

# A Comparative Analysis of NEST and NNEST Lesson Plans: Examining Cultural Influences, Autonomy, and Teaching Objectives in EFL Writing Classes

Shao Luyi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Correspondence: Shao Luyi, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Received: October 2, 2025; Accepted: October 16, 2025; Published: October 17, 2025

## Abstract

As English remains a predominant global language, the demand for high-quality English lesson plans, delivered by both native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) and non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs), is increasingly critical in EFL contexts such as China. The present study investigates the disparity between lesson plans and pedagogical beliefs among Native English-Speaking Teachers (NESTs) and Non-Native English-Speaking Teachers (NNESTs) in writing lessons for primary students, with particular emphasis on the influence of their linguistic and cultural backgrounds on classroom decision-making. The study employs Bloom's Taxonomy to evaluate the alignment of classroom activities with diverse cognitive requirements, utilizing four actual lesson plans and interviews with two NESTs and two NNESTs. The results show that NESTs often plan their lessons in a way that moves from simple recall to more creative and open-ended assignments. This shows how important it is for students to be able to work on their own and communicate with each other. On the other hand, NNESTs tend to focus more on aligning with the textbook, structured practice, and grammar accuracy. This focuses give students a strong foundation through modeling and repetition. The interviewees' responses, which showed differences in training, classroom priorities, and limitations, also show these differences. The study suggests that writing lesson plans could benefit from the collaboration of each group's distinct strengths, combining creativity and structure to better address the diverse needs of young students in writing classes.

**Keywords:** NESTs, NNESTs, Lesson Plans, EFL Writing Classes, Cultural Influences/Backgrounds, Autonomy

## 1. Introduction

Due to globalization, English has gradually become a lingua franca, resulting in an increasing demand for proficient English teachers worldwide. In recent years, Chinese schools and language institutions have actively recruited both native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) and non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs) to meet this demand. In China, however, hiring practices often reflect a strong preference for NESTs, largely influenced by perceptions of linguistic authenticity and fluency, due to the influence of native-speakerism—the belief that native speakers of English are naturally more competent or effective as language teachers<sup>[10]</sup>.

Also, there have been plenty of research areas on the comparison between them. For example, Wu compared students' listening performance before and after receiving listening input from NEST for one year and found that those students achieved higher performance in standardized English listening test<sup>[40]</sup>. Deng, Zhang & Mohamed demonstrated NESTs and NNESTs have different perspectives of English teacher's qualities<sup>[10]</sup>. Although Carless and Walker did study the lesson plan coordination strategies in a co-teaching environment<sup>[5]</sup>, there are few studies on the comparison of their lesson plans in the field of EFL writing class. Hence, I believe that it is important to compare the difference of NESTs with NNESTs in terms of their lesson plans in order to enhance teaching effectiveness and allow different types of teachers to complement each other.

Writing is a critical skill in EFL education that involves both the grammar and structure, as well as the ability to express ideas clearly and creatively<sup>[16]</sup>. Lesson plans, as a foundation of classroom practice, offer valuable insight into how teachers organize instruction, set goals, and choose activities<sup>[14]</sup>. By examining the specific elements of lesson plans, such as the choice of teaching methods and classroom management strategies, research can provide a more detailed picture of how these educators' cultural and educational experiences influence their teaching approaches and decisions. Since lesson plans reflect not only training and experience but also underlying beliefs

about teaching and learning, comparing the plans of NESTs and NNESTs can help us better understand how different educational backgrounds shape instructional choices.

In China, writing classes are often based on what students need to do for tests, with a focus on structure, accuracy, and memorized patterns<sup>[18]</sup>. NNESTs, who have often learned this way, may feel more at ease reinforcing these patterns. NESTs, however, may be more familiar in a different approach that values student creativity and expression<sup>[5]</sup>. At the same time, these differences can also be complementary. Therefore, when used together thoughtfully, the strengths of both teacher groups can enrich the classroom and support student learning better.

Hence, this study looks at lesson plans for teaching writing in Chinese EFL settings from both NESTs and NNESTs, and it also includes interviews with both groups. This study looks at the differences in their plans and the problems they face to learn more about how working together and learning from each other can make teaching more effective.

## 2. Literature Review:

### 2.1 Definition of NESTs and NNESTs

A "native speaker" is defined as a person, who has been speaking the language as their first language since birth and raised in that language. The native speaker has an inherent understanding of his first language's grammar and possess mastery of linguistic competence on the language. In comparison, a non-native speaker is someone who speaks a language that is not their first language and have learned the target language later in life as a second language. Non-native speakers might have their own strengths and should be appreciated for their distinct language abilities.

Over the decades, native-speakerism has influenced the choose of teachers<sup>[20]</sup>. Nevertheless, in many ESL/EFL contexts, non-native English speaker teachers(NNESTs), who teach English but learned it as a second language themselves, still take up larger proportion in Chinese education, for the unique perspectives and advantages they bring to language teaching, such as empathy for language learners and a deep understanding of how to acquire second language<sup>[3]</sup>. Although there is no exact statistical data, many studies have shown that most students, teachers, and university administrators expect to recruit NESTs<sup>[28]</sup>. Compared to NNESTs, native English speaker teachers(NESTs), whose first language is English in terms of language education as teachers, are perceived as having an intuitive grasp of English and emphasize on individual qualities and student engagement in class<sup>[10]</sup>.

Similar studies have also been done according to the differences between NNESTs and NESTS. For example, as for the advantages and disadvantages from students' perceptions, the perceived strengths of NESTs are that they were generally viewed as more effective in employing interactive teaching methods and demonstrating accurate pronunciation, which helped to create a more communicative classroom environment, while NNESTs were more proficient in the teaching of grammar and examination strategies, which aligned more closely with students' academic needs. However, students also identified limitations: NESTs were sometimes seen as lacking in structured grammar instruction and familiarity with local exam systems, whereas NNESTs were occasionally criticized for relying on traditional, teacher-centered approaches and having non-native-like pronunciation<sup>[36]</sup>.

While I recognize the linguistic distinction between NNESTs and NESTs, I use these terms in this paper as my study compares their lesson plans in EFL writing classes at a primary school in China. Such a comparison is indispensable for improving teaching by allowing both groups to complement each other.

### 2.2 Challenges Faced by Chinese English Teachers

Teachers are central to improving English classrooms<sup>[33]</sup>. The increasing demands for the capabilities of English teachers present challenges to Chinese English teachers. Thus, plenty of studies have been done in terms of the obstacles they are facing. For instance, having been accustomed to grammar and translation methods during their own schooling, Chinese English teachers tend to favor monotonous traditional teaching approaches in their teaching as well<sup>[36]</sup>. Additionally, the educational environment in China is dominated by standardized testing<sup>[7]</sup>, leading many teachers to focus on exam-oriented teaching with students often motivated primarily by exams.

As native English-speaking teachers become more common in English education in China, Chinese English teachers face increasingly intense competition. For instance, in Hong Kong, native English teachers often receive higher salaries and teach more advanced or privileged students<sup>[38]</sup>. Many people believe that Chinese English teachers cannot match native speakers, at least in terms of teaching speaking<sup>[35]</sup>. However, surprisingly, according to the research on students' and parents' preferences for NESTs and Chinese English teachers, Studies investigating students' and parents' preferences reveal that factors such as teaching effectiveness, classroom engagement, and teacher personality are often prioritized over whether the teacher is a native speaker<sup>[32]</sup>.

Thus, the most important issue, given parents' and students' preferences and the challenges faced by Chinese English teachers, is not to determine whether native or Chinese English teachers are better, but to urgently improve the teaching abilities and proficiency of Chinese English teachers. To align with globalization and enhance intercultural communication skills, comparing the differences in their lesson plans for complementary strengths can help address traditional teaching issues and better meet students' needs.

### *2.3 Cultural Influences on Teaching Plans*

Cultural influences can significantly impact how lessons are designed and delivered. The most apparent cultural difference may be the educational model. For example, Chinese English teachers are familiar with and heavily affected by the traditional teacher-centered educational model in China<sup>[10]</sup>, which emphasizes on teachers' authority knowledge transmission<sup>[15]</sup>. Therefore, it is common that in an EFL classroom issued by a Chinese English teacher, students tend to receive knowledge passively and listen with full attention<sup>[7]</sup>. By contrast, a NEST, raised and educated in Western countries, where the educational model has moved from teacher-centered to student-oriented<sup>[1]</sup>, is used to paying attention to a more flexible classroom, students' participation and diversity<sup>[39]</sup>. Therefore, their teaching objectives, which is an inevitable part of teaching plans, can differ as well. However, due to the development of education and globalization, Chinese classrooms are beginning to adopt more student-centered strategies. For example, Li proposed certain student-centered activities, like role play and group discussion can significantly raise motivation and language outcomes in SLA contexts<sup>[21]</sup>.

Studies have shown that Chinese English teachers emphasize on developing meta-linguistic and literary competence and assigning activities that are exam-oriented<sup>[15]</sup>, while NESTs hold the idea that positive participation is the key assessment of the success of a class and prefer to hold communicative activities<sup>[10]</sup>. Exam-oriented teaching can sometimes lead to surface-level knowledge acquisition, but this is primarily due to systemic pressures rather than an inherent flaw in the teaching approach itself. Moreover, it is worth noting that classes led by NESTs sometimes neglecting the more holistic development of language skills. Therefore, instead of regarding the two approaches as dichotomous, this study would focus on their complementary aspect by bridging teacher-centered and student centered approaches and balancing exam preparation with communicative competence. By combining the strengths from both groups, students can be better supported, developing both linguistic competence and communicative fluency.

### *2.4 EFL Writer and EFL Writing Class*

Writing is often considered the most challenging of the language skills, which include listening, speaking, and reading, for it requires simultaneous planning, translating ideas into language, reviewing, editing, and sustained attention<sup>[13][7]</sup>. Therefore, EFL writers, who write in English as a Foreign Language, face a great challenge and so does EFL teachers<sup>[19]</sup>. A typical writing class starts with communicating with students, such as Giving directions, jigsaw story writing, etc. and followed by composing, which involves pre-writing, drafting, redrafting, and editing and organize ideas. After scaffolding the ideas, the last group of activities emphasizes on the collaboration between the teacher and the class, such as peer editing, raising awareness about text quality and so on<sup>[11]</sup>.

Plenty of researches has been done in different fields in EFL writing class. For example, in terms of improving students' writing through written feedback, a study shows that there were similarities and differences between NNESTs and NESTs. They all agreed that promoting students' writing performance and informing their pedagogical practices were the two main purposes of an EFL writing class and the feedback focus should be the content and organization of the articles. However, NNESTs were used to having comprehensive feedback and negative comments while NESTs preferred focused feedback and positive comments<sup>[7]</sup>. This distinction in feedback practices can influence how lesson plans are designed, particularly in terms of assessment or revision stages, and student-teacher interaction in the class. NNESTs may design lesson plans that are highly structured, with activities focused on grammatical accuracy and teacher-led correction, which is a beneficial to class management and exam preparation. However, NESTs may emphasize student participation and self-expression in order to align with the development of communicative competence by positive feedback.

However, almost no research has been done on the overall differences in designing writing lesson plans between NESTs and NNESTs in a primary school EFL writing class. Most studies focus only on one specific aspect of the class. Therefore, it is necessary to compare and analyze the two lesson plans according to a writing class containing similar contents to attain a more comprehensive view of the issues.

### *2.5 Lesson Plan*

A lesson plan involves outline the structure and content of a class session, which mainly contains clear objectives, appropriate materials, structured activities, and assessment methods<sup>[42]</sup>. A good lesson plan ensures more effective

management and use of available resources, and serves as an important blueprint that every effective teacher should be equipped with, which is also a teacher's sophisticated description of the teaching/learning activities for a particular lesson<sup>[24]</sup>.

NESTs and NNESTs perceive similar but also different challenges when designing lessons. NNESTs believed that classes based on grammar was the root cause for negative attitudes toward English lessons and thus suggesting integrate some technological tools when designing lessons. On the part of the NESTs, they problematized the students' lack of autonomy in class<sup>[9]</sup>. Therefore, NESTs may be more likely to design lessons to highlight students' autonomy. In terms of the cooperation between NESTs and NNESTs, Lin and Wang<sup>[26]</sup> have noted that NESTs often found it difficult to ask their NNEST partners to discuss lesson plans together. Collaborative lesson planning could create a balance between student-centered and teacher-centered approaches, as well as between exam preparation and communicative competence. Whether this lack of collaboration impacts the coherence and effectiveness of lesson plans when both groups of teachers work in the same institution can be noted in my research.

However, there are fewer researchers studying on the comparison of different lesson plans between NNESTs and NESTs<sup>[29]</sup>, especially on writing class. So the purpose of this study is to fill this gap and learn about the problems these teachers have when they plan lessons and how their different methods can work together to facilitate the learning outcomes.

### 3. Participants and Contexts

This study is conducted in an EFL context in which one NEST called Anene are asked to write a lesson plan about description of *my family*, one NEST named Eric are asked to write one about *animal skeletons*, one NNEST called Miss Lin shares a lesson plan about *expressing yourself* and Miss Xin shares a lesson plan about *healthy food*. Although these four lesson plans address different topics, i.e., family, food, animals, and emotional expression, they are all related to students' real life and encourage students to connect learning with their personal experiences. Also, they are all interviewed about their problems when designing their writing lesson plans. Miss Lin and Miss Xin were raised in China and knows well about Chinese education background. They were also trained to be a teacher in the colleges in China and Miss Lin has 10 years of teaching experience and Miss Xin has been teaching for 12 years. Anene and Eric are from USA and Anene has 5 years' teaching experience in America and 3 years' experience in the same school as her counterparts, Miss Xin and Miss Lin in China, while Eric has 4 years' teaching experience in America and 5 years' experience in the same school as Anene, Miss Xin and Miss Lin's. Therefore, Miss Lin and Miss Xin can be a representative of Chinese English teachers who aims to improve students' grades and Anene and Eric are familiar with western education background but try to adapt to Chinese education background through the years.

The subjects of their teaching plan are 82 third-grade students from international schools. The first class, containing 44 students are from Miss Xin's class and have been taught by Anene twice a week since the first grade. And the other 38 students are from Miss Lin's class and have been taught by Eric twice a week since the first grade. These students started learning English from Oxford textbooks in the first grade and switched to PEP textbooks in the third grade. Therefore, they have a certain basic understanding and practice of English, and the pass rate in the most recent school's final exam is higher than 80%. Therefore, they are familiar with the four teachers of this study.

### 4. Research Purpose and Questions

Considering the literature review and the underlying research problem, this study is conducted to examine differences in academic writing in EFL classes among Chinese EFL learners who are exposed to NEST and NNEST. Both groups have their own strengths, but their cultural and language backgrounds may affect how they plan lessons. Hence, this study argues that these differences are not merely stylistic, but reflect deeper pedagogical orientations rooted in their educational and cultural experiences. Such study may lead to more effective teaching in writing class and the implications of the study may enable two groups of teachers to reflect themselves and learn from each other's strengths, particularly in co-operative efforts as many Chinese education instructions are likely to hire both NESTs and NNESTs<sup>[10]</sup>. Therefore, my study aims to address two research questions.

(1)How do cultural and language backgrounds influence the content and structure of lesson plan design, especially on the distribution of autonomy and teaching objectives.

(2)What are the problems they may encounter when they are planning their lessons?

### 5. Applied Concepts

In this study, I would adapt Krashen's theory of comprehensive input to compare the input activities that they have used to assess if the input is understandable yet also challenging enough to promote learning. As for the assessment,

I would apply Bloom's Taxonomy, which divided the learning objectives into six levels, that is, Level 1: Knowledge; Level 2: Comprehension; Level 3: Application; Level 4: Analysis; Level 5: Synthesis; Level 6: Evaluation<sup>[2]</sup>. This model can be used to evaluate how their lesson plans match the level of the learners' abilities and desired learning outcomes.

## 6. Methods

### 6.1 Research Methods

This study adopts the literature review method, which involves systematically collecting, analyzing, and synthesizing existing scholarly research related to the definition of NNESTs, NESTs, challenges faced by Chinese English teachers, cultural influences on teaching plans, EFL writer and EFL writing class and lesson plan. By this way, I could have a grasp of current knowledge related to my topic and identify where further research is needed. Also, this method allows me to underlie theoretical frameworks and place new findings within the context of existing ones.

What is more, the interview method is utilized as well. The two NNESTs (Eric, Anene) and two NESTs (Miss Xin and Miss Lin) are interviewed in terms of their lesson plans, such as purposes of certain activities, their objectives of this class, etc. The interviews last about 30 minutes, which are audio-recorded for research purposes.

### 6.2 Instruments

An interview would be conducted to understand the problems encountered by NESTs and NNESTs in designing lesson plans. The interview aims to identify the specific challenges NESTs and NNESTs face when designing lesson plans, focusing on objectives and structure when planning their lessons, teaching philosophy, students' autonomy and engagement, challenges in lesson planning, writing-specific questions and insights related to the relationship between NESTs and NNESTs. The interview would involve open-ended questions. First, it includes an introduction about the teacher's teaching background and the factors they consider when planning writing lesson plans. Secondly, there are also questions about the objectives and structure of their writing lesson plans. Next, the teacher are asked about what ways they adapt their lesson plans to meet the cultural expectations of their students or the educational environment. Also, questions about students' autonomy and engagement in their lessons and challenges they meet in lesson planning are also contained. At last, there are also questions focusing specifically on writing and their insights on the collaboration between NESTs and NNESTs. With permission, the interviews would be recorded to compare and contrast their responses to highlight any key differences or similarities.

Besides, all participants are informed about the purpose of the study and obtain their consent before conducting interviews. They would be informed that their privacy would be protected and individual responses would not be traced back to them to ensure their confidentiality and thus obtaining the most valuable answer.

## 7. Results

### 7.1 Bloom's Taxonomy Analysis Summary

Figure 1 shows the original lesson plan about *Animal Skeletons* from Eric.


Animal skeletons							
<b>Topic</b> Animals, parts of the body			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clean the board. Now explain that you are going to invent an animal skeleton together. The skeleton can be of a real animal, or an imaginary one.</li> <li>• Ask questions and draw an animal skeleton using the learners' answers on the board, for example:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Does the animal walk, fly, swim?</li> <li>○ Does it have legs? How many?</li> <li>○ Does it have a tail? How many bones does it have?</li> <li>○ What else does it have? Wings? Fins?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Label the parts of the body on the board. Leave the picture on the board.</li> </ul>				
<b>Learning outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Say and write some body parts of different animals</li> <li>• Write simple sentences to describe an animal using present simple tense</li> </ul>							
<b>Age and level</b> 5-8 (A1)							
<b>Time</b> Approximately 45-50 minutes							
<b>Materials</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coloured pencils or crayons</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use the picture to review parts of the body, for example:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Point to a body part and say a sentence e.g. point to the head and say, 'This is an ear'. Learners listen and say true or false. Repeat with more true / false sentences.</li> <li>○ Point to body parts and ask learners to name the parts.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Tell learners to quickly copy the picture of the animal into their notebooks. You may like to set a time limit for this.</li> <li>• Make sure all learners can access coloured pencils or crayons, then give some instructions for colouring different parts of the animal in, for example:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Colour the tail blue.</li> <li>○ Colour one eye red, and the other eye green.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• To check answers, point to the body parts of the picture on the board and ask: 'What colour is the tail?' Etc.</li> </ul>					
<b>Introduction</b> In this lesson, learners review vocabulary for parts of the body and are introduced to the names of animal body parts. They invent the skeleton of an animal, then label and describe it.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tell learners to imagine what the skeleton of the animal drawn on the board would look like. Ask them how it would be different from a human skeleton. Invite them to give some ideas – they can use their first language for this (e.g. it would have tail bones). It may be useful to teach the word 'bone' here.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ask learners to draw their own animal skeletons. They can draw the skeleton of a real or imaginary animal. Give a time limit for the drawing. Walk around the room as learners work. Offer help and also talk about learners' drawings e.g. 'That's a big animal! Does it live on land or in the sea?'</li> <li>• Ask learners to label their drawings. You may need to write the words for different body parts on the board e.g. wing, fin, trunk etc.</li> </ul>				
<b>Procedure</b> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Stage</th> <th>Instructions</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Review animal body parts (10 minutes)</td> <td>Display a picture of an animal such as a cat or a dog or draw the outline of a simple animal on the board. You can find a video here for tips: <a href="https://www.teachingspreading.org.uk/professionals/">https://www.teachingspreading.org.uk/professionals/</a>.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Stage	Instructions	1. Review animal body parts (10 minutes)	Display a picture of an animal such as a cat or a dog or draw the outline of a simple animal on the board. You can find a video here for tips: <a href="https://www.teachingspreading.org.uk/professionals/">https://www.teachingspreading.org.uk/professionals/</a> .	<b>3. Creating animal skeletons (10 minutes)</b>	<b>4. Writing (10-15 minutes)</b>
Stage	Instructions						
1. Review animal body parts (10 minutes)	Display a picture of an animal such as a cat or a dog or draw the outline of a simple animal on the board. You can find a video here for tips: <a href="https://www.teachingspreading.org.uk/professionals/">https://www.teachingspreading.org.uk/professionals/</a> .						

Figure 1. Eric's Original Lesson Plan

The instructional sequence for the *Animal Skeletons* unit is organized according to Bloom's Taxonomy to support progressive cognitive development from recognition to creative synthesis. At the Knowledge level, learners review

and identify animal body parts through interactive tasks such as pointing, naming, and responding to true-or-false statements about different body parts (Activity 1). These activities reinforce foundational vocabulary related to animals and the human body. The Comprehension stage focuses on understanding animal anatomy by engaging students in colouring exercises that associate language with visual recognition. Learners follow instructions such as “Colour the tail blue” and respond to comprehension checks like “What colour is the tail?”, demonstrating their grasp of the vocabulary in context (Activity 2). In the Application phase, students are encouraged to imagine and sketch an animal skeleton, integrating language, creativity, and scientific reasoning. This stage introduces the concept of “bone” and allows learners to use their first language when generating ideas, facilitating deeper conceptual engagement. The Analysis level extends this by prompting learners to compare animal and human skeletons through guided questioning about function and form—considering features such as movement type, number of legs, or presence of tails, wings, or fins. At the Synthesis stage, students construct imaginative written descriptions of newly invented animals, for instance, “This animal is a Megafish. It lives in the sea and has three fins on its back.” These writing activities encourage integration of linguistic, scientific, and creative thinking. Finally, the Evaluation stage involves peer sharing and discussion, as learners display and reflect on their creations collaboratively. This scaffolded progression from vocabulary recall to creative production cultivates not only language competence but also observation, comparison, and imaginative expression within a science-integrated language learning framework.

Figure 2 shows the original lesson plan about *My Family* from Anene.

<p><b>My Family</b></p> <p>Topic</p> <p>Families</p> <p><b>Learning outcomes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use family vocabulary</li> <li>Identify key language in short descriptions of different families</li> <li>Write simple sentences about your own family using 'I've got' and 'My family is ...'</li> <li>Some learners write sentences using present simple tense and other structures</li> </ul> <p><b>Age and level</b></p> <p>5-8; 9-12 (A1)</p> <p><b>Time</b></p> <p>Approximately 45-50 minutes</p> <p><b>Materials</b></p> <p>Several options are presented for this lesson. Teachers can use just paper and pencils or crayons for drawing. They can also use any or a mix of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation (PowerPoint or PDF) (optional)</li> <li>Descriptions of families (PDF) (optional)</li> <li>Images of families (PDF) (optional)</li> </ul> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>Most primary course books include a unit on families, but they are usually very traditional, with mum, dad, a brother and a sister. This lesson provides teachers and primary children with an opportunity to see different kinds of families that might better reflect their own experiences. In this lesson primary children do a series of simple and supported vocabulary and reading activities which lead to them writing about their own</p>	<p>families. At the end of the lesson, they draw pictures of their families and they make a classroom display of their texts and pictures.</p> <p><b>Procedure</b></p> <p><b>Before the lesson</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepare the presentation if using. Alternatively, download and make copies of the description and image cards. Cut them into cards. See options for stage 2 of the lesson.</li> </ul> <p><b>1. Warmer (5 mins)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduce the topic by playing a guessing game. Draw a simple stick picture of a child on the board and label it 'me'. If necessary, explain that this is a picture of you as a child.</li> <li>Draw a mum and dad (stick figures) next to the child and elicit the words by pointing and saying: 'This is my ...'. Learners hold up their hands to guess. When a learner guesses correctly, write 'mum' and 'dad'.</li> <li>Add other stick figures to represent family members. Ask learners to guess the words and add the labels. If necessary, use flashcards or drawings to revise family words: mum, dad, brother, sister, aunt, uncle, grandma, grandpa, cousin and baby.</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Descriptions of different families (10-15 minutes)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Before the lesson, read the family descriptions and check for any unknown vocabulary. Decide whether to pre-teach words or encourage learners to guess the meaning from the context. Then choose one of these options depending on the level of your learners and the resources you have available:</li> </ul> <p>using the description and image cards: Put learners into pairs. Hand out a set of cut-up description cards and a set of cut-up image cards to each pair. Explain that learners need to read the family descriptions and match each description with its corresponding picture. Monitor learners while they read and match. Help and guide where necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elicit the answers with the whole class. One way of doing this is by reading out each text in turn and asking learners to hold up the correct picture each time. Answer key: 1. Maya, 2. Anna, 3. Eric, 4. Nita, 5. Cecilia, 6. Jan</li> </ul>	<p><b>3. Follow-up (5 minutes)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ask learners if any of the families in the pictures are the same as theirs. Ask 'Is this like your family?' Encourage learners to think about the components of each family and to find similarities and differences.</li> <li>Point out that all families have things that are the same and things that are different and that every family is special.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note:</b> You may prefer to use learners' first language for this discussion. It may be a sensitive issue for some learners.</p> <p><b>4. Extension and personalisation (20-25 minutes)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Give learners a piece of paper. Tell them to draw a picture of their own family, including themselves. If they like, they can draw and write about an imaginary family.</li> <li>When they are ready, tell them to write some sentences about their families. If necessary, before they write you could write some sentences about your family, and / or write some useful structures on the board, for example: My family is big / small. I've got ... / I haven't got ...</li> </ul> <p>His / her name is ... There are ... people in my family. ... lives with us.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Walk around the room as learners draw and write about their families. Help with vocabulary where necessary e.g. stepfather, half-sister. Write any common words on the board. Encourage higher-level learners to write more sentences, for example about family members' likes / dislikes or activities.</li> <li>Early finishers can colour their pictures.</li> <li>Make a classroom display with the learners' pictures and texts. Add a heading: Our families</li> </ul>
---	--	--

Figure 2. Anene's Original Lesson Plan

According to Bloom's Taxonomy, *My Family* unit is designed to develop learners' linguistic and cognitive skills progressively, moving from recognition of vocabulary to creative and reflective production. At the Knowledge level, students are introduced to family member terms through a guessing game in which the teacher draws simple stick figures and prompts learners to identify relations such as “mum,” “dad,” and “sister.” This activity reinforces basic kinship vocabulary through visual and interactive engagement. At the Comprehension stage, learners work in pairs to read short family descriptions and match them with corresponding images, thereby demonstrating understanding of family-related texts and vocabulary in context. The Application phase extends learning as students write sentences about their own families using guided structures such as “My family is big/small” or “There are four people in my family.” This task encourages personalization and meaningful language use. The Analysis level prompts learners to compare different family types by identifying similarities and differences between families shown in the materials and their own, fostering awareness of diversity and inclusion. In the Synthesis phase, students create drawings and written descriptions of their real or imaginary families, incorporating new vocabulary and sentence patterns, while advanced learners are encouraged to elaborate on family members' preferences or daily activities. Finally, the Evaluation stage involves reflection and sharing; learners display their family portraits under the heading *Our Families*, discuss them with peers, and receive feedback. This systematic progression from vocabulary acquisition to creative expression not only enhances students' communicative competence but also nurtures empathy, self-awareness, and respect for social diversity within the classroom context.

Figure 3 shows the original lesson plan about *Expressing Yourself* from Miss Lin.

<p><b>Step1.Pre-reading</b></p> <p>Activity1.Let's sing:Expressing yourself If you're happy ,we _____. If you're happy.We can do a lot of things.</p> <p>Activity2.Let's chant We show our love to our _____(parents)</p> <p>Activity3.Pair work T:How do we express our love to our parents? Ss:We sing and dance/... T:We express ourselves in many ways.</p>	<p>Ss sing the song together.</p> <p>We show our love to our parents.</p> <p>Learn the new sentence: We express ourselves in many ways.</p>		<p>Read after the tape.</p>
<p><b>Step2.While-reading</b></p> <p>Activity1.Look and say We show our love to our _____(pets/...)</p>  <p>Activity2. Read and circle How do they show love? Circle the main words or phrases. Talk/draw pictures/sing songs/dance/smile</p>  <p>Activity 3.Read and number 1)T:Do we talk in picture1/2/3/4? 2)How about sentence 2/3/4? 3)Let's think:How can we talk with dogs? Activity 4.Listen and repeat</p>	<p>Ss:We show our love to our Pets/friends/teachers.</p>	   	<p>Let's retell Let's think:How do the writer express or show his love? We write and show pictures. We show love to our parents. We show our love to _____.</p>
<p>Analysis the sentences one by one.Read and numbers.</p>	<p>Try to read and check together.</p>	<p><b>Step3.Post-reading</b></p> <p>Activity1. Read and match</p>  <p>Activity2. Write a "Love Note" Share your "love note" and put on the "Love Wall".</p>	<p>Read and match the exercise. Let's write,draw and say Put on the "Love Note"on the wall.</p>
		<p><b>Step4. Homework</b></p> <p>Must to do 1. Read the text on P21 2.Share your "Love Note" with your friends and put it on the "Love Wall".</p>	

Figure 3. Miss Lin’s Original Lesson Plan

The instructional design for the *Expressing Yourself* unit employs Bloom’s Taxonomy to scaffold students’ emotional literacy and communication skills. At the Knowledge level, learners recall and match sentences with corresponding pictures through activities such as singing “Expressing Yourself,” chanting phrases about showing love to parents, and engaging in pair work to discuss ways of expressing affection (Activities 1–3). In the Comprehension phase, students demonstrate understanding by identifying how love is expressed toward pets, family members, or friends, using tasks like “Look and Say,” reading and circling key words, and repeating target phrases (Activities 4–5, 8–9). The Application level encourages real-life use, where learners match expressions with images, write personal “Love Notes,” and share them on a “Love Wall,” thereby practicing communication in meaningful contexts (Activities 10–11). During Analysis, students examine sentences and images critically, numbering steps in dialogues and considering how to communicate with different audiences, including animals (Activity 6). At the Synthesis level, learners integrate prior knowledge to create original notes and retell experiences, reinforcing expressive skills and personal engagement with the theme “Show Your Love & Express Yourself” (Activities 7, 11). This structured progression enables students to develop both affective and linguistic competencies, fostering empathy, creativity, and expressive confidence in a scaffolded and interactive learning environment.

Figure 4 shows the original lesson plan about *My Family* from Anene.

<p><b>Step1.Pre-reading</b></p> <p>1.Sing a song-《What would you like?》</p> <p>2.Free-talk</p> <p>Q1:What do you eat for breakfast today?</p> <p>Q2:Is your plate healthy?</p> <p>Q3:What shall we eat?</p> <p>3.Look and say.</p> <p>O1:What's that in the right?</p> <p>Some food groups.</p> <p>Q2:What are they?</p> <p>Q3:What are Zoom and Zip doing?</p> <p>They're doing exercise.</p> <p>4.Read and circle the food in the pictures.</p> <p>5.Read and fill.</p> <p>Rice and noodles are ____.</p> <p>Meat, milk and eggs are ____ too.</p> <p>Fruit and vegetables are colourful and ____.</p> <p>Eat some every day!</p> <p>Candy and cake are ____, but don't eat too much!</p> <p>学习词汇:healthy,yummy.</p> <p>6.Read and repeat.</p>	<p><b>Step3.Post-reading</b></p> <p>9. Think and match.(按照中国居民平衡膳食宝塔,将食物进行分类)</p>  <p>10.Pair work.</p> <p>A:Would you like some...?</p> <p>B:No,thanks.I'd like some...and...What about you?</p> <p>A:I'd like some some...and..</p> <p>10.Look,choose and write.</p> <p>Would you like some noodles?</p> <p>No,thanks.I'd like some vegetables.</p> <p>meat and rice</p>  <p>I'd like some bread, egg, and juice.</p> <p>I'd like some egg, meat and noodles.</p>
<p><b>Step2.While-reading</b></p> <p>7.Let's retell.</p> <p>____are good.</p> <p>____are good too.</p> <p>____are colourful and ____.</p> <p>Eat some every day!</p> <p>____are yummy but don't eat too much!</p> <p>8.Let's group.(将食物进行分类)</p> 	<p><b>Step4. Homework</b></p> <p>基础性作业:跟读 Read and write</p> <p>拓展型作业:Look,choose and write.(选词填空)</p> <p>breadjuiceeggmeat</p> <p>vegetablesnoodlesricessoup</p> <p>I'd like someand</p> <p>提升型作业:Let's write.</p> <p>andare good.andare good too.</p> <p>Fruit and vegetables are colourful and. Eat some every day!</p> <p>Candy and cake are, but don't eat too much!</p>

Figure 4. Miss Xin’s Original Lesson Plan

According to Bloom’s Taxonomy, at the Knowledge level, students engage in recognition and recall tasks through activities such as singing “What would you like?”, identifying food items in pictures, and reading short texts to fill in missing words and classify foods (Activities 1, 3–6). The Comprehension level emphasizes understanding through communicative practice, where learners discuss questions such as “What do you eat for breakfast?” and “Is your plate healthy?” to demonstrate comprehension of food-related vocabulary and concepts (Activity 2). The Application level allows students to use learned language in practical contexts through pair work and written exercises involving dialogues like “Would you like some...?” and “I’d like some...” (Activity 10). At the Analysis level, learners categorize food items and match them with corresponding health categories to deepen their analytical understanding of nutrition (Activities 8–9). The Synthesis level integrates prior knowledge into creative output, encouraging students to retell what they have learned using structured sentence patterns such as “\_\_\_\_ are good,” and “Candy and cake are yummy but don’t eat too much!” (Activity 7). This structured progression from knowledge acquisition to synthesis fosters both linguistic competence and health awareness in an engaging, scaffolded manner.

7.2 Brief Comparison of the Lesson Plans

Table 1.

Bloom’s Level	NNEST: Healthy Food	NNEST: Expressing Yourself	NEST: Animal Skeletons	NEST: My Family
<b>Knowledge</b>	Read and repeat; food vocabulary drills	Math images to sentences	Review animal parts	Recall family terms
<b>Comprehension</b>	Classify food(healthy/unhealthy)	Picture-word associations	Label skeletons	Match descriptions with families
<b>Application</b>	Pair-work with sentence models	Fill-in-the-blank writing	Draw& describe animals	Write about own family
<b>Analysis</b>	Categorize food by pyramid	Discuss emotional description	Compare skeletons (human vs animal)	Compare family types
<b>Synthesis</b>	Write guided sentences about healthy eating	Write a “love note”	Invent new animals	Draw/ write own (real or imaged) family
<b>Evaluation</b>	Rarely emphasized	“Let’s think” task (light reflection)	Peer presentation/discussion	Reflect on similarities across families

According to Table 1, NNESTs often aid learners with their writing by giving them set structures and controlled language practice. A great deal of their lessons employ exercises from textbooks that focus on recognizing words and sentence patterns<sup>[20]</sup>, like “Read and repeat,” “Look and say,” and “Pair practice.” These activities mostly fit into the lower to middle levels of Bloom's Taxonomy, which are Knowledge, Comprehension, and Application. They focus on using language in a way that is based on form. This dependence on textbook material may limit chances for creative thinking or personal expression, even though it gives structure and clarity. Hence, getting NNESTs to modify textbooks and add their own knowledge, experiences, and resources could make the lessons more interesting and engage learners more deeply. Conversely, NESTs incorporated more Analysis, Synthesis, and Evaluation tasks, such as comparing skeletons, inventing creatures, or reflecting on familial diversity. In other words, some NEST-led lessons may not have included sufficient input or pre-teaching scaffolds to support all learners. As a result, only the more advanced or confident students might have fully benefited from these open-ended tasks. These findings align with prior research that NESTs often prioritize communicative competence over linguistic perfection<sup>[23][16]</sup>.

Beyond the differences in autonomy and objective setting, there is another key distinction emerging from the four lesson plans: How much space is given to student-led language production. In the lessons designed by NESTs, there is a noticeable tendency to include open-ended tasks where students are encouraged to create, imagine, and share their own ideas. For instance, in *My Family*, not only are learners asked to describe their own families, they are also invited to invent imaginary ones. Similarly, *Animal Skeletons* ends with students presenting their animal drawings and describing them in their own words. These activities illustrate more spontaneous use of language and give students the chance to go beyond controlled structures and have their own ideas if all students could follow the lesson. In contrast, the lesson plans from NNESTs tend to focus more on structured activities that guide students step-by-step. In *Healthy Food*, much of the work revolves around recognition, repetition, and matching tasks, while *Expressing Yourself* provides writing practice that is heavily modeled and scaffolded. These tasks are certainly useful, especially in early stages of language learning, but they generally offer less room for creative or personalized expression.

This difference may be due in part to the teachers' own language backgrounds and teaching experiences. Teachers in an L2 setting might be more careful about letting students speak freely because they are worried about mistakes or managing the classroom<sup>[12]</sup>. At the same time, NESTs seem to be more sure about letting students have their own voice, maybe because of their own language skills and training in the classroom that was mentioned in Holliday's study, who suggested that NESTs are socialized into individualistic, student-empowering classroom cultures, where communication is prioritized<sup>[20]</sup>. Thus, they believe that students' active participation is the key to a successful class and interactive and independent activities in teaching are of great significance<sup>[1]</sup>.

An interesting pattern emerged when comparing the sequencing of activities across the four lesson plans. The NESTs usually plan their lessons in a way that closely follows Bloom's Taxonomy, starting with simple tasks that test students' knowledge and understanding and moving on to harder ones that require analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. In both “*Animal Skeletons*” and “*My Family*,” students first do vocabulary recall or picture matching, and then they do creative tasks like making up animals or writing about families that aren't traditional. This step-by-step method shows that these teachers really care about building cognitive depth over time. They may have learned this from training that focuses on developmental sequencing in language learning<sup>[3]</sup>. The non-native English-speaking teachers (NNESTs), on the other hand, use a more mixed approach. In “*Healthy Food*” and “*Expressing Yourself*,” the build-up isn't as linear. For example, comprehension, application, and even creative writing tasks may all occur at the same time. Students might be asked to retell the information before they learn the sentence patterns. Rather than being a weakness, this flexible ordering may reflect context-driven decisions, such as time constraints, curriculum demands, or the need to sustain young learners' attention through varied and engaging tasks (Appendix 3). This method may actually be similar to a spiral model of teaching, where cognitive functions are revisited at different levels of depth. Students can reconstruct their understanding of knowledge multiple times and can also access the same topic multiple times at their own pace, making it easier to bridge learning gaps<sup>[4][17]</sup>.

These differences do not necessarily point to better or worse approaches, but rather highlight how teacher background and training can influence lesson design. NESTs seem to favor a more structured, developmental path, while NNESTs opt for a more integrated, sometimes pragmatic arrangement. Recognizing these tendencies can help educators reflect on their planning habits and potentially learn from one another's strengths.

When NNESTs plan lessons, they often stress using precise words and sentence patterns. This could assist students acquire basic grammar well. Activities like “read and match”, “Look,choose and write” all help students practice the targeted vocabulary and sentence patterns. NESTs, on the other hand, usually prefer students to be

creative, express themselves, and acquire knowledge about different cultures in the classroom, like asking them to draw imaginary animals and families. So, these two ways of teaching might work well together if they are used together, whether through co-teaching or collaborative curriculum development. In this way, students can benefit from more interesting lessons and improved learning outcomes in this way.

### 7.3 Instructional Design Philosophy

Table 2.

Aspect	NNESTs: “Healthy Food” / “Expressing Yourself”	NESTs: “Animal Skeletons” / “My Family”
Pedagogical Orientation	Textbook-based, content-heavy, structured by curriculum (PEP primary series)	Task-based, creativity-driven, loosely textbook-dependent
Cultural Integration	Strong integration of Chinese contexts. For example, the “Healthy Food” lesson uses the Chinese food pyramid, and “Expressing Yourself” discusses familial love in culturally resonant forms.	Culturally neutral or inclusive. For example, “My Family” features diverse family types rather than traditional nuclear units; “Animal Skeletons” includes imaginary creatures that encourage personalization. Cultural relevance is built through student choice rather than national context.
Language Support	Frequent use of scaffolding (pictures, sentence stems) Often focuses on completion, accuracy, and textbook alignment.	Higher expectation for linguistic independence, optional L1 support
Assessment Focus	Activities such as sentence matching and filling blanks are used for checking understanding.	Focus on creative expression and participation. Assessment appears more formative, emphasizing language use over correctness. Peer sharing and class displays are common.

According to Table 2, the results indicate that NNESTs generally utilize a curriculum-based, structurally scaffolded methodology for lesson planning. Their lessons are highly in line with national education standards and the order of the textbooks (for example, the PEP English series). They focus on accuracy, repetition, and vocabulary acquisition. For example, in the “Healthy Food” lesson, the teacher introduces vocabulary (e.g., “milk,” “vegetables,” “hamburger”) through flashcards and then reinforces it with structured repetition exercises, such as matching words to pictures and completing guided sentences like “I like \_\_\_.” Similarly, in the “Expressing Yourself” lesson, sentence stems such as “I love my \_\_\_ because...” are provided, which guides students to produce grammatically accurate and culturally appropriate expressions.

On the other hand, NESTs prefer to integrate some task-based and creative approaches. Their lessons give students more chances to be independent and personalized output. For example, the “Animal Skeletons” plan asks students to make up imaginary animals and write descriptive sentences. This gets them involved in the synthesis and evaluation stages of Bloom's Taxonomy<sup>[2]</sup>. In the “My Family” lesson, students are also asked to draw and discuss their own family structures, with a focus on non-traditional families. This shows a teaching philosophy that is culturally inclusive and focused on the students.

These patterns show that NNESTs often plan their lessons based on local education rules, high-stakes tests, and a need for linguistic accuracy. On the other hand, NESTs, which are based on Western teaching traditions, stress individual expression, creative meaning-making, and communication between people<sup>[33]</sup>.

### 7.4 Distribution of Autonomy in Learning

Table 3.

Level	NNEST Lessons	NEST Lessons
Teacher Control	High – tight control of input, repeated drills, strong guidance in comprehension tasks	Medium – teachers facilitate but learners make decisions (e.g., inventing animals, drawing their own family)
Learner Autonomy	Present but guided (e.g., “Let’s think”, “Pair work” with fixed sentence frames)	Strong – learners create unique content (e.g., write about an imaginary skeleton or describe a non-nuclear family)

Another important difference is how autonomy is shared. NNESTs tend to maintain control, so they typically design tasks that are clear and contribute to maintaining order in the classroom. NESTs, on the other hand, offer flexible frameworks and let students shape the content (for example, by making their own drawings, stories, or categories). This autonomy, while advantageous for motivation and engagement, may also pose challenges for NESTs operating in environments where structured assessment and adherence to textbooks are emphasized<sup>6</sup> and for the language proficiency of young EFL learners, who would struggle to express themselves in L2.

## 8. Analysis of the Interviews

This study sought to investigate the impact of cultural and linguistic backgrounds on EFL writing lesson planning by contrasting the perspectives of NESTs and NNESTs. Interviews with two NESTs (Eric and Anene) and two NNESTs (Miss Lin and Miss Xin) revealed several distinct patterns concerning instructional focus, autonomy distribution, and pedagogical challenges.

Firstly, one clear difference lies in the lesson objectives and planning priorities. NNESTs put a lot of emphasis on making sure that the curriculum is in line with language accuracy and step-by-step support. For instance, Miss Lin (NNEST) said that her main goal was to help her students write short, grammatically correct sentences that fit with the PEP textbook and the national curriculum standards (Appendix 3). NESTs like Eric, on the other hand, put more emphasis on creativity, building confidence, and meaningful communication, even at the most basic level of sentence structure. He talked about lessons that start with reviewing vocabulary through movement and end with making up sentences using sentence frames. However, Eric also acknowledged the need to align with curriculum expectations. He identified challenges in balancing prescribed grammar targets with communicative goals, noting: *“When the curriculum emphasizes grammar drills, which can conflict with communicative approaches, I am learning to bridge the gap by embedding grammar in meaningful tasks”* (Appendix 5).

When it came to autonomy and engagement, both NESTs mentioned the time constraints when having lessons. NESTs seemed more open to adding open-ended and student-driven learning opportunities. Anene stressed the importance of students' autonomy, noting *“I incorporate student autonomy by offering choices in writing topics and allowing students to set personal writing goals”* (Appendix 4), which is in line with what she has seen in culturally diverse classrooms. In the meantime, both NNESTs were more cautious about giving their students freedom. They preferred structured support through sentence starters or controlled writing formats because their students' language skills were lower and Chinese public schools were focused on tests (Appendix 3). It is worth mentioning that their targeted students are only primary school students and the structured support is indeed of necessity.

Cultural background also played a subtle yet influential role. NNESTs who were educated and trained in China understood the local educational norms and emotional expectations. One NNEST Miss Lin specifically mentioned using culturally resonant topics like filial piety to foster emotional connection and learning motivation. On the other hand, NESTs like Eric stressed the need to find a balance between Western teaching values like creativity and independence and the structured learning environment that Chinese students are used to.

Despite these differences, all four participants acknowledged the value of cross-cultural collaboration. NESTs realized that objective design required more structure and clarity which NNESTs are good at. Although NESTs noticed the importance of curriculum requirement in Chinese EFL context, they may encounter difficulty, like Anene said, *“I have encountered difficulties aligning lesson plans with students' needs when their interests diverge from the curriculum requirements. In such cases, I strive to find common ground where students can engage with the material while still meeting educational standards.”* At the same time, NNESTs stated they wanted to add more flexible, communicative activities that were inspired by their NEST coworkers. Anene said, *“By combining their strengths, [NESTs and NNESTs] can create a more holistic learning experience”* (Appendix 4). And Miss Xin noted, *“It mainly depends on what the teaching objectives of the writing lessons are, how the two teachers coordinate the teaching division of labor and the progress tracking after class.”* (Appendix 3).

The interviews also showed that these two groups face a few of the same problems, such as how to balance curriculum standards with student needs, especially in writing lessons where students' language levels are very different. This shared challenge makes it even clearer how helpful co-planned writing instruction could be.

In short, this interview shows that NESTs and NNESTs have different strengths which aid EFL writing instruction. NNESTs excel at structured, language-focused planning as they are aware of the local curriculum well, while NESTs often encourage pupils to express themselves creatively and take charge of their own learning. These findings indicate that collaborative lesson design between the two groups can result in writing instruction that is not only more effective but also more culturally appropriate, especially in contexts such as China where both groups are actively teaching.

## 9. Summary of Findings

The research utilized lesson plan analysis and semi-structured interviews to uncover consistent patterns that illuminate each group's pedagogical orientation and instructional challenges.

First, NESTs typically employ a step-by-step cognitive progression that is identical to Bloom's Taxonomy in both content and structure. In their lesson plans, which include "Animal Skeletons" and "My Family," they clearly move from assignments that test knowledge to higher-order thinking tasks like synthesis and evaluation. The focus on communicative competence in Western educational traditions may have affected the activities in these plans, which often included projects led by students, creativity, and connections to the real world. On the other hand, it is important to note that similar approaches are also advocated in China's national English Curriculum Standards<sup>[4]</sup>. NNESTs gave more lesson sequences that were based on the curriculum and had a clear structure. Sentence patterns, vocabulary drills, and repetition were very important in lesson activities like "Healthy Food" and "Expressing Yourself." Language accuracy and following national teaching resources are the most important things. Even though these classes sometimes have open-ended parts, the overall cognitive growth is spiral and more integrated with tasks.

The interviews supported these conclusions. It is clear that NESTs valued learner independence, adaptability, and the development of self-assurance. They also spent plenty of time changing their lessons based on what the students were interested in and how the class was going. On the other hand, NNESTs were worried about the need to "stay on track" with the goals of the curriculum, the content of the exams, and the levels of student proficiency. Consequently, teachers' freedom, structure, and practice that focuses on form are getting more attention. Both groups were interested in learning from each other's strengths and admitted that they have problems, especially when it comes to balancing engagement with curriculum requirements. For example, NESTs admitted that they needed to work on their own scaffolding and curriculum alignment, while NNESTs liked how NESTs could encourage creativity and spontaneity.

These results indicate more than merely a variation in teaching methodologies. The way NESTs and NNESTs set up their writing classes shows how they received their education, how they learned to be teachers, and the demands that different school systems place on them. Instead of thinking of these differences as opposing methods, it's better to think of them as complementary. More specifically, NNESTs provide clarity and consistency through well-organized lessons that follow the local curriculum. On the other hand, NESTs often bring energy to the classroom through activities that encourage creativity and self-expression. Combining these two advantages could result in a more comprehensive and successful writing program for young students, particularly when it comes to cooperative planning or team instruction.

## 10. Teaching Suggestions for Lower Primary EFL Writing Instruction

There are pros and cons to both native English speakers (NESTs) and non-native English speakers (NNESTs) when it comes to helping young EFL learners write.

NNESTs, particularly Chinese English teachers who are acquainted with the national curriculum, are great at delivering lessons that are clear, organized, and well-structured. Their deep familiarity with textbook content, exam expectations, and the linguistic challenges Chinese learners face enables them to design writing tasks that feel achievable and focused. In classes like "Healthy Food" or "Expressing Yourself," NNESTs often break writing down into smaller parts that are easier to understand. They do this by using structured sentence patterns, pictures, and repetition. This is especially useful for younger EFL learners who need clear instructions before they can speak for themselves. But this structured way of doing things can sometimes get too mechanical. Students may be tired of writing lessons that feel like grammar drills or vocabulary exercises, with little room for imagination or personal voice, leading to a probable risk that students associate writing only with correctness rather than creativity or communication. Hence, this is where NESTs often bring a needed balance. In lessons like "Animal Skeletons" or "My Family", native teachers encourage students to draw, imagine, and narrate. Students are invited to create stories, invent characters, and explore personal experiences. These open-ended tasks contribute to help young learners consider writing as meaningful and expressive. However, Anene noted, "Sometimes I may find that students can't totally engage in the activity, maybe, because their age or language proficiency." Hence, it is crucial to design activities that are both engaging and aligning with targeted students' levels. On the other hand, NESTs are not without challenges. Although they have noticed the importance of curriculum requirements, they may have problems meeting language targets while also making lessons fun and accessible. In terms of students' L1, Eric also suggested that "*sometimes when students propose questions about grammar rules, I find it difficult to explain in English in a simpler way that they can understand,*" (Appendix 5) and thus too much autonomy for young learners too soon may have a counter-effect. Also, some students may struggle to follow open tasks if they have

not yet acquired the necessary language structures. And while spontaneity and creativity are of great importance, they can lead to classroom management issues and students may not reach the learning objectives of the lesson if the lesson lacks clear focus, especially for younger children.

Thus, as NNESTs often adopt a teaching method with clear structure and clear language objectives, it helps students master sentence patterns and vocabulary. However, if they rely too much on textbooks and templates, it may inhibit students' creativity in language expression. On the contrary, NESTs tend to encourage students to express themselves freely and output in a personalized way, but excessive openness may make students with weak language foundation feel at a loss. Therefore, it is recommended that teachers organize writing activities through the "structure + open" model: lay the foundation through input and sentence construction in the early stage, and stimulate students' output through semi-open tasks in the later stage. The second point is that NNESTs may be dependent on the content of the textbooks to a large extent and follow the textbook structure and examination requirements in the teaching design. Although this method ensures the consistency of teaching standards, it may not be suitable for the cognitive and language development rhythm of all students. It is recommended that teachers should not only understand the textbooks, but also adapt the textbooks and adjust the tasks and redesign the materials according to the students' interests, age characteristics and actual language level. The third point is that writing tasks such as "writing stories about family members" or "creating imaginary animals" may be too difficult for lower grade students despite their high degree of openness. It is recommended that teachers gradually transition and add scaffolding when designing tasks, such as providing vocabulary lists, sentence cards, graphic templates, etc., to help students gradually transition from "imitative writing" to "expressive writing". Besides, some NESTs may not be familiar with the national curriculum standards, and may not be good at explaining grammar. And some NNESTs may lack training in how to carry out creative thinking or task-based teaching. Therefore, schools and training institutions should strengthen the integration of teaching concepts and sharing of classroom strategies in teacher training, provide NESTs with curriculum standard guides and language support strategies, and provide NNESTs with task-based writing training and cross-cultural teaching skills improvement. Finally, as all four teachers mentioned, collaboration between NESTs and NNESTs are indispensable, since it helps improve teachers' language skills, cultural understanding and teaching strategies, and promotes improved classroom design and emotional support<sup>[17][22]</sup>, ultimately "*benefiting students' writing skills in a comprehensive manner*" (Appendix 4).

Importantly, these adjustments are so feasible that large systemic changes are not necessarily required. Even simple modifications can shift the classroom dynamic and improve student engagement. Ultimately, teaching writing to young EFL learners is not just about accuracy or creativity, it is about giving students both the structure to feel secure and the freedom to express themselves. When NNESTs and NESTs reflect on their strengths and are open to learning from each other, writing lessons will be more than just assignments; they'll be chances for students to think, imagine, and grow in both languages.

## 11. Conclusion

This study shows how NESTs and NNESTs have different but complementary strengths which facilitate EFL writing lessons for lower primary students in China. NNESTs frequently deliver meticulously organized, curriculum-compliant lessons that emphasize precision and lucidity. This method works particularly well with young learners who learn best through repetition, routines, and straightforward examples. NESTs, on the other hand, are more likely to create activities that are more exploratory and student-centered, with a focus on voice, creativity, and personal engagement. But it's important to note that this openness can sometimes confuse or disengage lower-level students, especially when they are not receiving enough help with language. Both groups of teachers can definitely learn from each other and get benefits from doing so. NNESTs might explore how to incorporate more free expression, flexibility, and reflection into their writing lessons, while NESTs could use more scaffolding techniques to help students who are just starting to learn a language. Professional development and collaborative planning spaces could be great places for these cross-cultural exchanges to happen.

That said, the study has clear limitations. The small sample size and limited scope which focused solely on lesson plans without student learning data. It means that findings should be interpreted cautiously. It remains unclear how these lesson designs play out in real classroom settings or whether they lead to measurable gains in students' writing development. Future research should include in-class implementations of co-planned lessons, student performance tracking, and learner feedback to more fully evaluate the effectiveness of different planning styles. Longitudinal studies that follow teacher pairs working together across a term could also offer deeper insight into how mutual learning and collaboration evolve over time.

All in all, while this study only captures a glimpse of current teaching patterns, its real strength lies in pointing toward more flexible and collaborative ways of teaching writing in China's primary EFL classrooms. Rather than

arguing which approach is better, the focus should be on how these different strengths can come together. When teachers draw on each other's methods, i.e., structure from one, creativity from the other, students are more likely to feel both supported and inspired in their writing.

## References

- [1] Deng, X., & Zhang, Y. (2023). Exploring native-speakerism in China's EFL classrooms: Perceptions and implications. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 14(1), 1–10.
- [2] Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Schmid, R. F., Waddington, D. I., & Pickup, D. I. (2019). Twenty-first century adaptive teaching and individualized learning operationalized as specific blends of student-centered instructional events: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(4), e1017. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1017>
- [3] Bloom, B. S. (Ed.). (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. David McKay Company.
- [4] Braine, G. (2023). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Routledge.
- [5] Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The process of education*. Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674028999>
- [6] Carless, D., & Walker, E. (2006). Effective team teaching between local and native-speaking English teachers. *Language and Education*, 20(6), 463–477. <https://doi.org/10.2167/le627.0>
- [7] Cheng, X. (2011). The 'English curriculum standards' in China: Rationales and issues. In *English language education across Greater China* (pp. 133–150). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.29308474.11>
- [8] Cheng, X., & Zhang, L. J. (2022). Teachers helping EFL students improve their writing through written feedback: The case of native and non-native English-speaking teachers' beliefs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 804313. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.804313>
- [9] Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185–209. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587717>
- [10] Demir, Y. (2017). Native and non-native English teachers' perceptions of their roles, teaching practices and teacher identity. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13(2), 220–237.
- [11] Elmawi, E. E. (2021). *The impact of using peer editing as an effective feedback tool on developing Libyan EFL students' writing performance* [Unpublished master's thesis].
- [12] Floris, F. D., & Renandya, W. A. (2020). Supporting non-native English speaking teachers in the classroom. In A. S. Mahboob (Ed.), *The NNEST lens: Non-native English speakers in TESOL* (pp. 121–132).
- [13] Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365–387. <https://doi.org/10.58680/ccc198115885>
- [14] Freeman, D. (2016). *Educating second language teachers: The same things done differently*. Oxford University Press.
- [15] Gao, Y. (2018). *An exploratory sequential study of Chinese EFL teachers' beliefs and practices in reading and teaching reading* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Leicester].
- [16] Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools*. Alliance for Excellent Education.
- [17] Harden, R. M., & Stamper, N. (1999). What is a spiral curriculum? *Medical Teacher*, 21(2), 141–143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01421599979752>
- [18] Huang, Y. (2024). Exam-Oriented Education and Quality-Oriented Education in China: A Comparative Analysis-Taking English Education as an Example. *Lecture Notes in Education Psychology and Public Media*, 36, 125–130. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7048/36/20240439>
- [19] Huang, Y., & Zhang, L. J. (2020). Does a process-genre approach help improve students' argumentative writing in English as a foreign language? Findings from an intervention study. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 36(4), 339–364. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2019.1649223>
- [20] Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford University Press.
- [21] Jeon, I. J. (2010). Exploring the co-teaching practice of native and non-native English teachers in Korea. *English Teaching*, 65(3), 43–64. <https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.65.3.201009.43>

- [22] Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203878033>
- [23] Jun-shuan, L. I. U. (2020). The perceptions of Chinese ELT stakeholders on the employment of foreign English language teachers. *Journal of Literature and Art Studies*, 10(6), 478–485. <https://doi.org/10.17265/2159-5836/2020.06.004>
- [24] Khan, H. (2011). A study of the effectiveness of lesson planning on teaching performance of secondary school teachers. *Journal of Educational Research*, 14(2), 87–98.
- [25] Korkmazgil, S. (2023). Investigating EFL teachers' coursebook dependency: A convergent mixed-methods study. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 12(4), 776–787. <https://doi.org/10.14686/buefad.1283398>
- [26] Cheng, L., & Wang, H. (2004). Understanding professional challenges faced by Chinese teachers of English. *TESL Canada Journal*, 22(1), 1–18.
- [27] Li, J. (2023). *A research on relationship between student-centered approach and student competence development in higher education: Case studies in China and Italy* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Padua].
- [28] Liu, J. (2020). Native and non-native English-speaking teachers in China: Perceptions, preferences, and practices. *Asian Englishes*, 22(1), 52–68.
- [29] Luo, W. H. (2006). Collaboration between native and non-native English-speaking teachers: How does it work? *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 3(3), 1–17.
- [30] Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who's worth more? *ELT Journal*, 46(4), 340–349. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/46.4.340>
- [31] Park, G. (2012). "I am never afraid of being recognized as an NNES": One teacher's journey in claiming and embracing her nonnative-speaker identity. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(1), 127–151. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.4>
- [32] Rahman, M. M., & Yuzar, R. (2020). Students' and parents' preferences for native and non-native English teachers in EFL contexts. *International Journal of English Language and Literature*, 1(1), 1–11.
- [33] Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009024532>
- [34] Savignon, S. J. (2002). *Communicative language teaching: Linguistic theory and classroom practice* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- [35] Schenck, A. (2018). *NESTs, necessary or not? Examining the impact of native English speaker instruction in South Korea* [Master's thesis, California State University, Long Beach].
- [36] Sung, C. C. M. (2014). An exploratory study of Hong Kong students' perceptions of native and non-native English-speaking teachers in ELT. *Asian Englishes*, 16(1), 32–46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2014.880252>
- [37] Shinhye, L. (2011). Examining the effectiveness of communicative language teaching for non-native English speakers in the Korean context. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(2), 217–235.
- [38] Wong, R. M. H. (2018). Native-speaking English teachers (NETs) in Hong Kong: Challenges, effectiveness, and equity issues. *Asian Englishes*, 20(3), 223–238.
- [39] Wright, G. B. (2011). Student-centered learning in higher education. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 23(1), 92–97.
- [40] Wu, L. (2021). The impact of native English input on Chinese students' listening performance: A longitudinal study. *Foreign Language Education*, 42(4), 107–114.
- [41] Zheng, Q. (2019). A comparative study between NESTs and NNESTs. In *5th International Conference on Arts, Design and Contemporary Education (ICADCE 2019)* (pp. 854–858). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icadce-19.2019.182>
- [42] van Diggele, C., Burgess, A., & Mellis, C. (2020). Planning, preparing and structuring a small group teaching session. *BMC Medical Education*, 20(Suppl 2), 462. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-020-02281-4>

### Appendix 1: The original Interview

#### Pilot Interview

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research. This interview aims to understand how cultural and language backgrounds influence lesson plan designs in EFL writing classes and to identify challenges faced by teachers in the planning process. Reiterate confidentiality and obtain verbal consent to record the session.

#### Introduction

- 1. Can you tell me about your teaching background, including your experience in EFL writing classes?
2. What factors do you consider when designing your lesson plans for writing classes?

#### Objectives and Structure

- 1. What are the primary objectives of your writing lessons (e.g., linguistic accuracy, creativity, communicative competence)?
2. How do you structure your lessons from the beginning to the end?
3. Could you describe the sequence of activities in this writing lesson?

#### Teaching Philosophy

In what ways do you adapt your lesson plans to meet the cultural expectations of your students or the educational environment?

#### Autonomy and Engagement

- 1. How do you incorporate student autonomy in your lesson plans? Do you encourage independent exploration or focus more on guided instruction?
2. Do you believe your background influences how you engage students during lessons?

#### Challenges in Lesson Planning

- 1. What are the biggest challenges you face when designing lesson plans?
2. Have you encountered difficulties aligning lesson plans with students' needs or curriculum requirements?

#### Writing-Specific Focus

- 1. What types of writing activities do you prioritize (e.g., pre-writing, peer editing, creative tasks)? Why?
2. How do you balance grammar-focused instruction with activities that foster creativity and autonomy?

#### Insights

- 1. What do you think NESTs and NNESTs can learn from each other regarding lesson planning?
2. How do you see the potential for collaboration between NESTs and NNESTs in designing effective writing lessons?

Thank you for your participation and time.

### Appendix 2, Miss Xin's Interview

#### Interview

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research. This interview aims to understand how cultural and language backgrounds influence lesson plan designs in EFL writing classes and to identify challenges faced by teachers in the planning process. Reiterate confidentiality and obtain verbal consent to record the session.

#### Introduction

- 1. Can you tell me about your teaching background, including your experience in EFL writing classes?
I have taught IGCSE Second Language English in an international school in China for more than 4 years, obviously writing was a part of the syllabus as students have to take an exam afterwards.

- 2. What factors do you consider when designing your lesson plans for writing classes?

- a. Teaching and learning objectives.
b. Students' proficiency level.
c. Differentiation.
d. Student-centered activities.
e. Language support (e.g. writing prompts)
f. Homework

#### Objectives and Structure

- 1. What are the primary objectives of your writing lessons (e.g., linguistic accuracy, creativity, communicative competence)?

The primary objectives would be linguistic accuracy and the organization of ideas.

- 2. How do you structure your lessons from the beginning to the end? It depends on the teaching objective of the lesson. There are some structures like lead-in activity to activate students' prior knowledge, in-class activities to engage

students, etc.

- 3. Could you describe the sequence of activities in this writing lesson?

- a. Lead-in activity to activate students' prior knowledge
b. In-class activities to introduce the writing task and engage students
c. Language support to facilitate students' engagement and learning
d. Group work or individual work in class
e. Homework after class

#### Teaching Philosophy

In what ways do you adapt your lesson plans to meet the cultural expectations of your students or the educational environment?

I don't think there was rigid cultural expectations for students back then, but as a teacher, I try to be more inclusive and prepare students to be exposed to a variety of cultures so that they could be more motivated in learning. I believe that students benefit more, in terms of motivation and global perspective, when they are encouraged in class.

#### Autonomy and Engagement

- 1. How do you incorporate student autonomy in your lesson plans? Do you encourage independent exploration or focus more on guided instruction?

It was of significance that students play a more active role in learning. Therefore, students' autonomy was prioritized in my previous teaching. However, enabling them to have the autonomy doesn't mean that students don't need to be guided and facilitated. It should be a joint effort by both teacher and students. So it is fair to say that I do support both independent exploration and guided instruction to maximize students learning.

- 2. Do you believe your background influences how you engage students during lessons?

Yes, I do. Background plays a role as that is part of my prior knowledge. However, besides that, teachers' practices and experience also contribute to how the engagement is developed in class.

#### Challenges in Lesson Planning

- 1. What are the biggest challenges you face when designing lesson plans?

I would say the primary challenge would be differentiation. To cater to individualized learning, differentiation is inevitable. In this case, more time, energy and effort have to be invested in lesson planning.

- 2. Have you encountered difficulties aligning lesson plans with students' needs or curriculum requirements?

I don't think so.

#### Writing-Specific Focus

- 1. What types of writing activities do you prioritize (e.g., pre-writing, peer editing, creative tasks)? Why?

I prefer creative tasks as students would be more engaged, which is one of the most important factors contributing to successful learning. Apart from that, creative tasks can further motivate students to explore or expand their learning after class, enhancing learning to a greater extent. But I would also consider time constraints, curriculum demands, and the need to sustain young learners' attention when I plan activities.

- 2. How do you balance grammar-focused instruction with activities that foster creativity and autonomy?

Grammar-focused instruction can also be creative. So if the instruction is creative itself, there will not be much difficulty in achieving the balance.

#### Insights

- 1. What do you think NESTs and NNESTs can learn from each other regarding lesson planning?

我思考中国的 lesson planning 更偏向于结果导向，注重语法，被学日规范为模板，得到教师的 lesson planning 更以过程导向，注重思维，教学成果更开放。

- 2. How do you see the potential for collaboration between NESTs and NNESTs in designing effective writing lessons?

There is definitely potential. It mainly depends on what the teaching objectives of the writing lessons are, how the two teachers coordinate the teaching division of labor and the progress tracking after class.

Thank you for your participation and time.

### Appendix 3, Miss Lin's Interview

#### Interview

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research. This interview aims to understand how cultural and language backgrounds influence lesson plan designs in EFL writing classes and to identify challenges faced by teachers in the planning process. Reiterate confidentiality and obtain verbal consent to record the session.

#### Introduction

- Q Can you tell me about your teaching background, including your experience in EFL writing classes?

I've been teaching English in China for over ten years. I received my teacher training in a normal university here, and I've worked primarily in public primary schools. Over the years, I've become quite familiar with the PEF textbook series, especially for Grade 3. I teach writing as part of integrated reading - writing lessons, mostly in short, guided formats because students at this level are still developing their vocabulary and sentence structures.

- Q What factors do you consider when designing your lesson plans for writing classes?

I usually start with the unit theme and teaching objectives from the national curriculum. The main goal is to help students use simple English to express personal ideas. So linguistic accuracy is important, but I also try to foster confidence and emotional connection. In this unit, for example, students write short sentences or fill in blanks to talk about feelings - this encourages both language use and self-expression.

#### Objectives and Structure

- Q What are the primary objectives of your writing lessons?

The main goal is to help students use simple English to express personal ideas. So linguistic accuracy is important, but I also try to foster confidence and emotional connection. In this unit, for example, students write short sentences or fill in blanks to talk about feelings - this encourages both language use and self-expression.

- Q How do you structure your lessons from the beginning to the end? Could you describe the sequence of activities in this writing lesson?

I typically follow a pre-reading, while-reading, and post-reading structure. In this lesson, I start with singing and chanting to activate prior knowledge. Then we move to matching pictures and texts, doing key phrases, and guided reading. After that, students

complete sentence frames and finally write a "love note" to express their feelings.

#### Teaching Philosophy

- Q In what ways do you adapt your lesson plans to meet the cultural expectations of your students or the educational environment?

I use familiar topics like family, school life, and feelings. I also integrate values that are important in Chinese culture, such as filial piety and gratitude. For example, the lesson accepted way. I try to strike a balance between textbook requirements and what students are emotionally comfortable with.

#### Autonomy and Engagement

- Q How do you incorporate student autonomy in your lesson plans? Do you encourage independent exploration or focus more on guided instruction?

Because my students are young and still developing their English ability, I usually provide strong guidance - like sentence starters and picture prompts. However, I do offer moments of choice, like letting them choose how to express love (drawing, writing, or speaking). Autonomy is present but structured.

- Q Do you believe your background influences how you engage students during lessons?

Yes, absolutely. I understand what it's like to learn English as a foreign language. I'm very aware of students' anxiety or hesitation, so I build in lots of repetition and visual support. My background helps me design lessons that scaffold learning, step-by-step, and avoid overwhelming students.

#### Challenges in Lesson Planning

- Q What are the biggest challenges you face when designing lesson plans?

Aligning lesson creatively with the curriculum is one challenge. There's a pressure to meet textbook standards and prepare for assessments, so sometimes writing tasks have to be more controlled. Also, limited class time means I can't always let students explore freely.

- Q Have you encountered difficulties aligning lesson plans with students' needs or curriculum requirements?

Yes, especially when students' actual language levels are lower than expected. The textbook assumes they can recognize and write certain words, but in reality, they may need more foundational work. I often adjust tasks to make them easier or break them down into smaller steps.

#### Writing-Specific Focus

- Q: What types of writing activities do you prioritize and why?

At this level, I prioritize short sentence writing, sentence completion, and introducing story writing or descriptive writing. But in Grade 3, we focus on simple, structured writing.

- Q: How do you balance grammar-focused instruction with activities that foster creativity and autonomy?

I embed grammar into the task. For example, when writing "We show our love to..." , students naturally practice sentence structures while choosing their own expression method. I don't isolate grammar drills - I integrate them into meaningful output.

#### Insights

- Q: What do you think NESTs and NNESTs can learn from each other regarding lesson planning?

NNESTs are good at structure and scaffolding; we understand what our students struggle with. But I think we can learn from NESTs to allow more flexibility and promote creativity. Sometimes we worry too much about correctness.

- Q: How do you see the potential for collaboration between NESTs and NNESTs in designing effective writing lessons?

I think collaboration would be very helpful. NESTs can bring in ideas for more open-ended tasks and authentic language use. NNESTs can provide insight into students' learning needs and classroom management. Together, we could design lessons that are both effective and enjoyable.

Thank you for your participation and time.

### Appendix 4, Anene’s Interview

<p><b>Interview</b></p> <p>Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research. This interview aims to understand how cultural and language backgrounds influence lesson plan designs in EFL writing classes and to identify challenges faced by teachers in the planning process.</p> <p>Restate confidentiality and obtain verbal consent to record the session.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>1. Can you tell me about your teaching background, including your experience in EFL writing classes?</p> <p>Teaching Background: I have been a teacher for many years, specializing in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) with a focus on writing classes. My experience includes teaching students from diverse backgrounds, tailoring my approach to meet their unique linguistic needs. I have developed and implemented various curricula that emphasize both the technical aspects of writing and the creative process, allowing students to express themselves effectively in English.</p> <p>2. What factors do you consider when designing your lesson plan for writing classes?</p> <p>When designing my lesson plans, I consider several factors, including the students' proficiency levels, cultural backgrounds, specific learning goals, and the overall curriculum objectives. Additionally, I take into account the types of writing skills I want to develop, such as narrative, descriptive, or argumentative writing, and I ensure that my plans include a variety of engaging activities to maintain student interest.</p> <p><b>Objectives and Structure</b></p> <p>1. What are the primary objectives of your writing lessons (e.g., linguistic accuracy, creativity, communicative competence)?</p>	<p>The primary objectives of my writing lessons are to enhance linguistic accuracy, foster creativity, and build communicative competence. I aim to ensure students not only produce grammatically correct writing but also engage their audience effectively.</p> <p>2. How do you structure your lessons from the beginning to the end?</p> <p>I typically structure my lessons to begin with a warm-up activity that activates prior knowledge, followed by direct instruction on specific writing techniques. After that, I guide students through collaborative writing exercises, allowing them to practice in pairs or small groups, before moving to independent writing tasks. I conclude with a reflection or sharing session where students can discuss their work.</p> <p>3. Could you describe the sequence of activities in this writing lesson?</p> <p>In a typical writing lesson, I would start with a discussion of the writing topic, followed by a mini-lesson on relevant techniques or styles. This would be followed by brainstorming sessions, drafting, peer review, and finally, a revision phase where students refine their work based on feedback.</p> <p><b>Teaching Philosophy</b></p> <p>In what ways do you adapt your lesson plans to meet the cultural expectations of your students in the educational environment?</p> <p>I adapt my lesson plans to meet the cultural expectations of my students by incorporating culturally relevant topics and examples that resonate with their experiences. I also consider the educational environment, ensuring that my methods align with institutional goals while being sensitive to the diverse backgrounds of my students.</p> <p><b>Autonomy and Engagement</b></p> <p>1. How do you incorporate student autonomy in your lesson plans? Do you encourage independent exploration or focus more on guided instruction?</p> <p>I incorporate student autonomy by offering choices in writing topics and</p>	<p>essential for developing a love for writing.</p> <p>2. How do you balance grammar-focused instruction with activities that foster creativity and autonomy?</p> <p>I balance grammar-focused instruction with creative activities by integrating grammar lessons within the context of writing assignments. For instance, I might focus on a specific grammatical structure during a creative writing task, allowing students to practice grammar in a meaningful way.</p> <p><b>Insights</b></p> <p>1. What do you think NESTs and NNESTs can learn from each other regarding lesson planning?</p> <p>NESTs and NNESTs can learn a great deal from each other regarding lesson planning. NESTs might offer insights into native expressions and cultural nuances, while NNESTs bring a deeper understanding of the challenges faced by language learners, enabling the development of more effective strategies.</p> <p>2. How do you see the potential for collaboration between NESTs and NNESTs in designing effective writing lessons?</p> <p>There is significant potential for collaboration between NESTs and NNESTs in designing effective writing lessons. By combining their strengths, they can create a more holistic learning experience that addresses both linguistic proficiency and cultural relevance, ultimately benefiting students' writing skills in a comprehensive manner.</p> <p>Thank you for your participation and time.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Date: 12 June 2025 Name: Anene Nd</p>
---	--	---

### Appendix 5, Eric’s Interview

<p><b>Interview</b></p> <p>Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research. This interview aims to understand how cultural and language backgrounds influence lesson plan designs in EFL writing classes and to identify challenges faced by teachers in the planning process.</p> <p>Restate confidentiality and obtain verbal consent to record the session.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>Q: Can you tell me about your teaching background, including your experience in EFL writing classes?</p> <p>I've been teaching for 9 years total – 4 years in the U.S. and the past 5 in a Chinese international school. In the U.S., I taught general elementary education, but in China, I've specialized more in EFL, especially writing and literacy for young learners aged 3-8. I've developed a strong interest in helping young EFL students express themselves confidently in writing, even at a basic sentence level.</p> <p>Q: What factors do you consider when designing your lesson plans for writing classes?</p> <p>Age appropriateness is crucial. I consider linguistic level, cognitive development, and cultural familiarity. For my current learners, I also factor in how to scaffold vocabulary and sentence structures as they move from guided practice to independent expression. Visuals, movement, and peer interaction are also priorities in my planning.</p> <p><b>Objectives and Structure</b></p> <p>Q: What are the primary objectives of your writing lessons?</p> <p>My main goals are developing linguistic accuracy and building confidence in sentence construction. At this level, creativity is encouraged, but I still prioritize correct use of present simple and vocabulary related to themes like animals or body parts.</p> <p>Q: How do you structure your lessons from the beginning to the end?</p> <p>I start with a vocabulary review using visuals and physical engagement. Then I move to a teacher-led model or shared writing activity, followed by independent work. The lesson ends with a sharing or gallery walk to reinforce learning through peer interaction.</p> <p>Q: Could you describe the sequence of activities in this writing lesson?</p>	<p>Sure, in the "Animal Skeletons" lesson, we begin by reviewing animal body parts using a drawing and games. Then, we co-create a fictional animal skeleton on the board. Students draw and label their own skeletons. They write sentences describing their creations using sentence frames. Finally, we display and share the work. A fun game like "Simon Says" adds movement and reinforces vocabulary.</p> <p><b>Teaching Philosophy</b></p> <p>Q: In what ways do you adapt your lesson plans to meet the cultural expectations of your students in the educational environment?</p> <p>Chinese students are used to structure and teacher-led instruction, so I provide clear models and scaffolded language. However, I also integrate Western pedagogical elements like creativity, autonomy, and peer work to balance both expectations. This hybrid approach supports engagement while respecting cultural norms.</p> <p><b>Autonomy and Engagement</b></p> <p>Q: How do you incorporate student autonomy in your lesson plans?</p> <p>I give students choice in their creations – such as what kind of animal to invent – and encourage them to label and describe it independently. I also allow time for them to share and reflect with peers, which ignites their ownership of their work.</p> <p>Q: Do you believe your background influences how you engage students during lessons?</p> <p>Absolutely. Coming from the U.S., I naturally value student voice and creativity. I try to foster a classroom where exploration is encouraged – even if students are at a low language level. I want them to feel they have something to say.</p> <p><b>Challenges in Lesson Planning</b></p> <p>Q: What are the biggest challenges you face when designing lesson plans?</p> <p>Balancing curriculum demands with student needs can be tricky. I need to meet language targets while also making lessons fun and accessible. Sometimes when students propose questions about grammar rules, I find it difficult to explain in English in a simpler way that they can understand.</p> <p>Q: Have you encountered difficulties aligning lesson plans with students' needs or curriculum requirements?</p> <p>Yes, especially when the curriculum emphasizes grammar drills, which can conflict with</p>	<p>communicative approaches. I am learning to bridge the gap by embedding grammar in meaningful tasks.</p> <p><b>Writing-Specific Focus</b></p> <p>Q: What types of writing activities do you prioritize? Why?</p> <p>I emphasize pre-writing (drawing and brainstorming) and sentence writing with scaffolded models. Peer editing is minimal at this level due to language constraints. I focus on creating fun, visual, and meaningful contexts for writing.</p> <p>Q: How do you balance grammar-focused instruction with activities that foster creativity and autonomy?</p> <p>I integrate grammar through creative contexts. For example, in the "Animal Skeletons" lesson, students use present simple to describe their imaginary animal. It's grammar with a purpose, which keeps them motivated and reinforces language in context.</p> <p><b>Insights</b></p> <p>Q: What do you think NESTs and NNESTs can learn from each other regarding lesson planning?</p> <p>NESTs often bring creativity and flexibility, while NNESTs bring deep knowledge of language learning strategies and student needs. Sharing these strengths can lead to more balanced and effective lessons.</p> <p>Q: How do you see the potential for collaboration between NESTs and NNESTs in designing effective writing lessons?</p> <p>There's huge potential. NESTs can model communicative, interactive methods, while NNESTs can ensure language goals are met with proper scaffolding. Co-planning helps meet both curricular and student-centered goals more efficiently.</p>
--	--	---

### Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).