers did not display any significant differences. The same was true for the low-experienced (non)native participants.

The convergence between the (non)native teachers' cognition revealed their comparable beliefs about language teaching, language learning, learners, and teachers. The findings support a growing body of research that has recently shown

that (non)native dichotomy might not be a suitable grouping anymore. Whereas the current study found no differences between the (non)native participants, further research is necessary to help if this can be considered an unchanging conclusion.

The findings might lead to the conclusion that native teachers' L1 and the process of learning an L2 by nonnative teachers mold (non)native cognitions into the same cognitive state. Giving thought to Lung (1999, as cited in Sutherland, 2012) who argues learners in native teachers' classes are, first, more motivated but soon get discouraged, it is inferred that nonnative language teachers' experience as L2 learners might provide language schools with a better asset. The findings also showed that the language learning experience of the nonnative teachers could compete with the linguistic ability of the native teachers to provide convergent cognitions of both groups.

The findings have an important implication for teacher education to broaden the current understanding of (non)native language teachers' beliefs and to guide student teachers to adopt their future beliefs about teaching/learning more professionally. The findings suggested no significant differences between the (non)native language teachers' cognitive perceptions. Hence, they imply that it is time for language schools to appreciate nonnative teachers for their experiences as L2 learners, rather than seeking only natives to fit their vacancies as language teachers. Future studies are needed to warrant this claim, but attention should be paid to numerous studies that have found out nonnative teachers' qualities in language classes.

There were some limitations in the current study which need to be considered in future research. The study aimed to explore teachers' perceptions of their own cognition. Due to the fact that such perceptions might be affected by their personal preferences and personal frames of reference, these factors are to be included in future studies to offer a more illustrative view of the concept. It is also more revealing to include cognitive perceptions of supervisors of the schools where language teachers teach and students' cognitive perceptions to give a more holistic understanding of teachers' cognition. Supervisors' and learners' perceptions added to language teachers cognitive perceptions might provide a better portrait of the concept with clearer practical implications.

The present study chose its nonnative participants from one nonnative-speaking context. As the tag being used for these participants is nonnative, the nonnative group should be sampled in a way to ensure that the selected participants are perceived as a representative group. Accordingly, a larger-scale study is needed to take vast array of nonnative language teachers from different contexts into its scope.

### References

- Almarza, G. G. (1996). Student foreign language teacher's knowledge growth. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp. 50-78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ariogul, S., Unal, D. C., & Onursal, I. (2009). Foreign language learners' beliefs about language learning: a study on Turkish University students. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1), 1500-1506.
- Árva, V., & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and nonnative teachers in the classroom. *System*, 28(3), 355-372.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36, 81-109.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. London: Continuum
- Borg, S. (2009). *Introducing language teacher cognition*. Retrieved 5 January, 2015, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.education.leeds.ac.uk/research/files/145.pdf>
- Braidi, M. (2002). Reexamining the role of recasts in native-speaker/nonnative-speaker interactions. *Language Learning*, 52, 1-42.
- Braine G. (2005). A history of research on nonnative speaker English teachers. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Nonnative language teachers: Perceptions, challenges, and contributions to the profession* (pp. 13-23). New York: Springer.
- Braine G. (2010). *Nonnative speaker English teachers: Research, pedagogy, and professional growth*. New York: Routledge.
- Busch, D. (2010). Preservice teacher beliefs about language learning: The second language acquisition course as an agent for change. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(3), 318-337.
- Butler, Y. (2007). Factors associated with the notion that native speakers are the ideal language teachers: An examination of elementary school teachers in Japan. *JALT Journal*, 29(1), 7-39.
- Caner, M., Subaşı, G., & Kara, S. (2010). Teachers' beliefs on foreign language teaching practices in early phases of primary education: A case study. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 1(1), 62-76.

- Cordero, A. D. (1984). The role of translation in second language acquisition. *The French Review*, 57(3), 350-355.
- Duff, P. (2000). Repetition in foreign language classroom interaction. In J. K. Hall & L. S. Verplaetse (Eds.), *The development of second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 109-138). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Eisentein-Ebsworth, M., & Schweers, C. W. (1997). What researchers say and practitioners do: Perspective on conscious grammar instruction in the ESL classroom. *Applied Language Learning*, 8, 237-260.
- Fajet, W., Bello, M., Leftwich, S. A., Mesler, J. L., & Shaver, A. N. (2005). Preservice teachers' perceptions in beginning education classes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(6), 717-727.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (1999). The reflective assignment: Unlocking preservice teachers' beliefs on grammar teaching. *RELC Journal*, 30(2), 1-17.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2001). English language teacher socialization during the practicum. *Prospect*, 16(1), 49-62.
- Freeman, D. (2002). The hidden side of the work: teacher knowledge and learning to teach. *Language Teaching*, 35, 1-13.
- Gupta, P., & MacWhinney, B. (1997). Vocabulary acquisition and verbal short-term memory: Computational and neural bases. *Brain and Language*, 59, 267-333.
- Hauptmann, D. (2010). Introduction: Architecture and mind in the age of communication and information. In D. Hauptmann & W. Neidich (Eds.), *Cognitive architecture: From bio-politics to no-politics; architecture and mind in the age of communication and information* (pp. 10-45). Rotterdam: 010 Publishers.
- Hawks, P. (2001). Making distinctions: A discussion of the mother tongue in the foreign language classroom. *Hwa Kang Journal of TEFL*, 7, 47-55.
- Hedrick, W. B., Harmon, J. M., & Linerode, P. M. (2004). Teachers' beliefs and practices of vocabulary instruction with social studies textbooks in grades 4-8. *Reading Horizons*, 45(2), 103-125.
- Horwitz, E. K. (1999). Cultural and situational influences on foreign language learners' beliefs about language learning: A review of BALLI studies. *System*, 27, 557-576.
- Johnson, K. E. (1992). Learning to teach: Instructional actions and decisions of preservice ESL teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(3), 507-535.

- Joram, E., & Gabriele, A. J. (1998). Preservice teachers' prior beliefs: Transforming obstacles into opportunities. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*(2), 175-191.
- Kane, T. J., Taylor, E. S., Tyler, J. H., & Wooten, A. L. (2010). *Identifying effective classroom practices using student achievement data*. (Working Paper No. 15803). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Machida, S. (2011). Translation in teaching a foreign (second) language: A methodological perspective. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2*(4), 740-746.
- Marshall, M. N. (1996). Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice, 13*, 522-535.
- Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or nonnative: Who's worth more? *ELT Journal, 46*(4), 340-349.
- Merino, I. G. (1997). Native English-speaking teachers versus nonnative English-speaking teachers. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses, 10*, 69-79.
- Numrich, C. (1996). On becoming a language teacher: Insights from diary studies. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(1), 131-153.
- Özmen, K. S. (2012). Exploring student teachers' beliefs about language learning and teaching: A longitudinal study. *Current Issues in Education, 15*(1), 1-16.
- Pajares, F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Clearing up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(2), 307-332.
- Palfreyman, D. (1993). How I got it in my head: Conceptual models of language and learning in native and nonnative trainee EFL teachers. *Language Awareness, 2*(4), 209-223.
- Peacock, M. (2001). Preservice ESL teachers' beliefs about second language learning: a longitudinal study. *System, 29*(2), 177-195.
- Philips, S., & Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System, 37*, 380-390.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phothongsunan, S., & Suwanarak, K. (2008). Native and nonnative dichotomy: distinctive stances of Thai teachers of English. *ABAC Journal, 28*(2), 10-30.
- Popovic, R. (2001). The place of translation in language teaching. *Bridges, the Journal of the Thrace-Macedonia Teachers' Association, 5*, 3-8.
- Rydland, V., & Aukrust, V. G. (2005). Lexical repetition in second language learners' peer play interaction. *Language Learning, 55*, 229-274.

- Ryerson, L. M., & Llurda, E. (2008). Nonnative English-speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Language Teaching*, 41(3), 315-348.
- Schmitt, N. (2010). Key issues in teaching and learning vocabulary. In R. C. Beltrán, C. Abello-Contesse, & M. del Mar Torreblanca-López (Eds.), *Insight into nonnative vocabulary teaching and learning* (pp. 28-40). Salisbury: Multilingual Matters.
- Sutherland, S. (2012). Native and nonnative English teachers in the classroom: A reexamination. *AWEJ*, 3(4), 58-71.
- Tang, C. (1997). The identity of the nonnative ESL teacher on the power and status of nonnative ESL teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 577-583.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (2011). Teacher education and teacher development. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. II; pp. 21-39). New York: Routledge.
- Vefali, G., M., & Tuncergil, Ç. (2012). Exploring in-service English language teacher trainees' and trainers' practice and beliefs in Northern Cyprus. *English Language Teacher Education and Development*, 15, 42-56.
- Wajnryb, R. (1992). *Classroom observation tasks: A resource book for language teachers and trainers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, C. S., Sturtevant, E. G., & Dunlap, K. L. (2003). Preservice and beginning teachers' perceptions of the influence of high stakes tests on their literacy-related instructional beliefs and decisions. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 42(2), 39-62.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 377-389.

### Appendix English Language Teachers' Cognition Questionnaire

**Directions:** This questionnaire is aimed at identifying the nature of language teacher cognition. The items are related to cognition about language teaching/learning. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

	Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	It is difficult to teach an L2 to learners.					

2	It is important to speak an L2 with an excellent accent.					
3	It is necessary to know the target culture in order to speak an L2.					
4	Learning an L2 is mostly a matter of learning many new words.					
5	Learning an L2 is mostly a matter of learning many grammar rules.					
6	Learning an L2 is mostly a matter of translating from the L2 to the L1.					
7	It is important to do lots of repetition and practice to learn an L2.					
8	Communicative language teaching is the best teaching method.					
9	Learners' L1 can be used to facilitate L2 learning.					
10	A teacher should have good relationship with learners in an L2 classroom.					
11	Learning an L2 is different from learning other school subjects.					
12	Sufficient L2 proficiency is the most important factor in becoming a qualified teacher.					
13	Positive personality, communication ability, and leadership qualities can be more important than language proficiency and teaching skills.					
14	Materials (e.g., textbooks) are more important than teachers.					
15	Teachers should be a language model for their L2 learners.					
16	It is important for language teachers to communicate with their students out of their L2 classrooms.					